

The Development And Validation Of The Maladies Of The Nafs Scale (MNS)

Shahid Ijaz¹, Muhammad Tahir Khalily², Carrie York Al-Karam³, Brian Hallahan⁴

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to create a reliable assessment tool, the "Maladies of Nafs Scale (MNS)," for measuring the impact of maladies of Nafs on an individual's moral character and well-being in Islamic psychology. The study employed a 200-item scale, iteratively refined through expert discussions. This scale, named the "Maladies of Nafs Scale (MNS)," was reduced to 108 items. Language experts reviewed it for clarity. The MNS was administered online to 355 students. Principal component analysis was used to identify underlying factors, and convergent validity was assessed by correlating it with related psychometric instruments. The Maladies of Nafs Scale (MNS) demonstrated strong reliability with a Cronbach's α coefficient of 0.97. The analysis identified eleven distinct factors each with satisfactory reliability (Cronbach's α ranging from 0.72 to 0.97). The Maladies of Nafs Scale (MNS) can serve as a valuable instrument for research in understanding and addressing maladies of Nafs. Furthermore, the MNS may find relevance in studies and interventions focused on enhancing moral character and overall well-being within the context of Islamic psychology. The novelty of this study lies in the development of the Maladies of Nafs Scale (MNS), a robust and comprehensive tool designed explicitly for assessing maladies of Nafs within the context of Islamic psychology. The MNS not only fills a critical gap by providing a standardized assessment method but also opens doors for more profound and reliable research in this field, offering fresh insights into the relationship between moral character, well-being, and Islamic principles.

Key Words: *maladies of the self, Islamic psychology, Arrogance, Avarice, Backbiting, Breaking ties/Family grudges, Envy, Impulsive Anger, Lie scale, Materialism, Ostentation, Slanders, and Taunting*

Introduction:

According to Islamic philosophy, individuals are composed of five major elements: the soul (Ruh), the self (nafs), the heart (qalb), the mind (aql), and the physical body (jism) (Abu-Raiya, 2012; Andopa, Hardivizon, & Yunita, 2018; Abdullah, & Sharif, 2019). Muslim scholars categorize nafs into three major states based on their characteristics: (1) al-nafs al-ammara (the demanding self), (2) al-nafs al-lawwama (the accusing self), and (3) al-nafs al-mutma'inna (the

¹PhD Scholar International Islamic University Islamabad.

²Professor and Dean Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities Shifa Tameer E Millat University Islamabad and Academic Fellow University Science Malaysia.

³Director Al Karam Institute.

⁴Senior Lecturer, University of Galway Consultant Psychiatrist, University Hospital Galway.

tranquil self) (Ghazali, 2001; Ghazali, 1993). These categories represent different aspects of an individual's engagement with worldly desires and ethical principles, personal responsibility, and divine will. It is particularly characteristic of the Nafs al-Ammara to manifest “maladies”, which are purported to result in negative thoughts, attitudes, emotions, and behaviours.

The concept of “maladies of the Nafs” (i.e. negative self-conditions) have been described as impacting deleteriously on an individual's moral compass with “nafs”, previously described as characterological ailments or afflictions of the heart, deleteriously impact an individual's spiritual growth/ personality growth, their adherence to Islamic tenets, and overall well-being (Yusuf, 2012). Maladies of the nafs have been purported to cause internal conflicts, adverse emotions, and moral shortcomings, related to nafs' tendencies towards worldly desires, egoism, and the pursuit of personal satisfaction (Mohamed, 1986; Abu-Raiya, 2012; Ali-hujveri, 2015; Abdullah & Sharif, 2019; Khattak, & Mustafa, 2022). The development of personality disorders, substance use disorders and worsening of mental health disorders including anxiety and mood disorders have been ascribed to “maladies of the nafs” (Cleary et al., 2015; Kasser & Sheldon, 2000; Dijkstra & Buunk, 2002; Feder et al., 2010; Piff et al., 2012; Sussman et al., 2011; Fernandez & Johnson, 2016; Young, 2014; Weiss & Miller, 2018; Kim et al., 2021), with subsequent deleterious effects on family dynamics described (Lammers, et al., 2011; Fitness & Fletcher, 1993; Tandler & Petersen, 2020). Furthermore, “maladies of the nafs” have been described as fostering harmful attitudes and behaviours, leading to less engagement in Islamic teachings (Kasser, 2002; Banerjee & Duflo, 2011; Gudykunst, 2004; Bond & Smith, 1996), corruption and engagement in criminal activity (Piff, et al., 2012; Kasser, & Sheldon, 2000; Williams & DeSteno, 2008).

Within Islam, there is an emphasis on cleansing one's qalb from the “maladies of nafs”. The Quran underscores that humans are innately capable of both good and evil, with the balance between these extremes largely dependent on personal choices and actions (Quran 91:7-8), emphasizing individual responsibility to strive for righteousness and avoid the “maladies of the nafs”. Islamic scholars, including but not limited to Imam al-Ghazali (d.1111), Imam Ibn Qayyam (d. 1350), Junaid Baghdadi (d. 910), Al-Iskandari (d. 1309), Imam Mawlud , Ali Hajveri (d. 1072), Molana Ashraf Ali Thanvi (d. 1943), Molana Shah Hakeem Akhtar, and Molana Ameen Ahmed Islahi, have delved into the topic of nafs, its maladies, and potential approaches for their treatment (Akhtar, 2017; Kardas, 2018; Setiawan et al., 2020; Fiza & Nazeer, 2020; Rasool & Luqman, 2022; Amin et al., 2022; Arroisi & Rahmadi, 2022; Khattak & Mustafa, 2022; Yusuf, 2023)

Despite extensive theoretical literature related to “maladies of the nafs”, there remains a lack of empirical work for their measurement. Consequently, the aim of this study is to develop a psychometric instrument that demonstrates good reliability and validity indices to measure “maladies of the nafs”, which would enable greater evidence-based research in the future.

METHOD

Construct and Face Validity

Based on extensive reading of Islamic literature, a preliminary list of maladies was presented to a diverse panel of experts, including a clinical psychologist, an Islamic psychologist, and a psychometrician. A total of 20 items were initially generated for each malady, culminating in 200 items with each item assigned a rating of 1 to 10 with a score of 1 indicating little to no relevance and 10 indicating high relevance to the “maladies of Nafs”. Items that failed to achieve a minimum score of 5 were excluded leaving 108 items. Following this reduction, the scale underwent a review by two language experts with the aim of ensuring clarity of language

and avoidance of any potential misunderstanding or misinterpretation of the items, enhancing the instruments' face validity.

Sample

The finalized version of the Maladies of Nafs Scale (MNS) was then deployed for data collection. An online survey, hosted on Google Forms, was disseminated to a convenience sample of 355 students from the University of Karachi, International Islamic University Islamabad, Wah University, and Shifa Tameer-e-Millat University enabling efficiency of data collection and the potential for reaching a more diverse sample.

Psychometric Instruments

Psychometric scales were additionally disseminated that measured narcissistic traits, anger, envy and malingered to ascertain if they correlated with the MNS scale and included:

- 1) Grandiose Narcissism Scale (GNS): A 33-item measure of grandiose narcissism including seven subscale scores reflecting the seven Narcissistic Personality Inventory variables (Foster et al. 2015a), with associated high psychometric indices including a Cronbach's alpha of 0.91, with subscale scores ranging from 0.77 to 0.85. It was hypothesized that GNS scale would positively correlated with specific maladies including ostentation; arrogance; backbiting and slander.
- 2) Anger Expression Scale (AES): A 20-item self-report measuring anger internalization, externalization, control and expression, with associated high psychometric indices including Cronbach's alpha scores of 0.72 to 0.93 (Knight et al., 1988). It was hypothesized that AES scores will positively correlate with specific maladies relating to (impulsive) anger.
- 3) Benign and Malicious Envy Scale (BMES): A 10-item self-report instrument measuring benign and malevolent jealousy, with previous utilization across a range of cultural groups and associated high psychometric indices. High internal consistency has been demonstrated with Cronbach's alpha values ranging from 0.87 to 0.92, with sub-scales of benign ($r=0.81$) and malicious envy ($r=0.84$) with similar values (Kwiatkowska et al., 2022). It was hypothesized that benign envy scores would positively correlate with maladies of the nafs related to envy measurements.
- 4) Lying in Ordinary Situations Scale (LOSS): A 14-item self-report questionnaire that examines the frequency of lying in daily circumstances, with convergent validity with other measures of deceit and lying, and high psychometric indices including a Cronbach's alpha of 0.87 (Hart et al., 2019). It was hypothesized that the relational lie construct in the LOSS would positively correlate with the lie sub-scale of the "maladies of Nafs".

Statistical Analysis

Statistical analysis was conducted utilising the Statistical Package for Social Sciences 26.0 for Windows (SPSS Inc., IBM, New York, USA). A Principal Components Analysis (PCA) explored the underlying structure of the Maladies of Nafs Scale (MNS). The orthogonal varimax rotation was employed to ensure that the factors contributing to MNS were independent of each other (Field, 2005). Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was utilized to ascertain if sample size was adequate ($KMO > 0.60$ is desirable; Kaiser, 1974) and Bartlett's test of sphericity was undertaken to ascertain if PCA was appropriate ($p < 0.05$). A scree plot was used to determine the number of factors to retain. Correlation analysis was undertaken between the MNS and included psychometric scales and their sub-components.

RESULTS

Participants consisted of 258 females (72.7%) and 97 males (27.3%), with an age range of 18 to 41 years ($M = 22.6$, $SD = 3.94$).

The sample size was adequate for the MNS, with $KMO = 0.94$ and the Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2(6903) = 35976.05$, $p < .05$), indicating the suitability of the MNS for PCA. A scree plot suggested that eleven factors should be extracted for PCA. Items with loadings less than 0.30 (i.e., 10% of variance) on their respective factors were deleted, as were items that cross-loaded greater than 0.30 on more than one factor. The final factor solution accounted for 61% of the variance and comprised 94 items in total (Table 1), with the factor loadings from the rotated factor solution displayed in Table 2. These factors demonstrated good internal consistency with Cronbach's alpha ranging from 0.72 to 0.96, with a Cronbach's alpha (α) for the full scale of 0.97 (Table 3). Mean scores for items demonstrated that higher scores were noted for the Slander, Taunting and Envy factors.

Significant correlations were evident between factors across the MNS scale and in particular between slander and envy ($r = 0.834$), taunting ($r = 0.778$), and arrogance ($r = 0.765$) and between anger and breaking ties ($r = 0.775$) and taunting ($r = 0.743$). The LOSS demonstrated greatest correlations with the MNS factors, and was correlated most strongly with Slander (0.706), back-biting (0.703) and taunting (0.699). The AES was moderately correlated with the MNS anger factor (0.420), with other correlations weaker. The BMES was weakly but significantly correlated with envy ($r = 0.236$, $p < 0.01$). The GNS was most strongly correlated with slander ($r = 0.337$) (see Table 4).

Table 1: MNS Factors

Factors	Initial items (n)	Dropped Items (n)	Retained Items (n)	Item Description
Anger	7	0	7	Sudden and intense anger outbursts leading to impulsive and harmful actions (i.e. verbal or physical aggression, self-harm, or damaging property)
Arrogance	10	3	7	Excessive sense of self-importance and superiority often leading to a lack of empathy and understanding. It includes a tendency to demand more attention and respect
Avarice	8	5	3	Excessive concern or reluctance to spend money due to a strong desire to accumulate wealth and includes overthinking purchases, avoiding necessary spending, and prioritizing wealth accumulation over other life goals.
Backbiting (Gossip Propensity)	14	2	12	Inclination to engage in negative conversations about others, including their flaws and mistakes. Tendency to prioritize sharing negative information over personal integrity and relationships.
Breaking ties (Grudges Tendency)	12	1	11	Tendency to hold grudges and negative feelings towards family members and close friends for extended periods. Dwelling on past wrongs experienced and a preference for attaining support from non-relatives.
Envy	11	4	7	A desire to possess something someone else has. Often includes dissatisfaction with one's own achievements, possessions, and status and may include negative emotions such as jealousy and feelings of inferiority.
Lie (Dishonesty)	15	0	15	A deliberate act of sharing false or misleading information for personal advantage, self-preservation, or to evade negative outcomes, including lies, distortion of truth, or making insincere promises
Materialism	3	0	3	An excessive focus and prioritisation on material possessions over other values and goals often viewing these as central to their well-being. This can negatively impact relationships and well-being by emphasizing external factors over internal ones.
Ostentation	10	1	9	Craving acknowledgement for virtuous deeds, hoping to be viewed as morally superior. Openly showcases good deeds and may feel threatened by others performing similar good deeds. Often ashamed or embarrassed when errors are highlighted, as it may jeopardize a self-projected image of moral superiority
Slanders	5	1	4	Intentional spreading of false and/or damaging information in oral or written form about someone to harm their reputation or cause others to view them

				negatively. Slander can result in emotional distress, financial loss and damage to personal relationships.
Taunting	16	0	16	Act of insulting or mocking someone in a contemptuous manner, often involving humorous or sarcastic remarks that make the recipient feel inferior or embarrassed. It may involve mocking people past errors or using abusive or derogatory language to people.
Total items	108	14	94	

Table 2: Factor Structure for MNS (N= 355)

Item Number	Question	Code	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Factor 1: Anger													
1	I get angry very quickly	AO1	0.548										
2	I abuse in anger	AO2	0.379										
3	I break things down in anger	AO3	0.413										
4	I beat people in anger	AO4	0.319										
5	My anger is very intense and bad	AO5	0.644										
6	I suppress anger in my heart and take the appropriate revenge appropriately when the time comes	AO6	0.346										
7	When I feel even a little bad about the things, I get angry.	AO7	0.610										
Factor 2:Arrogance													
1	I think I am better than others	ARO1		0.481									
2	I often think that the people around me are inferior to me.	ARO2		0.404									
3	I wish other people were inferior to me in wealth, beauty and honour.	ARO3		0.360									
4	When I meet people, I want everyone to pay attention to me	ARO4		0.496									
5	I want people to respect me more than anyone else	ARO5		0.464									
6	My family is better than other families.	ARO6		0.549									
7	I am more beautiful than others.	ARO7		0.669									
Factor 3: Avarice													
1	I think a lot before even buying a small thing.	AV10				0.550							

2	Often my heart wants to give charity but I feel reluctant considering my own needs.	AV2	0.43 2	
3	I feel difficult in spending money.	AV4	0.55 1	
Factor 4: Materialism				
1	The greater the wealth, the better it is.	MA1	0.70 1	
2	I want to be the richest person.	MA2	0.70 6	
3	I want to be rich so that people honour me more.	MA3	0.54 1	
Factor 5: Back-biting				
1	Whenever I talk about people, I get into gossips and backbiting spontaneously.	BB10		0.516
2	When I gossip with my acquaintances/friends, I mention the evils and negative side of the strangers.	BB11		0.690
3	I tell my close friends about the evils of people in my office or neighbourhood or about any action that has hurt me.	BB12		0.470
4	I gossiped about negative behaviours of other people in the past years.	BB13		0.411
5	Sometimes people talk / act in a way which hurts, in such a situation I lighten my heart by talking to close ones	BB14		0.326
6	I usually mention people's mistakes, deceptions and crimes in everyday conversation.	BB3		0.528
7	I ask my acquaintances/friends about the negative side of people.	BB4		0.447
8	I often gossip/ back bite about others.	BB5		0.487
9	It's fun to talk about people's stupidities.	BB6		0.414

10	If I hear of a dispute, I report it to my acquaintances/friends.	BB7	0.706
11	Whatever evil happens to me, I mention it to my acquaintances/friends. .	BB8	0.656
12	Evils committed by the people should be expressed for catharsis.	BB9	0.514
Factor 6: Breaking Ties			
1	I have relatives / friends with whom I have been angry for a long time.	BT1	0.647
2	Wounds caused by evil deeds of people always remain fresh in my heart.	BT10	0.469
3	I prefer seeking help from a non-relative rather from a relative.	BT11	0.455
4	It hurts me more when relatives of mine makes a mistake	BT12	0.411
5	I have relatives / friends with whom I have broken up because of their mistakes	BT2	0.578
6	If my relatives do anything bad to me, I will break up with them for some time.	BT3	0.619
7	If someone is not going well with you, it is better to break up with them.	BT4	0.560
8	Relatives are always bad	BT5	0.439
9	It is useless to look after your relatives.	BT6	0.317
10	I do not forgive unless I punish the other person.	BT8	0.309
11	Relationships should be ended on a single big mistake.	BT9	0.325
Factor 7: Envy			
1	When I see someone is having a car, I wish I had it.	ENV1	0.392
2	When my friends buy something new, I wonder why I didn't buy it.	ENV2	0.520

3	Some of my friends / relatives have more wealth than me, and I think I am more entitled to that wealth than they are.	ENV3	0.433
4	My friends / relatives should have as much wealth as I have,	ENV4	0.442
5	If my friends / relatives have more wealth than me, I want them to have equal to me.	ENV5	0.401
6	I am saddened by the happiness of others.	ENV6	0.338
7	It hurts when other people have more knowledge than I have.	ENV8	0.437
Factor 8: Lie			
1	If you slightly change the real situation while presenting it to the people and it doesn't harm anyone, then there is nothing wrong with it.	L1	0.43 3
2	I lie to avoid the evil eye of the envious.	L10	0.46 3
3	I lie to prevent the relationships from going poor.	L11	0.46 7
4	I lie to improve the relationship	L12	0.58 4
5	I often tell white lies.	L13	0.48 4
6	If I get into trouble I lie to get rid of situation.	L14	0.55 3
7	I often lie while joking	L15	0.57 3
8	There is nothing wrong with telling a simple lie.	L2	0.60 6
9	There is nothing wrong while lying in joking.	L3	0.68 8
10	You have to lie to save your honour.	L4	0.78 5
11	You have to lie to avoid embarrassment.	L5	0.70 9
12	Taking oaths is my habit.	L6	0.40 8

102 *The Development And Validation Of The Maladies Of The Nafs Scale (MNS)*

13	I do not refrain from taking false oaths.	L7	0.58 2
14	I lie to avoid quarrelling.	L8	0.53 7
15	Sometimes I lie just for fun and humour.	L9	0.60 2
Factor 9: Ostentation			
1	I want people to think that I'm pious.	OST1	0.32 5
2	I want my good deeds to be talked about everywhere.	OST10	0.48 4
3	I feel good when people praise my good deeds	OST2	0.73 4
4	I feel good when people see me doing something good.	OST3	0.76 3
5	When I do good for someone, I want them to feel good about me.	OST4	0.77 0
6	I don't want people to think badly of me.	OST5	0.47 0
7	I feel bad when people correct me and / or point out my mistakes.	OST6	0.49 6
8	I want no one else to do the good thing which I am doing.	OST8	0.30 9
9	I want to look unique.	OST9	0.39 0
Factor 10: Taunting			
1	Do you call people by funny names?	TAU1	0.58 6
2	To what extent do you use the following abuses in a state of anger? Metaphorical abuses, such as likening a person with an animal (e.g. You Dog)	TAU10	0.60 7
3	Insults limited to the person, such as finding fault with him	TAU11	0.68 2
4	Sexual abuses such as abuse related with sexual activity or adultery	TAU12	0.63 2
5	Insulting their family members	TAU13	0.45 9
6		TAU14	0.44 9

7	Do you call people by funny names?	TAU15	0.64 6
8	Do you make fun of people by making them realize their past mistakes?	TAU16	0.56 4
9	Do you make fun of people by making them realize of their past mistakes?	TAU2	0.54 5
10	Do you mock people?	TAU3	0.57 6
11	Do you use dual meaning words to insult someone? (Words that make you look like you're joking, but you are actually insulting them.)	TAU4	0.65 0
12	Do you taunt?	TAU5	0.63 8
13	If someone makes a mistake, I scold them harshly	TAU6	0.54 9
14	If someone makes a mistake, do you use derogatory words to make them realize it?	TAU7	0.60 5
15	Do you scold someone in an insulting way?	TAU8	0.59 5
16	How much have you abused in the last year?	TAU9	0.64 8
Factor 11, Slanders			
1	I blame people for someone else mistake?	SLA2	0.364
2	I gossip about other people while associating false allegations to them.	SLA3	0.312
3	If a person is really bad, I exaggerate his evils in front of others.	SLA4	0.338
4	I have slandered someone.	SLA5	0.397

A = Anger Outburst, ARR = Arrogance, AV = Avarice; BB = Back-biting; BT = Breaking Ties; ENV = Envy; L = Lies; MA = Materialism; OSS = Ostentation; TAU = Taunting; SLA = Slanders

Table 3: Psychometric Properties of Scales

	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Item Mean	Cronbach's α
Total Scale	326.10	79.35	94.00	468.00	3.47	0.97
Scale Factors						
Anger	24.41	7.41	7.00	35.00	3.49	0.88
Arrogance	24.72	7.58	7.00	35.00	3.53	0.90
Avarice	9.68	3.38	3.00	15.00	3.23	0.72
Backbiting	38.80	11.69	12.00	60.00	3.23	0.92
Breaking ties/ Family grudges	36.34	11.03	11.00	55.00	3.30	0.94
Envy	25.98	7.51	7.00	35.00	3.71	0.89
Lie scale	52.46	14.43	15.00	75.00	3.50	0.93
Materialism	8.81	3.50	3.00	15.00	2.94	0.77
Ostentation	27.95	8.88	9.00	45.00	3.11	0.87
Slanders	15.99	4.59	4.00	20.00	4.00	0.92
Taunting	60.86	16.31	16.00	80.00	3.80	0.96

Table 4: Correlation between variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. LOSS Total	-	.847*	.287*	-.099	.237*	.232*	.703*	.642*	.653**	.487*	.461*	.658**	.706*	.640*	.552*	.699*
2. MNS Total		-	.306*	.135*	.276*	.136*	.830*	.820*	.849**	.647*	.602*	.845**	.857*	.847*	.737*	.886*
3. GNS Total			-	.058	.456*	.275*	.226*	.221*	.262**	.235*	.061	.195**	.337*	.308*	.178*	.309*
4. AES Total				-	.137*	.226*	-.069	.420*	-.147**	-.083	-.067	-.164**	-.106*	-.111*	-.084	-.119*
5. BMES Total					-	.340*	.173*	.255*	.256**	.194*	.078	.215**	.263*	.236*	.188*	.276*
6. Lie Factor						-	.132*	.168*	.100	.097	-.003	.107*	.151*	.094	.061	.116*
7. Backbiting Factor							-	.645*	.641**	.547*	.504*	.621**	.678*	.649*	.592*	.650*
8. Anger Factor								-	.775**	.455*	.420*	.669**	.659*	.635*	.486*	.743*
9. Breaking Ties Factor									-	.555*	.508*	.689**	.661*	.675*	.553*	.723*
10. Avarice Factor										-	.435*	.518**	.568*	.579*	.514*	.496*
11. Materialism Factor											-	.551**	.427*	.524*	.542*	.406*
12. Arrogance Factor												-	.765*	.752*	.628*	.720*
13. Slander Factor													-	.834*	.563*	.778*
14. Envy Factor														-	.613*	.736*
15. Ostentation Factor															-	.580*
16. Taunting Factor																-

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

AES = Anger Expression Scale, BMES = Benign and Malicious Envy Scale, GNS = Grandiose Narcissism Scale, LOSS = Lying in Ordinary Situation Scale, MNS = Maladies of the Nafs Scale

DISCUSSION

The present study developed a psychometric instrument that demonstrated good reliability and validity indices to measure the “maladies of the nafs” with this long-reported concept in Islamic literature purported as impeding spiritual growth and adversely impacting physical and mental well-being and an individuals’ relationships with others.

The MNS scale was developed after a process demonstrating construct and face validity with this new 94 item scale demonstrating a Cronbach’s α of 0.97. Eleven factors (anger, arrogance, avarice, back-biting (gossip propensity), breaking ties (grudge tendency), envy, dishonesty, ostentation, slander, taunting, and materialism) were elucidated utilizing a PCA, with high reliability for these factors evident. Internal reliability was evident with moderate to high correlations between different factors, and convergent validity additionally noted (mild-moderate correlations with similar measures from established psychometric instruments (AES, BMES, LOSS)).

Factors included in the Maladies of Nafs (MNS), were quite extensive and are detailed in Table 3. However, it has been noted that the manifestation of these often adverse traits can vary based on individual differences, situational contexts, and cultural norms (i.e. an individual may be angry in only certain environments or scenarios). The inter-correlations suggest however that if one factor is expressed, that others may also be expressed simultaneously.

This study has a number of limitations. The study was conducted amongst university students in Pakistan, with the results potentially not generalizable to individuals of different ages or from different cultures. Replication of these findings utilizing the MNS in a different population cohort would thus be optimal. Establishing further convergent validity would be important given some modest correlations between the MNS factors and some psychometric instruments included in this study (i.e. GNS scale). Additionally, correlating the MNS with data from personality inventories and measures of impulsivity might be optimal in future research.

CONCLUSION

The MNS demonstrated robust psychometric indices for measuring the “maladies of the nafs” and will hopefully support evidence-based research on this concept within Islamic Psychology in the future.

LIMITATION AND STUDY FORWARD

The present work, which seeks to construct the Maladies of Nafs Scale (MNS), faces several technical constraints that should be taken into account. The primary emphasis of this study was on university students in Pakistan, which may restrict the generalizability of the scale to other populations. Future research should investigate the MNS's psychometric qualities in other demographic groups in order to improve it. Moreover, while the MNS has shown convergent validity, it is recommended that future research endeavors focus on broadening this aspect by examining its associations with additional psychometric measures, such as personality inventories and impulsivity assessments. This will ensure that the scale possesses comprehensive applicability within the domain of Islamic Psychology research.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND ETHICAL STANDARDS

The research study obtained official approval from the Board of Advanced Studies of the International Islamic University, confirming compliance with ethical and research protocols. It is imperative to underscore the absence of conflicts of interest pertaining to any other party. Moreover, the investigation was carried out with a strict commitment to upholding ethical principles, ensuring the absence of any unethical behaviors such as plagiarism or incorrect testing protocols.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors express deep gratitude to the students who actively participated in this study, as their involvement was crucial in enabling its execution. The contributions and collaboration provided by the individual were of great value in facilitating the effective culmination of this study endeavor. It is noteworthy to mention that no financial or nonfinancial assistance was extended for the purpose of conducting this research.

AUTHOR'S CONTRIBUTION

Shahid Ijaz: Made substantial contributions to the conceptualization and design of the study, performed data collecting, conducted analysis and interpretation of the findings, and assumed primary responsibility for producing the report.

Muhammad Tahir Khalily: Made substantial contributions to the conceptualization and design of the study, and actively engaged in the drafting of the manuscript.

Carrie York Al-Karam: Contributed to the conceptualization and design of the study.

Brian Hallahan: Contributed to the development and shaping final draft of the manuscript. The results were evaluated by all authors and the final version of the publication was approved by them.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, A., & Sharif, M. F. (2019). The Concept of Islamic Personality and Spiritual Development. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 9(9), 936-949.
- Abu-Raiya, H. (2012). Towards a systematic Qura'nic theory of personality. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 15(3), 217-233.
- Akhtar, H. M. (2017). *Rooh ki bimariyan aur un ka ilaj [Spiritual Diseases and Remedies, Urdu]*. Khanqah Imdadiyah. Accessed at: <https://d3irrwpfbszm5l.cloudfront.net/media/documents/AT020-Rooh%20ki%20bimariyan.pdf>
- Al-Ghazali. (1993). *Ihya 'Uloom-id-Deen* (F. ul-Karim, Trans., Vol. 3). Darul Ishaat.
- AL-HUJWRI. (2015). *KASHF AL-MAHJUB*. ROUTLEDGE.
- Amin, M. I., Trisnani, A., Nasif, H., & Puspita, E. D. A. (2022, November 8). *Qalbun Saliim: The Concept of A Clean Heart as A Foundation for Mental Health According to Ibn Qayyim al Jauziyah*. [Paper presentation]. International Conference on Psychology, Mental Health, Religion, and Spirituality. UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya.
- Andopa, A., Hardivizon, H., & Yunita, N. (2018). The Meaning of Nafs in the Qur'an Based on Quraish Shihab's Interpretation. *AJIS: Academic Journal of Islamic Studies*, 3(2), 139-162.
- Arroisi, J., & Rahmadi, M. A. (2022). Theory of Mind on Ghazali and Ibn Qayyim Al Jauzi Perspective (Analysis Model on Islamic Psychology). *International Journal of Islamic Psychology*, 5(1), 8-22.
- Banerjee, A. V., & Duflo, E. (2011). *Poor economics: A radical rethinking of the way to fight global poverty*. PublicAffairs.
- Bond, M. H., & Smith, P. B. (1996). Cross-cultural social and organizational psychology. *Annual review of psychology*, 47(1), 205-235.
- Cleary, M., Walter, G., Sayers, J., Lopez, V., & Hungerford, C. (2015). Arrogance in the workplace: Implications for mental health nurses. *Issues in mental health nursing*, 36(4), 266-271.
- Dijkstra, P., & Buunk, B. P. (2002). Jealousy as a function of rival characteristics: An evolutionary perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 6(2), 131-148.
- Feder, J., Levant, R. F., & Dean, J. (2010). Boys and violence: A gender-informed analysis. *Psychology of Violence*, 1(S), 3-12. <https://doi.org/10.1037/2152-0828.1.S.3>
- Fernandez, E., & Johnson, S. L. (2016). Anger in psychological disorders: Prevalence, presentation, etiology and prognostic implications. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 46, 124-135.
- Fitness, J., & Fletcher, G. J. (1993). Love, hate, anger, and jealousy in close relationships: a prototype and cognitive appraisal analysis. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, 65(5), 942.
- Fiza, M., & Nazeer, S. (2020). From our soul to the horizon of self: the sacred psychology of self-affirmation through self-annihilation in hazrat ali hajveri's unveiling the veiled. *Iqbal Review*, 61(4), 5.

- Foster, J. D., McCain, J. L., Hibberts, M. F., Brunell, A. B., & Johnson, R. B. (2015). The Grandiose Narcissism Scale: A global and facet-level measure of grandiose narcissism. *Personality and individual differences*, 73, 12-16.
- Ghazali, A. H. (2001). *Kimya I Saadat (Alchemy of Eternal Bliss)*. (M. A. Bilal, Trans., J. Dr. M. A. Mughal, Rev.). Kazi Publication.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (2004). *Bridging differences: Effective intergroup communication*. Sage publications.
- Hart, C. L., Jones, J. M., Terrizzi Jr, J. A., & Curtis, D. A. (2019). Development of the lying in everyday situations scale. *The American Journal of Psychology*, 132(3), 343-352
- Kardaş, S. (2018). Ibn Ata Allah al-Iskandari and al-Hikam al-'Ata'iyya in the Context of Spiritually-Oriented Psychology and Counseling. *Spiritual Psychology and Counseling*, 3(2), 115-137.
- Kasser, T. (2002). *The high price of materialism*. MIT Press.
- Kasser, T., & Sheldon, K. M. (2000). Of wealth and death: Materialism, mortality salience, and consumption behavior. *Psychological Science*, 11(4), 348-351.
- Khan, A. H. *The Problem of Evil: Islamic Theodicy*. Proceedings of SOCIOINT14.
- Khattak, A. Z., & Mustafa, R. (2022). Islamic psychology in the view of maulana ashraf ali thanvi: a literature review. *Al Misbah Research Journal*, 2(04), 11-20.
- Kim, H., Schlicht, R., Schardt, M., & Florack, A. (2021). The contributions of social comparison to social network site addiction. *PloS One*, 16(10), e0257795.
- Knight, R. G., Chisholm, B. J., Paulin, J. M., & Waal-Manning, H. J. (1988). The Spielberger anger expression scale: Some psychometric data. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 27(3), 279-281.
- Kwiatkowska, M. M., Rogoza, R., & Volkodav, T. (2022). Psychometric properties of the Benign and Malicious Envy Scale: Assessment of structure, reliability, and measurement invariance across the United States, Germany, Russia, and Poland. *Current Psychology*, 41(5), 2908-2918.
- Lammers, J., Stoker, J. I., Jordan, J., Pollmann, M., & Jordan, J. (2011). Power Increases Infidelity Among Men and Women. *Psychological Science*, 22(9), 1191-1197.
- Mohamed, Y. (1986). *The Islamic conception of human nature with special reference to the development of an Islamic psychology* (Master's thesis, University of Cape Town).
- Piff, P. K., Stancato, D. M., Côté, S., Mendoza-Denton, R., & Keltner, D. (2012). Higher social class predicts increased unethical behavior. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(11), 4086-4091.
- Rassool, G. H., & Luqman, M. (2023). Ibn qayyim al-jawzīyah's islāmic psychology: psychological and spiritual diseases. *Journal of Spirituality in Mental Health*, 25(2), 144-159.
- Setiawan, C., Maulani, M., & Busro, B. (2020). Sufism as The Core of Islam: A Review of Imam Junayd Al-Baghdadi's Concept of Tasawwuf. *Teosofia: Indonesian Journal of Islamic Mysticism*, 9(2), 171-192.
- Sussman, S., Lisha, N., & Griffiths, M. (2011). Prevalence of the addictions: A problem of the majority or the minority? *Evaluation & the Health Professions*, 34(1), 3-56.
- Tandler, N., & Petersen, L. E. (2020). Are self-compassionate partners less jealous? Exploring the mediation effects of anger rumination and willingness to forgive on the association between self-compassion and romantic jealousy. *Current Psychology*, 39, 750-760.
- Weiss, B., & Miller, J. D. (2018). Distinguishing between grandiose narcissism, vulnerable narcissism, and narcissistic personality disorder. *Handbook of trait narcissism: Key advances, research methods, and controversies*, 3-13.
- Williams, L. A., & DeSteno, D. (2008). Pride and perseverance: the motivational role of pride. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 94(6), 1007.
- Young, J. E. (2014). *Schema-focused therapy for personality disorders*. In *Cognitive behaviour therapy* (pp. 215-236). Routledge.
- Yusuf, H. (2012). *Purification of the heart: Signs, symptoms and cures of the spiritual diseases of the heart*. eBooks2go, Inc..
- Yusuf, H. *Signs, symptoms and cures of the spiritual diseases of the heart*. Translation and Commentary of Imām Mawlūd's Maṭharat al-Qulūb. Cited in https://www.fussilatbd.com/Islamic/English/Hamza-Yusuf/Hamza-Yusuf_Purification-of-the-Heart.pdf (accessed May 27, 2023).