

A STUDY ON THE EXPLORATION OF THE HUMAN DEVELOPMENT PARADIGM

Mr. Sachin Kumar¹ Prof. Syed Mehartaj Begum²

¹Research Scholar, Centre for Federal Studies, Jamia Hamdard University, Mehrauli - Badarpur Rd, near Batra Hospital, Block D, Hamdard Nagar, New Delhi, Delhi 110062

E-mail- sachinchoudhary86ss@gmail.com

²Guide, Centre for Federal Studies, Jamia Hamdard University, Mehrauli - Badarpur Rd, near Batra Hospital, Block D, Hamdard Nagar, New Delhi, Delhi 110062

E-mail- smtaj@jamiahamdard.ac.in

Submitted: 24 July, 2020

Revised: 18 August, 2020

Accepted: 03 September, 2020

ABSTRACT

While the notion of growth has been fundamental to human thinking for thousands of years, its novelty also makes the principle of development much better. Until the 1990s the notion of GNP as the measure for development in nations was badly conceived and loosely specified in terms of economic growth or increased revenues. This strategy was not a really good way to reflect on progress, since it was not about promoting human well-being and human rights. As an alternate creation model, human evolution arrived. This document examines the emergence, significance and facets of human development as a model of progress as well as its evaluation in the context of the Human Development Index and its numerous changes. The definition of ability and independence are explored and the paper concludes that education or the learning of know-how and skills are the cornerstone for all other skills which enhances human choice and the human well-being.

Keywords: Development, human development, well-being, capabilities, freedom, choices.

I. INTRODUCTION

For centuries, the concept of creation is a key aspect of human thinking that covers many societies and widespread cultures. Nevertheless it is also believed that the way creation is described may be changed. This is mostly due to the complicated concept of creation. When the topic started in the 1940s, it was influenced primarily by progress on the theory of economic growth which took place both in the 1930s and in the 1940s. Developments that were undertaken in the past sixty years have been badly conceived and loosely described, especially before the last decade of the 20th century. The underlying view was that developing countries became low-income countries, focusing simply on transcending undevelopment issues by economic growth, the growth of GNP, etc. This theory has proven to be a poor way of thinking about sustainability, since development needs to be about promoting human well-being and freedom. While income is a contributing factor to well-being and independence, it is not the only factor. Although revenue and economic development are not insignificant, they constitute rather a weak foundation for evaluating the success of a government. [1] [2]. [3].

Going back to tradition, to name just a handful, in the days of Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill and Karl Marx, it can be seen that the growth movement has a great deal of interest in human existence at the very beginning. The object, the end, of growth have for a long time been the human health as emphasis for philosopher, economists and political leaders. Many Aristotle-Emmanuel Kante philosophers and some of Adam Smith's most influential political economists, from David Ricardo to Thomas Malthus to Karl Marx to John Stuart Mill [3] referred to and highlighted in their work on "human, flowery and human life" as the "real end." That's how Aristotle, in ancient Greece, affirmed: "Wealth is obviously not the good we want, for it is just useful in other ways." The human development strategy is about what Amartya Sen believes to be the fundamental principle of development, which is to promote human life's wealth rather than the wealth of the economy in which people work. Promoting economic wealth is only one aspect and not the whole thing growth.

II. EMERGENCE OF THE HUMAN DEVELOPMENT PARADIGM

The Brutal National Product (BNP) remained the unique tool used by economists to assess the development of nations for decades before 1990. The overall value of the products and services provided in a country was measured. However, there were some deficiencies in this measure. For eg, they could not provide us statistics about people's quality of life, for instance, informing us on

children's wellbeing, school quality, etc. The emphasis was on economic development – with or without concerns of equity. Economic growth has been designed as "a mechanism through which a country's actual per capita income rises over a long term while concurrently reducing poverty and decreasing or at least never the inequities in society" [4] [5].

This is what the World Bank embraced in its analyses, and since the beginning of the 1970s it has been informing the policies thereof. However, significant variations in the World Bank's policies were noted until about 1980. The World Bank primarily wanted to combine per capita development with special aid for the vulnerable. The various methods have been given separate titles. For instance, a strategy was once defined as a "distribution with development," whereas the "simple requires strategy" was used at the other moment. In accordance with macroeconomic equilibrium restitution, systemic adjusting and the foreign exchange incomes in the 1980s, the emphasis was moved towards aggregate expansion. In the 1990's, though, the Bank's overall approach to development focused on growth for deprived and resource-low groups — coupled with aggregate growth [6][7]. The intention, in theory, to better the living standards and health of society's members was embodied in this philosophy of economic growth. Indicators and initiatives, however, remained confined to revenue and real income development remained the goal. Besides the fact that the usage of GNP in the evaluation of developments in different countries has significant limitations or disadvantages [8], the use of GNP in terms of growth indicators or improving the GNP as the primary national objective often has substantial fiscal, political, and cultural consequences.

This notion of growth was opposed by some influential economists such as Amartya Sen, Paul Streeten, Mahbubul Haq and others. They concluded that increasing revenues should not be an end in itself but should be a way to enhance human health. They saw human welfare as an overarching growth goal. They were also of the opinion that, while increased GNP revenues per capita were crucial for improving livelihoods and national economic development, they were not the only pre-conditions. This rise has not been mirrored in or resulted in an improvement in schooling in many countries, or an improvement in health conditions, resulting in higher lifespans[9][10].

The notion of human progress has arisen as an alternate development model for development against development definitions based on economic growth [11], owing to the weakness of GNP as a measure of development. In the late 1970s, specifically in 1968, in the global South this modern vision of growth started to percolate. In the next two decades, the current economic growth school has solely concerned with GNP as a means of advancement and has faced a major obstacle[12].

III. THE CONCEPT OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

There were different definitions of the idea of human growth. The physical and behavioural mechanism of developing, from the unicellular zygote to the adult, is considered in developmental biology as human growth. In addition, the word 'child growth' refers to 'developmental psychology,' which represents the empirical analysis of progressive social shifts in humans as they grow up. At the beginning, developmental psychology was associated with toddlers and babies. She then got involved in several times of great transition including puberty and ageing. It now covers a wide variety of subjects including motor skills and other psychological mechanisms, problem-solving capabilities, intellectual comprehension, language learning, moral understanding and personality development.

Two concepts, as mentioned by [13], are closely linked to the above meanings. One that is often frequently viewed as "unfolding of traits and capabilities as one grows" in the early history of growth-orientated child development. The other, mostly employed in psychology for progress, considers human development as "patterns of talents, attitudes and behaviours arising in life." These two concepts are not inconsistent; their distinctive element lies in their conclusions and in their theoretical basis. Another concept is Freeman[14], who views human growth as "the capacity to manage one's existence more, to become self dependent, to meet one's own potential, and to take on responsibility for one's own behaviour."

IV. ASPECTS OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Certain elements of the model derive from the definition(s) and the philosophy of human growth. The academics who pioneered the theory agreed on these aspects equally. The following are included:

- Focus places citizens at the centre of their issues with growth. It considers people like ends and doesn't mean.
- That, as opposed to the previous methods that stressed Gross National Product, growth purposes are to increase human choices (GNP). The goal of progress, in other words, goes beyond revenue growth. It regards revenue as a way and not as an end. Human growth concerns an increase in the number of human choices; freedom of choice is a necessity. The model concerns human capacity building (by investing in individuals and gaining skills) and the full use of human capacity (through an enabling framework for growth and empowerment). Therefore, although human beings are seen as the development goal, they are often a valuable resource for that progress.

- The model for human growth identifies the ends of development and analyses sensitive alternatives to achieve them[15]. Although in principle the theory of human development concentrates mostly on the fundamental needs of products and services, it also addresses other topics, such as rights, equality, ethnicity, the climate, societies and culture. It is then free and all problems that could influence the potential of human beings are taken into play[16].

The paradigm holds that economic prosperity is crucial to human progress. However, this development has to be handled correctly to make the most of the resources that this growth gives for better well-being. The question is: how will the desired connections be built between economic growth and human development? There are four different ways: (i) investing in schooling, wellness, and people's skills; (ii) more fairly distributed wealth and assets; (iii) improved development of humans by well-structured government social spending. These planning techniques address each topic within the conventional growth paradigm from the point of view of persons in order to establish the preeminence of persons in the development phase. It is not about denigrating economic prosperity, but about finding out what it really is about[17]. [18].

The model of human evolution has several features that are remarkable. First of all, this paradigm must be taken into consideration. It is not a completed hypothesis, but a still under development paradigm. Secondly, the method to human growth is multidimensional in the context that diverse ideals are achieved. It's considered holistic by Mahbubul Haq although it's pluralistic by Amartya Sen. Again, the way it challenges the neo-liberal theory is important. It is interdisciplinary and comprises political, technological, statistical, psychological, sociological, political and other social sciences. Finally, it was founded in the United Nations and in dialogue with the governments of the member nations it aims to change human circumstances [19]. The paradigm of human growth was pragmatic.

Performance, equality, liberty and empowerment as well as growth include human progress. The utilisation of resources effectively and the supply of these resources is meant by productivity. Therefore, growth and efficiency are pro-human production. By equality, distributive fairness is intended here. It's about options and prospects in particular. The option is meant by equality and empowerment. Amartya Sen's argument that freedom has a constitutive value and a tool value is clearly reflected (as a means to efficiency and equity). In this way, longevity implies that development is not just for the current generation, but also for future generations.

V. MEASURING HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

The need for an alternative measure of growth has become necessary in recognising GNP weaknesses as an indicator of the level of development among nations. The decision to try to quantify it came during the introduction of human growth as the alternative model for development. The dilemma of any metric essentially centred on which proportions, the measuring scale to use and the way in which the various elements to be used were weighed[20].

Countries are named and classified annually in accordance with these steps. The HDI meaning varies between 0 and 1, with higher levels of human growth in society [21]. "Disaggregated HDIs" are often available for various regions or ethnic groups in a world. However, it should be remembered that the human development strategy has also been misunderstood as restricted strictly to or perhaps closer to the HDI three capabilities (life expectancy, literacy and schooling, and adjusted income).

HDI was extremely helpful in calculating the human level in various countries and played an important part. Sen suggested, though, that the notion of human existence extends well beyond HDI[22]. There are still new facets of the paradigm of Human Growth and changes to the HDI have been proposed. These amendments include the Gender Development Index (GDI) measuring average performance in the basic human capacity of a nation, such as HDI, and taking account of the inequalities in achievement between men and women and a new measure of women activities, the Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM). If GDI is focusing on improving simple women's abilities, GEM focuses on using these skills to benefit from life opportunities[23]. In 1996, the Capability Poverty Measure (CPM) was adopted to measure human suffering in a multidimensional manner. The calculation consists of three factors, calculated in percentages and equivalent in weight in the index. The factors include: unattended deliveries by professional health workers, under weight infants less than five, and women's analphabetism. It is considered that a lower CPM value is better[24]. In 1997 the CPM was substituted by a modern Human Poverty Index (HPI)[25] after a lot of elaboration and change. In contrast to CPM, HPI was designed to quantify inequality by five factors rather than three: predicted deaths by the age of 40, illiterate adult; health care facilities for non-accessible individuals; clean water for people; and underweight children under 5. Again, a lower HPI value shows improved poverty alleviation. Though national development is measured by the HDI, the HPI calculates the deprivations of those left out [26].

The HDI is a genius for the public, a rating scheme which is directly opposed to the prevailing GNP indicator[27]. Contrary to GNP, the social complexities of human lives are, therefore, not blind to HDI. As such, countries such as Norway, Canada and Sweden rate above those of a healthier person, while they do not rank as rich as the United States. Although the US has been the number one powerhouse in the world, it regularly places fourth and eighth at HDI, falling behind Norway, Canada and Sweden. The US was in

reality the eighth country on the list of UNDP-based HDI nations, coming after Norway, Iceland, Australia, Ireland, Sweden, Canada and Japan in the Human Development Report for 2006[28].

The Human Development Index (HDI) provides an overview of the situation in a particular nation in the context of human development. However, many critiques and debates have been made about it, such as: small dimensions and factors, data accuracy, the treatment of the income element and recommendations to enhance democratic liberty, cultural ideals and protection of the climate. There are already discussions on HDI and the need to develop it. The new alternatives created by HDI at UNDP and the countries show that the key methods can be rethought. However, the development of nations remains a much better measure than GNP.

VI. CAPABILITIES AND FREEDOM

The words 'capabilities' and 'democracy' usually relate to Amartya Sen, Nobel Laureate in Economics in 1998. They are seen as part of his work to create a modern branch of human development research. In this respect, Sen's views on "functions" and "skills" are significant. By "functions"[28], we say the different conditions of life that we can and cannot fulfil and our capacity to perform certain functions through "capabilities." Sen described human growth as an expansion of a person's "functioning and functioning capacities and the number of activities a person could do and will do in ...life" [28]. [28]. In the Human Development Reports, this has been articulated as increasing "choices." However, it is not obvious that in the Human Development Reports the word 'choices' replaced 'capabilities.' This substitution may create misunderstanding, since the word "option" is a popular word with different connotations.

For instance, some critics[33] claimed that Sen has employed the term 'competency' in two or more sensed ways: one is the actual achievement of different components of living standards, like a certain degree of wealth, health status, schooling, etc. However, given that Sen links his idea of ability and living conditions to the true freedom and dignity of people, we believe that it makes our interpretation much clearer that we consider 'powers' rather than their real achievement as the ability that citizens have attained. We should also conclude with [31] that capacity includes everything from physical, analytical and social facets to human resources. We will bring supernatural abilities to this too. This inclusion is due to our belief that humans are made up of mind, soul (or brain, will, emotions) and body in three dimensions. Skills provide a range of needs to be well met in order to improve the capabilities, such as good fitness, healthy food, practical training, convenient accommodation, a secure climate, a stable neighbourhood, etc.

In its analysis of the problems of modern development, the Human Development Reports released every year since 1990 have used the skills strategy of Amartya Sen as a methodological basis [32]. The construction theory of Sen is the capacity extension. He sees the aim of growth as improving people's lives by widening the array of activities an individual can and can do – well, well-fed, well-informed and involved in community life. In this light, architecture seeks to remove obstacles to life for an individual, barriers like illiteracy, poor health, lack of access to services or a lack of civil and political liberties[33].

We regard schooling or intelligence as the bedrock, the basis for all other capacities of the various capabilities. It is the principal effort to cultivate and manifest the potentials and virtues intrinsic in the individual. It is the most important effort. Education should enable people to explore and maximise their abilities. Education should be so. Potential creation involves attention and deliberate preparation and knowledge-based application. Education increases potential and encourages individuals to gain the capabilities necessary to pursue growth objectives. It also provides them with easier access to services for improved living standards and improved living efficiency. Together they help to improve fitness, decrease deaths and eventually increase life expectancy. Education and skills training open up possibilities for the participant, enhance their options and enable them to engage in and learn from the growth process[34].

VII. CONCLUSION

This is a very abstract theory of creation. The notion of economic development and wages had been badly formulated and loosely specified prior to 1990. Although the development of human well-being and equality must be concerned. Therefore, the philosophy of human growth has arisen as an alternate development model that emphasises the development of the wealth of human life rather than the economic wealth. It implies a complex, developmental, and ongoing phase, seen as an enlargement or improvement of peoples' choices. Choices include the free will, decision-making and the right to determine existence and to avoid those reversible limitations in the way human beings act, such as anxiety, starvation, illiteracy, unemployment, isolation, oppression, etc. The Human Development Index is the metric used today to assess human development in countries, which comprises a composition of three components: survival, education and quality of life. Human production, however, is not restricted to these three fundamental HDI skills. The interpretation of human development is quite broad and covers any aspect of society which promotes or prevents human development. While the latest choices for the HDI show that the key policies need to be rethought, the progress of nations is a stronger measure than GNP, which is a blind instrument to the social facets of human lives.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Bagchi, A.K. (2019). Capabilities, freedom and human development: Amartya Sen’s human science of development: Part III. *Frontline*, 16 (14) July, 03-16.
- [2]. Cohen, G.A. (2013a). Amartya Sen’s unequal world. *Economic and Political Weekly*, October, 2, 2156-60.
- [3]. Cohen, G.A. (2013b). Equality of what? On welfare, goods, and capabilities. In M. Nussbaum, & A.K. Sen (Eds.), *The quality of life*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- [4]. Davies, A. &Quinlivan, G. (2006). A panel data analysis of the impact of trade on human development. *Journal of socioeconomics* (<http://www.business.duq.edu/faculty/davies/research/hdi.pdf>)
- [5]. Engler, M. (2005). From within the Labyrinth: A call for human development. *New Internationalist*, January.
- [6]. Elu, J. (2000). Human development in sub-Saharan Africa: Analysis and prospects for the future. *Journal of Third World Studies*, Fall.
- [7]. Fukuda-Parr, S. (2003). The human development paradigm: Operationizing Sen’s ideas on capabilities. *Feminist Economics* 9 (2-3), 301-317.
- [8]. Haq, Mahbul (2015). *Reflections on Human Developm.*, New York: Oxford University Press. Haque, M.S. (2004). The myths of economic growth (GNP): Implications for human development. In G.
- [9]. Madacumura& M.S. Haque (Eds.), *Handbook of Development Policy Studies* (pp. 1-24). New York: Marcel Dekker. Human Development Foundation (2002). Introduction to the human development concept. (<http://www.yespakistan.com/hdf/whywedoit/hdconcept.asp>)
- [10]. Jiyad, A.M. (2018). Human development paradigm under globalization environment. Paper presented at the Nordic conference on Middle Eastern Studies: The Middle East in globalizing world. Oslo, August 13-16.
- [11]. Jolly, R. (2003). Human development and neo-liberalism: Paradigms compared. In S. Fukuda-Parr, & A.K. Shiver Kumar (Eds.), *Readings in Human Development: Concepts, Measures and Policies for a Development Paradigm*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- [12]. Lerner, R.M. (2018). *Handbook of Child Psychology. Vol. 1: Theoretical Models of Human Development*. New York: Wiley.
- [13]. Martinussen, J. (2016). Introduction to the concept of human development. (<http://www.husdyr.kvl.dk/htm/php/tune96/1Martinussen.htm>)
- [14]. Obayan, A.O.I. (2005). Cultural intelligence and human development: The challenge of an emerging paradigm in a globalizing world. Paper presented at the International Conference on Human Development held at Covenant University, Ota, Nigeria. June 27-30.
- [15]. Sen, A.K. (2017). The standard of living: Lecturer I, concepts and critiques. In A.K. Sen, R. Kambur, K. Hart, & B. Williams (Eds.), *The standard of living (the Tanner Lectures, 1985)* (pp.1-19). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [16]. Sen, A.K. (2018). The concept of development. In H. Chenery, & T.N. Srinivasan (Eds.), *Handbook of development economics*. Amsterdam: North Holland.
- [17]. Sen, A.K. (1989). Development as capabilities expansion. *Journal of Development Planning* 19, 41-58.
- [18]. Sen, A.K. (1993). Capabilities and well-being. In M. Nussbaum, & A.K. Sen (Eds.), *The quality of life*. Oxford: Clarendon Press
- [19]. Stewart, F. (2005). Human development as an alternative development paradigm. (www.undp.org/docs/training/oxford/presentation)
- [20]. Streeten, P.P. (1994). *Strategies for Human Development*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard International Publishers.
- [21]. Tinker, I. (2001). Poverty and gender in developing nations. In N.J. Smelser, & P.B. Baltes (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioural Sciences*. Vol. 17 p. 11901.
- [22]. UNDP (1990). *Human Development Report 1990*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [23]. UNDP (1994). *Human Development Report 1994*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [24]. UNDP (1996). *Human Development Report 1996*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [25]. UNDP (1997). *Human Development Report 1997*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [26]. UNDP (1998). *Human Development Report 1999*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- [27]. UNDP (1999). Human Development Report 1999. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [28]. UNDP (2000). Human Development Report 2000: Human Rights and Human Development. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [29]. UNDP (2001a). Human Development Report 2001: Making New Technologies Work for Human Development. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [30]. UNDP (2001b). The human development concept and paradigm change. National Human Development Report Armenia 2001 (http://www.undp.am/publications/nhdr01/main.php?1=en&chapter=4id=4_4) UNDP (2002). Human Development Report 2002: Deepening Democracy in a Fragmented World. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [31]. UNDP (2006a). Human Development Report 2006: Power, Poverty and Global Water Crisis. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [32]. UNDP (2006b). About HDRO (<http://hdr.undp.org/aboutus/>) Williamson, J. (1990). What Washington means by policy reform. In J. Williamson (Ed.), Latin American adjustment: How much has happened? Washington, D.C.: Institute for International Economics.
- [33]. World Bank (1980). World Bank Development Report 1980. Oxford University Press for the World Bank.
- [34]. World Bank (1990). World Bank Development Report 1990, Oxford University Press for the World Bank.