JIEBR
JOURNAL OF ISLAMIC ECONOMIC AND BUSINESS RESEARCH

E ISSN: 2798-1304
P ISSN: 2798-1207

Journal of Islamic Economic and Business Research
Vol. 2 Number(1), Page 51-65, (June) 2022

Investigating the Methods of Restaurant Rating to Develop Halal Compliance Rating (HCR) Tool Within the Halal Certified Restaurants Globally

Md Siddique E Azam[1], Moha Asri Abdullah[2], Anis Najiha Ahmad[3]

[1]International Institute for Halal Research and Training (INHART)
[1,2,3]International Islamic University Malaysia (IIUM)

Article History

Received: March, 03nd 2022 Revised: April, 21nd 2022 Accepted: June, 7nd 2022

**Corresponding author:*
E-mail:
siddique77hstu@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper reviews the weighted average approach of rating systems among the restaurant industries globally. Such review is crucial to developing Halal Compliance Rating (HCR) tool within the halal-certified restaurants in Malaysia as all as in other parts of the world. Halal-certified restaurants are in the Halal food and beverage (F&B) industry. At this moment, the Halal F&B industry does not have any standard rating method to rate the level of halal compliance practice of halal-certified restaurants. Hence, the objective of the study is to investigate the methods of restaurant rating globally and adopt the best-suited method to develop an HCR tool within halal-certified restaurants. Simultaneously, the study finds and recommends suitable linguistic and symbolic expressions for different ratings of halal compliance. To achieve the objectives, an extensive literature review was carried out. Additionally, to develop the HCR tool, the study used the ten components of halal compliance identified and weighted by Azam (2021). The findings show an example of using and calculating the HCR tool to rate the halal compliance of a restaurant and expressing the ratings linguistically and/or symbolically. Simultaneously, this paper justifies the use of the weighted average approach for rating halal-certified restaurants. Finally, it provides recommendations for future research to establish a standard HCR tool globally.

Keywords: *Halal compliance, rating, restaurant, weighted-average method.*

How to cite:
Azam, M. S. E., Abdullah, M. A., & Ahmad, A. N. Investigating the Methods of Restaurant Rating to Develop Halal Compliance Rating (HCR) Tool Within the Halal Certified Restaurants Globally. *Journal of Islamic Economic and Business Research, 2*(1). 51-65. https://doi.org/10.18196/jiebr.v2i1.32

I. Introduction

The halal F&B is the fastest-growing segment of the global halal industry. According to the report by Research (2021), it is also the fastest-growing consumer market in the world that growing by US$412.33 billion during the period of 2015 to 2020. Additionally, according to the State of the Global Islamic Economy Report 2020/21, halal F&B was the least affected segment by the COVID-19 pandemic (DinarStandard, 2020). However, the restaurant and hospitality sectors have been affected seriously. Restaurants are crucial in socio-economic development where prepared meals are served to paying customers. Likewise, one of the most crucial sectors in the field of the Halal food industry is the restaurant industry. Food is one of the basic needs of human beings that fall under the necessity level of daruryyiat of sharia. Out of this basic need, restaurants are the business establishments to provide services for foods and beverages, most commonly. The global halal food and beverage market spending in 2019 was US$1.17 trillion, projected to reach US$1.38 trillion by 2024 (Thomson Reuters and DinarStandard, 2018). This statistical evidence implies the increasingly high demand for halal foods and beverages (F&B) globally. One of the biggest service providers in this sector is the restaurants scattered in different locations in the market. Simultaneously, the responsibility of providing the faith-based needs (halal and toyyib foods) of consumers is shouldered on the halal-certified restaurant operators (Rahman et al., 2012). In the context of Malaysia, the duties or obligations of halal-certified restaurant providers are reflected by the Halal Standard 1500:2019. However, some recent non-compliance issues in halal restaurants have raised concerns among consumers regarding the reliability of halal certification in Malaysia (Tiema, 2019; Rahman et al., 2012).

When it comes to appraising the performance of the restaurants, it is usually measured and expressed in terms of financial and non-financial performance. Similarly, Halal-certified restaurants are appraised in terms of their financial performance as well as halal compliance practices. Halal compliance can be measured from several aspects.

Problem statement: The number of Halal-certified businesses is increasing every year (Department of Statistics Malaysia, 2017), and so is the number of halal-certified restaurants. According to the 2015 economic census released in 2017, a total of 6,138 establishments received Halal certificates, and the number of applications is increasing tremendously every year (Department of Statistics Malaysia, 2017). A similar trend is observed in other countries as well. For instance, as of the 2017 report, 127,286 products have been certified by the MUI, which proves the booming halal market in Indonesia (Mufti, 2018). Additionally, The Islamic Religious Council of Singapore (MUIS) has certified more than 4,400 premises and 54,378 types of products made in Singapore, which is five times more than in past decades (MUIS, 2018). Subsequently, it leads to an increase in the number of options for consumer preferences as well as the number of competitors in the market. Considering only the halal concern of consumers, the halal food industry lacks an established and systematic tool to rate the level of halal compliance. The earlier research

(Azam et al., 2021) explored and identified the components of best halal practices for restaurants. However, the study was limited to selecting ten components of best halal practices for restaurants. In this regard, a suitable methodology needs to be explored to develop the HCR tool. Such a tool is also essential to appraise the performance of restaurant operators against their halal compliance practice.

With the problem statement mentioned above, the present study aims to address a few research questions (RQs). What mathematical approach is used in the existing rating systems globally? What are the linguistic expressions of the existing compliance rating systems? Can a similar method also be adopted for the HCR system to rate the halal compliance practices? How the components of best halal practice that have been selected by earlier studies be used to develop the HCR tool?

To address the RQs, the study aims to achieve the following objectives-

1. To investigate the method of existing compliance rating systems globally
2. To explore the linguistic expressions of restaurant ratings globally and recommend a suitable expression for the HCR system globally
3. To develop an HCR tool applying the method of existing rating systems and using the components of best halal practices selected by earlier research

II. Literature Review

Halal compliance is crucial as it is a faith-based need of Muslim consumers globally. Halal compliance refers to meeting the requirements to meet a certain standard of halal products and services. In this regard, it is important to identify the components of halal compliance that encompass the definition of halal and its standard. After reviewing several halal standards, the definition of halal, and rating systems, Azam (2021) identifies ten (10) most significant components of HCR. Table-1 presents the ten components of HCR and their respective weights as measured in a previous study using the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) method.

Table 1. Ten components of HCR and their weights

No.	HCR components	Rating code	Weights
[1]	**Knowledge of halal and *toyyib:*** knowledge of critical ingredients, halal and toyyib, cleanliness and processing	KNW	15.00%
[2]	**Management responsibility:** training, internal halal committee, documentation and storage, and communication	MGT	16.00%
[3]	**Premise:** location and design, prayer facility, water-friendly toilet	PLD	8.00%
[4]	**Hygiene and food safety:** GHP grading, cleanliness, pest control, hygiene, lighting, ventilation, food storage, changing room, furniture, wash basin, toilet, drainage facility, and disposal of waste.	HFS	22.00%
[5]	**Human resources and culture:** personal hygiene, clothing, health condition, training, code of conduct, appearance, Muslim workers, Muslim-friendly services, and medical examination.	HRC	4.00%

[6]	**Branding, packaging and labeling:** name of the restaurant, design, halal marketing, packaging for home delivery, storage	BPL	4.00%
[7]	**Image and customer satisfaction:** online review (if any), customer feedback, online presence on halal apps and web pages	ICS	6.00%
[8]	**Legal requirements:** local licensing and other certifications and documents	LR	10.00%
[9]	**Green practice and sustainability:** water and energy efficiency and conservation, recycling and composting, no toxic or chemical products, local and organic foods.	GPS	5.00%
[10]	**Halal supply chain:** storage, halal suppliers, dedicated vehicles, transportation, etc.	HSC	10.00%

Source: Azam (2021)

Performance Appraisal And Compliance Rating

Performance appraisal refers to a management system where the performance of an individual or an organization is evaluated relative to a certain standard (Macwan & Sajja, 2013). Such actual evaluation against certain standards or requirements provides the individuals or organizations feedback that helps respective participants improve their performance (Dessler, 2000).

The most widely used method of measuring performance appraisal is the Fuzzy logic, a powerful problem-solving methodology (Macwan & Sajja, 2013). Simultaneously, most of the research used this methodology for employee performance evaluation of an organization. Yee & Chen (2009) used the Fuzzy method in their study to deal with rating appraisal of employees in terms of a number of factors like working output, knowledge and skills, personal quality, and informal events and contribution. However, the wider application of this methodology also involves evaluating an organization's performance against certain standards. For example, Yousif & Shaout (2018) used the Fuzzy logic computational model to evaluate the performance of the universities in Sudan and categorize them. Additionally, the method has also been used to evaluate the change management process in the context of sustainability and rate as high, medium, and low (Vlasenko et al., 2019).

One of the several approaches of the Fuzzy method is the weighted average approach (Chang & Hung, 2005; Guh et al., 2008). The approach involves three operations. Firstly, the scoring on the performance achieved by the respondents under each factor. Secondly, the weighting reflects the relative importance of each attribute for a group of relevant factors. And finally, the aggregating is the perception function of decision making in making a final decision (Guh et al., 2008). Chang & Hung (2005) expressed the approach as the following function, which consists of fuzzy addition, multiplication, and division.

$$M = \frac{\sum_{i-1}^{n} Wi.Ai}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} Wi}$$

Where,
M is the membership function
W is the weightage of each group of relevant factors, and
A is the achieved score for each factor

Example:
ABC company wants to rate its overall performance. For this, it uses a rating model with five scale levels with numerical values 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. This example considers two components of 'competencies' and 'performance goals' to measure the overall performance, where each component has a number of items. The company assigns certain weights to the components and each component item. While applying the weights, it has been assured that-

- The sum of the weights of all component items within each component/ section is 100.
- The sum of the weights of all components (in this example, 'competencies' and 'performance goal') within a performance measurement document is also 100.

Table 2 shows the rating calculation for the component 'competencies'

Table 2. Rating calculation of the component "Competencies"

Items	Item Rating Score	Maximum Score	Decimal Score (Item score/ Maximum Score)	Weights	Weighted score (Decimal score x Weight)
Teamwork	4	5	0.8	35	35
Leadership	3	5	0.6	5	5
Communication	2	5	0.4	10	10
Analytical skills	4	5	0.8	20	20
Ethics	5	5	1.0	10	10
Conceptual Thinking	4	5	0.8	20	20
Total			**4.4**	**100**	**100**

Calculation of the competency rating will be as follows:

Competency rating (C1) = {(Weighted Score) / (Total Maximum Weighted Score)} x (Maximum Numeric Rating from Section Rating Model)
= (77.0/100) x 5
= 3.85 ≅ 4.00

Table 3 shows the calculation for the 'performance goal' rating

Table 3. Rating calculation of the component "Performance goal"

Items	Item Rating Score	Maximum Score	Decimal Score (Item score/ Maximum Score)	Weights	Weighted score (Decimal score x Weight)
Increase sales revenue	5	5	1.0	30	30.0

Cut expenses	3	5	0.6	30	18.0
Go global	5	5	1.0	25	25.0
Participate in mentoring	5	5	1.0	15	15.0
Total				100	88

Calculation of the 'performance goal' rating will be as follows

Performance goal rating (C2) = {(Total Weighted Score) / (Total Maximum Weighted Score)} x (Maximum Numeric Rating from Section Rating Model)
= (88.0/100) x 5
= 4.40 ≅ 4.00

Calculation of the competency rating will be as follows:
Now, let's say that the assigned weights for each component, C1 and C2, are 40 and 60, respectively. The overall score is as follows:

Table 4. Overall Performance Rating

Components	Achieved Rating Score	Maximum Score	Decimal Score (Item score/ Maximum Score)	Weights	Weighted score (Decimal score x Weight)
Competency (C1)	4	5	0.8	60	48.0
Performance goal (C2)	4	5	0.8	40	32.0
Total				100	80

Therefore, the calculation for the overall performance rating will be as follows:

Overall Performance Rating = {(Weighted Score) / (Total Maximum Weighted Score)} x (Maximum Numeric Rating from Section Rating Model)
= (80.0/100) x 5
= 4.00

Source: How Performance Ratings Using the Weighted Average Method are Calculated, retrieved from https://fga.fa.us1.oraclecloud.com)

The weighted average method is also known as the weighting-rating-calculating (WRC) method of multi-criteria decision-making (MCDM). It is one of the widely used methods of MCDM for rating compliance performance (Schöttle & Arroyo, 2017). In this regard, this method has been used by Røtterud et al. (2020) in hygiene performance rating as an auditing scheme for the evaluation of slaughter hygiene. The research weighted the scores against 12 criteria of hygiene on a given scale of 1 to 3. Additionally, Olabanji & Mpofu (2020) used both Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) and the weighted average method for

identifying optimal design concepts in their research. The following subsections review relevant rating systems that apply weighted average approach for rating compliance performance against respective standards and regulations.

Crescent Muslim Friendly Hotel Rating System

The Crescent rating system is the most widely used rating system until now in 13 different fields of Halal/Muslim travel, tourism and hospitality. For example, this system uses a numerical rating of 1 to 7 to rate the Muslim-friendly hotels depending on the halal compliance level of the hotel management. The four different criteria that are considered to check the halal compliance level are halal food facilities, prayer facilities, services during Ramadan, and the level of non-halal activities in the hotel. The numerical rating of Muslim Friendliness has been further categorized into Helpful (1.2 and 3), Accommodating (4 and 5), and Specialized (6 and 7) (https://www.crescentrating.com/rating-accredations/hotels .html).

The Muslim-friendly hotel rating system

Malaysia has also developed a standard for Muslim-Friendly Hospitality Services (MFHS) known as MS2610:2015. The initiative of developing MFHS was started in 2012 by the International Institute for Halal Research and Training (INHART) and the Department of Standards Malaysia (DSM). Finally, the standard was published and released in January 2015 (Commercial Cooperation of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (COMCEC), 2017). MFHS also applies the weighted average approach for the calculation of compliance ratings. The rating system puts a score against the compliance of the legal requirements, six general requirements, and 4 specific requirements as mentioned in MS2610:2015.

Global Islamic Economy Indicator (GIEI) score

It has been more than seven years since Thompson Reuters and Dinar Standard started publishing the Global Islamic Economy report on an annual basis. The report provides a comprehensive overview of the global halal industry that represents the global Islamic economy. It scores in 73 countries and ranks top 15 economies in six different fields of the halal industry globally. For such ranking, the report adopts the composite weighted methodology for 49 important metrics. The indicators are weighted under four broad components that include supply and demand, governance, awareness, and social considerations. A weighted score is calculated for each indicator to decide the final ranking of a country (Thomson Reuters and DinarStandard, 2019).

The online movie rating system

The online reviews and ratings have a great influence on the consumers, especially millennials, for choosing their intended products and/or services (Mangold & Smith, 2012). One of the most common cases in this digital world is movie rating. The three most popular and recognized movie rating websites are IMDb, MovieLens, and Rotten Tomatoes, which use the application of the weighted average scoring method for rating movies from the reviews and scores given by the critics and users online (Allahbakhsh & Ignjatovic, 2015).

Compliance rating tools in other industries

The Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) method of sustainability rating is one of the most popular rating systems globally. The method also uses the weighted average approach to rate an establishment based on a total of 69 scores distributed amongst six different categories. Simultaneously, the benchmark in sustainability rating globally is the Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) assessment method. BREEAM uses a system of 'credits' in eight different areas of sustainability. The method adopts three types of weighting for all the eight areas of sustainability (Table 1). For each sustainability section, it is the assessor who determines the credits for the respective sections based on the assessment issues. The percentage of credits achieved in each section is then multiplied by the corresponding weighting. Adding up all the section scores together gives the total BREEAM score compared to the benchmark. Examples are given in Table 2. 8 and Table 2. 9.

Table 5. BREEAM Weighting for the different environmental section

Sustainability Section	Fully fitted out	Weighting Shell only	Shell and core only
Management	12%	12.5%	11%
Health and well being	15%	10%	10.5%
Energy	15%	14.5%	15%
Transport	9%	11.5%	10%
Water	7%	4%	7.5%
Materials	13.5%	17.5%	14.5%
Waste	8.5%	11%	9.5%
Land use and ecology	10%	13%	11%
Pollution	10%	6%	11%
Total	**100%**	**100%**	**100%**

Source: https://www.breeam.com/

Table 6. BREEAM Score and Rating Calculation Example

BREEAM Section	Credits achieved	Credits available	% Of Credits achieved	Section weighting	Section score (%)
Management	10	22	45.45	0.12	5.45
Health and well being	8	10	80.00	0.15	12.00
Energy					10.13
Transport	16	30	53.33	0.19	4.44
Water	5	9	55.56	0.08	3.33
Materials	5	9	55.56	0.06	6.25
Waste	6	12	50.00	0.125	3.21
Land use and ecology	3	7	42.86	0.075	5.00
Pollution	5	10	50.00	0.10	3.85

Innovation	5	13	38.46	0.10	2.00
Total	2	10	20.00	0.10	**55.68%**

Source: http://www.breeam.com/BREEAM2011SchemeDocument/Content/03_ScoringRating/calculating_a_building_s_breeam_rating.htm

The linguistic expression of different ratings

Once the performance has been calculated and rated, the numerical rating can be expressed through stars or linguistically in a number of ways. Perform (2019) stated several examples in his web article, which is presented in Table 2. 7.

Table 7. Examples of linguistic expression of the numerical rating scale

Rating Organization	Rating
Berkeley human resources department, University of California	5- Exception (E) 4- Exceeds expectations (EE) 3- Meets expectations (ME) 2- Improvement needed (I) 1- Unsatisfactory (U)
Huntington Ingalls	5- Far exceeds (E) 4- Exceeds expectations (EE) 3- Meets expectations (ME) 2- Development required (DR) 1- Improvement required (IR)
Harvard	5- Leading 4- Strong 3- Solid 2- Building 1- Not meeting expectations
Press Ganey Associates LLC, US	5- Very good 4- Good 3- Fair 2- Poor 1- Very poor

Restaurant hygiene rating system in Malaysia

Malaysia has a grading system for restaurants under the Food Hygiene Regulations (FHR) 2009. FHR was established to ensure that the consumers are free from food-borne diseases and served safe and quality foods. The restaurants are graded from the inspection and scored against 100 cleanliness points under nine major aspects. The final grading is expressed as 'A' (for 86-100 points), 'B' (71-85 points), 'C' (51-70 points), and 'D or No grade' (less than 50 points). Restaurants that score 'D' are given notice for immediate shut down (Just & Show, 2019).

Restaurant ratings globally

There are numerous rating methods that are well-known and used globally. A recent study on gastronomy tourism by Bertan (2020) reviewed a number of restaurant rating systems that are most popular across the world. Table 6 identifies the linguistic expression used by these rating systems.

Table 8. Linguistic expressions of the most popular restaurant ratings globally

Name of the rating system	Rating expression
1. Micheline guide of restaurant ranking (International)	**Star rating (1 to 3):** - One star = 'Very good cooking, worth trying.' - Two star = 'Excellent cooking that is worth multiple visits' - Three star = 'Exceptional cooking that is worthy of regular visits.'
2. La Liste restaurant rating (International)	Restaurants are scored out of 100 and then ranked based on the **"trustworthiness index"** from 0 to 10, where '0' implies 'not to be trusted at all,' and '10' implies 'very trustworthy'.
3. The world's best 50 restaurants (International)	Ranking from number one (1) to number fifty (50) based on the votes from food experts, consumers, food writers, and travelers.
4. Gault Millau guide of restaurant ranking (Europe)	Ratings are based on a point from 1 to 20. The listing is done only for those restaurants that achieve points between 10 to 20, and the scores are expressed as follows- - 19-20 points get 4 chef's hats and expressed as exceptional. - 17-18 points get 3 chef's hats and expressed as excellent. - 15-16 points get 2 chef's hats and expressed as very good. - 13-14 points get 1 chef's hat and expressed as good. - 10-12 points are expressed as average ranking
5. The Good Food Guide of restaurant ranking (England)	Restaurants are rated on a point scale of 1 to 10, where the ranking is done from the consumers' feedback and assessment from experts like writers, critics of the food industry, restaurant owners, and chefs.

Muslim-friendly hotel rating system:

Several Muslim-friendly hotel rating systems are well-recognized and becoming popular day by day. Table 2 presents some of these systems reported by the Commercial Cooperation of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (COMCEC) (2016). All these rating systems adopt the star rating system, where the stars range from a minimum of 1 (one) star to a maximum of 5 (five) stars.

Table 9. Muslim Friendly Tourism (MFT) standards using a star rating system.

Standard	Country	Issuing body
MS2610:2015	Malaysia	Department of Standards Malaysia (Government)
TS 13683	Turkey	Turkish Standards Institution (Government)
Crescent Rating (1-7 stars)	Global	Crescent Rating (Private)
Salam Standard	Global	Lagitasu Travel (Private)
Taiwan Muslim Friendly Tourism (MFT) certification	Taiwan	China Muslim Association (an NGO backed by the Government)
Sofyan Standard	Indonesia	Sofyan Hotels (Private)
Instituto Halal internal standard	Spain	Instituto Halal (NGO)

Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED)

This method of sustainability rating is one of the most popular rating systems globally. The method uses a total of 69 scores distributed amongst six different categories. Each category has been assigned a credit score based on the number of involved items. The total of 69 points are classified into four ratings, namely, Certified (26-32 points), Silver (32-38 points), Gold (39-51 points), and Platinum (52-69 points). Similarly, the Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment (BREEAM) method is considered to be the benchmark in sustainability rating globally and rated as Fail, Pass, Good, Very Good, Excellent, and Outstanding.

III. Results and Analysis

From the reviewed literature, it has been found that all the reputed international and national rating systems have measured the compliance performance of restaurants against certain standards. The measurement is done in terms of scores or points. Then the scores or points are expressed both linguistically and symbolically. Table-1 identifies and recommends suitable linguistic and symbolic expressions for the HCR score. The developed rating tool in this study rates the halal-certified restaurants with a minimum score of 1 to a maximum of 5. The rating of halal-certified restaurants can be expressed as 'Excellent' with five (5) stars for an HCR score of 4.5 to 5.0. This is followed by an HCR score of 3.5 to less than 4.5, which will be expressed as 'Very Good' with four (4) stars. The third rating category is expressed with a three (3) stars symbol that implies 'Good' halal compliance and an achieved score of 2.5 to less than 3.5. The 'Satisfactory' halal compliance achieves a score of 1.5 to less than 2.5 and receives two (2) stars. Finally, restaurants with a score of less than 1.5 will be expressed as 'Poor' halal compliance performance and receive one (1) star symbolic expression.

Table 10. Linguistic and symbolic expression of HCR

HCR Score	Linguistic expression	Symbolic Expression
4.5 to 5.0	Excellent	✪✪✪✪✪
3.5 to < 4.5	Very Good	✪✪✪✪
2.5 to < 3.5	Good	✪✪✪
1.5 to < 2.5	Satisfactory	✪✪
Less than 1.5	Poor	✪

Halal Compliance Rating (HCR) tool

This study aimed to develop an HCR tool for halal-certified restaurants. In this regard, from the literature review, it has been found that most of the popular rating systems across the world have used the weighted average method to rate the compliance performance of restaurants against certain standards. In this method, scores are given under different components of compliance performance. Earlier research (Azam, 2021) finds ten components of HCR (Table-1). The HCR tool has been developed by applying the weighted average method and the ten HCR components. Table-2 shows the HCR tool and its application to rate halal-certified restaurants as an example. The example rates ABC restaurants for which the halal auditor gives scores against the ten components of HCR. The second column of the table presents the achieved average scores of the restaurant against the ten HCR components, where the maximum achievable score of each component is 5.0 (column 3). The actual score for each component is found by dividing the average score (column 2) by the maximum score (column 3). The assigned weights of the components are presented in column 5, which had been calculated and weighted by Azam (2021). The total assigned weight (∑W) of the ten components is 100. The last column calculates the weighted average score of each component by multiplying actual scores (column 4) and respective weights (column 5) of the HCR components.

Before calculating the final HCR score, the summation of the weighted average score (∑Wi) is found by adding all the individual weighted average scores (Wi) of the HCR components. Finally, the rating is calculated by dividing ∑Wi by ∑W and multiplying with the maximum numeric rating. The example shows an HCR rating score of 4.0 for ABC restaurant, which is expressed linguistically as 'Very Good' and/or with the symbol of four stars (✪✪✪✪).

Table 11. HCR tool and an example of applying the tool HCR rating of ABC restaurant

HCR Components (1)	Average Score (2)	Maximum score (3)	Actual score value (4) = 2/	Assigned Weight (W) (5)	Weightedaverage score (Wi) = (4) *(5)
HFS	4.00	5	0.80	22.30%	12.24
MGT	4.13	5	0.83	15.70%	12.95
KNW	4.11	5	0.82	15.30%	6.50
LR	4.09	5	0.82	10.00%	18.25
HSC	4.00	5	0.80	9.50%	3.28
PLD	4.40	5	0.88	7.90%	3.87
ICS	3.33	5	0.67	5.50%	3.67
GPS	4.50	5	0.90	5.40%	9.00
BPL	3.50	5	0.70	4.40%	3.78
HRC	3.67	5	0.73	4.10%	6.97
	Total			**∑W = 100**	**∑Wi = 80.50**

Halal Compliance Rating (HCR) score:

= {(∑Wi / ∑W) x (Maximum Numeric Rating from Rating Model)}

In this example,

∑W= 100

∑Wi= 80.64

Maximum numeric score in the model = 5

So, the HCR score = (80.50/100) *5 = 4.0 = Very Good

IV. Conclusion

The study achieves its objective of developing an HCR tool. For this purpose, an investigation has been carried out to explore the methodologies of restaurant rating globally. After an extensive review of literature, the weighted average method was found to be the most suitable and widely used approach for compliance rating of restaurants globally. Simultaneously, the linguistic and symbolic expression of rating was also reviewed. The study suggests one (1) to five (5) stars for symbolic expression and poor to excellent for linguistic expression for an HCR score that ranges from a minimum of one (1) to a maximum of five (5). Additionally, an example of calculating HCR shows the feasible, practical application of the developed HCR tool. A future study should be carried out to validate the developed HCR tool by conducting a field survey among halal-certified restaurants. Simultaneously, the feasibility of applying the HCR tool during an onsite halal audit should be explored. Additionally, the investigation can be extended to other fields of the halal industry like halal logistics and supply chain management, halal cosmetics, and halal pharmaceuticals.

References

Allahbakhsh, M., & Ignjatovic, A. (2015). An iterative method for calculating robust rating scores. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems, 26*(2), 340–350. https://doi.org/10.1109/TPDS.2013.215

Azam, M. S. E., Abdullah, M. A., & Ahmad, A. N. (2021). Identifying and Measuring the Weights of Halal Compliance Rating (HCR) Components of Best Halal Practices by Applying AHP Method. *International Journal of Islamic Business Ethics, 6*(2), 104. https://doi.org/10.30659/ijibe.6.2.104-118

Bertan, S. (2020). Restaurant rankings factors in gastronomy tourism. *Tourism, 68*(1), 34–42. https://doi.org/10.37741/T.68.1.3

Chang, P. T., & Hung, K. C. (2005). Applying the fuzzy-weighted-average approach to evaluate network security systems. *Computers and Mathematics with Applications, 49*(11–12), 1797–1814. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.camwa.2004.10.042

Commercial Cooperation of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (COMCEC). (2016). Muslim Friendly Tourism: Understanding the Demand and Supply Sides In the OIC Member Countries. *COMCEC Coordination Office, August,* 1–148. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0074711

Department of Statistics Malaysia. (2017). *Economic Census 2016 - Halal Statistics.* www.dosm.gov.my

DinarStandard. (2020). State of the Global Islamic Economy Report 2020/21. In *State of the Global Islamic Economy Report 2020/21*. https://cdn.salaamgateway.com

Guh, Y. Y., Po, R. W., & Lee, E. S. (2008). The fuzzy weighted average within a generalized means function. *Computers and Mathematics with Applications, 55*(12), 2699–2706. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.camwa.2007.09.009

Just, N., & Show, F. (2019, September 25). Here ' s Why You Should Care More About That A , B Or C Grade You See On The Walls Of F & B Stores Score-Based Grading. *Vulcan Post.* https://vulcanpost.com/676378/malaysia-food-restaurant-hygiene-grades/

Macwan, N., & Sajja, P. S. (2013). Performance Appraisal using Fuzzy Evaluation Methodology. *International Journal of Engineering and Innovative Technology, 3*(3), 324–329.

Mangold, W. G., & Smith, K. T. (2012). Selling to Millennials with online reviews. *Business Horizons, 55*(2), 141–153. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2011.11.001

Olabanji, O. M., & Mpofu, K. (2020). Hybridized fuzzy analytic hierarchy process and fuzzy weighted average for identifying optimal design concept. *Heliyon, 6*(1). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e03182

Perform, Y. (2019). *Performance Review Ratings Scales - Examples.* PerformYard Blog. https://blog.performyard.com/performance-review-ratings-scales-examples

Rahman, I. N. A., Saleh, R., Rahman, S. A., & Hashim, D. (2012). A Review on factors of non-compliance of halal standards among restaurant operators in kuala lumpur. In *International Business Management* (Vol. 6, Issue 6, pp. 611–620). https://doi.org/10.3923/ibm.2012.611.620

Research, B. (2021). *Global Halal Food & Beverage Market Overview, 2026.* https://www.researchandmarkets.com/

Røtterud, O. J., Gravning, G. E. N., Hauge, S. J., & Alvseike, O. (2020). Hygiene performance rating—An auditing scheme for evaluation of slaughter hygiene. *MethodsX, 7*, 100829. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mex.2020.100829

Schöttle, A., & Arroyo, P. (2017). Comparison of Weighting-Rating-Calculating, Best Value,

and Choosing by Advantages for Bidder Selection. *Journal of Construction, Engineering, and Management, 1*(1), 143 (8).https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0001342

Thomson Reuters and DinarStandard. (2018). State of Global Islamic Economy Report 2018/19. In *Dubai International Financial* Centre. https://haladinar.io/hdn/doc/report2018.pdf

Thomson Reuters and DinarStandard. (2019). State of the Global Islamic Economy Report 2019/20. Dubai International Financial Centre, 1–174. https://haladinar.io/hdn/doc/report2018.pdf

Vlasenko, T., Hatsko, A., Larina, T., Hryn, Y., Streimikiene, D., & Balezentis, T. (2019). Fuzzy evaluation of change management processes in the context of enterprise sustainability. *Sustainability (Switzerland), 11*(22). https://doi.org/10.3390/su11226310

Yee, C. C., & Chen, Y. Y. (2009). Performance Appraisal System using Multifactorial Evaluation Model. *International Scholarly and Scientific Research & Innovation, 3*(5), 304–308.

Yousif, M. K., & Shaout, A. (2018). Fuzzy logic computational model for performance evaluation of Sudanese Universities and academic staff. *Journal of King Saud University - Computer and Information Sciences, 30*(1), 80–119. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jksuci.2016.08.002