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Introduction: the research project goal

The broad goal of the research project is to investigate poverty reduction, understood as human development and increased well-being. Specifically we are looking at whether and how this is present as a key social transformation goal for South African universities.

Our focus is professional education and training in universities and how higher education develops educational functionings and professional values by providing ‘transformational resources’ (Terzi, 2008, p.152) and ‘wide possibilities to learn in a stimulating environment’ (Terzi, 2008, p.154). The outcome is that students are able to become and be professionals committed to pro-poor human development as a core professional value and their guide to action.

We ought then to ask: what is owed to the poor by professionals? In turn, what practices and educational opportunities in higher education and training enable students to ‘act rightly’ (Brighouse, 2008, p.xi) as professionals in South African society?

What can professionals really do?

We recognize the limits as well as the possibilities of the contributions professionals might make to reducing poverty, and acknowledge that while it is essential that each person has a basic secure income, this may be something professionals have less influence or power to change (although they could have some, for example by working across professions and as activists with civic associations in a spirit of ‘rectifying injustice’ [Cohen, 2000, p.110]).

At the same time as we acknowledge this limit, we still hold the normative view that the better off in South African society – like professionals – ‘must become highly sensitive to moral appeals’ for there to be progress in solidarity to link the better with the worst off (Cohen, 2000, p.112). We are also mindful of Iris Marion Young’s (1990) five faces of oppression which include not only exploitation, but also marginalization, powerlessness, cultural imperialism, and violence. The issue then is which of these aspects professionals might learn to change, and how to strengthen or develop through their university education the values that orient them to wanting to change oppression. There is then something to be explored regarding how a university education forms the values of professionals, while also providing the skills and knowledge to undertake professional work.
In the same way that we understand poverty to be multi-dimensional; we also understand professional education and professional work to be multi-dimensional and to involve both knowledge for justice set for and by society (for example in the South African Constitution) and also fostering personal choices to support justice and distributive justice (Cohen, 2000). Thus G.A. Cohen writes that he now believes that 'justice cannot be a matter only of the state-legislated structure in which people act but is also a matter of the acts they choose within that structure, the personal choices of daily lives' (2000, p.122).

**Principles of justice**

Education, as Brighouse (2002) says, is an inescapably normative field – if we are egalitarians, for instance, we hold views on what ought to be fair and just in and through education and we are critical of economic and social inequalities.

In this research project we therefore hope to work with participants to generate principles of justice which might inform university and national policies to promote justice and the public and common good, but also as a framework for evaluating the design and reform of higher education. Here we are much influenced by Harry Brighouse (2002) who explains that we need a theory (principles) of justice to enable us to tell whether a policy is likely to promote or impede justice. Such a theory, he says, explains what rights and liberties people have, and how to judge and manage difficult trade-offs. In other words such decisions cannot be made opportunistically, or case by case, or expediently.

The South African Constitution, approved in 1997, enshrines the ideals of improving the quality of life of all citizens and establishing a society based on democratic values, social justice and fundamental human rights (Magasela, 2006). If the South African government guarantees these equal liberties, as we argue ought to be the case, then people will face ongoing choices about how to use those liberties in their lives and with others. For professionals, we propose, following Brighouse that:

> It is their right, and their obligation, to use these liberties responsibly, both for their own benefit and the good of others. To do this they [professionals] need to weigh reasons and evidence for different courses of action: the capacity for rational reflection is an essential tool for this. (2002, p.10)

It then follows that the university education of professionals ought to develop capabilities for right and rational reflection.

**‘Capabilities’**

In this paper we advance our framework and principles of justice by exploring capabilities - the real and actual freedoms people have to do and be what they value being and doing - and the capability approach (Sen, 1992; 1999 and Nussbaum, 2000) as a means to take up questions of justice and professional education. To foreshadow this discussion we note here what Henry Richardson identifies as perhaps the most important capability, and one which resonates with our argument that even in the face of overwhelming poverty there is something professionals can do to ‘nudge’ (Thaler and Sunstein, 2008) people’s lives in a direction which enables them to have more well being. Thus Richardson suggests that:
perhaps the most important individual thing is for each of us to be capable of treating others with respect: that is something that is up to each of us, but which takes proper training [education, learning, pedagogy]. One must start with the internal capability of treating others with respect. (2007, p.411).

Values

Less developed at this point and requiring further thought is how professionals-in-the-making arrive at the capabilities and functionings they have reason to value (Deneulin, 2007), what role is played by others in this, and by their university education fostering critical and public reasoning.

As Deneulin points out, ‘Very little, if anything, has been written in the area of human development about the formation and social construction of values and how these are endorsed by people, transmitted across time and space, and changed’ (2007, p.2). Yet values point to what we believe to be good in life, work and society, and different value systems may conflict. This will therefore be the focus of a separate Working Paper in the research project.

Poverty reduction is multi-dimensional

We consider poverty reduction to involve expanding human well-being and agency so that one might say poverty has been reduced when a human life has more well being or more ‘capability’ (Sen, 1992 and 1999) for well being. We are working with a definition of well being as the various opportunities and achievements that make up a good life for a person’ it is multi-dimensional embracing ‘all aspects of human life’ (Clark and MacGillivray, 2007, p.2), and depends on the exercise/achievement of a range of human capabilities (Sen, 1999; and see Unterhalter et al, 2007). We therefore define both well-being and poverty as multidimensional and take ‘capability expansion’ to be our philosophical basis of human development (Alkire, 2002). Poverty is defined in this project as capability failure and the deprivation of plural valuable freedoms (Alkire, 2002; Clark and MacGillivray, 2007’); poverty reduction is therefore defined as capability expansion for well being and agency.

We are influenced by literature and research on empowerment of the poor, which emphasises the importance of understanding dignity and empowerment, even where professionals might lack power to change economic and material conditions to any substantial degree. For example, Narayan et al (2000) argue that poor people often feel powerless, trapped in a web of linked deprivations, including lack of information, education, skills and confidence. Poor people, they say, lack voice and power. The challenge for professionals is then to enable voice and power:

Powerlessness leaves most poor people having to choose between one bad thing and another. In the face of agonizingly constrained choices, poor people are remarkable for their tenacity, resilience and hope. For them the will is there but often not the opportunity. The challenge for development professionals, and for policy and practice, is to find ways to weaken the web of powerlessness and to enhance the capabilities of poor women and men so that they can take more control of their lives. (Narayan et al, 2000, p.235)
From our perspective, a core professional value is that being treated with respect matters (see Richardson, 2007 above). Sixty thousand poor people in Narayan et al’s (2000) comprehensive project on the Voices of the Poor spoke about a range of behavioural criteria that are important to them: ‘respect, not being rude, honesty, fairness, not being corrupt, truthful, not lying, not cheating, listening, and being caring, loving, kind and compassionate, hard-working, helpful and professional’ (2000, p.188).

These perceptions map over Nussbaum’s (2000) concern with human dignity and that each person is treated as a human being worthy of respect and dignity; we have intrinsic worth by virtue of our human being-ness. Nussbaum writes that, ‘This idea of human dignity has broad cross-cultural resonance and intuitive power’ (2000, p.72) and, ‘each person [is] a bearer of value, and an end’ (2000, p.73). ‘What this approach is after’, she says, ‘is a society in which persons are treated as each worthy of regard, and in which each has been put in a position to live really humanly’ (2000, p.74). It then follows that:

guidance [for professional education and professionalism] will always be supplied first and foremost by the ideas of practical reason and of human dignity: the idea that each human being is the maker of a life plan and that each should be treated as an end and none as the mere instrument of the ends of others. These ideas, combined with the rest of the capabilities [her list of 10], provide a set of goals for public [curriculum and pedagogy] action: we aim to create citizens who have these powers and opportunities, as active planners of their lives and as dignified equals. (Nussbaum, 2000, pp.284-285)

Respect for human dignity commits us ‘to redressing the social and economic conditions of those whose development and agency is stunted by poverty’ (Liebenberg, 2005, p.12), because we value each person as an end in themselves. It therefore follows, we might argue, that poverty can also be understood as a denial of people’s human rights guaranteed to them by the South African Constitution (Liebenberg, 2005) and that in this respect professionals might play a significant role in working to secure some or all of the capabilities which guarantee these rights to each person.

Appadurai (2004) further argues for the need to strengthen the capability to aspire, especially among the poor. He suggests that this capacity constitutes a resource for poor people to contest and alter the conditions of their own welfare. He argues for an expansion of people’s aspirational maps, what we might call a thick rather than a thin capacity, a flexible horizon of aspirations. Added to this is the importance of hope where hope is not only related to income level, but is about the sense of possibility that life can offer (Hage, 2001).

Key aspects of capabilities

The capability approach is freedom-focused. Human development consists in ‘expanding the real freedoms that people enjoy’ (Sen, 1999, p.1) through ‘the removal of various types of unfreedoms that leave people with little choice and little opportunity of exercising their reasoned agency’ (Sen, 1999, p.xii). Freedom is, for Sen, fundamental to the quality of human life and our well being. Sen focuses on
what people are actually able to be and do, personally and in comparison to others, and on the self-determination of their ends and values in life to generate reflective, informed choices of ways of living that each person deems important and valuable - to choose and lead a life one values. Put simply, the capability approach asks us to evaluate well being in terms of what people value being and doing, and to work to increase their freedom to be in those ways or to do those things.

The key aspects of the capability approach are therefore:

(i) Capabilities comprise the real and actual freedoms people have to do and be what they value being and doing

(ii) Valuable beings and doings ('functionings') are constitutive of our well being

(iii) Capabilities are the real opportunities we have to achieve such functionings.

Applying this to an educational setting, equality and the just design of educational institutions should be evaluated in the space of capabilities. This enables us to say/compare that one human life has more wellbeing or more capability for well-being than another, and then to ask how well each person’s life (and in this case the lives of the poor) instantiates such well-being.

The capability approach therefore provides a framework for evaluating the content of higher education and the presence of equality-as-social transformation.

A ‘rough set’ of dimensions of human development

We have drafted a ‘rough set’ (Alkire, 2002) - a provisional list- of dimensions of human development. We take these dimensions to be the capabilities everyone needs to have and has reason to value for full human flourishing. But given our research focus we need to ask the further question: which of these capabilities and functionings are specific to professionals working for social transformation and which should, therefore, be incorporated as broad goals in pro-poor professional education and training? We do not expect or want these dimensions/capabilities to be complete or exact; we develop them here for the purposes of public dialogue in the project and with others who may be interested in this approach.

While a set of dimensions should not be unduly prescriptive or over specified or derived from a particular metaphysical worldview, nonetheless we need some framework of dimensions for the purposes of evaluation and comparison of one life with another life:

without agreement on some kind of multidimensional framework cum procedure-for-identifying-locally-valued-and-relevant-capability sets, the multidimensional approaches to development are operationally vacuous and risk being misunderstood and misoperationalized by practitioners. (Alkire, 2002, p.6)

Alkire (2002) suggests four reasons for specifying dimensions (capabilities):
1. To give secure epistemological and empirical footing to the goal of human development. (We need to say what it is we want to develop and what the ends of development ought to be, and how we will know.)

2. To identify practical and effective methodologies to evaluate difficult trade-offs:

   A multidimensional approach to development as exemplified in Amartya Sen’s capability approach requires many more value choices to be made explicitly – whether by democratic institutions that can be scrutinized by participation in neighbourhood meetings, or by public debate – rather than relying on the market. This need for explicit values choices can be a strength insofar as it empowers diverse groups of a society to shape their common good. Yet communities need to figure out how they can exercise this freedom cost-effectively and reliably – they need streamlined methodologies for public debate. (2002, p.4)

3. To identify unintended impacts - by showing how choice is expanded in some dimensions while being restricted in others, for example – and factored into the decision making process:

   With globalization increasing the tension between cultural values and economic values, this problem grows more acute. There may be tremendous practical value inferring deftly with a mental glance, to a set of dimensions of human development, in order to spark conversations about objectives or to make sure that no obvious negative side-effect of a proposed initiative is overlooked. No practical methodology can do away with hard choices, much less one tool. But it can assist groups to make more informed, reflective choices’. (2002, p.4)

4. To enable more accessible theorising.

**On what basis are dimensions and capabilities chosen?**

Alkire (2002) argues that the dimensions of human development should have the following:

1. The dimensions must be valuable (readily recognizable as the kinds of reasons for which oneself or others act).
2. The dimensions must combine scope with specificity (both broad and clear).
3. The dimensions must be critical and complete (taken together should encompass any human value).
4. The dimensions do not pertain to one view of the good life.

Moreover, in the ‘spirit of the capability approach, the process of specification should be collaborative, visible, defensible and revisable’ (p.20).

She (2007, p.90) suggests five steps:

1. Use existing data.
2. Make assumptions – perhaps based on theory.
3. Draw on an existing list that was generated by consensus.
4. Use an ongoing deliberative participatory process.
5. Propose dimensions based on empirical studies of people’s values and/or behaviours.

For her part Ingrid Robeyns (2003, pp.70-71) suggests the following five criteria for the selection of capabilities:

1. ‘Explicit formulation’ by which she means any list should be ‘explicit, discussed and defended’. We might need to include a discussion of capabilities that would be appropriate but for which no information is available, as well as those for which there is information.
2. ‘Methodological justification’ which involves clarifying and scrutinizing the method that has generated the list and justifying its appropriateness.
3. ‘Sensitivity to context’ which means taking into account audience and situation, speaking ‘the language of the debate’, and avoiding ‘jargon’ which might alienate a participant group. In some contexts the list might be more abstract or theory-laden than in others.
4. ‘Different levels of generality’, which is related to but distinct from the third and applies to lists which are to be implemented. This involves drawing up a list in two stages, where the first stage involves an ‘ideal’ list and the second a more ‘pragmatic’, second-best list, taking actual constraints into account. The ideal list relates to her first criterion to include capabilities for which there may not be information, in an ideal list because this strengthens the argument for collecting data on them and this in turn affects analysis and practice.
5. ‘Exhaustion and non reduction’, that is, the listed capabilities should include all important elements and the elements should not be reducible to each other, although there may be some overlap.

Taken together these ideas will inform how we develop and refine our own capability list.

Our next steps

1. In the research team we have decided to start with an existing list of items drawn from the work of Martha Nussbaum (2000) and expanded through philosophical reasoning and empirical research by Wolff and De Shalit (2007).
2. In the project we will draw on participatory discussion and feedback and qualitative research to decide which dimensions to keep, which to drop and whether to add new ones.
3. From a list of ‘comprehensive’ capabilities (what is needed for a flourishing life and well being) we have identified some (not all) specific valuable capabilities and functionings of a professional who cares about poor people and reducing poverty. If it is valuable to a professional that their work should contribute to poverty reduction/capability expansion of the general population (their comprehensive capabilities), then ideally their training course should expand their capability to exercise their functioning in ‘human development professional capabilities’.
4. We have identified ‘indicators’ of the kind of professional education and training that fosters capability development and functioning for students that orients them to working in particular ways with poor persons and communities, and to appreciate that poverty is multi-dimensional and
reducible, in some way. We propose that these are indicators of quality in pro-poor professional education and training.

**Why functionings as well as capabilities in professional education and training**

The responsibility of a university committed to social transformation is to enable students to develop relevant capabilities while at university: that is, to impart the knowledge, skills and competence which constitute the capability to practice as professionals working for social transformation. We are interested also in their actual functionings as professionals - that they actually do exercise their professional capabilities in a way that furthers social transformation. These functionings then constitute a proxy for seeing how and if they are developing valuable capabilities.\(^1\)

We might describe functionings in another way as professional ‘beings and doings’ that are valuable to the professionals who emerge from higher education. For example if it matters to a student that their work as a professional will contribute to poverty reduction in the wider society, then their training should widen and expand their capability to function as such a professional. As this vision of poverty reduction would entail, for example, an ethic of care and respect for the vulnerable and disadvantaged in society, then in classrooms, practical settings and assessment tasks of a course which successfully expanded these ‘professional capabilities’, we would expect to see the students functioning in this way. If we think it is important for students to develop critical perspectives on knowledge and scholarship (see Badat, 2008 and Walker et al, 2008), then we would want to see them functioning in this way.

*Functionings would be proxies for valued ‘human development professional capabilities’.*

But while a university can ask for evidence of functionings while students are studying as a proxy for a valuable capability, they cannot impose functionings once they leave university. We still need to allow for the choices people will make with regard to what is good life for them (Nussbaum, 2000). If students have had their ‘professional capabilities’ expanded to act as a professional who can help reduce poverty, they may still choose different functionings after they have left their training. For example, a lawyer might choose to do corporate law for high-end business; a nurse might choose to work in cosmetic surgery for the wealthy, although of course they could still do these jobs treating people with respect and dignity!

**Choosing our ‘rough set of dimensions: process and outcomes**

---

**Capability and well-being**

Following Sen (1992) we take (achieved) functionings to be constitutive of a person’s well-being and their absence to suggest ill-being. Capabilities (opportunities) are also constitutive of well-being. For example, both having the opportunity to appear in public without shame and actually appearing in public without shame constitute
well-being. Thus wellbeing freedom depends on the underlying capability so that ‘the capability set gives us information on the various functioning vectors that are within reach of a person’ (Sen, 1992, p.41-42).

In this way capability and well-being are connected. By looking at capability and functioning and making interpersonal comparisons we are at the same time comparing one person’s well-being (or ill-being) with that of another. Thus equality in key capabilities (dimensions) points to equality in social and educational arrangements and society.

But well-being and agency are also connected in that the capability approach recognizes the importance of the choices we make about which dimensions matter for our quality of life. Sometimes agency might appear to conflict with well-being, for example if one chooses to be a public health worker in a war zone. But we need also to take agency into account to develop a rich informational base for interpersonal comparisons. Terzi explains that this ‘does not detract from the emphasis on well-being freedom as the dimension constitutive of the capability set, and as the kind of concern that should inform egalitarian policy’ (2008, p.141).

What we have sought in identifying domains/dimensions is not a perfect measure but some categories to guide poverty reduction efforts by HEIs.

**Human Development professional capabilities and functionings**

After discussion in the research team on 2 July 2008 we arrived at a helpful distinction between ‘comprehensive capabilities’ - which apply to all aspects of a person’s life, public and private, social, economic and political - and more specific ‘human development professional capabilities’. We were of the view that the combined Nussbaum/Wolff and De Shalit (2007) list constituted a comprehensive list which needs to be specified in a broad and vague way to allow for contextual variations in how such capabilities might actually look in different situations.

But we did not feel that all these capabilities needed to be applied in the space of professional education in universities, and in curriculum and pedagogy.

We thought there might be a case to be made for the comprehensive list to inform broader university decision-making and the institutional ethos beyond the specificity of curriculum and pedagogy in a department. For example, we discussed the issue of HIV/AIDS education and the impact of AIDS on the number of professionals in South Africa. We therefore thought that life and bodily health did matter for the wider institution (and for the comprehensive list for the poor) but was not specific to professional education (except as curriculum content for some professional groups). We further discussed the issue of bodily integrity given the high incidence of crime and rape in South Africa (see Dison et al, 2008) and the evidence of harassment and violence against women on many South African campuses (Shore, 2003). We were of the view that fear of harassment and violence on campus was an issue for the university, and would be an issue for a department in so far as there was a failure in the social arrangements at the University to support bodily integrity.
STAGE ONE

In the first stage of our thinking therefore we developed the notion of comprehensive capabilities for the well being of the poor, a provisional capability list constituted of such capabilities, and the relationship of these to the student’s own capabilities:

**FIGURE 1 ‘Comprehensive’ Capability Set**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability for well-being of the poor</th>
<th>[Provisional] Capability list</th>
<th>Student capabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A life of full human dignity</td>
<td>From Nussbaum (2000) and Wolff and De Shalit (2007) (see Appendix for detail) – ‘thick’ and vague specification:</td>
<td>Selection of capabilities and functionings from the ‘provisional’ spine to form a ‘professional’ capability set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty as capability deprivation</td>
<td>1. Life</td>
<td>Transversal professional core, with additions for specific professions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty reduction as capability expansion</td>
<td>2. Bodily Health</td>
<td>Formation of capabilities and exercise of functionings will be influenced by ‘conversion’ factor of individual student biographies (for example, gender, race, socio-economic background, schooling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive capability set (everything on the ‘spine’) for all important aspects of well-being and human flourishing, and human dignity.</td>
<td>3. Bodily Integrity</td>
<td>How/whether university expands each student’s capability set to form and exercise social transformation values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive list to be debated, especially with NGOs working closely with the poor/disadvantaged, and with Professional Bodies, and other publics.</td>
<td>4. Senses, Imagination and Thought</td>
<td>Refine list with university staff, students, and alumni, and other publics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Practical Reason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Other Species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Control over One’s Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Doing Good To others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Living In A Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Understanding the Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAGE TWO

We then went ahead and worked from the Nussbaum/Wolff and De Shalit list, choosing a number of dimensions from the comprehensive capabilities list which would be particularly relevant to a professional working for social transformation.

By considering what professional functionings were linked to these capabilities we then identified indicators in curriculum and pedagogy of professional education and training that would develop these ‘human development professional capabilities’. We therefore worked to begin relating selected ‘comprehensive’ capabilities, human development professional functionings as proxies for capabilities, and how these might appear as indicators in curriculum and pedagogy for professional education and training.

It was not our plan to work out all the possible professional capabilities as our intention is to work with the universities to flesh out, refine and change this list.

Below then is our attempt to work through our conceptualization of professional capabilities, using five which we take to be especially valuable ‘fertile functionings’ (Wolff and De Shalit, 2007, p.10) from the Nussbaum/Wolff and De Shalit list. Securing fertile functionings ‘is likely to secure further functionings’ (Wolff and De Shalit, 2007, p.10). Similarly ‘corrosive disadvantages’ such as disrespect for students or disrespect for poor persons in practice settings yields further disadvantages (Wolff and De Shalit, 2007, p.10), in our case it would diminish pro-poor professionalism.

**FIGURE 2 Selected ‘comprehensive’ capabilities, human development professional functionings (2) and indicators in professional education and training**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability (dimension of human development/well being)</th>
<th>Professional goals as functionings ('beings' and 'doings')</th>
<th>Indicators in/from professional education and training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practical reasoning</td>
<td>Forming a conception of the good</td>
<td>Exposed to and engaged in socially relevant, critical scholarship (for example, a critical reappraisal of Practical Theology in South Africa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having pro-poor professional values</td>
<td>An up to date curriculum of professional and subject knowledge which also integrates theory, and practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critically reflecting in planning one’s life</td>
<td>Being prepared for active citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being knowledgeable about both South African society and global society.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having knowledge base of the profession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introducing theory, practice and professional values</td>
<td>Debates about what it means to 'act rightly' as a professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over one’s environment - political</td>
<td>Participating effectively and confidently in political choices that influence one's professional life</td>
<td>Opportunities to have a voice in curriculum development, pedagogy and assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity to openly and critically debate the role of the profession as it is now and as it ought to be to contribute to social transformation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning to communicate effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Valuing human beings and their human dignity</td>
<td>Pedagogies of discussion, dialogue, deliberation and collaborative work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Showing concern for others</td>
<td>Respectful relations between staff and students, and students and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imagining and understanding how the world is experienced by poor persons</td>
<td>Learning how to identify and listen to the 'better' argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respecting each person’s identity and dignity</td>
<td>Learning to live with and value diversity; learning how to act/be interculturally aware and competent, and to act and communicate in an anti-sexist and anti-racist way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working collectively with fellow professionals for transformation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identifying with the role of contributing to pro-poor professionalism beyond your own professions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acting in an ethical way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td>Resilient in coping effectively with difficult professional situations and contexts</td>
<td>Opportunities to learn and to be emotionally reflexive about clinical practice experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having aspirations and hope for the future and building better future</td>
<td>Being appropriate supported in this process by staff and other students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining professional commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imagination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thinking innovatively and creatively about problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Cultivating the possible’ (Bruner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-perspectival views of knowledge made available; learning to think critically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum, pedagogy and practice opportunities to be imaginative, creative and innovative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| To be developed further............. |
| To be developed further..... |
| To be developed further..... |

**STAGE THREE**

In this stage we will work participatively to refine and revise both the comprehensive and professional capabilities. This will be informed by consultation, dialogue and qualitative data. Even then the final list will remain provisional, a tool for social and educational change, and open to revision.

**NOTES**

1. There is an unresolved problem in education/capabilities work in general – about whether knowledge is a functioning or a capability. Here, is ‘having the knowledge, skills etc’ a functioning in itself; or is it knowledge a capability because it enables a range of different functionings? We think it can be either and we just need to be explicit about how we are using it. Here we are taking it that ‘having the knowledge’ is the capability which enables students to exercise a range of professional functionings. It is the same problem with health – is health a functioning or a capability? And we could go on. In our context, we are at the moment most comfortable with the proposal that ‘having knowledge’ is a capability which enables professional functionings.

2. In the capability approach we should not assume that functioning is evidence of an underlying capability. We would still need to know whether the person had the freedom to choose the functionings from equally valuable alternatives. This is, however, tricky in education in that students may not actively choose to learn and understand social theory as part of having the knowledge base of the profession. They may find it hard and difficult. But as educators we would say it is important. We could also assume that students have chosen to come on the course for what they believe it offers them in becoming a professional. After that, students are in an unequal power relationships shaped by curriculum and pedagogies. There will be things they are required to learn, even if they have not chosen them. But this is also arguably consistent with Sen’s argument that if having all the information
they would have chosen this anyway, then it is rational to require that they develop this functioning. We can also make the assumption that, if the training provided was of good enough calibre, they would have been provided with the right environment and tools to make good choices, and that is what the third column tries to indicate. We therefore are using the functionings in column 2 as proxies for valued capabilities. We further note that because column 2 identifies functionings (beings and doings) we have described them in this way. For example ‘being able to’ (is a capability) and ‘doing’ (a functioning); thus ‘being able to act in an ethical way’ (capability) and acting in an ethical way’ (functioning).
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APPENDIX: CAPABILITY LISTS

A. Central Human Capabilities, Martha Nussbaum (2000)

1. Life. Being able to live to the end of a human life of normal length; not dying prematurely, or before one’s life is so reduced as to be not worth living.

2. Bodily Health. Being able to have good health, including reproductive health; to be adequately nourished; to have adequate shelter.

3. Bodily Integrity. Being able to move freely from place to place; to be secure against violent assault, including sexual assault and domestic violence; having opportunities for sexual satisfaction and for choice in matters of reproduction.

4. Senses, Imagination and Thought. Being able to use the senses, to imagine, think and reason – and to do these things in a “truly human” way, a way informed and cultivated by an adequate education, including, but by no means limited to, literacy and basic mathematical and scientific training. Being able to use imagination and thought in connection with experiencing and producing works and events of one’s own choice, religious, literary, musical, and so forth. Being able to use one’s mind in ways protected by guarantees of freedom of expression with respect to both political and artistic speech, and freedom of religious exercise. Being able to have pleasurable experiences and to avoid non-beneficial pain.

5. Emotions. Being able to have attachments to things and people outside ourselves; to love those who love and care for us, to grieve at their absence; in general, to love, to grief, to experience longing, gratitude, and justified anger. Not having one’s emotional development blighted by fear and anxiety. (Supporting this capability means supporting forms of human association that can be shown to be crucial in their development.)

6. Practical Reason. Being able to form a conception of the good and to engage in critical reflection about the planning of one’s life. (This entails protection for the liberty of conscience and religious observance.)

7. Affiliation.
   a) Being able to live with and toward others, to recognize and show concern for other human beings, to engage in various forms of social interaction; to be able to imagine the situation of another. (Protecting this capability means protecting institutions that constitute and nourish such forms of affiliation, and also protecting the freedom of assembly and political speech.)
   b) Having the social bases of self-respect and non-humiliation; being able to be treated as a dignified being whose worth is equal to that of others. This entails provisions of non-discrimination on the basis of race, sex, sexual orientation, ethnicity, caste, religion, national origin.

8. Other Species. Being able to live with concern for an in relation to animals, plants and the world of nature
9. Play. Being able to laugh, to play, to enjoy recreational activities

10. Control over one’s environment. A. Political. Being able to participate effectively in political choices that govern one’s life; having the right of political participation, protections of free speech and association. B. Material being able to hold property (both land and movable goods) not just formally but in terms of real opportunity; and having property rights on an equal basis with others; having the right to seek employment on an equal basis with others; having freedom from unwarranted search and seizure

B. Secure Functionings Approach (Jonathan Wolff and Avner De-Shalit, 2007)

Nussbaum’s list plus three additional capabilities:

- Doing good to others. Being able to care for others as part of expressing your humanity. Being able to show gratitude.

- Living in a law-abiding fashion. The possibility of being able to live within the law; not to be forced to break the law, cheat, or to deceive other people or institutions.

- Understanding the law. Having a general comprehension of the law, its demands, and the opportunities it offers to individuals. Not standing perplexed before the legal system.

C. John Finnis (in Alkire, 2002)

1. Life itself – its maintenance and transmission – health and safety
2. Knowledge and aesthetic experience ‘Human persons can know reality and appreciate beauty which intensely engages their capacities to know and to feel’
3. Some degree of excellence in Work and Play – ‘Human persons can transform the natural world beginning with their own bodily selves, to express meanings and serve purposes. Such meaning-gaining and value-creation can be realized in diverse degrees’
4. Friendship ‘Various forms of harmony between and among individuals and groups of persons living at peace with others, neighbourliness, friendship’
5. Self-integration ‘Within individuals and their personal lives, similar goods can be realized. For feelings can conflict among themselves and be at odds with one’s judgments and choices. The harmony opposed to such inner disturbance I sinner peace’
6. Self-expression or practical reasonableness. one’s choices can conflict with one’s judgments and one’s behaviour can fail to express one’s inner self. The corresponding good is harmony among one’s judgments, choices and performances – peace of conscience and constancy between one’s self and its expression.
7. Religion [Transcendence] ‘most persons experience tension with the wider reaches of reality. Attempts to gain or improve harmony with some more-than-human source of meaning and value may take many forms, depending on people’s world-views. Thus, another category is peace with
god, or the gods, or some other nontheistic. but more than human source of meaning and value


1. Material well being, having enough: Food, Assets, Work
2. Bodily well being: being and appearing well: Health, Appearances, Physical Environment
3. Social Well being: being able to care for, bring up, marry and settle children’
   Self respect and dignity’ Peace, harmony, good relations in the family/community
4. Security: Civil peace; A physically safe and secure environment; Personal physical security’ Lawfulness and access to justice; Security in old age; Confidence in the future
5. Freedom of choice and action
6. Psychological well being: Peace of mind; Happiness; Harmony (including a spiritual life and religious observance).


1. to be alive;
2. to live in physical security;
3. to be healthy;
4. to be knowledgeable, to understand and reason, and to have the skills to participate in society;
5. to enjoy a comfortable standard of living, with independence and security;
6. to engage in productive and valued activities;
7. to enjoy individual, family and social life;
8. to participate in decision-making, have a voice and influence;
9. of being and expressing yourself and having self-respect;
10. of knowing you will be protected and treated fairly by the law.

F. Dimensions valued by black African social work students Social Work Students in South Africa, themselves from poor backgrounds and having lived and experienced apartheid (Vivienne Bozalek, 2004)

1. being able to move from place to place;
2. having freedom from unwarranted search and seizure;
3. being able to control one’s own life in one’s own surroundings and context;
4. being able to experience and produce spiritually enriching religious events of one’s choice;
5. being able to live for and in relation to animals, plants and the world of nature;
6. being able to have attachments to things and persons outside ourselves;
7. to have adequate shelter;
8. to have the right to sell equal employment on an equal basis with others;
9. in work being able to work as a human being, exercising practical reason and entering into meaningful relationships of mutual recognition with other workers;
10. being able to imagine, to think, and to reason in a way informed and cultivated by an adequate education;
11. being able to live to the end of a human life of normal length;
12. to be adequately nourished being able to laugh, play, to enjoy recreational activities;
13. having freedom of association.

G. Higher education pedagogy (Melanie Walker, 2006)

1. Practical reason. Being able to make well-reasoned, informed, critical, independent, intellectually acute, socially responsible, and reflective choices. Being able to construct a personal life project in an uncertain world. Having good judgment.
2. Educational resilience Able to navigate study, work and life. Able to negotiate risk, to persevere academically, to be responsive to educational opportunities and adaptive to constraints. Self-reliant. Having aspirations and hopes for a good future.
3. Knowledge and imagination. Being able to gain knowledge of a chosen subject –disciplinary and/or professional - its form of academic inquiry and standards. Being able to use critical thinking and imagination to comprehend the perspectives of multiple others and to form impartial judgments. Being able to debate complex issues. Being able to acquire knowledge for pleasure and personal development, for career and economic opportunities, for political, cultural and social action and participation in the world. Awareness of ethical debates and moral issues. Open-mindedness. Knowledge to understand science and technology in public policy.
4. Learning disposition. Being able to have curiosity and a desire for learning. Having confidence in one’s ability to learn. Being an active inquirer
5. Social relations and social networks. Being able participate in a group for learning, working with others to solve problems and tasks. Being able to work with others to form effective or good groups for collaborative and participatory learning. Being able to form networks of friendship and belonging for learning support and leisure. Mutual trust.
6. Respect, dignity and recognition. Being able to be have respect for oneself and for and from others, being treated with dignity, not being diminished or devalued because of one’s gender, social class, religion or race, valuing other languages, other religions and spiritual practices and human diversity. Being able to show empathy, compassion, fairness and generosity, listening to and considering other person’s points of view in dialogue and debate. Being able to act inclusively and being able to respond to human need. Having competence in inter-cultural communication. Having a voice to participate effectively in learning; a voice to speak out, to debate and persuade; to be able to listen.
7. Emotional integrity, emotions. Not being subject to anxiety or fear which diminishes learning. Being able to develop emotions for imagination, understanding, empathy, awareness and discernment. Respect, dignity and recognition. Being able to be have respect for oneself and for and from others, being treated with dignity, not being diminished or devalued because of one’s gender, social class, religion or race, valuing other languages, other
religions and spiritual practices and human diversity. Being able to show empathy, compassion, fairness and generosity, listening to and considering other person’s points of view in dialogue and debate. Being able to act inclusively and being able to respond to human need. Having competence in inter-cultural communication. Having a voice to participate effectively in learning; a voice to speak out, to debate and persuade; to be able to listen.

8. *Respect, dignity and recognition.* Being able to be have respect for oneself and for and from others, being treated with dignity, not being diminished or devalued because of one’s gender, social class, religion or race, valuing other languages, other religions and spiritual practices and human diversity. Being able to show empathy, compassion, fairness and generosity, listening to and considering other person’s points of view in dialogue and debate. Being able to act inclusively and being able to respond to human need. Having competence in inter-cultural communication. Having a voice to participate effectively in learning; a voice to speak out, to debate and persuade; to be able to listen.

9. *Bodily integrity.* Safety and freedom from all forms of physical and verbal harassment in the higher education environment.