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**Introduction**

In 2009, the independent report, an “Agenda for a Reformed Cohesion Policy” was prepared in 2009 by Fabrizio Barca, the, Director-General of the Ministry of Economy and Finance of Italy, with the support of John Bachtler from the European Policies Research Centre at the University of Strathclyde, indicated  “A remarkable lack of political and policy debate on results in terms of the well-being of people, at both local and EU level, most of the attention being focused on financial absorption and irregularities.”  (p. XVI)

The paper explores to what extent the response of the EU regulation for the new ESIF programming period, is providing an answer to this challenge as put forward by the report.

The paper will argue that the challenge is not met adequately but that this is in part due to the poor definition and operationalisation of the ideas of well-being and human development in the report.

In doing so, the paper attempts to clarify these concepts by drawing on the work of economist Amartya Sen (capability approach).

Next, the paper provides an overview of approaches that hold great potential for reorienting ESIF towards human development, notably Human Centered Design approaches such as used by MINDLAB in Denmark and Seddon’s systems thinking.

Finally, the paper makes recommendations how to use its insights.

The paper is conceptual and exploratory in nature, hence it offers many hypotheses for future research.

**An agenda for a Reformed Cohesion Policy, “well-being” and “development”**

The “Agenda for a Reformed Cohesion Policy” was prepared in 2009 by Fabrizio Barca, Ministry of Economy and Finance of Italy, with the support of John Bachtler from the European Policies

Research Centre at the University of Strathclyde. It will be referred to in this paper as the “Barca report”.

The report put forward as one of five most evident weaknesses of cohesion policy “A remarkable lack of political and policy debate on results in terms of the well-being of people, at both local and EU level, most of the attention being focused on financial absorption and irregularities.” (p. XVI).

It is important to note the connection here between the word “result” and “well-being”, implying that a greater results orientation also required more emphasis on the concept of well-being.

In addition, the ambition of the report is to reorient cohesion policy towards being “a development approach…objective is to reduce persistent inefficiency (underutilisation of resources resulting in income below potential in both the short and long-run) and persistent social exclusion (primarily, an excessive number of people below a given standard in terms of income and other features of well-being)…This is, in the Report’s view, the appropriate and modern way to interpret the task set by the EU Treaty to promote ‘harmonious development’”. (p.XI)

“Harmonious development” is put forward as the ultimate objective here, with well-being (put here in terms of reducing inequality) being a key part of this agenda.

Given these basic orientations towards well-being and development in the Barca report, it should not be surprising that a specific reference is found in it to the work of Amartya Sen, an economist who won the Nobel prize for his contributions to welfare economics, in particular with his capability approach relating to human development.

The report states: “Amartya Sen’s capability approach makes clear that the capacity of any individual to convert a given amount of any “commodity”, including money, into achievements that are relevant for their life depends on a combination of (social and physical) circumstances and on access to other “commodities” often produced by policy. Indeed, several dimensions of well-being strongly depend on public institutions performing essential tasks and provide public goods and services” (p.29).

However, the Barca report does not define what is exactly meant by “well-being” or “development”. Hence, this paper will proceed with clarifying these concepts first.

**Defining human development**

First, the paper draws on Amartya Sen for an understanding of human development. The paragraphs quoted earlier from the Barca report explicitly mention Sen’s work. However, the Barca report does not explain Sen’s approach in great clarity[[1]](#footnote-1).

Alkire et al (2009) states: “consider an approach to development in which the objective is to

expand what people are able to do and be – what might be called their real freedoms. It puts people first. In this view, a healthy economy is one that enables people to enjoy a long and healthy life, a good education, a meaningful job, physical safety, democratic debate and so on. Notice…: first, the analysis shifts from the economy to the person. Second, the currency of assessment shifts from money to the things people can do and be in their lives, now and in the future.” (p. 23).

As Sen’s approach is very sophisticated, an example may be more illuminating rather than a theoretical exposition. Box 1 takes the example of someone who dreams of becoming an architect.

Box 1: Sen’s capability approach in an example

Imagine you are a young person dreaming of becoming an excellent architect… (functioning)

But do you have the real choice (capability) to be one?

There needs to be a university that offers the study…

You need to be able to pay the fees…

You need approval from your parents…

You may have a handicap that makes it challenging…

Realising your dream may involve “sacrificing” other choices for doings/beings you have reason to value e.g. …

…to enjoy your family (the nearest university may be far away)

…to enjoy the natural environment of your rural village

…to have an unstressful life…

…to support your younger sister going to secondary school by taking a job…

If your dream is not a real choice, you may want to strive (agency) towards making it real e.g…

…by organising a public movement to lower school fees

…by creating a public debate concerning the right to pursue another career than your parents…

…

a) Doings and beings that people have reason to value

Sen would call “being an excellent architect” a “functioning” or a “doing/being” you have reason to value. “Functionings are valuable activities and states that make up people’s well-being” (Alkire et al, 2009, p. 31). It is important to remember that for Sen, functionings are what constitutes well-being. If someone does not value a particular doing or being, then there is no well-being to be derived from engaging in it. For example, if someone does not dream of becoming an architect yet is forced to become one, then, for this person, well-being is not enhanced.

It should also be clear that “functionings are not limited, which is why the human development approach applies to rich and poor countries, and to rich and poor people.” (Alkire et al, 2009, p. 32)

b) Freedom as the key to understanding human development

Sen would talk of a “capability” if, when we experience an intrinsic need, such as excelling at being an architect, we also have the actual freedom (real possibility) to become one. For Sen, if we want to increase well-being in terms of functionings, we need to expand people’s capabilities: what choices do they actually have to engage in what they value?

Opportunity freedom should not be confused with “choice”. Behavioral social sciences such as behavioral economics (for an overview see Darnton, 2008[[2]](#footnote-2)) for example describes the frustration that arises when people are given too many choices (e.g. on a restaurant menu, in a shop[[3]](#footnote-3)). Opportunity freedom related to already having made a choice in one’s mind in terms of what an individual values and then having the possibility to make the functioning implied in the choice a reality. Sen is concerned with the deliberate pursuit of human flourishing, not the largely unconscious drivers of mundane behavior that behavioural sciences take an interest in. Satisfying an urge is not to be confused with the pursuit of human development in terms of fulfilling our potential. However, behavioral economics is of great value as “urges” can get in the way of developing our potential.

Also, an activity or being that people may want to engage in “counts” as a functioning for a person only if that person values it intrinsically as and “end” , not a “means”. Of course the functioning could also “serve” (it has instrumental value) to cause other positive changes in a person’s life but even if this would not be the case, the person would still value the activity. “Capabilities… are always things that must matter intrinsically, whether or not they additionally also matter instrumentally.” (Alkire, 2009, p. 222).

It is also key in Sen’s view to understand that having the same resources at their disposal (e.g. the existence of a university degree in architecture) does not mean they will be able to convert resources into the same level of capabilities (real choice) as others could. What he refers to as differing conversion factors creates a considerable degree of variety in outcomes.

(Alkire, 2009, p.234) states “… there are numerous factors influencing how different individuals convert resource inputs into valued functionings. These ‘conversion factors’ occur at the individual, social, institutional (formal or informal) and environmental level. Individual factors that determine how a given resource will be used include, for example, age, gender, metabolic rate, pregnancy, illness and knowledge. Social or family dynamics are also relevant in converting resource inputs to… outputs of value. Formal rules or informal regulations similarly intervene in our ability to use resource inputs to achieve desired functionings. And, lastly, our natural or man-made

environment can facilitate the efficient (or inefficient) use of given inputs.”

To stay with education consider the following. “From the perspective of the human development and capability approach, educational policy focuses on the freedoms individuals and social groups have to achieve valued functionings (the capability set) and the ways in which conversion works to limit or expand these capabilities. Conversion might work both internally (with regard to how individuals learn or understand the value of education) and externally (with a bearing on the quality of school provision, the level of teacher knowledge and capacity to put this into practice, forms of discrimination, such as education privileges some learners might have, and so on). “ (Alkire et al, 2009, p. 218)

In sum, internal conversion factors are individual ones (physical, mental) while external ones relate to constraints deriving from social or family dynamics, formal rules or informal regulations as well as our physical environment. In all cases, their variety explains why similar resources do not translate into similar outcomes in terms of functionings for each person. Of course, certain social groupings can be identified by similarities their members display in conversion factors.

It is useful to come back to the perspective offered by behavioural science. Much of what is studies there could be classified as a conversion factor. Indeed, the London Collaborative (2013, p. 11) classifies “what makes us tick” into “internal factors” that consist of “heuristics and biases” and “social factors” that consist of social proof and social norms, collective efficacy, social commitment and social standing.

For Sen, it is therefore also crucial that people are able to exert “agency”, or, the freedom to create new freedoms, hence expand our capabilities, ourselves. “It includes not just individual agency, but what one can do as a member of a group, collectivity or political community.” (Alkire et al., 2009, p. 37). This allows to tackle some of the conversion factors. In fact, what happens is that extra resources are mobilized to modify conversion factors. For example, for a young person with a learning disability, several extra resources such as giving extra time, assigning a mentor etc. may help equalize the conversion of an available resource such as access to a university degree into the desired functioning of obtaining the degree (or rather the knowledge the degree symbolises).

So, we are talking about two very different kinds of freedom:

* our freedom to make choices from the realm of given, real possibilities (capability) where no one should choose for us and the more relevant choices (for functionings) we have the better;
* our freedom to expand this given set of choices, to create new choices (agency).

Development then refers to an expansion of people’s real freedoms (capabilities or opportunity freedom), enabling them to flourish and at the same time, supporting people and groups to help themselves (process freedom or agency) (Alkire, 2009, p. 23).

Indeed, “Agency and the expansion of valuable freedoms go hand in hand.... In order to be agents of their own lives, people need the freedom to be educated, to speak in public without fear, to have freedom of expression and association, etc. But it is also by being agents that people can build the environment in which they can be educated and speak freely, etc.” (Alkire et al, 2009, p.28)

Agency is important for two reasons. First, a mere focus on expanding people’s functionings would allow someone to do this by force. From this point of view it would, for example, be acceptable to coerce people into a job e.g. by threatening to take away benefits or harassing them constantly, because work is something people generally would agree to value. Furthermore, people should be free to refrain from a functioning for good reasons if and when they so choose. In the example provided in box 1, the young person may choose to refrain from becoming an architect because he or she values also to care for a younger sister.

However, public interventions that rely on narrow service protocols that force people into a limited set of standard “solutions” that they can take or leave (and sometimes not even leave) are far removed from Sen’s ideas on how human development. Saying to people they should comply because it is “for their own good” and “we know best what is good for you” are not justified from Sen’s perspective.

What is justified from Sen’s perspective, is to support people in their efforts to realize their potential by expanding the set of possible choices relevant to them (e.g. lower structural barriers to employment such as discrimination) or to help them create new choices by and for themselves (by exerting their agency and hence removing restrictions on that e.g. by removing restrictions on freedom of association).

c) Principles that must accompany human development

Equity, efficiency, participation/empowerment and sustainability are not inherent in the capability approach and hence have to be added as principles:

* “equity draws attention to those who have unequal opportunities due to various disadvantages and may require preferential treatment or affirmative action…
* …efficiency refers to… optimal use of human, material, environmental and institutional resources to expand capabilities…
* …participation and empowerment… implies that people need to be involved at every stage, not merely as beneficiaries…
* …sustainability refers to … advancing human development such that outcomes progress in all spheres – social, political and financial – endures over time.” (Alkire et al, 2009, p. 29-30)

Equity and participation/empowerment are important to ensure that there is not only human development but also greater equality in it. “An essential test of development is whether people have greater freedoms today than they did in the past. A test of inequality is whether people’s capability sets are equal or unequal.” (Alkire et al, 2009, p. 31). In the context of cohesion policy, these principles are of utmost importance.

Sustainability is needed to ensure that there is also development and equality over time for future generations. These cannot participate in today’s decision-making hence safeguards are required.

As to efficiency, this is just a reminder that human development could happen at random but that it is better to try to approach it more rationally.

d) Challenges

Of course, the personal nature of functionings, where what one person values is not necessarily what another values, poses some challenges:

* a first challenge arises when what one person values also has negative consequences for what another values. This is why Sen defined a functioning as what someone has “reason” to value. Establishing what is “reasonable”, needs to happen through a social process. However, “...while the capability approach argues that public debate and critical scrutiny are often helpful, it stops well short of proposing one particular process as relevant in all contexts, and rather depends on the agency of people acting in those contexts to address these questions themselves…” (Alkire et al., 2009, p. 32). Also “Agency is exercised with respect to the goals the person values and has reason to value.” (Alkire et al., 2009, p. 37). Hence, a person who harms or humiliates others would not be exerting agency as it is not reasonable to value this nor is it of intrinsic value.
* a second challenge could be how we should measure progress, not only in terms of functionings, as this could be achieved by force, but also progress in terms of freedom (expansion of choice and of the freedom to create new choices).
* a third challenge is how we can design and put in place interventions that aim at this.

Regarding the first challenge, it must be said that Sen does not provide much guidance on what this social process should look like, apart that there should be some form of public scrutiny regarding what is supposed to be of value (Alkire, 2008, p.7[[4]](#footnote-4)).

Alkire (2008, p.7-14) discusses five different ways that lists have been made by researchers, three of which are deemed not fully in line with the capability approach and two that have substantial practical problems to deal with.

The three that are not in line are:

* select what is valued on the basis of the existence of readily available (comparable) data or convention;
* normative assumptions drawing on general theories of what is supposed to be valued by humans;
* expert analysis that treats specific people as objects sidelining their agency, as done by behavioural economics.

Two that are in line but have some problems are:

* public consensus building at one point in time concerning functionings that are expected to be stable for some time and hence do not require ongoing debate. However, this list may become quite inflexible and hence not incorporate dissenting views that may arise. It is also far from likely that such big debates can be joined adequately by the most disadvantaged;
* ongoing deliberative participation: this is the most attractive mechanisms from Sen’s point of view as value judgments can be made and revised directly by concerned constituents. Also, understanding the give and takes of views and reasons can be quite useful for improving the debate about what is valued. This approach can be used at various levels (from local to national). Problems are that conflicting views at local levels tend to be compounded at national level and it is not clear how to synthesise them. Also, power imbalances may derail the discussion and it may not even be possible in situations of low trust or conflict. Also, as this is a dynamic process, what is valued will change over time, making it hard to get data that is comparable over time.

A way of proceeding with the last approach is to start with some general list of dimensions (Alkire, 2008, p. 12). However, Sen does not endorse (Alkire, 2010, p. 19[[5]](#footnote-5)) one set of basic capabilities because the value judgements involved in this should not be disassociated from the process of public reasoning and discussion. Also, he deems not all contexts can be covered by the same set.

But the following arguments are brought to bear to draw up lists. “Having a list of capabilities others in a similar situation have selected can help people to clarify their own set, and may bring to mind important capabilities they might have overlooked or not dared to hope for… always a danger that the powerful – be these economic elite, a particular ethnicity or gender or family or party – will select capabilities that advance their views, perhaps at the expense of minority voices.” (Alkire et al, 2009, p. 43). Sen does not mind this idea, as long as it does not pre-empt the social process. This is assured by the fact that the items on the “lists” are relatively vague (Alkire, 2008, p. 12).

Therefore, the paper will now turn to what dimensions of functionings may be of general interest and how they could be measured.

**Defining functionings in terms of dimensions of “well-being”**

The OECD (2013a, p. 23)[[6]](#footnote-6) defines well-being through the framework below. This represents a ‘list’ of sorts.

Figure 1: OECD well-being framework



The framework focuses mostly on “objective” aspects of well-being (what can be seen by others).

The OECD provides specific indicators for all the items in their framework. However, these “items” can also be used as a list of generic “dimensions” that may contain a variety of specific functionings.

Within the OECD list we find items that can be deemed of “intrinsic value” by many sources (see for example Alkire, 2002[[7]](#footnote-7) for a discussion of a variety of lists). Alkire (2005) provides for example the following alternative list:

* Life/health/security
* Excellence in work and play
* Understanding
* Self-direction (practical reason)
* Friendship and affiliation
* Inner peace / self-integration
* Creative expression
* Spirituality / harmony with sources of meaning and value
* Harmony with the natural world

There is some overlap with the OECD dimensions but the list provided by Alkire is worth reflecting on as it seems to be more complete. It should also be noted that income and wealth as mentioned in the OECD list are generally not present in lists of dimensions of functionings as they are instrumental (serve to get something else) rather than intrinsic (valued for themselves).

However, as Sen’s theory related to what individuals value and have reason to value, the key element of interest of the OECD list for this paper is “subjective” well-being. The OECD measures this with just one indicator namely by asking people to rate their current life between the best possible life for them (scored at 10) and the worst possible (scored at 0). But this is a quite general assessment. If we see the objective conditions as possible domains in which possible functionings can be defined, then understanding if these beings and doings are of value requires looking at this from the perspective of individuals.

In another OECD publication (2013b)[[8]](#footnote-8) the concept of subjective well-being is defined as: “good mental states”(p.29). It is put forward that subjective well-being can be seen as an umbrella term that captures many kinds of valuations -hedonic or eudaimonic- people make internally and hence they are subjective.

The concepts of hedonic versus eudaimonic well-being hence require closer scrutiny to determine if these can be used define and to measure “functionings” as subjective valuations of objective conditions (behaviours, situations).

OECD (2013a, p. 33) provides the model in the figure below that lists components of subjective well-being as well as its determinants.

Figure 2: OECD model of subjective well-being

 

The report notes that this list of determinants and sub-components is meant to be illustrative rather than exhaustive. Apart from personality type and culture, the determinants correspond to the “objective” categories of well-being in the overall OECD framework noted earlier. Hence, it could indeed be said that subjective well- being provides a way to assess if changes in objective aspects also made a difference internally for people.

Psychologist Daniel Kahneman is a proponent of well-being in terms of hedonism (Ryan et al, 2001[[9]](#footnote-9), p. 144). Kahneman won the Nobel prize for economics[[10]](#footnote-10) for his achievement in linking insights from psychology with economics (now commonly known as behavioural economics). His area of psychology is linked to behavioural theories of reward and punishment and cognitive expectations concerning such outcomes (e.g. expectancy-valence approach). This view appeals to economists as it is easily amenable to concepts like utility calculation, maximising reward, optimising input, etc.

Annex I provides an overview of the measures proposed by OECD (2013b) to measure the concepts of life satisfaction as well as affect. Life satisfaction can be in general as in the core question of “Overall, how satisfied are you with life as a whole these days?” (OECD, 2013b, p. 253). But it can also relate the specific aspects of life. In annex 1 we find satisfaction with standard of living, job, health, personal relations, feeling part of community, quality of local environment, safety, future security as well as achievement in life and doing the things you like. Apart from the latter two, these aspects are all related to the dimensions already cited in OECD (2013a). In fact, we only seem to be missing satisfaction with educations and skills and with work-life balance.

However, satisfaction and affect lead to criticism that a focus on well-being is just “happiology” (OECD, 2013b, p. 32). Alkire (2010, p. 39-40) raises specific issues:

* measuring satisfaction and affect shifts the emphasis away from debate as a venue in which to identify priorities and where people can act as agents of their own development, making their own choices relating to the various trade-offs they face. In fact, it would rather be the experts that tell policy-makers what makes people happy. It is not clear how people that disagreed with top-down decisions inspired by experts would be able to exert their voice and take control of their lives;
* satisfaction and affect is subject to adaptive preference which means that, for example, poor people lower their expectations regarding their health state, making richer people sometimes less satisfied or having less positive affect than the poor;
* as satisfaction and affect can be related to very specific moments, it is possible that policies could end up trying to maximize national happiness by focusing on supporting a rich banker who lost his job rather than a poor person that accepted their poor situation and is hence, relatively satisfied.

The OECD (2013b) therefore raises the existence of another set of measures for well-being that are called “eudaimonic”, which they define as good psychological functioning, sometimes also referred to as “flourishing”. “Eudaimonic well-being goes beyond the respondent’s reflective evaluation and emotional states to focus on functioning and the realisation of the person’s potential.” (p. 32).

To start to understand eudaimonic well-being as distinct from its hedonistic cousin, Aristotle provides the starting point. As stated by clinical psychologist P. Verhaeghe (2013, p. 47)[[11]](#footnote-11), in Aristotle’s philosophy, every organism has “telos”, a fundamental purpose that it tries to realise as well as possible. Self-realisation of what is already always present as a seed, as potential, but did not blossom yet is therefore inherently good. This applies of course also to realising our potential as human beings. Key is that when human beings try to fulfill needs that are rooted in human nature and whose realisation is conducive to human growth, this equates to “eudaimonia” or “human flourishing”.[[12]](#footnote-12)

For Aristotle, success however depends on both the organism in terms of its inherent potential (the ‘seeds’) as the environment (the ‘soil’). It should also be clear that everyone’s potential may be different. But everyone has it in them to realize it, given the environment is conducive to it. This is substantiated by the work of developmental psychologists working with children that have serious learning disabilities such as autism (Janssens et al, 2012 [[13]](#footnote-13)).

Realization of one’s potential is never finished but an ongoing, continuous affair. It is lived every day as we engage in meaningful activities. In this sense, Aristotle’s notion of eudaimonia is much closer to Sen’s notion of a functioning as something we are/do that we have reason to value. Alkire (2010, p.15 and 23) explicitly links Sen’s thinking with Aristotle.

 Ryan and Deci (2001, p. 145) also point out that for Aristotle “hedonic happiness” which is based on pursuing “…those needs (desires) that are only subjectively felt and whose satisfaction leads to momentary pleasure…” was a a vulgar ideal, making us slavish followers of desires rather than fulfilling our potential. This brings us back to the argument made earlier regarding behavioural economics as being focused mostly on unconscious “urges”. Satisfying these urges would show up on hedonic measures but would typically not register on eudaimonic measures.

Annex 2 provides examples of measures of eudaimonic well-being as proposed by OECD (2013b). The recommended core question is “Overall, to what extent do you feel the things you do in your life are worthwhile?” (OECD, 2013b, p. 255). However the guideline provides relatively little information about the conceptual structure of eudaimonic well-being. So this paper will now explore this structure more in detail.

Samman (2007, p. 9 [[14]](#footnote-14)) sees eudaimonic valuations as concerned with “1) perception of meaning in life -defined by the individual based on his/her unique potential; and 2) ability to strive towards excellence in fulfilling this idea”. (p.9)

The search for meaning should not be confused with the sense of meaning (looking for it versus having it). Samman (2007, p.13) refers to Steger’s “meaning of life” questionnaire that contains in its short form the following items (to be scored on a scale ranging from “not at all true” to “completely true”):

* My life has a clear sense of purpose;
* I have a good sense of what makes my life meaningful;
* I have discovered a satisfying life purpose.

This is similar to the eudaimonic OECD question cited earlier about how worthwhile life is.

Samman (2007, p13) also states that meaning of life measures should be complemented with measures derived from self-determination theory. The following items (short form of Basic Psychological Needs scales, rated from not at all true to completely true) are put forward:

* Autonomy:
	+ I feel like I am generally free to decide for myself how to live my life;
	+ I generally feel free to express my ideas and opinions;
	+ I feel like I can pretty much be myself in daily situations;
* Competence:
	+ People I know tell me I am competent at what I do;
	+ Most days I feel a sense of accomplishment from what I do;
	+ I often feel very capable;
* Relatedness:
	+ I get along well with people I come into contact with;
	+ I consider the people I regularly interact with to be my friends;
	+ People in my life care about me.

Alkire (2005) also puts forward that the concept of agency (process freedom) is interesting in relation to a presented list of functionings, as it is at the same time a means, an instrument, to expand our capabilities while also representing a dimension of well-being, namely self-direction (autonomy in Samman’s paper) (p. 220).

She also proposes that from the perspective of its instrumental value “empowerment” is actually to be defined as a sub-set of agency that can be exercised through:

-access to information;

-participation/inclusion (incl. via democracy);

-local capacity;

-accountability.

Empowerment is here a more narrow concept than agency, whereas agency is itself the instrumental form of self-direction, which is valuable as an end in itself. To increase empowerment is automatically to increase agency but not the other way around.

In line with Samman (2007), she concludes (Alkire,2005, p.235), after a review of five different approaches, that the most adequate instruments for measuring the functioning of “agency” are those provided by Ryan and Deci’s in the context of self-determination theory.

However, for Ryan and Deci (2001, p. 147), the three needs of autonomy, competence and relatedness are not to be confused with well-being, rather, they should be understood as determinants of well-being which they define as “being fully functioning “ and as “healthy, congruent, vital functioning”. They therefore helpfully view “being” eudaimonic (in terms of competency, relatedness and autonomy) as different from eudaimonic well-being. Innate needs (hence they are of intrinsic value) for autonomy, competence and relatedness , when thwarted, decrease well-being. To measure well-being, they therefore supplement hedonistic well-being measures with measures of self-actualisation, vitality (also a positive affect but different from “happiness” , rather referring to the state of feeling alive and alert, to having energy available to the self) and mental health that relate more to “eudaimonic” well-being, including the aforementioned ‘”meaning in life”. Annex 2 provides some examples of such measures.

Annex 3 provides an example of the RAND mental health questionnaire as a general questionnaire used for assessing psychological well-being in Mc Dowell (2006[[15]](#footnote-15) , p. 249-250) which shows a variety of questions related to both hedonic and eudaimonic well-being without distinguishing them as such. Ryan and Deci (2001, p. 148) cite research that applied factor analysis to such a set of measures and found that indeed, two factors appeared, one reflecting happiness and the other meaningfulness. They state that “in spite of significant overlap, the most interesting results may be those that highlight the factors leading to divergence rather than convergence in the hedonic and eudaimonic indicators”.

Ryan and Deci’s viewpoint regarding the three innate needs resonates, in the author’s opinion, closely to Aristotle’s focus on an “eudaimonic life” as how we should live life rather than the outcome of this, “eudaimonic well-being”.

An enhanced model of subjective well-being can now be constructed as in the figure below.

Figure 3: subjective and psychological well-being



It is clear that a large variety of measures exist that help use determine satisfaction and affect as well as sense of purpose, vitality, self-actualisation, etc. concerning our life in general but also concerning specific objective material conditions as well as elements of quality of life as put forward by the OECD (2013a). Hence, this provides a good starting point for measuring “functionings”.

To come back to the example in box 1, we could ask how much satisfaction someone derives from being an architect (an objective material condition in the model), as well as how they feel (affect) about it. We could also ask them if they derive meaning from it as well as vitality and self-actualisation. This is all about determining if a being or doing is valued or not and hence whether it is a functioning or not.

The figure shows that improving objective conditions on their own may have already an effect on measures of well-being. But this effect will be very varied, especially in terms of eudaimonic well-being, depending on the “quality” of the objective conditions in terms of whether or not they hinder or support satisfaction of the three basic needs, as put forward by self-determination theory.

To use the example again: if we manage to become an architect, but we have to do this job in a work environment where we have little opportunity to exercise our autonomy (because we have a boss who wants to decide everything), competence (because we rarely receive positive feed-back) and relatedness (because we do not work in teams but on our own), then we can hypothesise that subjective well-being will not be as high as it could be.

In annex 2, an example is also provided how Ryan and Deci’s three basic needs can be measured concerning work in general.

**Measuring capabilities**

However, in terms of Sen’s capability approach, although we can now measure to what extent people’s well-being is evolving, relating to specific objective conditions, this does not provide a response to whether or not their capability is being increased, which Sen sees as key to the process of human development. Indeed, the issue still remains “how” policy-makers can foster well-being. For Sen, they need to increase people’s capabilities (opportunity freedom) relative to functionings (beings and doings they value).

From the point of view of self-determination theory, this makes sense. The choices people will make for themselves, based on what they value and have reason to value, are superior to choices others would make for them as the process of choosing is more likely to satisfy the three basic needs (we are able to choose for ourselves hence exercising our autonomy, feel competent to do so as we know best what matters to us individually, but also remain embedded in our web of social relations rather than feel alienated) which itself affects our present well-being.

Economists, like Sen, would also argue (Anand et al[[16]](#footnote-16), 2007, p.55) that people are more likely to find themselves in the future in beings and doings they do not value or value less than other ones, if someone else makes the decisions for them. This idea is quite central to economics. Indeed, when someone else would choose a specific career for me that I do not value myself or not as much as another one, then this will limit future well-being that derives from that career. If I want to be an architect but am told to be a teacher (because my father was one), then, regardless of the fact whether or not in the actual teaching job my three basic needs are satisfied, the way I ended up there violated my needs and is likely to have repercussions, especially on my eudaimonic well-being for the rest of my life.

This should clarify why “human development” is not the same as “increasing well-being”.

The figure below depicts this logic.

Figure 4: capability framework relative to well-being



This of course brings us back to the question. How do we measure development rather than just increases in well-being?

Anand et al (2007, p. 57) put forward five ways of doing this:

1. Externally oriented questions about opportunity: e.g. “Do you have sufficient opportunity to engage in physical exercise, itself part of a healthy life?”
2. Explicit questions about personal ability: e.g. “Are you able to engage in physical exercise?”
3. Explicit constraint questions: e.g. “Are you prevented from engaging in physical exercise?”
4. Functioning probes combined with questions about reasons: “Do you engage in physical exercise? Why? Why not?”
5. Functioning probes combined with a universality assumption: this concerns a smaller set of behaviours or situations that are assumed to imply reduced opportunity freedom e.g. “Are you afraid to walk around in the evening?”

Hollywood et al (2012[[17]](#footnote-17)) however state that “the focus on the individual suggests a strong role for qualitative approaches that are most suitable for uncovering individual motivations, attitudes and deeper levels of understanding.” Several case studies are provided of researchers using this approach.

The measurement of capabilities reveals also a big difference with the measurement of well-being as discussed earlier. Measuring capabilities is inherently future oriented as it deals with what people could or could not do in the future. Measuring functionings through how much well-being is derived from them is an assessment of the past. It is not however, because we value functionings, relative to each other, as made clear by the current satisfaction, affect, meaningfulness, vitality etc. we derived from them, that we will continue to do so. Of course, we could ask people how much well-being they think they will derive from an activity, even if they never engaged in it before. But the point remains that capabilities are inherently about “opportunity” not about what we already are doing.

Summarising, we learned that for human development to take place, we should engage in either a public consensus exercise or an ongoing deliberative participation as to what individuals value and what they can have reason to value. We can start from a list of dimensions to discuss specific doing and beings. The process needs to respect three basic needs all humans have (autonomy, competence, relatedness). We also have a variety of ways to measure whether people actually value these doings and beings in terms of affect, satisfaction, meaning, vitality, self-actualisation etc. (subjective well-being). We also have ways to measure if people have opportunity freedom relating to these valuable doings and beings.

We now need to establish where we are in terms of the three challenges for using Sen’s approach, set out earlier:

* Establishing what is “reasonable”, needs to happen through a social process but apart from specifying that three basic human needs should be respected in either a public consensus exercise or an ongoing deliberative participation, we have not yet clarified further how to approach this practically;
* How we should measure functionings and capabilities for “individuals”? We now know how to measure what individuals value and if they have opportunity freedom towards what they value;
* How to put in place interventions that aim at and measure progress in terms of functionings as well as capability? How to take into account variations in conversion factors?

The following sections will discuss approaches that shed more light on how to organise the social process and at the same time design interventions, while using the kind of measurement described earlier.

**Case study: working with the severely disadvantaged –the Life[[18]](#footnote-18) programme by Participle and Well-being teams by Vanguard**

When dealing with troubled families, Participle, a social enterprise based in London, working throughout the UK, explicitly wanted to take on board Sen’s capability approach (Cottam, 2013, p 16[[19]](#footnote-19)).

“Life is focused on supporting families to independence, as opposed to fixing a crisis or managing a risk. The programme aims to support a shift from intensive involvement with re-active, costly, enforcement based interventions to pro-active use of universal and preventative services. For some families, being fully independent from services might not be realistic but a ‘healthier interdependence’ with services is the goal…” (p.16).

The emphasis is on “valuing myself, designing a life I value, meaningful relationships and living in the

Community” (p.60).

 “The programme is based around four broad stages: Invitation – opening families to change; Aspirations – building a plan of what a better life might look like; Activities – developing and practising core capabilities around relationships, working and learning, health and living in community; Opportunities – sustaining independence and exiting the programme.” (p. 4)

During “invitation”, there are no forms, no assessments. Rather, families are invited to meet members of the Life team informally and to think of an activity that can be done together with the team. After that, families can decide to enter the programme. Next, family members think about what they would like their life to be like and what has held them back in the past. Therapeutic assistance is required in many instances. They also think about their talents. There are tools to help people visualise their own progress, reflect on setbacks and support the team and families to have difficult conversations. They make realistic short and long-term plans to achieve their aspirations. After that, new opportunities and experiences are sought that are deemed relevant to this. Family members can have a high dependency on the Life Team at this stage as they find their feet. Supporting families to establish new ways of doing things can often involve setbacks and is likely to last a number of months. The idea of “exit” is that those activities families have tried and found to work for them, become part of their life.

Even in developing the programme, Participle took an orginal approach. An initial Participle team started by immersing themselves in the lives of families for 8 weeks. They also gave families videocameras to film things the Participle team wouldn’t know about these families. Seeing reality from the point of view of future participating families was key.

“…the daily reality of Life families who live in a pattern of constant crisis: domestic abuse, debt, poor living conditions, feuds with neighbours, alcohol misuse, truancy, the threat of homelessness, criminal proceedings, exclusion. Crisis has become the norm, as families reel from one difficulty to another. Antisocial behaviour is common; but these families have often been victims themselves too….families are isolated from support networks, live in fear, have numerous and serious mental, physical and emotional health issues and – most importantly – have never known a different life. The

challenges are inter-generational: just as parents and grandparents before them, children and grandchildren grow into the same patterns.”(p. 7).

The team also saw a succession of policemen, social workers, learning support officers, housing officers etc. make their calls.

 In one community they found that there were 73 services on offer for families in crisis, run from 24 departments. They also found that “typically, front-line workers spent 74% of their time on administration, 12% on liaison and just 14% of their time on work with family members. Most of this 14% face-to-face time was spent on data collection, to fulfil the remaining 74% (the demands of the forms), rather than in relationship-building and engaging in people’s lives to find out how they could best serve them. These figures changed slightly from service to service, but remained fairly constant.” (p. 10)

Then, they selected a smaller set of families to work with and to create a new approach together. They recruited Life team members from diverse services and let the families choose from the applicants. They started a variety of practical activities with families, where possible with involvement of wider community (e.g. neighbours) to counter stereotypes and social isolation. This gave families courage to go on, built trust with the Life team and subtly shifted power to the families.

The key question now became: how do the families want to use the support from the Life team, rather than, what can families take or leave or must they take? Families then started to make life plans, informed by what they, in interaction with the Life team, saw as a priority.

The current “programme” was founded on this experience of “trying many things” and seeing how they took off with the initial families.

It is important to note that one of the major challenges for the “Life” programme was to get the other “services” to back off, as long as Life was working with a family. Indeed, as is stated : “The current services on offer, however they are re-organised against new targets, are unlikely to deliver the radically different approach we believe is needed. A family that has never lived in any other way cannot change on command. What is needed is a developmental approach based on sustained, trusted relationships.” (p. 4)

A Department for communities and local government report is cited that states “often have a whole host of agencies involved with them, often focusing on the individuals within that family. Families

become confused by overlapping professionals, assessments and appointments… Currently systems and services around families are highly complex and fragmented. Often this results in an uncoordinated and inadequate response to chronic, multi-faceted needs, forcing frontline staff to ‘work round’ the system” (p.7)

As one Life participants states: “We used to ask for help, but it never really helped, it just kept stuff the same. Life actually helps us, and it’s about us. It’s helping me to build my family, not tear it apart. The whole family is working together to make changes. I reckon no one thought we could change, but things are getting better really fast. We have a future: I wonder what’s next.” (p.15)

The Life programme also reports that those who stay derive enormous satisfaction from seeing the change they support. Staff turnover is small compared to normal services (p. 26).

Participle’s work with the Life programme has won the support of, amongst others, David Halpern at Number 10, and the Office of National Statistics (p.60). Annex E of the report provides extensive data about outcomes (incl. relating to crime, housing, school and work) and cost savings associated with the programme.

Life is not the only example of programmes approaching the complex situation of the highly disadvantaged in a different way. Another set of very similar examples come from a publication by “locality”, the UK-wide network for community-led organisations, supported by Vanguard, a consultancy company that utilizes a “systems approach” (Locality, 2014[[20]](#footnote-20)).

The publication considers the instructive case of Ruth (Locality, 2014, p. 29-31). Once running a business with her husband, Ruth’s life went off the rails when her husband started to abuse her and she moved her residence to escape him. The same happened with two subsequent partners. All the moving caused problems with housing benefits and council taxes. Her ex-husband had also left her with debts which put her in financial distress. The children started to run away and skip school. Ruth also started to have health problems. She quit her job to look after her children better. But matters deteriorated as Ruth’s health got worse and she went into depression. Due to her illness, she had to use a wheel-chair and hence could not go upstairs anymore where the kids went to escape her supervision. Also, she had trouble maintaining the property, leading to threats of eviction. Finally, the children were taken away after a fight with the neighbour.

Ruth had had multiple contacts with a variety of services (incl. the police) over a 6 year period which had involved:

* 8 social workers;
* 22 support workers;
* 30 referrals;
* 16 assessments;
* 36 teams/services.

This is similar to what we saw happening in the Life programme. Yet, again, as was ascertained by Life team members, matters ended up getting worse not better. The figure below depicts this.

Figure 5: Ruth’s journey



Clearly, there was “output” enough as Ruth participated in many services. Most of the time, the services were on a take it or leave it basis or were even mandatory. For example, Ruth had to go to the same parenting programme twice. Her children were also sent to the same anger management programme twice.

How to improve this situation? Similarly to the Life programme, a first step is to understand Ruth’s needs as seen through her eyes. The figure below shows what Ruth, together with a new service referred to as a cross-functional “well-being team” decided were her priorities. This could be totally different for another person. Progress is also depicted on the same figure (where a score of 10 means the issue is fully resolved). The well-being team is multi-disciplinary, as in the case of the Life programme, and hence can work with Ruth an all her issues in a variety of ways. There are no targets as all what matters is progress relating to what is depicted in the figure.

Figure 6: progress chart for multiple interconnected needs (source: Vanguard)



Locality (2014) reports that Ruth is now, as a consequence of working with the well-being team, in a suitable accommodation, with her children and that her situation has stabilized.

The Life programme is itself a good example how new services can be developed, not by sitting behind a desk with a big pile of statistics next to you, but by engaging citizens early on. This approach has been used by MINDLAB in Denmark for some time now. MINDLAB is a cross-governmental innovation unit, that is part of three ministries and one municipality: the Ministry of Business and Growth, the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Employment and Odense Municipality and forms a collaboration with the Ministry for Economic Affairs and the Interior.

As Christian Bason, now former director of MINDLAB, said “Most of my colleagues are really, really scared about what would happen if we really took a hard look at what happens when our policies or regulations or services meet the citizen… because as you know, no strategy and no policy survives meeting reality.” (Worm-Petersen, 2013[[21]](#footnote-21)).

MINDLAB on the contrary makes heavy use of empathy (seeing reality through user’s eyes) to identify opportunities for action and to engage in rapid prototyping. Both are a crucial part of what is commonly referred to as Human Centered Design[[22]](#footnote-22).

Prototyping is used to learn how various components of a new policy will turn out in real life , from the user’s perspective. It goes through multiple iterations of developing ideas, testing them with prototypes on users and relevant stakeholders, redeveloping them and then testing again, until a reasonably well-functioning policy can be put into legislation.

This approach can be used equally with infrastructure e.g. after having decided to build a new community library[[23]](#footnote-23) as done by La 27ième region, a similar organisation as MINDLAB but then in France and at regional level.

The political initiative remains intact as policy-makers still reserve the right to define a relevant societal challenge. But after this, it is necessary to go as quickly as possible into the field.

This is different from the ruling model where an idea is developed into a full formed policy, which is then consulted on by stakeholders and then launched with a budget and plan. Sometimes these fully formed policies are piloted (e.g. using a randomized controlled trial) and assessed as a whole. But this is very different from designing and revising a policy fully in interaction with users. This is about creating policy with users rather than for users.

Indeed, in the Life programme, what kinds of activities could work to help troubled families were defined by trying a lot of different ideas with the initial group of families, rethinking some and dropping others. No one designed a fully formed “protocol” in advance and then tested it as a whole.

However, similar approaches to designing and delivering policies can be applied to less complex situations as troubled families as well. For this, we turn to another case study.

**Case study: regular service provision-social housing**

The case concerns the repair services for social housing in the UK. A local authority in charge of social housing (see ODPM, 2005, p.23[[24]](#footnote-24)) was doing fine regarding its top down targets relating to repair work (in terms of % of emergency repairs in 24 hours; urgent repairs in seven days, non-urgent repairs in 28 days). What tenants really want from a repair service (functioning) is that the repair is done quickly and properly. So the targets seem to make sense. But these targets are not comprising the tenants point of view, how they see a “good repair”.

It is key to note that “a good repair” can mean something very different for different tenants for different repairs. Some will be more impatient while others have more time. But for all, faster will be better. Also for all unsatisfactory repair will be something they know when they see it, even though one person may have greater tolerance than another regarding how “perfect” the repair has to be done. What matters is that people can say afterwards whether or not their specific expectations were satisfied. The only thing that is required is to ask them about it from their own perspective. This allows service providers to learn about variety of needs and what drives this variety. The more they can match the variety the better it is.

As Seddon (2008[[25]](#footnote-25), p.30) states: ‘”Often authorities rated excellent against the targets are no better than those rated more poorly when performance is measured in this way, that is against the purpose they are meant to achieve”.

Seddon (2008) rather proposes to measure what a service is able to deliver against its purpose (hence the user point of view) in a predictable way and use statistical process charts to visualize this (see figure below[[26]](#footnote-26)). Such a chart shows for each separate request to the repair service how long it took to make the repair in a way that was satisfactory for the tenant.

Figure 7: capability chart for housing repairs



In the case of repairs, what citizens can predictably expect is depicted in the sense of the average repair time and the upper and lower control limits. If a control limit is breached several times, the process is not under control. What a tentant would like to have is to have the repair done in a proper way with a high degree of predictability with a lower average and a smaller space between the upper and lower control limits and no breaches of the limits. The chart shows that the service was getting worse over time.

A satisfactory repair can still be different according to each tenant. A service provider who is interested in improving capability would try to understand why it takes longer to deal with some jobs from the perspective of variation on the demand side. For example, in some areas, more houses were having problems with roofs while in others there were more problems with windows. Variation was driven by the area which itself was due to different uses of materials and age of the building. Different demographics associated with different areas and kinds of buildings could also be a reason for variation with some people being more demanding than others.

As there will always be variation, the point is not whether service providers can meet an arbitrary target set for an average. The point is whether the provider is trying to understand demand better and better and changes their delivery system to take into account this improved understanding.

Counterintuitively, this ends up being cheaper for the service provider. The reason for this is that in the pursuit of “the target”, a lot of demand is not being met properly and this is creating “failure demand” that also has to be dealt with (e.g. dealing with complaints, chasing up repair persons, going back to fix poor repairs, etc.). There are also a lot of hidden costs associated with “management” and control. The current audit explosion is an example of that.

In an “efficient” system, only value demand , that directly meets the needs of users, has to be taken care of. This ideal will never be reached of course, but it is the ongoing striving for it that matters.

In the specific case of the repairs service the nature of the demand coming in to the call service is depicted (ODPM, 2005, p. 26). It should be clear that only the first time someone calls to report they need something fixed is value demand. Everything else represents failure.

Table : failure versus value demand



What is actually going on as opposed to the what was supposed to happen is depicted below (ODPM, 2005, p. 34).

Figure 8: housing repairs as a system



The following information was delivered by Vanguard at a conference organized by the Community of Practice on Results Based Management, in Brussels, at the European Commission on 8 and 9 January 2014[[27]](#footnote-27).

The repair persons were in fact achieving the targets by closing jobs even though they never completed them and reopening them later as a new job. Sometimes this was done with a justification e.g. if tenants are out, we cannot do the job, so this job should not count. Also job classifications changed to meet the deadline e.g. an emergency repair became just urgent etc. What was one job for the tenant was several ones for the system e.g. to repair a window one needed 1) glazing 2) carpentry 3) plastering 4) painting, with glazing and carpentry deemed urgent but plastering and painting not.

There was a lot of waste in the system (activity that does not help the users) like queuing each day to get allocated materials, arriving at a home when tenants are absent (the call centre needed to reschedule, the worker needed to revisit), arriving at home without proper materials as a job was misspecified by the call centre (the call centre and the tenant cannot know what the job really entails over the phone). Administrators also had to collect returned work order to pass to manager to check if respecifying was justified (which mostly it was). Material was allocated according to a fixed schedule of rates, not according to what was really required.

Call centre staff, supervisors and workers were dealing with a lot of complaints regarding poorly done jobs.

The key to improving capability was to redesign the system to remove causes of failure demand and to absorb the variety of value demand with expertise. As demand was predictable by geography tradesmen were allocated to zones. The call centre now patches through demand to nearby tradesmen who arranges a visit, go there, diagnose and, if possible, fix immediately. If this is not possible they agree a future date directly with tenants.

As material requirements are predictable by predictable type of work, tradesmen now carry a suitable stock so no more queing is required every morning while at the same time there is an increased probability of being able to do repairs when coming for the diagnosis.

Notably, the tradesmen elected not to be paid per job anymore like before (which led to playing favorites by supervisors) but with fixed salary.

Rather than being driven by arbitrary targets, tradesmen are now driven by their desire to do a good job in a system that allows them do this. It should not be underestimated how important it was to change the original purpose of the system from “to do repairs within the target time and maximize use of the in-house team” to “to do the repair right, first time and achieve what matters to the customer”. (ODPM, 2005, p. 37)

Improvements in the service as well as cost saving are reported in ODPM (2005, p. 52-54, 58). From an average of 28,8 days during 2003-4, rising to 46 days in March-May 2004, the new way of working led to 5,9 days on average with an upper limit of 8,8 days.

**The case studies analysed from the perspective of Sen**

We use the three challenges mentioned earlier to see how they are resolved in the cases.

Table : Analysing the cases

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Challenges | Life programme / Well-being teams | Social housing repairs |
| What kind of social process do we find to determine what individuals value and have reason to value? | The programme consists of an ongoing deliberative participation process between troubled family members and Life team members. Key is that it is the families who decide to use the Life team. They do this based on an understanding of their individual aspirations, yet within a family setting. The Life team support them in gaining this understanding of what they value. The team will not let the participants choose destructive behavior. This is how “reason” to value comes to be. This is similar for the well-being teams that also start from an exploration into what the participant really needs. | After redesigning the service, frontline tradesmen are now in charge of co-determining with tenants what needs to be done and when it should be done. Obviously, nothing else is going to happen apart from delivering repairs. But before the opportunity to get the repair done properly first time and within reasonable times was severely restricted. The tradesmen will not allow the tenants to demand unreasonable service either. They can explain on the spot what is involved and why it will require a certain amount of time.  |
| How do they measure functionings in terms of the well-being they generate and how do they measure capabilities? | Measurement consists of tracking progress in a visual way, relative to priorities set by participants themselves (as in the case of Ruth). The “current” level can be seen as a hedonic measure of satisfaction for a variety of functionings, selected by participants themselves. In fact, it is very similar to the core measure of life satisfaction (the “ladder” as proposed by OECD (2013b) see annex 1a).The score of ten is the desired level. What is being measured by comparing the current score and the maximum score of ten is therefore in fact an opportunity freedom gap: today, the person is not able to enjoy the listed functionings. At a score of 10, the person has full capability however. Increases in the score therefore reflect increases in capability.This relates to the five ways discussed by Ananand et al (2007) earlier as follows. The items could be reframed as externally oriented questions about opportunity and personal ability with 0 being no opportunity and/or ability and 10 full. The scales do not represent explicit constraint questions as they do not ask if someone is prevented from engaging in the functionings, nor do they represent as such probes with questions about reasons why people are not enjoying the functionings. Of course, such questions can conceivable still be asked qualitatively during the frequent interviews with Life or well-being team members, without seeking to quantify the responses across the population of participants.In addition, questions relating to meaning, vitality, self-actualisation etc. could also conceivable be asked to see how they are doing overall. | Measurement is done with a capability chart. This chart shows how well a service is able to deal with variety of demand. The less distance the upper and lower control limits have from each other, the better the service is doing in this respect. Of course the average also counts since a high average with a narrow distance between control limits may just mean everyone is dealt with equally poorly. The chart is in fact a depiction of opportunity freedom in terms of good housing as it shows what one can predictably expect from the system, relative to the purpose of the system from the user perspective. Opportunity freedom is higher if the average is lower together with less distance between the lower and upper control limits. Hence, we can track increases or decreases in capability.This represents a hedonic measure of satisfaction. In terms of Anand et al (2007) it reflects an opportunity question relating to the functioning of enjoying good housing conditions. However, if we would frame it as an ability question we would immediately have to think about what could be done so people can do (some) repairs themselves or take more preventative actions. The scales do not represent explicit constraint questions as they do not ask if someone is prevented from engaging in the functionings.However, the capability chart will highlight for which specific individual users the current system did not deliver in a predictable way (points outside of the control limits) and will prompt to seek them out to collaborate in improving the system. Hence this represents a type of probe with questions about reasons why people did not enjoying the same capability (in terms of predictable satisfaction of demand) as others did.Finally, people could conceivable be asked about their well-being in terms of meaning, vitality, self-actualisation. It could indeed be expected that having to continuously progress chase, complain, etc. to get what is right, would sap people’s energy, sense of meaning etc. regarding this aspect of their life.  |
| How do they design initiatives that increase capabilities as well as well-being? | The design phase of the Life programme was not very different than how it is run today. It could be said the programme is still being “co-designed” between teams and families. A key first step was for the team to immerse themselves in the reality of the families. Next, families were involved in defining for themselves what their aspirations were. Also they needed to reflect on what had held them back in the past as well as what their strengths were. This relates to understanding their conversion factors. Next they test out various activities, to see what works and what does not for them. In this way, families could choose what they would continue with for themselves. No one chose for them. The programme still focuses on helping people determine for themselves what they value, show them opportunities that they can choose to take or not, incl. shaping new possibilities (exerting agency).  | The housing repair service had to be redesigned, not designed from scratch.In the case a first step in defining what is of value was done by properly defining the purpose of the service as “to do the repair right, first time and achieve what matters to the customer”. This purpose had to be defined by looking at it from the user perspective. Based on a study of the system in terms of value versus failure demand and of wasteful activity, relative to the purpose, a better system was designed. A key principle for redesign is that each demand needs to be treated as unique (“ a batch of one”, ODPM, 2005, p. 38)In addition, proposed improvements are not just implemented across a system. Rather they are tested in a smaller number of transactions and then results are compared with those transactions that were not changed (ODPM, 2005, p. 39-40).Also, if the capability chart reveals specific individual users the current system did not deliver for in a predictable way (points outside of the control limits) seeking them out to collaborate in improving the system amounts to understanding variations in conversion factors. Indeed, the existence of the repair service (a resource) does not provide the same opportunity (freedom) to get the functioning they want (decent housing).  |

The case studies reveal some common elements relating to the three challenges:

* What kind of social process do we find to determine what individuals value and have reason to value?

In both cases, the ongoing deliberative participation process is conducted by frontline staff, as a normal part of their work. It is not conducted by a policy-maker who is far removed from the daily realities of the tenants or troubled families. What matters and what can be done about it is co-determined which ensures that the functionings that families/tenants value are also reasonable.

* How do they measure functionings in terms of the well-being they generate and how do they measure capabilities?

In both cases, the capability measures are based on hedonic measures of satisfaction, but always with a forward looking element. For tenants, the capability chart shows what they can predictable expect from the system. For families the “radar” tool shows the gap between where they are and where the want to be. This means it is a measure of degree of ability/opportunity to enjoy the relevant functionings (a life on the rails / decent housing).

In both cases, this kind of measurement could benefit from (occasional) eudaimonic measures such as meaning, vitality, self-actualisation, etc. as well as questions regarding constraints and reasons for (not) engaging in particular functionings. However, this could be done qualitatively, in a conversation, rather than by using long lists of questions.

* How do they design initiatives that increase capability as well as well-being?

In both cases, it is clear that designing initiatives is not separate from the same social process that helps identify what people have reason to value. Empathy, by Life team members or housing repair providers taking the perspective of the families or the tenants, was the first step. Next, possible actions to include in the future Life programme or to redesign the existing repair service were always tested in practice first with some of the families or tenants, to see if they worked to improve the situation. In this way, an appropriate understanding arises also of the different conversion factors of different individuals when offered resources (e.g. a repair service, a social service) that lead to different levels of capabilities (opportunity) unless they are taken into account. In the social housing repair service case, this happened by taking variation seriously (visualized in the capability chart). In the well-being team / Life programme cases this is done by actively inquiring about variations in conversion factors (asking what held people back in the past in Life or understanding why a repair fell outside of the control boundaries in the repair case) and finding ways of dealing with those.

The way MINDLAB thinks of policy design also shows that this way for working in no way means that policy-makers have no role. In fact, they still play a crucial role in trying to generate public debate and foster consensus as to the key societal challenges that need to be addressed.

Regarding implementation, it is the same frontline staff of the Life / well-being team or the tradesmen that engage the families or tenants to determine how to improve the situation (many aspects of life / housing condition). In the Life programme this is obviously much more challenging than for housing repairs where it is limited to determining how and when repairs will be done.

It was also interesting to note in both cases that the existing system, before Life or before the redesign of the repair service, was dysfunctional in similar ways. The next section will explore how these dysfunctions seem to be related to what is called ‘command and control’ thinking.

**The influence of command and control thinking in both cases and how it relates to the capability approach**

In both cases the existing system seemed to be driven by top-down targets that did not look at reality from the point of view of the families or tenants but from the suppliers and whatever they think they must provide. Also, in both cases, it is clear that existing services were not very good at dealing with the variety in demand, leading to many complaints in the cases of the repair services and total disillusionment in the case of the families.

Seddon (2008, p. 48-50) puts forward that the prevailing management thinking is today still derived from the interplay between ideas and practices from Adam Smith (division of labour to increase productivity ), Frederick Taylor (with scientific management, in terms of time studies, being practiced by a “organization and methods” department), Max Weber (with the theory of bureaucracy, incl. dividing labour and authority), Alfred Sloan (managing by numbers) and Henry Ford’s mass production system.

He refers to it as the “command and control paradigm”. Within this paradigm, everything starts from the top down, with decision-making being separated from the work. Also, functional specialization is strived for. Productivity is measured in in terms of achieving targets and standards. The attitude to customers is contractual. The role of management is to manage “resources” namely people and budgets. People are understood to be driven by extrinsic motivation (primarily money).

Henry Ford’s production of the black model T was a prime example of what this model could deliver. Cost of production were halve while wages were doubled. However, the average labour turnover was three months. Many walked off the job without any formal notification giving rise to the term “five day man “ as after five days absence, they were presumed to have quit.

Seddon (2008) makes the point that nowadays there is a trend towards thinking of “reforming” the public sector to be more like “public service factories”, with similar thinking as was behind Ford’s mass production system.

Wauters (2013[[28]](#footnote-28)) already demonstrated sufficiently that target-based management to drive performance forward does not actually have an evidence base to support it and that on the contrary the evidence base advises against it. The idea that we require targets to improve is one of the most pervasive myths in management. Indeed, in the days of Ford, all the thinking had been done already in advance and no one needed to “learn” or “improve” as there was one best way that had been predefined based on timing how long it took. All that was then required was controlling that people actually did it like that and in that time with standards and targets. But as should be clear from the case studies, today’s public services do not resemble an assembly line where each worker performs a very simple task.

Command and control thinking (as described by Seddon, 2008à is also in several ways in conflict with Sen’s ideas regarding human development as the table below argues.

Table 3: command and control versus human development

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Command and control** | **Human development** |
| top down perspective | what different individuals value can be very different |
| functional specialization (silos) | people are being “referred” to others as their complex needs do not match the specialized “solutions” on offer in each silo |
| performance = meeting production targets and standards | development is about expanding capabilities and agency |
| decision-making being separated from the work | people need to co-create with service providers if they are to exert their agency |
| attitude to customers is contractual | people are not an “issue”, or “a job” to take care of but real persons with real needs. They also need to be able to establish longer term relationships for more complex needs. |
| people are understood to be driven by extrinsic motivation | people are driven by a desire to fulfill their potential  |

The table below shows how in each of the cases, the shift form command and control thinking to what Seddon (2008) calls systems thinking, was achieved, and how this supported the capability approach in practice.

Table 4: from C&C to human development

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **From C&C to human development** | **Human development in Life/Wellbeing teams and in social housing repairs** |
| Instead of top down perspective, we go for outside in perspective (how does the user see it)  | what different individuals value can be very different: For example, Ruth’s needs are visualized on a scale of zero to ten with ten meaning resolved. Someone else could have totally different items.Although in housing repairs, everyone shares a common purpose, how the user understands “proper repair” it is still key.  |
| Instead of functional specialization (silos) we go for value work and flow (cutting across silos), avoiding failure demand and waste | People are being “referred” to others as their complex needs do not match the specialized “solutions” on offer in each silo: e.g. Ruth went from assessment to assessment and service to service. In the well-being team, she is not being referred. The team works with her on all her issues.Originally the call centre had to specify jobs while tradesmen had to do repairs. Also, different kinds of jobs required different specialists (plumbers, carpenters, etc.), each of which saw their own part of the job as the only part and had their own deadlines for it. But for tenants fixing a window is one thing. Now, different tradesmen are in the area and can come and see what kind of repair needs to be done (together for more complex jobs), do it immediately or arrange to take care of it on specific moments agreed with the tenant.  |
| Instead of performance as meeting production targets and standards we look at capability related to purpose, recognising variety  | development is about expanding capabilities:Before all what mattered was hitting the target. Now, capability, in terms of narrowing the gap between what Ruth really wants (which is specific to herself) and what she can actually get, has been improved and almost resolved for all of her points.In housing repairs, the average time it takes to satisfy tenants, from their point of view, as well as the upper control limit have drastically decreased.  |
| Instead of decision-making being separated from the work we go for decision-making integrated with the work | people need to co-create with service providers if they are to exert their agency: For example, Ruth decides in tandem with the well-being team what matters and how to proceed. She decides how to use the team. Before tradesmen did not engage tenants. They were told what to do by supervisors who were told what was needed from the call centre. Now, tradesmen engage tenants directly to find a suitable solution, fitting their needs, in a suitable time period and to stick to this. But also, whenever a demand would not be handled within the control boundaries of the statistical process cart (it falls outside normal boundaries of variation), this would be investigated in detail, giving the tenants the possibility to exert their agency to improve the provision of the service. |
| Instead of an attitude to customers that is contractual, we go for the question “what matters” | Instead of dealing with Ruth and tenants as another “job” to do, they are seen as persons with specific needs.  |
| Instead of understanding people as driven by extrinsic motivation they are seen as more intrinsically motivated. | people are driven by a desire to fulfill their potential: Ruth wants to get her life back. She does not need to be forced. The well-being team does not require targets and incentives to support her in taking back control of her life. The Life programme team members derive enormous satisfaction from seeing the change they support. Staff turnover is small compared to normal services.The tenants were recognized in their justified striving to live in decent housing conditions. But also the tradesmen decided not to be paid per job anymore but be paid a fixed salary.  |

Of course, if such approaches as described in this paper have such potential in terms of fostering human development and well-being, then the question is whether the Barca report and the EC regulations for the European Investment and Structural Funds support this.

**The indequate response of the EC regulations and the Barca report to the human development challenge**

The paper will argue in this section that the Barca report unduly limited Sen’s ideas to the narrow scope of “social inclusion” and that by doing this, it put forward an approach that focused on minimal thresholds and standards for the disadvantaged. The understanding of results in a narrow way as hitting targets on indicators was in turn highly compatible with the idea of thresholds and standards. Hence, we find in the regulations and guidance documents only the idea of targets, without requiring the more sophisticated concepts of well-being and human development as proposed by Sen and as embodied in the case studies described in this paper.

The attention devoted to well-being in the Barca report, stands indeed in stark contrast to the general regulations governing the European Structural and Investment Funds (EC, 2013a) as well as the specific ones for the ERDF and ESF (EC, 2013b and c), where the word well-being is not even mentioned at all.

In fact, it is mentioned only once in any official EC document relating to ERDF and ESF, namely the Guidance Document on Monitoring and Evaluation by DG REGIO (EC, March 2014) that states that “The intended result is the specific dimension of well-being and progress for people that motivates policy action, i.e. what is intended to be changed, with the contribution of the interventions designed. An example is mobility, the improvement of which is the aim of building transport infrastructures, for instance a new railway line.” (p.4). Here we find a similar connection between “results” and well-being as noted earlier in the Barca report.

The official documents do refer more to “results” as the general regulation states:

* “'specific objective' means the result to which an investment priority or Union priority contributes…” (EC, 2013, art. 2, 34).
* “in order to strengthen the result-orientation of the programming, the expected results for the specific objectives, and the corresponding result indicators, with a baseline value and a target value, where appropriate quantified in accordance with the Fund-specific rules” (EC, 2013, art.96, 2, b, ii).
* ‘’In order to give Member States the option of implementing part of an operational programme using a result-based approach, it is useful to provide for a joint action plan comprising a project or group of projects to be carried out by a beneficiary to contribute to the objectives of the operational programme. In order to simplify and reinforce the result orientation of the Funds, the management of the joint action plan should be exclusively based on jointly agreed milestones, outputs and results as defined in the Commission decision adopting the joint action plan.” (EC, 2013, “wheareas” number 96)

It is interesting to note that the word “result” is in practically every instance in the general, ESF and ERDF regulations, mentioned in connection with “target” or “indicator”.[[29]](#footnote-29)

The roots of this can be easily found in the Barca report in statements such as “The policy process can be enhanced by requiring policy-makers to establish targets in terms of verifiable indicators of the objectives concerned, to document how closely results are to them and to focus public debate on this information. This process can encourage people to participate and increase policy effort... The task of ensuring that the focus is on the progress towards achieving objectives requires contracts to put a strong emphasis on these and to set targets.” (p. 46).

Of course, this derives from the starting point that one of the other five main failings of cohesion policy consisted in “methodological and operational problems that have prevented both the appropriate use of indicators and targets” (p.XVI).

However, this obvious piece of command and control thinking does not fully explain the absence of the concept of well-being in the EC regulations, only the unfortunate confusion of the concept of a results orientation with the misguided idea of managing by targets.

The following statements in the Barca report may shed some light on this as they put the use of the word well-being in context under the heading “The equity (social inclusion) objective” where the following is found:

* “A life worth living, including the opportunity both to achieve what an individual considers relevant and to widen her or his set of options, embraces labour skills, health, education, housing, security, income, working conditions, self-respect, a role in decision-making and so on. Income is a relevant component of these dimensions but it does not reflect them all…” (p.28)
* social inclusion refers to the “extent to which, with reference to multidimensional outcomes, all individuals (and groups) can enjoy essential standards and the disparities between individuals (and groups) are socially acceptable, the process through which these results are achieved being participatory and fair” (p.30)
	+ “…captures both a threshold and an interpersonal concept of inequality: a threshold concept, where the achievement of society consists of guaranteeing everyone some essential standards, which depend on (evolving) social preferences and attitudes; an interpersonal concept, where the achievement of society consists of ensuring that disparities between individuals (or groups) are socially acceptable…” (p.30)
	+ “The reference to ‘a participatory and fair process’ captures the idea that both the dimensions and the thresholds used in defining social inclusion must be established through a democratic process, in which everyone is given a chance to form an expectation and to voice it, information is exchanged, public scrutiny and criticism take place; and a consensus emerges on which dimensions are relevant and what is ‘essential’.“ (p.30)
* “improving social inclusion, in its various dimensions, through the provision of public goods and services, by guaranteeing socially agreed essential standards to all and by improving the well-being of the least advantaged.” (p. 30)
* “Accordingly, exogenous effort should be concentrated on the goods and services concerned: healthcare, education, housing, law and order, working conditions, transport services and so on. It should also be aimed not only at making these services available but at ensuring that people are able to access them and so can benefit from their provision: learning from education, availing themselves from the public transport; etc. In order to achieve this result, the active participation of the potential beneficiaries is necessary.”(p. 32)

We see in these statements that Sen’s ideas have ended up being restricted to the idea of “social inclusion” in the sense of ensuring some kind of minimal thresholds concerning various dimensions of well-being for the disadvantaged. The word well-being is indeed mentioned 16 times in the 8 pages of the main text that comprises the chapter on social inclusion, versus 26 times in the entire rest of the 244 page report.

Indeed, regrettably,from the beginning of the report, a division is made between addressing inefficiency versus addressing social exclusion to promote harmonious development: “inefficiency (underutilisation of resources resulting in income below potential in both the short and long-run) and persistent social exclusion (primarily, an excessive number of people below a given standard in terms of income and other features of well-being)”(p.XI)

The three challenges posed by Sen’s thinking therefore end up being resolved by the Barca report solely within the narrow confines of the idea of social inclusion. “Harmonious development” in terms of dealing with “underutilization of resources” seems to have nothing to do with human development in the sense of Sen anymore.

The first challenge in Sen’s approach is then handled as follows by the Barca report within the social inclusion chapter only:

* competing “beings and doings” (functionings) are dealt with via “a democratic process” that brings consensus on “essential standards” relating to dimensions that are through the same process deemed relevant;
* as we now have commonly established thresholds, the second challenge is removed: as the same threshold (which we can define unambiguously) applies to everyone, we need to measure only how far people are removed from it;
* the third challenge of designing and running interventions to expand opportunity is dealt with by “to achieve this result the active participation of the potential beneficiaries is necessary” or similarly “the process through which these results are achieved being participatory and fair”.

The EC regulations and guidance then in their turn responded in some fashion to these challenges as discussed below.

The DG REGIO guidance document captures this response to the first challenge in similar terms as the Barca report: “The starting point in designing any public intervention is to identify a problem to be addressed. As there will be always a multitude of real or perceived needs, the decision on which unmet needs should be tackled is the result of a deliberative social process (a "political decision").” (p. 4).

The general regulations state in an even weaker way that “Member States shall address, in an appropriate manner, the needs of disadvantaged groups in order to allow them to better integrate into the labour market, and thereby facilitate their full participation in society.” (5.3, 4)

As to the second challenge, the notion of minimum thresholds is highly compatible with the idea of setting targets mentioned earlier. Hence, in the regulations, no talk about well-being is needed as setting targets to the thematic objective of “promoting social inclusion, combating poverty and any discrimination” (EC, general regulation art. 9, par. 9) is assumed to take care of it.

Regarding the third challenge, it is interesting to note that the concept of “empowerment” is also not present in the official documents. Even the related notion of “participation” is present only as a sub-objective of the above mentioned thematic objective of thematic objective of “promoting social inclusion, combating poverty and any discrimination” which has an investment priority of “active inclusion, including with a view to promoting equal opportunities and active participation, and improving employability” (art. 3, b, 1 of the ESF regulation, EC, 2013 c).

**Conclusions**

This paper has demonstrated that the EC regulations as well as the Barca report that was meant to reorient these regulations towards harmonious development and well-being, are, in terms of their adoption of command and control ideas, conceptually opposed to the ideas of embodied in Sen’s capability approach and practical ways of working as described in various case studies, regardless of whether they concern social inclusion or other priorities.

A first step is for EU Member States and the EC who are engaged in ESIF, to recognise this. A second step is to see how, within the conditions of the current regulations, more initiatives such as depicted by the two cases can receive funding.

Indeed, it is the opinion of the author of this paper that the current regulation does not make this kind of initiative impossible. It certainly does not facilitate it but it is not impossible.

Therefore, a second step is to stop taking the command and control philosophy embodied in the regulations serious and to adopt a human development approach. This would mean no funding could be attributed anymore to public service factories, unless they engage in a fundamental redesign of their operations.

This latter activity of redesign of existing services, or, initial design when new policy challenges are put forward for which no services exist yet that can be redesigned, should be made the focus of attention for allocating funding, especially within the European Social Fund.

Finally, in light of future ESIF rounds, a fundamental revision of the EC regulations should be started. This revision should be based on a deep understanding of human development rather than on old-fashioned notions of command and control.

Annex 1: Hedonic measures of well-being

A. Life evaluation questions



It is also possible to evaluate specific domains of life, rather than life overall.



B. Affect



The day evaluation method below tries to relate affect to speficic instances in a persons life.



Annex II Eudaimonic measures of well-being

A) Eudaimonic measures (OECD, 2013b)



It should be noted that there seems to be overlap between question D8 here and question C2 and F2 in the affect measurement.

B) Measures of self-actualisation and vitality as outcomes of eudaimonic living

**Measuring vitality example:**

Ryan and Frederick (1997) subjective vitality scales [[30]](#footnote-30) are scored on a scale of 1 to 7 (not at all true to very true).

 1. I feel alive and vital.

2. I don't feel very energetic.

3. Sometimes I feel so alive I just want to burst.

4. I have energy and spirit.

5. I look forward to each new day.

6. I nearly always feel alert and awake.

7. I feel energized.

The above scales are a general assessment whole those below assess a moment in time.

1. At this moment, I feel alive and vital.

2. I don't feel very energetic right now.

3. Currently I feel so alive I just want to burst.

4. At this time, I have energy and spirit.

5. I am looking forward to each new day.

6. At this moment, I feel alert and awake.

7. I feel energized right now.

It would seem there is some overlap between C9 and F6 as they deal with feeling tired which is the reverse of feeling alert and awake.

**Measuring self-actualisation example:**

Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) questionnaire contains 150 items about various values and behaviors. Each item consists of two statements between which the participant must choose, and these choices are then used to obtain scores for individuals on 12 different scales, each measuring a characteristic of the self actualising individual. Some care has to be taken with this questionnaire as it may be baised in terms of scoring different for individualistic versus collective cultures (Ivtzan, 2008 [[31]](#footnote-31)). However, this does not affect within-culture measurement.

The two most important characteristics in the POI are the Time Ratio and Support Ratio. The time ratio is a ratio score which refers to an individual’s tendency to be either time competent (living in the present, and for the here-and-now) or time incompetent (living in the past and/or in the future); the self actualising individual is deemed to be time competent (TC). The support ratio is also a ratio score referring to an individual’s tendency to be either other orientated (over sensitive to feelings and approval of others) or inner orientated (aware of ones own feelings and approval). In this ratio, the self actualising individual is characterized as being inner orientated (I).

The POI also includes 10 complementary subscales measuring different characteristics of the self actualised individual:

* Self Actualising Values (SAV) - measuring affirmation of primary values characterized by self actualising individuals;
* Existentiality (Ex) - measures ability to react to each situation without rigid adherence to principles;
* Feeling Reactivity (FR) - measures sensitivity of responsiveness to one’s needs and feelings;
* Spontaneity (S) - measures freedom to act and be oneself;
* Self Regard (SR) - measures affirmation of self worth and strengths;
* Self Acceptance (SA) - measures acceptance of oneself in spite of weaknesses;
* Nature of Man (Na) - measures extent of constructive view of the nature of man;
* Synergy (Sy) - measures ability to resolve dichotomies;
* Acceptance of Aggression (A) - measures ability to accept one’s aggression as natural;
* Capacity for Intimate Contact (C) - measures ability to develop intimate relations with others, unencumbered by expectation and obligation.

C) Basic Need Satisfaction at Work Kasser et al (1992)[[32]](#footnote-32)

The following questions concern your feelings about your job during the last year (scale of 1 to 10).

1. I feel like I can make a lot of inputs to deciding how my job gets done.

2. I really like the people I work with.

3. I do not feel very competent when I am at work.

4. People at work tell me I am good at what I do.

5. I feel pressured at work.

6. I get along with people at work.

7. I pretty much keep to myself when I am at work.

8. I am free to express my ideas and opinions on the job.

9. I consider the people I work with to be my friends.

10. I have been able to learn interesting new skills on my job.

11. When I am at work, I have to do what I am told.

12. Most days I feel a sense of accomplishment from working.

13. My feelings are taken into consideration at work.

14. On my job I do not get much of a chance to show how capable I am.

15. People at work care about me.

16. There are not many people at work that I am close to.

17. I feel like I can pretty much be myself at work.

18. The people I work with do not seem to like me much.

19. When I am working I often do not feel very capable.

20. There is not much opportunity for me to decide for myself how to go about my work.

21. People at work are pretty friendly towards me.

Annex III

The RAND mental health inventory. This inventory contains many items that seem to be both hedonistic as well as eudaimonic.

* How happy, satisfied, or pleased have you been with your personal life during the past month?
* How much of the time have you felt lonely during the past month?
* How often did you become nervous or jumpy when faced with excitement or unexpected situations during the past month?
* During the past month, how much of the time have you felt that the future looks hopeful and promising?
* How much of the time, during the past month, has your daily life been full of things that were interesting to you?
* How much of the time, during the past month, did you feel relaxed and free?
* During the past month, how much of the time have you generally enjoyed the things you do?
* During the past month, have you had any reason to wonder if you were losing your mind, or losing control over the way you act, talk, think, feel, or of your memory?
* Did you feel depressed during the past month?
* During the past month, how much of the time have you felt loved and wanted?
* How much of the time, during the past month, have you been a very nervous person?
* When you got up in the morning, this past month, about how often did you expect to have an interesting day?
* During the past month, how much of the time have you felt tense or “high-strung”?
* During the past month, have you been in firm control of your behavior, thoughts, emotions, feelings?
* During the past month, how often did your hands shake when you tried to do something?
* During the past month, how often did you feel that you had nothing to look forward to?
* How much of the time, during the past month, have you felt calm and peaceful?
* How much of the time, during the past month, have you felt emotionally stable?
* How much of the time, during the past month, have you felt downhearted and blue?
* How often have you felt like crying, during the past month?
* During the past month, how often did you feel that others would be better off if you were dead?
* How much of the time, during the past month, were you able to relax without difficulty?
* During the past month, how much of the time did you feel that your relationships, loving and being loved, were full and complete?
* How often, during the past month, did you feel that nothing turned out for you the way you wanted it to?
* How much have you been bothered by nervousness, or your “nerves,” during the past month?
* During the past month, how much of the time has living been a wonderful adventure for you?
* How often, during the past month, have you felt so down in the dumps that nothing could cheer you up?
* During the past month, did you ever think about taking your own life?
* During the past month, how much of the time have you felt restless, fidgety, or impatient?
* During the past month, how much of the time have you been moody or brooded about things?
* How much of the time, during the past month, have you felt cheerful, lighthearted?
* During the past month, how often did you get rattled, upset, or flustered?
* During the past month, have you been anxious or worried?
* During the past month, how much of the time were you a happy person?
* How often during the past month did you find yourself having difficulty trying to calm down?
* During the past month, how much of the time have you been in a low or very low spirits?
* How often, during the past month, have you been waking up feeling fresh and rested?
* During the past month, have you been under or felt you were under any strain, stress, or pressure?
1. This paper draws for this section on S. Alkire and S. Deneulin, 2009,“The Human Development and Capability Approach”. In S. Deneulin and L. Shahani (eds.) , An introduction to the human development and capability approach, chapter 2, London: Earthscan. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Darnton, 2008, Reference Report: An overview of behaviour change models and their uses, Centre for Sustainable Development, University of Westminster [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. See <http://www.economist.com/node/17723028> retrieved on 4/2/2015 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Alkire, 2008, Choosing dimensions, MPRA paper No 8862. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Alkire, 2010, Human development: definitions, critiques, and related concepts, OPHI working paper nr 36 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. OECD, 2013a, How’s life 2013, Paris, OECD publishing. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Alkire, 2002, Dimensions of human development, World Development vol. 30, nr2, p. 181-205, Elsevier Science [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. OECD, 2013b, OECD Guidelines on measuring subjective well-being, Paris, OECD publishing [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. R. Ryan and E. Deci, 2001, “On happiness and human potential”, volume 52, Annual Review of Psychology, p. 141-166 [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. To be precise the Sveriges Riksbank Prize in Economic Sciences in Memory of Alfred Nobel [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. P. Verhaege, 2013, Identiteit, Bezig Bij, Amsterdam [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Daimon in ancient Greek refers to “true self” and eu to “good” [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. A. Jansenss and E. Van Doorn, 2012, Groeien doe je samen, Lannoo [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Samman, 2007, Psychological and subjective well-being: a proposal for internationally comparable indicators, OPHI working paper series [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Mc Dowell, 2006, Measuring Health, Oxford University press, 3rd ed. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. P. Anand, C. Santos, 2007, The measurement of capabilities, Open discussion papers in economics 67, Open University [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. E. Hollywood, V. Egdell, R. McQuaid, D. Michel-Sertges, “Methodological issues in operationalizing the capability approach in empirical research”, Social work and society international online journal, vol. 10 n1 [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Not to be confused with the aforementioned OECD measurement efforts that go under the name of “Better life index”. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. H. Cottam, 2013, The life programme –interim report, Participle. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Locality, 2014, Saving money by doing the right thing. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. K. Worm-Petersen, 2013, Why we need design in policy-making, Grasp Magazine, September 11 [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. See IDEO, Human Centered Design Toolkit, as an instructive guidebook. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. See <http://blog.la27eregion.fr/Penser-la-mediatheque-de-demain> [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2005,A Systematic Approach to Service Improvement: Evaluating Systems Thinking in Housing. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. J. Seddon, 2008, Systems thinking in the public sector, Triarchy Press. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Source: Vanguard [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. Materials can be downloaded at <http://www.coprbm.eu/sites/default/files/4%20Barry%20Wrighton%20Vanguard.pptx> [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. B. Wauters, 2013, SMART or not: are simple management recipes useful to improve performance in a complex world? A critical reflection based on the experience of the Flemish ESF Agency, paper presented at conference on “Performance of public sector organisations: from weighing to losing weight, Politicologenetmaal Ghent 30- 31 may 2013”, revised version of 18/6/2013. Downloadable at [http://www.coprbm.eu/modules/pubdlcnt/pubdlcnt.php?file=http://www.coprbm.eu/sites/default/files/paper plo gent rev1.docx&nid=644](http://www.coprbm.eu/modules/pubdlcnt/pubdlcnt.php?file=http://www.coprbm.eu/sites/default/files/paper%20plo%20gent%20rev1.docx&nid=644) [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. A simple use of the search function in the PDF version of the documents will replicate these findings [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. Ryan, R. M., & Frederick, C. M. (1997). On energy, personality and health: Subjective vitality as a

dynamic reflection of well-being. Journal of Personality, 65, 529-565. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. Ivtzan, 2008, “Self Actualisation: For Individualistic Cultures Only?”, International journal on humanistic ideology 10/2008; 1(2):111-138 [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. Kasser, T., Davey, J., & Ryan, R. M. (1992). Motivation, dependability, and employee-supervisor

discrepancies in psychiatric vocational rehabilitation settings. Rehabilitation Psychology, 37, 175-187. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)