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Amartya Sen’s capability approach has generated remarkable interest in recent years. This volume brings together a selection of papers initially presented at an international conference on the capability approach (CA) held at St Edmund’s College, Cambridge in 2001. This conference marked an important turning point in research on the capability approach. It brought together many young scholars who were interested in the approach as well as others who had been working on it for some time. The conference was initially motivated by issues relating to the usefulness of the approach in the particular contexts of poverty and injustice. However, conference papers covered a wide range of topics relating to concepts, measurement and other applications. In this volume, the papers are categorised in terms of these broad and overlapping areas. In 2002 a follow-up conference explored Martha Nussbaum’s version of the approach, and annual conferences have been held in subsequent years. Numerous initiatives have since emerged, including the Human Development and Capability Association (www.hd-ca.org). In part as a result of these initiatives, but also quite independently of them, a large literature on the capability approach has emerged.

Amartya Sen’s 1980 Tanner lecture, ‘Equality of What?’, set out a broad agenda for debate and further research. While the approach has been extensively discussed, Sabina Alkire suggests in Chapter 1 that work in this area is still at a relatively early stage. The drawing on the cover of this volume—a version of Jean-François Millet’s ‘Les Premiers Pas de l’Enfance’ (‘The First Steps of Childhood’) — shows a child taking its first tentative steps, supported by her mother. Only time will tell
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whether this image provides an appropriate metaphor for this early phase of work on the capability approach. Part of the value of bringing together a set of papers in a volume of this sort is that these papers allow us to assess how far the approach has gone and to define—however tentatively—potential directions for work on the approach. The volume brings together a diverse set of voices, each of which engages with the approach in its distinct manner. However, we emphasise that many of the chapters engage critically with different aspects of the approach, freely questioning and wrestling with it. Indeed, such critical engagement is a common theme of this volume. We hope to bring out the flavour and nature of this engagement in what follows through reference to relevant chapters in this introduction.

At this stage, it is not entirely foreseeable which directions will be pursued in future work on the capability approach and how fruitful they will turn out to be. If we return to the Millet crayon drawing, part of what engages our attention is the unpredictability of the child’s first steps and the hope—and anxiety—that unpredictability generates. The steps of a child are powered by its unique curiosity, temperament and circumstances. Similar unpredictability is evident in the emerging literature on the capability approach. It is part of what makes this literature both intriguing and exciting. We hope that this volume will convey some of that excitement.

Concepts

The central concepts involved in the capability approach are capability and functioning. Functionings are what Sen (1999: 73) calls ‘the various things a person may value being and doing’. Examples include being adequately nourished, being in good health, avoiding escapable morbidity, being happy, having self-respect, and taking part in the life of the community (Sen 1992: 39). There is no definitive list of basic functionings because different sets will be relevant to different groups and in distinct settings (Sen 2005: 157–160). A person’s capability ‘represents the various combinations of functionings (beings and doings) that the person can achieve’ (Sen 1992: 40). To this degree, the person’s capability reflects her freedom or (real) opportunities. Sen has used these concepts to analyse the quality of life, egalitarian justice and poverty inter alia. He has demonstrated the insights which arise from a capability or functioning-based analysis in comparison with analyses which exclusively use information on resources, or income, or ‘utility’ (when this is understood as happiness or desire satisfaction). The capability approach thus broadens the informational basis used in normative evaluations.

To illustrate some of these ideas, consider the quality of life of the painter Vincent Van Gogh, in the winter of 1889. At that time Van Gogh painted an interpretation of Millet’s ‘The First Steps of Childhood’. It is certainly true that Van Gogh had little income and that he was heavily dependent on his brother for financial support. However, if we considered his position only as regards income or resources we would have a very limited understanding of the quality of his life. In the months when he was working on this painting—as well as other paintings based on Millet’s work—he was extremely unwell and had recurrent fits. To this degree, he was clearly deprived in terms of Sen’s functioning ‘being in good health’. In addition, these paintings were created in the asylum of Saint-Rémy de Provence where he did not have people who could sit for portraits. As a consequence, his brother Theo sent him some black and white reproductions of works by Millet and Eugène Delacroix, which he worked from. Van Gogh’s choice of ‘The First Steps of Childhood’ as a subject reflected the limited opportunities or capability he had. His limited opportunities involved a form of disadvantage which may not be adequately captured through an analysis which merely checked his level of ‘utility’ (in terms of happiness or desire satisfaction), partly because he may have learned to adjust to the circumstances he found himself in.

Capability and functioning remain intimately connected but independently useful concepts in Sen’s writings. Because capability is a collection of functionings a person can achieve, capability is evaluated in the ‘space’ of functionings, thus functionings are integral elements of capabilities. However, the focus on capability directs our attention to freedom and opportunity—which functionings cannot do. Sen does not claim that capability is all that matters; functionings retain ongoing value in themselves. He also leaves open the relative importance of capability as opposed to functionings as well as the relative weights to be given to different capabilities or

2 Van Gogh’s interpretation is to be found in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York.
functionings (Sen 1992: 49–53 and 1999: 76–77). These are some of a range of ways in which the approach is intentionally open-ended and incomplete.

In addition to capability and functioning, Sen defines a third core concept, agency. On his account, an agent is ‘someone who acts and brings about change’ (Sen 1999: 19). The agency aspect is important in assessing ‘what a person is free to do and achieve in pursuit of whatever goals or values he or she regards as important’ (Sen 1985: 203). In some writings, agency – as well as capability – figures centrally. For example, the approach adopted in Drèze and Sen’s book India: Development and Participation as well as many of Sen’s single-authored writings ‘puts human agency (rather than organisations such as markets or governments) at the centre of the stage’ (2002: 6). When Roland de Leeuw notes that Van Gogh initially had as a ‘social objective’ that his Millet paintings would be presented to a local school – presumably to expose young people to Millet’s work – it is agency which is relevant (de Leeuw 1996: 466). Of course, Van Gogh’s aim if realised would also mark an achievement in terms of functionings, as regards ‘taking part in the life of the community’.

Sen uses a range of distinctions in his writings on freedom and development. To clarify his conceptual framework and to avoid potential confusion, we introduce two further terms: ‘opportunity freedom’ and ‘process freedom’ (Sen 1999; 2002: chapters 19–21). While ‘opportunity freedom’ refers to what people have opportunity or ability to achieve, ‘process freedom’ refers to ‘the process through which things happen’ (Sen 2002: 583). Clearly capability is closely related to opportunity freedom; agency relates to personal process freedoms.

As might be expected given the richness of foundational concepts, several interpretations of the scope of the capability approach are used in the wider literature and indeed in this book. These can be charted between two poles: one narrow and one broad, with the broad subsuming the narrow. The capability approach proposes that the comparison or evaluation of advantage or deprivation (whether or not through measurement) should occur in the space of capabilities inter alia (rather than simply utility or commodities), or in some sensible approximation of capabilities such as a vector of achieved functionings. The narrow interpretation sees the approach primarily as identifying capability and functionings as the primary informational space for certain exercises. The broad interpretation views the capability approach as providing a more extensive and demanding evaluative framework, for example by introducing human rights or plural principles beyond the expansion of capabilities – principles which embody other values or concerns such as equity, sustainability or responsibility.

Both interpretations can be found in Sen’s writings. Like the narrow interpretation, the broad interpretation argues that the quality of life should be evaluated primarily in the space of capabilities. However, information on capabilities alone is not sufficient. Other considerations (such as rights, process or agency) would enter the overall evaluation of states of affairs in this framework. To illustrate, consider an example which Sen has used recently. The example starts from the well-known claim that in similar conditions women live longer than men. It might be possible, Sen suggests, to equalise people’s capability as regards their life chances. However, pursuing such equality, perhaps by discriminating against women in the distribution of health care, would violate process freedom (Sen 2002: 660–661 and 2005: 156; see also Tsuchiya and Williams 2005). On a narrow interpretation, this example can be used to illustrate the limits of the capability approach. By contrast, on a broad interpretation, the very same example might be used to show how the capability approach introduces additional distributional considerations (see also Sen 1985 and 2000). In both the narrow and broad interpretations, the capability approach is viewed as a tool for evaluation – comparing situations with respect to the real opportunities they offer, among other things.

Sen (1984, 1990 and 1999) also frames the objective of development as an ‘expansion of capabilities’. This has led to an interest in identifying courses of action or policies that would further this objective. So going beyond the capability approach as an evaluative space or framework, we can identify a third preoccupation in the literature on the capability approach and, relatedly, human development which focuses on generating prospective policies, activities and recommendations. This preoccupation is central to the discussion in the section on measurement and other applications later in this introduction. The chapters in this volume, nonetheless, span all three aspects of the literature.

Much of the philosophical literature is concerned with debates relating to the capability approach as an evaluative space and its relationship to, and perceived merits and weaknesses in comparison with, other approaches. Contributions have included a wide range of
papers on justice, happiness, needs and opportunities. Chapters by Alkire, Mozaffar Qizilbash and Ingrid Robeyns engage critically with these issues. Alkire traces the boundaries of the approach and distinguishes evaluative and prospective aspects. Robeyns investigates the ability of the capability approach to address feminist concerns and shows that it can be seen as a 'gender-sensitive evaluative framework'.

She expresses a worry raised elsewhere in the literature about the 'under-specified' nature of the approach. Qizilbash considers the extent to which Sen's approach contrasts with the views of happiness, poverty and gender justice in John Stuart Mill's writings. He finds the two approaches remarkably similar in spite of the fact that one is a leading critic, while the other is one of the founders, of utilitarianism.

Another theme in the debate is the relationship between the individual and society in Sen's writings on capability. Chapters by Alkire, Séverine Deneulin, Robeyns and Miriam Teschl and Laurent Derobert engage critically with this debate at the conceptual level. Alkire argues that many criticisms of the so-called 'individualism' of the capability approach arise when the capability approach is drawn upon to generate 'prospective' recommendations (rather than evaluations in the broad or narrow sense). She clarifies that prospective recommendations generated in the capability literature inevitably draw upon institutions and intermediary processes and do not posit Robeyns' methodological individualism, so the criticisms, while accurate in substance, misattribute an individualism that the capability approach lacks.

Deneulin is unconvinced that Sen's capability approach can give sufficient importance to what Charles Taylor has called 'irreducibly plural goods'. She puts forward the notion of 'socio-historical agency' as central in the promotion of capabilities, bringing into perspective empirical illustration of capability expansion in Costa Rica. Her chapter can be read as making the case for a further broadening of the informational basis of the capability approach – when this is used as the basis for prescriptions – to include Paul Ricoeur's notion of 'structures of living together' which belong to a particular historical community but are irreducible to individual relations. Deneulin's argument suggests that in its current form the approach is not just incomplete but potentially misleading.

Robeyns distinguishes between ethical individualism – where the ultimate unit of concern is the individual – and methodological and ontological individualism – which hold that social phenomena can be explained by reference to individuals alone, and that society is merely a sum of its individual parts. She defends ethical individualism, arguing that it is necessary for an adequate account of the wellbeing of women and children. Teschl and Derobert explore how a person's agency and identity influence their choice of functionings from their 'capability set' – the set of vectors of functioning from which they choose. They note the powerful role that a person's diverse social identities can have in influencing their choices. In spite of the apparent contrast between Sen's alleged 'individualism' and the focus on community in the 'communitarian' literature, Teschl and Derobert find that Sen's position is closer to that of one leading figure in that literature – Michael Sandel – than either Sen or Sandel might acknowledge.

Measures and applications

Given that evaluation of capability raises a challenging array of issues of measurement, aggregation, comparison, vagueness, etc., it is with good reason that a growing literature explores these issues. Sen has distinguished three ways in which the capability perspective can inform empirical and quantitative measurement work: the 'direct approach' – which 'takes the form of directly examining and comparing vectors of functionings or capabilities'; the 'supplementary approach' – which involves 'use of traditional procedures of interpersonal comparisons in income spaces but supplements them with capability considerations'; and the 'indirect approach' – which 'remains focussed on the familiar space of incomes, appropriately adjusted' (Sen 1999: 82-3). Each of these approaches is seen as a way of giving 'practical shape to the foundational concern' (Sen 1999: 81).
In this introduction, we interpret the notion of ‘application’ broadly so that it covers the various ways in which a conceptual approach can be given a practical shape or value. Applications matter, not only because intellectual effort can contribute to practical change and inform policy-making but also because they can reshape understanding and contribute towards better conceptualisations of social phenomena and assessment procedures. Some applications involve measurement, but measurability is not a necessary condition for giving practical shape or value to a conceptual approach. The wide range of capability applications described in this book may contribute to shaping and illuminating the insights of the capability approach and can provide further refinements of its conceptual foundations.

The measurement literature includes examples of the direct, indirect and supplementary approaches at work. The direct approach is the most ambitious way of applying the capability approach. Attempts to pursue it typically address the multi-dimensional nature of wellbeing, inequality or poverty when these are understood in terms of capability or functionings. For this reason, some applications of the capability approach are close relatives of other approaches to multi-dimensional measurement. A large literature on such multi-dimensional measurement of wellbeing, poverty and inequality has emerged.

Figure 0.1 Schematic overview of multi-dimensional poverty for individual $i$ over time. This is represented by the broken arrow in the diagram. If a person or group falls within the fuzzy poverty band it is ambiguous whether they are poor. Multidimensional measurement would include information of this sort for each dimension.

Recurrent questions in this literature comprise the following. Which are the domains or dimensions that will be included, and on what basis? Which indicator(s) best represent each domain or functioning, and on what grounds will these be selected? What is the poverty threshold for each indicator, or, if a fuzzy threshold is defined, what are the upper and lower boundaries of the fuzzy poverty band? How does one represent the interaction between different indicators and the interactions between dimensions of poverty and identify substitutes and complements? In those cases in which it is necessary to aggregate across domains, how is this achieved and what relative weights are set for various domains? And how does one aggregate across individuals?

Various approaches to multi-dimensional poverty measurement propose clear answers to these questions. A multi-dimensional measure of poverty – the human poverty index – which Sen developed with Sudhir Anand (Anand and Sen 1997) is an example of such a particular measure which is inspired by the capability approach. Decisions about
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the selection of dimensions, indicators and weights are made in all the multi-dimensional measures of human development – most obviously in the Human Development Index (or HDI), developed by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) – and related measures of gender inequality (McGillivray and White 1993; Anand et al. 1994; Streeten 1994; Anand et al. 1995; Anand and Sen 1997; Anand and Sen 2000; Anand and Sen 2000; Sen 2000; World Bank 2000; Ogwang and Abdou 2003; McGillivray 2005).

While there is a significant overlap between applications of the capability approach and other approaches to multi-dimensional measurement, the capability approach is distinctive inasmuch as it stresses that capabilities and functionings have value in themselves: ‘intrinsic value’. Income, by contrast, is seen as having ‘instrumental value’ – value as a means to the realisation of other ends. While some ‘indirect’ applications of the capability approach use income as a proxy measure for certain capabilities (see Anand and Sen 2000 and Klasen 2000), income is not usually seen as a dimension of wellbeing itself. Furthermore, the fact that income has an instrumental rather than intrinsic value can influence the form in which income enters into a multi-dimensional measure. This is one among a number of instances where the capability approach as a conceptual framework has implications for measurement. Tracing out such implications is a central theme of Flavia Comim’s chapter. Drawing on the writings of both Nussbaum and Sen, he shows the relevance of the approach – understood broadly as an extensive evaluative framework – to measurement issues. Comim also illustrates his claims in various concrete contexts, discussing empirical work carried out in research projects aiming to measure capabilities.

Figure 0.1 also allows us to address a question which has been neglected in the literature on capability: how to handle time? It locates any individual’s or group’s achievement in a relevant dimension in time. If relevant information is available across time, we would then be able to judge whether a person’s failure to achieve a minimally adequate level in some dimension is merely temporary or ‘chronic’. This would be one way to link work on capability to work on ‘chronic poverty’ (Hulme and Shepherd 2003). By locating people or groups in time, Figure 0.1 illustrates how one might study capability dynamics. It also allows one to consider whether or not a person or group situated at some point in time might become poor in the future. Such ‘vulnerability’ is a rich research theme (Morduch 1994; Dercon and Krishnan 2000) which has just started to be explored in the literature on the capability approach. While some commentators have discussed how time might be addressed in the capability perspective (Comim 2005), there is scope for further work on these topics. In Chapter 8, Foris Papadopoulos and Panos Tsakloglou address the time dimension explicitly. They develop an approach to the measurement of social exclusion using the capability approach. They discuss some practical problems involved in using the CA: from an elaboration of a list of functionings and weighting issues to an evaluation of chosen capabilities. In their chapter, if deprivation in certain dimensions occurs for a number of periods in time, it constitutes social exclusion.9

Applications of the capability approach have also used techniques to capture the vagueness of notions such as poverty, wellbeing and inequality more explicitly than other work on multi-dimensional measurement. Enrica Chiappero-Martinetti argues that the capability approach’s ability to address complex problems without imposing artificial precision is a strength and that fuzzy measures provide one technique by which to capture this strength in empirical analyses – for example of poverty. Sara Lelli compares fuzzy measures with factor analysis using Belgian data. She investigates the empirical consequences of using particular techniques to the operationalisation of the capability approach. She shows how factor analysis could be a helpful device for defining a limited number of easily interpretable dimensions of capabilities and how fuzzy set analysis could be used to qualify the transition from membership to non-membership among different capabilities’ characteristics. She finds that the results that emerge from using these two techniques are remarkably similar. Qizilbash suggests that fuzzy poverty measures might be understood as measures of ‘vulnerability’, though he contrasts such ‘vulnerability’ from other definitions in much recent work.

While a number of studies look at a comprehensive set of dimensions of wellbeing, inequality and poverty, others focus on a smaller subset of such capabilities or functionings. Work which selects such a subset of capabilities or functionings often shows that approaches that focus on
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9 For an alternative approach to the measurement of social exclusion using the CA, see Bossert, D’Ambrosio and Peragine 2004.
income alone are inadequate. Many of Sen’s applications of the capability approach have taken this form (Sen 1984; Drèze and Sen 2002). Using Peruvian household survey data, Caterina Ruggeri Laderchi explores the policy relevance of using indicators of, and ‘production functions’ for, health and education rather than income. Because these capabilities are particularly significant, she takes the position that indicators of morbidity and functional illiteracy are adequate indicators for them. She finds that capability analyses provide more policy-adequate guidance than income analyses. In the context of Mozambique, Giorgio Ardeni and Antonio Andracchio explore one of the central tenets of the CA, that resources are imperfect indicators of wellbeing, arguing that women in female-headed households are not necessarily poorer than men in the space of resources, but that they are much more vulnerable when seen in the space of functionings (such as health and education), providing evidence for a phenomenon known as ‘feminisation of poverty’. Kirsten Sehnbruch uses the capability approach to develop a broad index of the ‘quality of employment’. She shows that, in the context of the Chilean labour market, this index illuminates a range of policy-relevant issues which would otherwise not be highlighted.

These chapters are among a range of applications of the capability approach that empirically demonstrate the relative strength of analysis and accuracy of policy advice that arise from a reliance on functionings rather than monetary measures, and suggests that these replace or at least supplement standard income, expenditure or consumption measures. At the very least, the findings in these chapters thus make a strong case for using what Sen calls the ‘supplementary approach’ in certain contexts. In fact, such an approach seems to be implicit in a wide range of policy contexts, as can be seen in the formulation of the ‘Millennium Development Goals’ (where income poverty headcount indices are supplemented by a wide range of other indicators). Finally, there is now a significant econometrics literature which focuses specifically on capability rather than functionings in applied work, this is an area where there is scope for further work. However, worries about this issue have not held back work on measurement which is guided by the capability perspective. For those researchers who are looking for tools to use in applying that perspective, the literature provides a rich menu of options, or at least a starting point and set of challenges, for further work. If capability-based measurement is in its early stages then the tools which are at hand may be somewhat rudimentary – rather like the spade and barrow in Miller’s ‘The First Steps of Childhood’ – but there are already many such tools as well as clearly defined possibilities for the use and development of techniques which can be explored.

As noted at the beginning of this section, while measurement can help to make a conceptual approach an object of practical value, measurement is not a necessary condition for the application of such an approach. While much of the conceptual and measurement literature has focused on the capability approach as identifying an appropriate space for evaluation, as noted earlier a rich literature has also emerged on generating prospective policies, activities and recommendations, particularly in the context of development conceived as capability expansion. The capability approach has proven to be a powerful tool in this arena quite independent of any work on measurement. At the most general level the approach has changed the language of policy work and public discussion on topics such as poverty, the quality of life and inequality. Part of the reason for this change has been the success of Sen’s work on hunger and on the Indian approach’. It has been insightful in the context of disability (Kuklys 2005; Zaidi and Burchardt 2005) and may be useful in other contexts.

In some attempts to apply the capability approach, the question of where information on freedom enters – as agency measures for specific dimensions or in other ways – also arises. Often it is also noted that while achieved functionings are easily observed, a person’s capability is not. Some of those who are sceptical about the usefulness of the capability approach view this problem as a fatal flaw. Others – including Sen (1999: 81–82 and 131) and some contributors to this volume (including Comim, Ruggeri Laderchi and Chiappero-Martinetti) – follow a more constructive strategy. While there have also been some attempts to focus specifically on capability rather than functionings in applied work, this is an area where there is scope for further work. However, worries about this issue have not held back work on measurement which is guided by the capability perspective. For those researchers who are looking for tools to use in applying that perspective, the literature provides a rich menu of options, or at least a starting point and set of challenges, for further work. If capability-based measurement is in its early stages then the tools which are at hand may be somewhat rudimentary – rather like the spade and barrow in Miller’s ‘The First Steps of Childhood’ – but there are already many such tools as well as clearly defined possibilities for the use and development of techniques which can be explored.

As noted at the beginning of this section, while measurement can help to make a conceptual approach an object of practical value, measurement is not a necessary condition for the application of such an approach. While much of the conceptual and measurement literature has focused on the capability approach as identifying an appropriate space for evaluation, as noted earlier a rich literature has also emerged on generating prospective policies, activities and recommendations, particularly in the context of development conceived as capability expansion. The capability approach has proven to be a powerful tool in this arena quite independent of any work on measurement. At the most general level the approach has changed the language of policy work and public discussion on topics such as poverty, the quality of life and inequality. Part of the reason for this change has been the success of Sen’s work on hunger and on the Indian
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10 For a summary of applications of the approach which distinguish the distinct nature of findings and policy conclusions see Kuklys 2005: 25–28. See also Chiappero-Martinetti’s chart in this volume (Table 9.1).

11 Alkire 2005.

economy, much of it co-authored with Jean Drèze (Drèze and Sen 1989 and 2002). However, Sen's collaboration with the United Nations Development Programme on various Human Development Reports has also led to the widespread use of the language of capability at the policy level and in public discussion and debate. While the HDI has been the most visible form in which the capability approach has had an impact on the policy world, this change in the language of policy and public discussion also needs to be noted.

There are many different areas such as health, disability and education where the capability perspective has influenced the language of policy and public discussion. To illustrate, in the context of education the use of capabilities language has been introduced alongside the widespread use of the notion of 'human capital'. Because the capability approach focuses on the intrinsic value of various abilities and is not merely concerned with skills which are of instrumental use, it introduces a new dimension to some educational debates. While the use of the capability perspective in discussions about education may be fruitful, existing applications of the approach have also been criticised.

In this volume, Elaine Unterhalter extends Sen's views on the role of education to enhance human wellbeing. She argues that education the use of capabilities language has been introduced alongside the widespread use of the notion of 'human capital'. Because the capability approach focuses on the intrinsic value of various abilities and is not merely concerned with skills which are of instrumental use, it introduces a new dimension to some educational debates. While the use of the capability perspective in discussions about education may be fruitful, existing applications of the approach have also been criticised.

In this volume, Elaine Unterhalter extends Sen's views on the role of education to enhance human wellbeing. She argues that education the use of capabilities language has been introduced alongside the widespread use of the notion of 'human capital'. Because the capability approach focuses on the intrinsic value of various abilities and is not merely concerned with skills which are of instrumental use, it introduces a new dimension to some educational debates. While the use of the capability perspective in discussions about education may be fruitful, existing applications of the approach have also been criticised.

There are many different areas such as health, disability and education where the capability perspective has influenced the language of policy and public discussion. To illustrate, in the context of education the use of capabilities language has been introduced alongside the widespread use of the notion of 'human capital'. Because the capability approach focuses on the intrinsic value of various abilities and is not merely concerned with skills which are of instrumental use, it introduces a new dimension to some educational debates. While the use of the capability perspective in discussions about education may be fruitful, existing applications of the approach have also been criticised.

In this volume, Elaine Unterhalter extends Sen's views on the role of education to enhance human wellbeing. She argues that education the use of capabilities language has been introduced alongside the widespread use of the notion of 'human capital'. Because the capability approach focuses on the intrinsic value of various abilities and is not merely concerned with skills which are of instrumental use, it introduces a new dimension to some educational debates. While the use of the capability perspective in discussions about education may be fruitful, existing applications of the approach have also been criticised.
democratic arrangements and the nature of participatory interventions in the characterisation of instrumental freedoms in India. Echoing Sen’s emphasis on the importance of the practice of democracy, Mehrorra argues that certain forms of local participation are crucial during exercises of democratic decentralisation in order for these to realise the promised expansion of capabilities. His concern with successful social interventions in operationalising the CA is shared by many other contributors in this book.

Finally, Jean-Luc Dubois and Sophie Rousseau, and Shahin Yaqub stress the importance of time. Dubois and Rousseau see capability as a useful concept in the context of poverty policy. They argue that enhancing capabilities can be a poverty-prevention policy primarily because it can reduce a person’s vulnerability (understood as the probability of having his/her own situation worsening in the face of a dramatic event). Dubois and Rousseau engage critically with the capability approach by suggesting that its static emphasis to date is insufficient. Shahin Yaqub explores ‘the lifecourse approach to capabilities’. He argues that interventions which affect capabilities at an early stage in life can be a crucial factor in influencing the chances that a person will escape poverty at a later stage in life. He shows how time affects individuals’ command over commodities, their ‘personal utilisation functions’ and the implications of their choices. Thus policies which aim at capability expansion must consider the lifecourse in prioritising interventions.

Concluding remarks

This book engages with a wide range of issues from disputed conceptual points to very practical concerns about public policy and discussion. This introduction has attempted to highlight certain gaps in the literature and pathways which might be pursued. At the same time, it has gathered together some of the themes in the diverse chapters. Critical engagement with Sen’s writings on capability emerges as a central theme. So while we have stopped well short of summarising the chapters, our introductory remarks aim rather at enticing readers to look more closely at the chapters that follow. Just as ‘The First Steps of Childhood’ mark the end of a phase in a human life and hint at possibilities, we hope that this book allows readers to appreciate what has been achieved while anticipating and encouraging further research on the capability approach.
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