

The people-orientation of definitions appears to be rapidly emerging and spreading. Schumacher (1975) emphasized, for instance, that development does not start with goods. It starts with people and education, organization, and discipline. To him “the alleviation of poverty depends primarily on the removal of these deficiencies. This is why it requires a process of evolution. All three must evolve step by step and the foremost task of development must be to speed this evolution. The policy must involve the entire population”.

Ong (1976), therefore, says that it really means developing people. Then, the people will change their environment. The development factors, according to Ong, are economy, social justice, moral values, and attitudes.

The environmental factor is also part of the definition of Inayatullah (1967). He viewed development as a process through which a society achieves increased control over the environment and its political destiny. The process also enables the individuals to gain increase control over themselves.

Based on the sample definitions given, it can be concluded that there is no universal definition of development. While some elements may recur in the definitions, not one of the definitions is exactly the same as another. There are several reasons for this. For one, development is relative: its meaning varies based on one's situation and experiences.

Development is also multi-dimensional. Thus, it is difficult to come up with a definition that can include all these dimensions and respective indicators of positives growth.

The process aspect of development is another reason. If we agree that a process is something that is dynamic and ever-changing, then, we are, in essence, saying that we cannot refer to something that is in a rut, or something that is static as development. In other words, as a process, development keeps on changing. We cannot freeze it, so that it will be the same throughout. For once it loses its dynamism, it ceases to be a process.