The Measurement of Capabilities: An Overview Or How to Measure Wellbeing if You Must

WEBINAR HDCA 11 APRIL 2013

Paul Anand Economics, The Open University and RA Health Economics Research Centre, Oxford University RA London School of Economics (CPNSS)

AIMS OF INTRODUCTION

- Provide Overview of Capabilities Measurement Project
- Illustrate some ways we've addressed the measurement and operationalisation issues
- Flag up some resources and welcome collaborations

Capabilities Measurement Project – Some Collaborators and Advisors

Ian Carter Keith Dowding Francesco Guala Martin van Hees Graciela Tonon Maria Sigala AHRB

Philosophy and

Social Science

Economics and Health **Alastair Gray Graham Hunter** Paula Lorgelly Jaya Krishnakumar Peter Moffat **Cristina Santos** Judit Simon **Ron Smith** Laurence Roope Amartya Sen **James Heckman** Leverhulme Trust

Some publications

Journal of Human Development (2009)

Chapter in Festschrift for Amartya Sen *Arguments for a Better World*, Oxford University Press, Basu and Kanbur, (2009)

Journal of Public Economics (2011)

Social Indicators Research, Journal of Health Economics, Journal of Medical Ethics, Health Economics etc

Modern Social Choice and Welfare Theory



Theory (Sen 1985 pp11-4)

Sen's Three Equations

EQ 1. fi = fi(xi) - heterogeneity in conversion
EQ 2. ui = hi(fi) - happiness
EQ 3. Qi = {f1,f2,...fm}/endowment advantage

xi is vector of commodities possessed by i
f(.) converts resources into activities (doings/beings aka functionings)
"Qi represents the freedom a person has in terms of the choice of functionings, given his personal features Fi...and his command over commodities xi."



Empirical Approach

 $f_{i} = f(r_{i}, c_{i}) \dots k \dim$ $h_{i} = u(f_{i,1}, \dots, f_{i,k})$ $Q_{i} \equiv \{\mathbf{f}_{i,r}\} | e$ $\equiv \{\max f_{i,1}, \dots, \max f_{i,k}\} = \hat{Q}_{i}$



Some Early Empirical Capabilities Research

- Human Development Index
- Schokkaert and van Ootegem (1990)
- Enrica Chiappero Martinetti (1994, 2000)
- Laderchi (1997)
- Kuklys (2005)
- Andrea Brandolini (1999)

"The purpose is to assess the operational content of the approach ie the empirical methods to measure functionings and capabilities...much of what one can do depends the available data....we discussed the practical difficulties of moving to capabilities and proposed to remain in the (refined) functionings space."

Source: Plenary paper given to the International Economics Association Congress, Buenos Aires

AHRB Project to Measure Capabilities



Can we measure capabilities across a wide spectrum of human domains within the conventions applicable to national household and social surveys?

Framework for Questions The OCAP 2005 instrument

Nussbaum's List

Comprehensive Robust (similar to others) Don't require universal claims Has normative grounding

Question Categories

- o Life
- Bodily Health
- Bodily Integrity
- Senses Imagination and Thought
- Emotions
- Practical Reason
- Affiliation
- o Nature
- Leisure
- Control over one's Environment

Bodily Health

 Being able to have good health, including reproductive health; to be adequately nourished; to have adequate shelter

- 2 Bodily Health
- Being able to have good health,
- BHEALTH (Q57)
- Does your health in any way limit your daily activities compared to most people of your age?
- Yes, No. BHPS
- including reproductive health;
- BREPRODUCT (Q61)
- Are you able to have children?
 - Yes, No, Don't know, Prefer not to answer
 - If No

0

0

- Please indicate the reason(s) you are not able to have children.
- I cannot have children because of: Q62_1 My age; Q62_2 I have had a vasectomy / hysterectomy; Q62-3 Another medical condition; Q62_4 My partner being unable / unwilling; Q62_5 Another reason; Q62_6 Prefer not to answer.
- to be adequately nourished
- BNOURISH (Q59)
- Do you eat fresh meat, chicken or fish at least twice a week?
- Yes/No BHPS
- If No
- o Q60
- For which of the following reasons, if any, do you NOT eat fresh meat, chicken or fish at least twice a week? [Please tick all that apply]
- I am vegetarian/vegan, I cannot afford to, I do not like eating fresh meat, chicken or fish that often, I do not have time to prepare fresh food., Some other reason
- to have adequate shelter.
- BSHELTER (Q85)
- Is your current accommodation adequate or inadequate for your current needs?
- More than adequate, Adequate, Inadequate, Very inadequate
- BCANMOVE (Q86)
- Are you prevented from moving home for any reason?
- Yes, No
- If yes
- o Q87
- What prevents you from moving home?
- Lack of money/finances; The Council would be unlikely to re-house me; Family responsibilities and/or schooling; I could not move out of my current accommodation because of some other reason

HEALTH STATUS

Does your health in any way *limit* your daily activities compared to most people of your age?

Yes, No. BHPS

REPRODUCTION

Are you able to have children? NEW Yes, No, Don't know, Prefer not to answer

If no please indicate the **reason(s)** you are not able to have children

I cannot have children because of: Q62_1 My age Q62_2 I have had a vasectomy / hysterectomy Q62_3 Another medical condition Q62_4 My partner being unable / unwilling Q62_5 Another reason Q62_6 Prefer not to answer

NOURISHMENT

Do you eat fresh meat, chicken or fish at least twice a week?

Yes/No BHPS with additions

If No

(Q60)

For which of the following reasons, if any, do you NOT eat fresh meat, chicken or fish at least twice a week? [Please tick all that apply]

I am vegetarian/vegan I cannot afford to I do not like eating fresh meat, chicken or fish that often I do not have time to prepare fresh food Some other reason

ADEQUATE SHELTER

BSHELTER (Q85)

Is your current accommodation adequate or inadequate for your current needs?

More than adequate, Adequate, Inadequate, Very inadequate

BCANMOVE (Q86)

Are you prevented from moving home for any reason? Yes, No

If yes (Q87) What prevents you from moving home? Lack of money/finances;

The Council would be unlikely to re-house me;

Family responsibilities and/or schooling;

I could not move out of my current accommodation because of some other reason

5 Types of Capability Indicators

Type 1. OpportunitiesType 2. AbilitiesType 3. ConstraintsType 4. Functionings + ReasonsType 5. Functionings + Universality

Dependent Variable	SWB2			
Capability Variables	Coeff.	S.Error	t-Stat	Prob.
BSHELTER	0.27	0.09	2.93	0.00
CDASALTP	-0.17	0.08	-2.01	0.04
CSEXSAT	0.25	0.07	3.33	0.00
ELOVE	0.08	0.03	3.03	0.00
EFEELING	0.11	0.03	4.14	0.00
ESTRAIN	-0.13	0.04	-3.24	0.00
FGOOD	0.09	0.03	3.17	0.00
FPLAN	0.12	0.02	5.10	0.00
FEVALUATE	-0.06	0.03	-2.15	0.03
FROLE	0.36	0.05	6.89	0.00
GCONCERN	0.09	0.03	2.69	0.01
GHOLIDAY	0.27	0.08	3.28	0.00
GWORTH	0.35	0.04	7.86	0.00
JRACEWP	-0.54	0.17	-3.18	0.00
JRACEWF	0.08	0.03	2.26	0.02
JSEARCH	-0.05	0.02	-2.20	0.03
JSKILLSW	0.08	0.03	2.61	0.01
(linear				
approximations)				
Adjusted R-squared Akaike info criterion Schwarz criterion Durbin-Watson stat	0.53 2.62 2.73 1.83			



ARGENTINA

2007 Survey1000 Adults





3 AIMS

- Further develop and refine he survey instrument as proposed by Anand et al
- Validate the instrument for use in public health evaluations
- Propose how future evaluations might employ the capability approach

4. METHODOLOGY

This project was conducted in three phases:

– Phase One reviewed the literature on capability, questionnaire design and outcome measurement; this informed the initial design and layout of the questionnaire (see Appendix One – version 1). Members of the public were recruited for five focus groups, during which they discussed the range of questions, style of elicitation, their understanding and the overall questionnaire design. The results of these focus groups, together with secondary analysis (factor analysis) of Anand's original YouGov data (N=1048), then informed the first revision of the questionnaire (version 2).TPF

1

FPT This revised version was piloted in a postal

survey and via interviews with members of the general public.

– Phase Two involved a thematic analysis of the interview data and a quantitative analysis of all completed questionnaires (factors analysis and correlation patterns) with the aim of identifying areas in which the questionnaire could be further reduced. The questionnaire was then redesigned using the reduced set of questions (version 3) prior to further interviews and a postal survey. The results from the second phase were used to validate and test the reliability of the instrument.

– Phase Three involved an analysis of the data from version 3 of the questionnaire, including further reflection on the debate between 'functioning' and 'capability' (by means of eliciting the public's preferences regarding each), and also an attempt to generate an index of capability.

Violent Crime, Gender Inequalities and Life Satisfaction (Anand and Santos 2007)

Data

- Past Experience/Future vulnerability to domestic, sexual and other forms of assault
- Current experience of Safety in local area during day and night

Emerging Themes

- 1. Violence in general has a negative impact on life satisfaction whether you use self report or local area reports
- 2. Self-reported vulnerability to future assault drives out past experience of violence in happiness equations
- 3. Some evidence that higher relative earning females are more at risk of domestic violence

Health and Capability Poverty

Data

- Does health limit your daily activities for your age
- All capabilities, life satisfaction and socio-economic covariates

Analysis (latent class)

- Can we identify a 'super-poor' group
- What are capability classes related to?

POVERTY CLASSES AND THEIR SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILES

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Cluster 5	Cluster 6
cluster size	23.7%	20.79%	19.05%	18.30%	10.13%	8.02%
Health Status	78.49%	82.96%	85.74%	61.45%	67.95%	47.01%
Household Inc	3.19	3.31	3.33	2.93	2.86	2.32
Pagreeable	4.73	4.88	5.50	4.93	5.23	4.41
Pconscientious	5.12	5.53	5.87	4.9	5.42	4.7
Popen	4.86	4.58	5.36	4.60	5.55	5.22
Pstable	4.47	4.87	5.32	3.61	4.70	3.41
Pextravert	4.09	4.07	4.84	3.53	4.14	3.51
Age	42.19	46.17	50.63	39.65	47.14	38.14
Mmale	59.73%	54.22%	45.55%	40.73%	10.64%	38.41%
mrmidwls	25.05%	29.76%	20.58%	18.30%	18.99%	13.47%
mrnorth	25.15%	28.93%	28.50%	24.78%	32.82%	38.71%
mrscot	10.25%	8.05%	10.64%	12.77%	7.02%	3.45%
mrsouth	16.61%	21.57%	27.10%	24.48%	13.09%	29.58%

Table 6b	Wald Statistics for Health Status and Other Predictors of Class Membership
in a Six Latent	Class Model

Covariate	Model Diagnostic Statistics						
Health	51.97,		31.5533,	42.5177,	25.6563,	30.7661,	
Status	5.50e-10		7.30e-06	4.60e-08	0.0001	1.00e-05	
Household		31.0012,	21.9757,	26.8417,	12.0814,	20.9303,	
Income		9.30e-06	0.00053	6.10e-05	0.034	0.00083	
Controls		No					
for Age							
Personality:							
pagree					29.036, 2.3e- 05	29.3056, 2.00e-	
pconsc					24.1576, 0.0002	05	
popen					55.0846, .3e-10	21.8305, 0.00056	
pstable					49.8809, 1.50e-	60.14, 1.10e-11	
pxtravt					09	50.2556, 1.20e-	
					19.8605, 0.0013	09	
						24.708, 0.00016	
Controls	No					Yes	
for Regions							

Notes

Cell entries indicate the value of the Wald statistic and its associated p value respectively. Controls for age comprise age and its square. Coefficients for all models in Table 3 are available on request.



Capability score- home Capability score- community

Capability score- work

Capability score- environment

Capability score- access services

Graphs by country

Some Conclusions - for Health

Capabilities can be measured

Health, along with money and age, is related to capability

Datasets (and survey instruments) now exist on capabilities in: UK 2005 UK, US, Italy 2012 UK mobility impaired subsample UK 2012-3 panel for 1000 adults

Some cognitive testing has been done in question refinement but of course specific groups may require more