

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL INDICATOR FRAMEWORK FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Ali Ishag Adam Mohamed¹
Mustafa Omar Mohammed²
Mohd Nizam Bin Baron³

¹Faculty Economic & Management Sciences, Universiti Islam Antarabangsa Malaysia (UIAM), Malaysia,
(E-mail: alialos2002@yahoo.com)

²Faculty Economic & Management Sciences, Universiti Islam Antarabangsa Malaysia (UIAM), Malaysia,
(E-mail: mustafa@iium.edu.my)

³Faculty Economic & Management Sciences, Universiti Islam Antarabangsa Malaysia (UIAM), Malaysia,
(E-mail: mohdnizam@iium.edu.my)

Accepted date: 21-11-2018

Published date: 17-03-2019

To cite this document: Mohamed, A. I. A., Mohammed, M. O., & Baron, M. N. (2019). A Critical Analysis of Social Indicator Framework for Sustainable Development. *Journal of Islamic, Social, Economics and Development (JISED)*, 4(16), 82 - 93.

Abstract: *This paper focuses on the idea of a critical analysis of social indicator framework for sustainable development. The paper has reviewed the concept of development and its indicators over the last seven decades. The concept of development has evolved from economic growth to human resource development, poverty alleviation, sustainable development, human development, and most recently the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) towards Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). A preliminary finding shows that the concept of development in conventional economic literature has focused more on the physical and material aspects of development, although of recent after introducing SDGs these literatures have begun emphasis on the social and moral aspects of development as well. Besides the concept of development, the indicators are also designed for this concept which covers material and physical aspects. Both the concept of the material and physical are not comprehensive to reflect the dynamics of the social aspect of development. The paper aims to identify the concept of development and its indicator from related modern literature on development and argues for the need of a new social indicator framework for sustainable development. Furthermore, the paper adopts meta-analysis and content analysis methods by reviewing and analysing of related literature from journals, books, conferences and reports. The final outcome of this paper reveals that there is an urgent need to develop a social indicator framework for sustainable development.*

Keywords: *Development Indicators, Social Indicators, Development Concept, Sustainable Development*

Introduction

The concept of development in conventional economies dates back again towards the 19th century and has become applied in many fields that include social sciences, physical sciences

and natural sciences (Cobbinah et al. 2011). For example, in the natural sciences, it absolutely was used by simply Aristotle to explain the nature of all items that develop, and Charles Darwin applied it in his basic principle of progress of variety (Cobbinah et al. 2011). In the field of social sciences, the concept of development was mainly used in the context of economic development, and which has constantly evolved over the decades. In the 1950s, the idea of development was mainly used in the context of economic development, gradually becoming primary for the newly independent countries (Sakamoto, 2009). Development, in general, was seen as progress by nations for societal welfare (Awan et al. 2012). Economic growth became the key focus and the main instrument to bring about structural and functional changes to individuals and society as well. Hence, economic growth became the main objective of development (Aziz et al. 2015). During the period, several developing countries realized their economic growth targets, yet the living circumstances in the public would not really change (Anto, 2009). Mass poverty continued in the developing countries and many people would certainly not have gain access to major quality education, employment, a decent lifestyle and health facilities. This implied that generally there was something wrong with the concept of economic development itself, along with its objectives, because economic development was supposed to involve a number of changes quantitative as well as qualitative. However, economic development during the period was only focused on quantitative aspects rather than the focus of the qualitative aspects that depend on non-economic aspects which are very fundamental to development. Consequently, most of the experts in this matter demanded pertaining to dethronement of economic growth, and described economic development in terms of poverty alleviation, quality education, good health and changes in the composition of input and output. The debate on this issue led to expanding the dimensions of economic development to include the notion of human resource development in the 1960s, albeit briefly in part, because it lacked theoretical foundation (Yap & Cabalfin, 2008). In the 1970s, the concept of economic development shifted into poverty alleviation with a new emphasis on the distribution of income and basic needs. As a result, a new view of development emerged known as sustainable development.

In the 1980s, the global trend of development expanded into sustainable development, which usually became one of the primary points to redefining development, along with the acknowledgement of the environmental aspects (Sakamoto, 2009). Based on the definition of the Brundtland Report on development in 1987, sustainable development shifted the focus of development to environmental, economic and social aspects (Tso & Li, 2012). During the period, sustainable development was only focused on environmental and economic dimensions. However, social dimension which is the main focus of the paper appeared in the middle of 1990s as very fundamental component to sustainable development, but its literature and definition are still missing. In the 1990s, the emphasis was given to human development as the key objective of development, “putting people at the center of the development agenda” (Yap & Cabalfin, 2008). In this context, the conceptualization of human development was closely connected to the basic principle of the idea of social development (Sakamoto, 2009). Matching to these evolutions of development concept, the idea of social development became enhanced, and its importance was confirmed globally in the Social Summit of 1995 (Awan et al. 2012). However, the definition of social development does not capture some components which are very fundamental to development. In the 2000s, the concept of sustainable development was extended in the form of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) as a new guidance for the global efforts on development over the next 15 years. In this new concept, eight goals were spelled out. These goals mainly focused on social development. It was expected that by 2015, the human race socially would have achieved the following: the ending extreme poverty, achieving quality education for all and preventable disease. However, by

2015 much of these goals were not achieved because the MDGs focused on poverty which understood as meeting basic needs, and its alleviation. Due to these limitations of MDGs, a new concept of emerged Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). It was intended to remedy the weaknesses in MDGs. The sustainable development goals (SDGs) are about sustainable development as a new guidance for the world after 2015, which adopted by the United Nations as a guiding principle for economic, environmental, and social development (Fukuda-Parr, 2016). These goals mainly focused on social development, and it is expected that by 2030, will have achieved the following: end poverty, fight inequality and injustice, good health, quality of education, and tackle climate change (UNDP, 2015). Although the social development which is the main focus in this paper appears as an important aspect of development, its literature and definition are still missing.

Following the evolutions in conception of development, the indicators of development also evolved over the last seven decades. Much of the literature have shown that the common indicators of development from conventional perspective are the Human Development Index (HDI), Physical Quality of Life Index (PQLI) and Gross Domestic Product GDP per capita income as well (Ray, 2008). Over the decades, much of the literature have found out that the PQLI has critiqued for its limited dimensionality, particularly after the lunch of the HDI, and the greater part of the literature on development came up to the conclusion that it is impossible to simply agree the output of the composite development index not having good and very well theoretical basis (Alkire & Foster, 2011; Ramli et al. 2015). This is because the PQLI takes into account formulated with simply the physical factors: adult literacy, infant survival rate and life expectancy at birth. Even though HDI possesses a life expectancy at birth, educational attainment and real GDP per capita (PPP\$). The two these types PQLI and HDI happen to be very equivalent, the key difference among the two being the inclusion of income in HDI and exclusion of the exact same from PQLI. In such a way, HDI includes both physical and economic attributes of development, and PQLI possesses the particular physical aspects of life. Yet, HDI has been criticized for containing some indicators instead of captured many social indicators to represent more areas of social concern that reflecting human development idea accurately (Kovacevic, 2010).

Accordingly, much of the literature in conventional economics on the concept of development have focused more on the physical and material aspects of development: e.g. economic and environmental aspects. At the same time, the indicators are also designed for this concept which covers material and physical aspects. Both the concept of the material and physical are not comprehensive to reflect the dynamics of the social aspect of development.

In view of the inadequacy of existing development concept and its indicators proposed, there is a need for extending the concept of development to reflect the dynamics of the social aspect of development. This paper makes attempt to present a view of the existing development concept and its indicator over the past seven decades and classify this development concept and its indicator based on the various development concepts. The paper further argues for the need of a new social indicator framework for sustainable development. The first part of this paper is the introduction, in then followed by the data and research methods. The literature on the development concept and its indicator in the conventional economic will be the following part. Finally, this paper will come to be closed down with final result.

Data and Research Methods

This paper examines a critical analysis of social indicator framework for sustainable development, which is evaluative in nature focusing more on qualitative information collecting

and analysis. This paper adopts meta-analysis and content analysis methods by reviewing and analysing of related literature on economic development from books, journals, reports, papers, conference papers and articles. Accordingly, a methodical literature review employing available library sources relevant to economic development and its indicators was conducted during the research process.

Literature Review

In this part, we will review literature related to the concept of development and its indicator from relevant modern literature on development and argues for the need of a new social indicator framework for sustainable development. This part consists of two main discussions in two sections. The first section analyses the evolution of the concept of economic development over the last seven decades, looking at related modern literature discussed. The second section focuses on literature relevant to the evolution of development indicators to demonstrate the need for a new social indicator framework for sustainable development.

The Evolution of the Concept of Economic Development

The main focus of previous studies on development concept was more on physical and material aspects of development and all of the discussions nearly limited on its economic and environmental scopes (Gupta, 1982; Kelly, 2006; Anto, 2009). Both the concept of the material and physical are not comprehensive to reflect the dynamics of the social aspect of development. In recent years, social dimension has been emphasised as an important component of development especially after introducing Sustainable Development Goals, but the literature and definition of social development, as well as social sustainability theoretical base are still missing as compared to that of economic and environmental factors. Much of the literature on economic development argued that social dimension of sustainability does not receive the same treatment as the other two dimensions of development: economic and environment, and there are various interpretations regarding what issues should be addressed (Dixon & Colantonio, 2008; Cuthill, 2010; Vavik & Keitsch, 2010; Murphy, 2014). Indeed, Murphy (2014) described social development as the most conceptually elusive dimensions in sustainable development discourse. Furthermore, Colantonio (2007) & Biczynska (2015) emphasised that the policy makers still focus and they give more weight on the environmental and economic dimensions. This is without question due to the fact sustainable development was born from the synergy between the emerging environmental movement as well as the basic need advocates, yet also assessing social aspects of development have measurement problems (Colantonio, 2009). Hence, social development remains unclear concept of what social development is and how it contributes to sustainable development more widely. Therefore, there is a need for extending the concept of development to reflect the dynamics of the social aspect of development.

In the history of development, the concept of development has constantly evolved over the decades. The main idea of economic development expanded from economic growth. Then the dimensions of economic development expanded to include the notion of human resource development, poverty alleviation, sustainable development, human development, and most recently the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) towards Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

In the 1950s, development was mainly used in the context of economic development, gradually becoming primary for the newly independent countries (Sakamoto, 2009). Development, in general, was seen as progress by nations for societal welfare (Awan et al. 2012). During the period, economic growth became the key focus and the main instrument to bring about structural and functional changes to individuals and society as well. Hence, economic growth

became the main objective of development (Aziz et al. 2015). Several developing countries realized their economic growth targets, yet the living circumstances in the public would not really change (Anto, 2009). Mass poverty continued in the developing countries and many people would certainly not have gain access to major quality education, employment, a decent lifestyle and health facilities. This kind of intended that generally there was a problem with the concept of economic development itself, along with its objectives, because economic development was supposed to involve a number of changes quantitative as well as qualitative. However, the greater part of the literature on development showed that economic development during the period, was only focused on quantitative aspects rather than the focus of the qualitative aspects that depend on non-economic aspects, which are very fundamental to development. Nussbaum (2000); Sen (1999); UNDP (2006); Cobbinah et al. (2011) argued that the concept of economic growth does not define the true meaning of development because it failed to focus on social aspects of development. This was a reason for disappointing concept of economic growth. As a result, most of the economists in this matter demanded pertaining to dethronement of economic growth, and described economic development in terms of elimination of poverty, quality of education, good health and changes in the composition of input and output.

In the 1960s, the dimensions of economic development expanded to include the notion of human resource development (Yap & Cabalfin, 2008). The term human resource development (HRD) was widely used as the process of increasing the knowledge, the skills, and the capacities of all the people in a society. Economically, HRD was used as the accumulation of human capital and its effective investment in the development of an economy, while it was politically used to prepare people for adult participation in political processes, particularly as citizens in a democracy (Kelly, 2006). In terms of social and cultural, the development of human resources used to help people to lead fuller, richer lives (Kelly, 2006). During the period, human resource development became a widely used term, but conceptions of the term vary widely. It implied that the broad approach to HRD was a necessary but not sufficient element of the broader economic development objective. Much of the literature on conventional economics argued that the focus of HRD was on the narrower objective of attaining or upgrading the economic growth and raising the average income (Nussbaum, 2000; Kelly, 2006; Cobbinah et al. 2011). This implied that an increase in per capita income or economic growth may not necessarily be an improvement in the levels of living of the masses. Therefore, it had been known that economic development supposed not merely raising the average income, nevertheless as well allowing the lesser portions for the population to fulfill their basic needs, i.e. poverty alleviation. The discussions on this issue have led to defining the concept of economic development as poverty reduction.

In the 1970s, the concept of development shifted from human resource development to poverty alleviation, with a new emphasis on the distribution of income and basic needs (Ayasrah, 2012). During the period, redistribution from growth started to be one prevalent slogan (Seers, 1979). Hence, the primary goal of economic development became a rise in income and economic growth. This raises the question of whether real development can be realized and sustained by only a rise in income and economic growth and the satisfaction of just the material needs of the human personality at the cost of the non-material aspects of development (Chapra, 2008). Much of the literature on development argued and provided a negative answer to the undue emphasis on material aspects of development (Ghai, 1977; Seers, 1979). Ghai (1977) elaborated that economic development may be termed imperfect when the welfare effect is smaller. This implied that economic development is of limited significance if it does not lead to economic welfare. Seers (1979) raised questions about the concept of economic

development: “What has been happening to poverty? What has been happening to unemployment? What has been happening to inequalities? If all three of these have become less severe, then beyond doubt this has been a period of economic development for the country concerned”. As a result, mass poverty continued in the developing countries and many people do not have access to quality education, good health, employment and a decent lifestyle (Yap & Cabalfin, 2008). The discussion on this issue led to shifting the emphasis to basic needs which became important in the context of understanding poverty. The International Labor Organization introduced a significant contribution to the popularization of this approach and stated in one of its reports that the main factors of the basic needs approach: education, health, sanitation and employment for the poor (Michałowski, 2016). This new focus of economic development emphasized the quality of human life and conservation of the natural environment (Cobbinah et al. 2011). As a result, a new view of development emerged known as sustainable development.

In the 1980s, the global trend of development expanded into sustainable development, which usually became one of the primary points to redefining development, along with the acknowledgement of the environmental aspects (Sakamoto, 2009). According to Biczynska (2015), the concept of sustainable development was initially applied by the ecologists’ movement in the 19th century and intended to be “the greatest good for the greatest number for the longest time”. “The drivers behind such claims were often of an economic nature; they referred to the most efficient way of resource exploitation” (Biczynska, 2015). During the period, the environment became the main objective of the anthropocentric worldview at that time. As a result, Brundtland Report in 1987 proposed and defined development as “development meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs (WCED, 1987). Based on this definition, sustainable development shifted the focus of development to social, economic, and environmental aspects (Tso & Li, 2012). However, much of the literature have shown that sustainable development was only focused on environmental and economic dimensions. Biczynska (2015) claimed that the idea of sustainable development was strictly design focused, then simply, the economic dimension was included in the debate, while the social dimension appeared in the later. Colantonio (2007) discussed that the policy makers also focus and they give more weight on the environmental and economic dimensions. Further Colantonio stated that this is without question due to the fact sustainable development was born from the synergy between the emerging environmental movement as well as the basic need advocates, yet also assessing social aspects of development have measurement problems. Generally, according to Murphy (2014), the concept of sustainable development refers to achieving a balance among the environmental, economic, and social dimensions, but the definition and related objectives of the social dimension remain unclear. As a result, there is a lack of the literature that has been focused on a comprehensive social development that reflect the dynamics of the social aspect of sustainable development.

In the 1990s, the emphasis was given to human development as the key objective of development, “putting people at the center of the development agenda” (Kumar, 2014). In this context, the conceptualization of human development was closely connected to the basic principle of the idea of social development (Sakamoto, 2009). Matching to these evolutions of development concept, the idea of social development became enhanced, and its importance was confirmed globally in the Social Summit of 1995 (Awan et al. 2012). The Social Summit described social development in terms of three basic criteria such as poverty eradication, employment generation, and social harmony. The leaders of state or government agreed that development should aim at improving and enhancing the quality of life of all people. The

leaders also emphasised that economic and social objectives will be accordingly connected which both economic and social elements contribute to sustainable development (Aziz et al. 2015). Despite these achievements, social development is still poorly defined and there is widespread disagreement about what social development means and how should be addressed. Murphy (2014) stated that social development describes as the most conceptually elusive dimensions in sustainable development discourse. Cuthill (2010); Vavik & Keitsch (2010) argued that social dimension of sustainability does not receive the same treatment as the other two dimensions of development: economic and environment, and there are numerous explanations regarding what matters should be addressed. Furthermore, Missimer (2015) and Dixon & Colantonio (2008) emphasised that social sustainability concept is not grounded on theory and its studies and literature is limited. This implied that the definition of social development remains vague. Therefore, there is a need to develop a clearer understanding of what social development means and how can contribute to development more widely.

In the 2000s, the concept of sustainable development was extended in the form of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) as a new vision to the global efforts on development over the next 15 years. In this new concept, eight goals were spelled out. These goals mainly focused on social development. It was expected that by 2015, the human race socially would have achieved the following: the ending extreme poverty, achieving quality education for all and preventable disease. However, by 2015 much of these goals were not achieved because the MDGs focused on poverty which understood as meeting basic needs, and its alleviation. Fukuda-Parr (2016) argued that the eight MDGs and 21 targets were limited to ending extreme poverty, thus reconceptualising development. Due to these limitations of MDGs, a new concept of emerged Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). It was intended to remedy the weaknesses in MDGs. The sustainable development goals (SDGs) are about sustainable development as a new guidance for the world after 2015, which adopted by the United Nations as a guiding principle for economic, environmental, and social development (Fukuda-Parr, 2016). In this new concept, seventeen goals were brought out. These goals mainly focused on social development and intended for the well-being of human beings. It is expected that by 2030, the human race socially would have achieved the following: end poverty, fight inequality and injustice, good health, quality of education, and tackle climate change by 2030 (UNDP, 2015). This new focus of development is a substitute of MDGs and simultaneously a response to the challenge of sustainable development at the global level, which according to several studies, has not been successfully implemented since its concept was first introduced publicly in 1987. The non-success is inextricable from the influencing factors, including understanding of the concept of social development and its components. Social development which is the main focus in this paper appeared as a very fundamental component to development, but the meaning and related objective remain unclear.

Having reviewed the literature on the concept of development and its evolution over the last seven decades, it found that the concept of development in conventional economic literature has focused more on the physical and material aspects of development, although of recent after introducing SDGs these literatures have begun emphasis on the social and moral aspects of development as well. However, the literature and definition of social development, as well as social sustainability theoretical base are still missing as compared to that of economic and environmental factors. Therefore, there is a need for extending the concept of development to reflect the dynamics of the social aspect of development. The following section elaborates how development indicators evolved over the period discussed.

The Evolution of Development Indicators

Following the evolutions in conception of development over the last seven decades, the indicator of development also evolved in the period discussed. This section would be useful in providing us with a clearer perspective for the need of a new social indicator framework for sustainable development.

In the 1950s, as discussed above, the global trend of the concept of development was based on economic growth. During the period, gross national product (GNP) developed as a key indicator to measure development of the nation. Therefore, “economic development was by and large evaluated in terms of the gross national product (GNP) and per capita income” (Anto, 2009). The GNP or per capita income was the ultimate standard of national progress and prosperity. This kind of intended that development is definitely a potential of a national economic system to generate and sustain an annual increase in its gross national product GNP at rates of most likely 5 to 7 percent or even more (Aziz et al. 2015). Hence, the gross national product or per capita income became the objective of economic development in the period. However, much of the literature found out that the GNP is not sufficient and adequate to measure the wellbeing of the human being in process of development. Yusof et al. (2015) argued that the GNP ignores account of non-material aspects and non-market actions, and takes a lot of consumption goods mainly because useful when basically hazardous this sort of as adverse environmental externalities related with increased production. In fact, some activities clearly related to social welfare such as public education spending which is counted as consumption in GNP instead of investments in future economic growth (Dickens et al. 2006). Besides that, applying the standard measure of income overlooked income distribution with the nation (Kula et al. 2008). This implied that the gross national product (GNP) may not be a sole indicator which can be used to assess economic development, consequently, it failed to account the overall progress of societies, particularly those related to distributional aspects and social and human welfare dimension. These criticisms of GNP as a measure of economic development have led researchers to propose alternative measures of well-being that attempt to more accurately quantify economic development.

In the 1960s, numerous efforts were made to construct other compound indicators which could be served as alternatives to the GNP or reasonable indicator of economic welfare. Streeten (Aziz et al. 2015) identified that though economic growth is still unarguably a crucial factor of development, there can be now a good realization that economic growth is never synonymous with development. A number of economists in these matters expounded the incorporation of economic, social and political indicators simply because alternative measures of development. Adelman and Morris (1967) for example, carried out a major to measure development in terms of a pattern of interaction among social, economic, and political factors. At the same time, the United Nations Research Institute on Social Development (UNRISD) proposed another composite index which concerned with the selection of the most appropriate indicators of development and an analysis of the relationship between these indicators at different levels of development (Aziz et al. 2015). However, these studies were criticised on the grounds that they sought to measure development in terms of structural change rather than in terms of human welfare. Another ground for criticism was the implicit assumption that developing countries must develop along the same lines of the developed countries (Dar, 2004).

In the 1970s, the major effort in the direction of human development was made by Morris when he proposed the Physical Quality of Life Index (PQLI). The PQLI was based on the most basic needs of the people to measure human development. It was combined information on life

expectancy, infant mortality and literacy which used for the cross-country comparison. The index enabled researchers to measure countries certainly not by income but simply by the performance of country in meeting all their people's basic needs. The index stood a simple and easily calculated composite index. However, the PQLI has critiqued for its limited dimensionality, and the greater part of the literature on development came up to the conclusion that it is impossible to simply agree the output of the composite development index not having good and very well theoretical basis (Alkire & Foster, 2011; Ramli et al. 2015). Furthermore, the index was not sufficient and adequate to account the quality of life, and at the same failed to take into account problems related with basic needs such as health, housing, nutrition, sanitation (Aziz et al. 2015). Besides that, the PQLI was inadequate to comprehensively and accurately portray the real level of development of a society. On the top of that it measures human development by only taking into account formulated with simply the physical factors: adult literacy, infant survival rate and life expectancy at birth. In so doing, the PQLI does not consist of freedom, justice, security and various other intangible factors that had been significant on the general idea of human development (Aziz et al. 2015).

In the 1980s, many experts in these matters continued to expound the combination of social indicators and efforts to propose other compound indicators that could be served as complements of existing measurement. Ray (1987) suggested the Social Development Index (SDI) based upon 13 physical factors to symbolise social development through 40 countries (Kantiray, 1989). The composite index of selected social indicators was proposed as a measure of social development which represented urbanization and industrialization health conditions, nutritional level, level of education and social communication dimensions. At the same vein, Camp and Speidel (Anto, 2009) conducted another attempts to construct an index of social welfare based on 10 factors: income, infant mortality, nutrition, adult literacy, and personal freedom. Further, Slottje done research of 130 countries which drawn on the capabilities approach by making a composite of 20 indicators, arguing that Morris' three components were insufficient to capture the quality of life (Anto, 2009). However, these approaches were criticized because there is no universal consensus on the theory, methodology and used of social indicators to measure human's well-being (Ramli et al. 2015). The discussions on this issue were led to the development of significant index to measure human development known as Human Development Index (HDI) invented by Amartya Sen and launched by Mahbubul-Haq in 1990.

In the 1990s, the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) developed the Human Development Index (HDI). It was based on information of human development cross many countries (Aziz et al. 2015). The index proposed to an expansion the focus of economic output, growth, and development on various dimensions of people's lives. This index covered four variables to represent the three major dimensions of human development: "life expectancy at birth, educational attainment, as measured by a combination of adult literacy and the combined first-, second- and third-level gross enrolment ratio; and standard of living measured by real GDP per capita (PPP\$)" (Kovacevic, 2010). The HDI was one of the majority of focused endeavors to methodically and adequately assess the comparative situation of socio-economic development in both developing and developed countries. HDI is the most popular measures of development, besides the Physical Quality of Life Index (PQLI) and per capita income as well (Ray, 2008). However, HDI has criticized for containing several limitations and weaknesses. Kovacevic (2010) asserted that HDI covers a small number of factors instead of captured a number of social factors to represent more areas of social issue that reflecting human development idea accurately. Ranis (2006) argued that the HDI is not comprehensive and sufficient to reflect the dynamics of the human development approach. He further stated that

HDI ignores to account a number of other important dimensions which are very fundamental to human development. Aziz et al. (2015) explained that HDI neglects the gender inequality aspect in a society to represent the development of a country. Furthermore, Sagar & Najam (1998) elaborated that the index also overlooks two important dimensions of human development: environment and equity. The exclusion of environment and equity as indicators of development inhibits the accurate representation of the realities of the world. In general, the HDI criticized to not successfully capture the richness and breadth of the concept of human development, and thus, unable to respond better to social issues and environmental concern.

In view of the limitations of development indicators as discussed above, in 2008, Ray (2008) introduced the Social Development Index (SDI). The index was primary based on ten physical variables for social development around 102 countries that contain 21 OECD countries and socialist countries just like China. The index was included numerous social factors to depict extra areas of social concern and it related to a great objective approach to deriving weight loads for merging multiple physical indicators. Although the index included many physical social factors, the spiritual (non-material) concern of human being of 102 countries was being ignored as no spiritual variable was included. This is one particular of the limits of social development indicators in presenting view of human well-being in the process of development. Another limitation of social development index is certainly that data of the variables will be not regularly available relating to similar years. As a result, presently there is a deviation in the numerous years of revealing on the most current info of the parameters. In addition, many other social development indices were proposed: Ohlan (Kumar, 2017) introduced 43 social development factors to receive measuring the socioeconomic development in India. Social Progress Index in 2015 (Kumar, 2017) scored social progress directly, independent of economic development. The index covered 54 factors of social and environmental outcomes for calculating social progress of a country. Although, all these attempts were made to measure social development, the availability of the data and choice of the social factors were a big challenge and should be chosen by considering social norms of the society (Kumar, 2017).

Conclusion

In general, the paper has found that most of the existing development concepts from conventional economics have been focused more on the physical and material aspects of development: e.g. economic and environmental aspects. At the same time, the indicators are also designed for this concept which covers material and physical aspects. Both the concept of the material and physical are not comprehensive to reflect the dynamics of the social aspect of development. This is because of a lack of the availability of the social sustainability theoretical base and lack of consideration and specification of social development framework. In such a word, although the existing development framework and its indicator may not comprehensive to reflect the dynamics of the social aspect of development, that could even now provide beneficial insights to get a better replacement for the existing social development indicators. Overall, the literature related to the concept of development and its indicator from related modern literature on development will help to direct to developing a viable new direction for measuring social development.

References

- Adelman, I., & Morris, C.T. (1967). *Society, Politics and Economic Development*(Baltimore): Jolins Hopkins University Press, 1967.
- Alkire, S., Foster, J. E. (2011). Counting and Multidimensional Poverty Measurement. *Journal of Public Economics*, 95(7): 476–487.

- Anto, M. H. (2011). Introducing an Islamic human development index (I-HDI) to measure development in OIC countries. *Islamic Economic Studies*, 19(2), 69-95.
- Awan, M. S., Aslam, M. A., & Waqas, M. (2012). Social Development Disparities among Districts of Punjab.
- Ayasrah, T. M. (2012). The Social Economic Development Index: A New Measurement of Development. *Jurnal Ekonomi Malaysia*, 46(2), 37-53.
- Aziz, S. A., Amin, R. M., Yusof, S. A., Haneef, M. A., Mohamed, M. O., & Oziev, G. (2015). A critical analysis of development indices. *Australian Journal of Sustainable Business and Society*, 1(01).
- Biczyńska, E. (2015). Measuring the Social Component of Sustainable Development in the Cities. *The Case of Medellín, Colombia. Barometr Regionalny. Analizy i prognozy*, 1,
- Cobbinah, P. B., Black, R., & Thwaites, R. (2011). Reflections On Six Decades of the Concept of Development: Evaluation and future research. *Journal of sustainable Development in Africa*, 13(7), 134-149.
- Colantonio, A. (2009). Social Sustainability: A Review and Critique of Traditional versus Emerging Themes and Assessment Methods. *In Sue-Mot Conference 2009: Loughborough University*. <http://www.suemot.org/conference/>.
- Cuthill, M. (2010). Strengthening the 'social' in sustainable development: Developing a conceptual framework for social sustainability in a rapid urban growth region in Australia. *Sustainable development*, 18(6), 362-373.
- Dar, H. A. (2004). On Making Human Development More Humane. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 31(11/12), 1071-1088.
- Dickens, W. T., Sawhill, I. V., & Tebbs, J. (2006). The Effects of Investing in Early Education on Economic Growth. *Brookings Institution*.
- Dixon, T. & Colantonio, A. (2008). Submission to EIB Consultation on the Draft EIB Statement of Environmental and Social Principles and Standards. *Oxford: Oxford Institute for Sustainable Development*.
- Fukuda-Parr, S. (2016). From the Millennium Development Goals to the Sustainable Development Goals: shifts in purpose, concept, and politics of global goal setting for development. *Gender & Development*, 24(1), 43-52.
- Ghai, D. P. (1977). The Basic Needs Approach to Development: Some Issues Regarding Concepts and Methodology. *Geneva: International Labour Office*.
- Gupta, R. C. (1982). A Study of Regional Disparities in the Levels of Economic Development of Uttar Pradesh: 1951-1974 (*Doctoral dissertation, Aligarh Muslim University*).
- Kantiray, A. (1989). On the Measurement of Certain Aspects of Social Development. *Social Indicators Research*, 21(1), 35-92.
- Kelly, D. J. (2006). Human Resource Development: For enterprise and human development. *Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 14th World Congress of International Industrial Relations Association (IIRA), Social Actors, Work organization and New Technologies in the 21st Century, Lima, Peru*.
- Kovacevic, M. (2010). Measurement of Inequality in Human Development—A Review", *Human Development Research Paper 2010/35, November*.
- Kula, M. C., Panday, P., & Parrish, B. (2008). A wellbeing index based on an enabling environment. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 35(3)0, pp. 174-187.
- Kumar, A. (2014). Human Development Indicators in India: A Critical Analysis. *Pacific Business Review International, Volume 7, Issue 3, September, 2014*.
- Kumar, N. (2017). Measurement of Social Development: Evidence from India. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 44(9), 1211-1230.
- Michałowski, T. (2016). Poverty in Sub-Saharan Africa: The Case of Sudan. *International Business and Global Economy*, 2016(Numer 1), 183196.

- Missimer, M. (2015). Social Sustainability Within the Framework for Strategic Sustainable Development. *Blekinge Tekniska Högskola*.
- Morris, D. M. (1979). Measuring the Condition of the World's Poor: The Physical Quality of Life Index, *New York: Pergamon Press*.
- Murphy, K. (2014). The Social Pillar of Sustainable Development A literature Review and Framework for Policy Analysis. *The ITB Journal*, 15(1), 4.
- Nussbaum, M. (2000). Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach. Cambridge: *Cambridge University Press*.
- Ramli, R. M., Ismail, A. G., & Tasrif, M. (2015). M-Dex among the Islamic Countries. *Policy Rountable Discussion on Maqasid Shariah, Malaysia*.
- Ranis, G., Stewart, F., & Samman, E. (2006). Human Development: Beyond the Human Development Index. *Journal of Human Development*, 7(3), 323-358.
- Ray, A. K. (1989). On the Measurement of Certain Aspects of Social Development. *Social Indicators Research*, 21: 35-92.
- Ray, A. K. (2008). Measurement of Social Development: An International Comparison. *Social Indicators Research*, 86(1), 1-46.
- Sagar, A. D., Najam, A. (1998). The Human Development Index: A Critical Review. *Ecological Economics, Elsevier Science*, 26: 249-264.
- Sakamoto, K. (2009). Social Development, Culture, and Participation: Toward theorizing endogenous development in Tanzania. *春風社*.
- Seers, D. (1969). The Meaning of Development. *International Development Review* 11(4),2-6.
- Sen, A. (1999). Development as Freedom. *New York: Oxford University Press*.
- Tso, G. K., & Li, J. (2012). Using Index to Measure and Monitor Progress on Sustainable Development. In *Sustainable development-education, business and management-architecture and building construction-agriculture and food security: InTech*.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2006). Human Development Report. *New York: Oxford University Press for the UNDP*.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2015). Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).<http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/mdgoverview/post-2015-development-genda.html>. Accessed in 1 September 2015.
- Vavik, T., & Keitsch, M. M. (2010). Exploring relationships Between Universal Design and Social Sustainable Development: Some Methodological Aspects to the Debate on the Sciences of Sustainability. *Sustainable development*, 18(5), 295-305.
- World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED). (1987). Our Common Future (The Brundtland Report). *Oxford: Oxford University Press*.
- Yap, J. T., & Cabalfin, M. R. (2008). Sustainable Development Framework for Local Governance (No. 2008-33). *PIDS Discussion Paper Series*.
- Yusof, S. A., Amin, R. M., Haneef, M. A., Muhammad, A. O., & Oziev, G. (2015). The Integrated Development Index (I-Dex): A new comprehensive approach to measuring human development. *Islamic economic: Theory, policy and social justice*.