



TITI

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3126/jtd.v4i0.26830>

**Journal of
Training and Development**
2019, Volume 4
ISSN: 2392-456X(Print)
ISSN: 2392-4578(Online)

TVET Approaches: A Diagnosis through the Lens of Human Capital, Right Based and Capability Approach

Binayak Krishna Thapa*, Aishwarya Rani Singh

Assistant Professor *in Development Studies,

Graduate Scholar of Development Studies at Department of Development Studies,

Kathmandu University School of Arts, Hattiban, Lalitpur, Nepal

Email for correspondence: binayak.thapa@ku.edu.np

Abstract

The key approaches utilised for the understanding and implementation of a Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) are primarily human capital and human rights approaches. While human capital approach advocates enhanced skills for the productivity, human rights approach systematically demands distributed enhancement of skills through short- or long-term trainings for all. The former approach connotes economic growth through better employment and income opportunity, whereas the latter situates itself for distributive opportunity, social inclusion and social justice. Both approaches target increasing employment and enhancing chances for better livelihood and well-being. These two approaches, however, are not the ultimate and only approaches for understanding the technical and vocational education and training. The major limitations of these approaches are that they conceptualize employment, income, better opportunity and even distribution to be ends or goals, while in this paper, the authors argue that the mentioned concepts are just means to a general end that is human development. Given this context, this paper offers an alternative lens to look at technical and vocational education and training. This alternative lens is arguably capability approach. The capability lens potentially explains how skill enhancement improves the 'being' and 'doing' of a person who engages in taking training and how the trained person can implement the learned skills to improve his/her well-being. In this regard, this approach helps understand how TVET can directly be linked with human development. This paper finally argues that TVET is also a tool for human development, albeit it is primarily, still concerned with productivity, employment and better incomes.

Keywords: Education, TVET, Human Capital, Rights-Based, Human Capabilities, Human Development

Introduction

The year 2015 brought about an end to a decade long endeavour directed towards Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), and subsequently

paved the way forward for sustainable development goals (SDGs). Both these goals in their target, set prioritise access to equality education. On this note, SDGs extends further by including assurance to

productive employment and decent work for all. While, most nations around the world pledge and promise to work together towards SDGs till 2030, there exists not one single formula that guarantees the actualization and realization of these goals. However, among different means, measures and instruments available for governments of different nations to work towards that realization, technical and vocational education and training (TVET) can play a potential role in this direction. The TVET and SDGs connect with each other in two major domains. The first being the TVET's potential role in inclusive and equitable education and its contribution towards promoting lifelong learning opportunities for all. The second follows with the translation of TVET to the promotion of sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all. From this stance, TVET is seen to be well connected with development as a whole, and, precisely with goal number four¹ and eight² of the SDGs.

Given these aspirations, TVET has received attention of governments, policy makers, planner, implementers and general citizens at national and international level. Scholars namely Tikly (2013) and McGrath (2012) claim that this surge seen today is but a gradual rise of interest on TVET since as early as 2000s. TVET scholars acknowledge this phenomenon as rebirth of TVET (McGrath, 2012). Around this time, magnitude of investment at global scale increased by threefold (King & Palmer, 2011). This immense investment, interest, and, involvement of government and different stakeholders in TVET calls for a proper diagnosis through the lenses or approaches (primarily TVET is viewed through the lens of human capital and rights- based) taken by these agencies. This is of vital importance as the policy and implementation plan for TVET embeds within the particular approach taken up. In addition, a proper diagnosis of the approaches to TVET helps to understand the differentials between the approaches

and the advantages and critiques it entails. This further contributes to context specific understanding of TVET, and helps select the best fit approach to TVET for a particular context and environment.

However, the choice of approach to TVET and its appropriateness is a highly contested issue. In the state of the art of TVET policy and academic debate, this contestation is observed across approaches taken, and the potential contribution each can have in the form of social, economic and cultural transformation. Each of the approaches is seen to have its own concern and objectives. Hence, it leaves an essential point to revisit the theoretical stances behind TVET approaches. In order to operationalize this, in-depth literature exploration needs to be conducted. Such exploration and diagnosis of each approach will help inform government and stakeholders to adopt the best approach to TVET that is most suited to the soil of the nation. Further, given that international community and national government have their interest in TVET, this surge in policy interest implies the vital need for the exploration of the purpose, nature and possible outcomes entailed in chosen approach to TVET.

In this article, we revisit the dominant approaches to and views on TVET. We argue that each approach to TVET is grounded on principles such as quality education, decent work, economic growth and productivity, inclusiveness and right. The differentials across the undertaken approaches are based on the purpose, nature and possibilities of concerned TVET approach. However, we limit our ambition to the discussion on just the dominant approach to TVET while taking into consideration, the recent trends in thinking and understanding TVET. We provide brief accounts of available literatures that helps us put forward our arguments.

The article first offers a context within which it has been written. This is followed by a brief

¹ SDG Goal No 4: Quality Education: Obtaining a quality education is the foundation to improving people's lives and sustainable development (Source: <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/>)

² SDG Goal No 8: Decent Work and Economic Growth: Sustainable economic growth will require societies to create the conditions that allow people to have quality jobs. (Source: <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/>)

conceptualization of different approaches to TVET. Following this section, is a discussion on human capital approach and its critique. Next is the discussion on human rights-based approach and the critiques it faces. Lastly, the article offers understanding of capability approach to TVET. In doing so, the article also offers the understanding on how capability, freedom and TVET connect and how TVET seen through the lens of capability approach, would translate to human development.

Setting the Context

In an education system, technical and vocational education and training is one of the sectors. This sector has received mandate from UNESCO for education, followed by World Bank with advocacy of skills since 2011 (Tikly, 2013). It is generally observed that different organizations have different reasons and rationale for prioritizing TVET. On one hand, financial institutions are more concerned with generation of human capital as a means to support economic growth and on the other hand, there are institutions that focus on human-centered view of TVET as means for supporting inclusiveness, just distribution, rights, equality and universality.

The key approaches as claimed by Tikly (2013), and McGrath (2012) undertaken by governments of different nations, policy makers, planners and implementers for the understanding and implementation of a Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) are primarily human capital³ and human right-based approaches⁴. Sen (1999) argues that the human capital approach advocates on enhanced skills for the productivity, and, the human rights approach demands for distributed enhancement of skills through short- or long-term trainings for all. The former approach connotes economic growth through better employment and income opportunity, whereas, the later situates itself for distributive opportunity, social inclusion and social justice. Both the approaches target increasing employment and enhancing chances for better livelihood and well-being. These two

approaches, however, may not be the ultimate approaches for understanding the TVET and subsequently its implementation. There could be possibilities of limitations in these approaches embedded in the conceptualization of the concepts such as employment, income, better opportunity and even distribution to be ends or goals, while, these could just be the means to other meaningful ends. This implies that the mentioned concepts are just a means to a general end that is human development.

Given this context, an alternative lens to look at TVET is needed. This alternative lens is arguably capability approach. The capability lens potentially as argued by Sen(1999) explains how skill enhancement improves the 'being' and 'doing' of a person who engages in taking training and how the trained person can implement the learned skills to improve his/her well-being. In this regard, this approach helps to understand as to how TVET can be linked with human development. It is argued that TVET can be a tool for human development, albeit it is primarily still concerned with productivity, employment and better incomes.

In order to support the above arguments, we build on the work of scholars namely Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum. Their works help outline an alternative approach that suggests an extension on the already existing approaches to TVET. This approach is based on the concept of human capabilities and is informed by principles of social justice. From this perspective, TVET is seen as a means for supporting the development of a range of capabilities that are conceived as opportunities to develop functioning, that individual, their community and society at large have reasons to value. These capabilities need to be defined through processes of informed public debate and it is this democratic dimension that is seen to underpin the capability approach. Rather than being universal in nature, the capabilities are defined in relation to context and can potentially contribute to economic, social, political, environmental and cultural development. Indeed, the development of valued capabilities and

³ Tikly (2013) offers case of Singapore and Ghana as implementers of Human Capital Approach to TVET.

⁴ Mclean(2010) offers cases of China, Afghanistan, Philippines, India and Thailand in regards to UNESCO initiative as right based approaches.

functions is seen as a good approach for human development in itself.

Further we discuss the intricate link between already existing approaches to TVET and TVET itself. The discussion offered explains how contemporary TVET and its emergence are intimately linked with economic growth, productivity, skills generation and employment. Such capitalist development concerns narrowly with economic consequences for development only and does not include social and cultural aspects which are other dimensions of transformation or development.

Hence, it is argued that a broader definition of development connoted with more humanistic aspect would serve the purpose of TVET as this perspective may expand the narrowly conceptualized definitions based on economic development. TVET today, in both global south and global north, is seen as a part and parcel of associated processes of capitalist growth, industrialization and urbanization. It can be suggested that TVET is an intrinsic part of these processes, and such processes and TVET itself can be gainful only if these translates to social transformation that underpin human development. This implies that TVET when seen only as a derivative and causes of economic development, could be misleading. Such views would require people engaged in TVET to be a passive agent only who react to macro-economic forces. This potentially rules out their agency in the long-run. In this regard, it can be argued that people engaged in TVET possess agency, skills enhancement, capacity building, knowledge transfer and training that contributes to the transformation at individual level and hence potentially contributes to the advancement of agency for human development.

Trails and Traits of Approaches to Education and TVET

Progressive education system is normatively an aspiration for all education stakeholders (Nodding, 2003). However, to determine whether an educational system is progressive or not, relates to examining

the nature of education development. This calls for a proper diagnosis of existing education system along with its associated purpose, aim, objects and policy outcomes McGrath (2012). The choice of diagnosis in turn, depends on the approaches to education. In this context, this section offers the concepts and its conceptualization to understand the dominant approaches to education development. As the TVET sector is a part and partial of education system (Sharma, 2009), these concepts help understand the approaches to TVET too. The approaches examined here are namely human capital, human right-based and human capability approach. These approaches in general help understand purpose of education, education systems and the entailed education policies of concerned country (Katusiime, 2014). Beyond understanding the purpose of education, the education approaches are also concerned about addressing issues such as equity, quality and relevance of concerned educational system and policies which are directly related to educational outcomes.

In the mid-20th century, human capital approach attracted significant attention of educationists and educational policy makers. The underlining assumption of this approach was that given an opportunity to be educated and trained, people will enhance their productive capacity. This called for productive worker for productive nation. The worker or the citizens of the concerned nation needed adequate knowledge, skills and information in order to be productive. This notion primarily concerned with making society productive, by making each citizen/ member of society productive, which, ultimately contributed to economic growth of the nation (Kochetkova, 2006). This approach to education prioritized creative capacity of workers, and their work quality against condition of workers themselves. This confined the approach to offer just the basic ways of quantifying the economic returns of education on people's income, and their productivity. Further, such returns were only private returns and were silent about associated social return.

At the core of human capital approach stands human

capital theory. This suggests that children and youth receiving education should be able to acquire certain skill sets and qualities that are instrumental in contributing to economic productivity (Unterhalter, 2009). Education policies crafted through the lens of human capital approach primarily is concerned with and only with economic value of education (Manion & Menashy, 2012). The implication of such education development approach pertains to values of educational kinds (general or vocational) being attributed directly to economic outcomes produced by it. In other words, this explains that the primary goal of this approach to education is enhancing people's productive capacity both in quantity and quality. The rationale underpinning this notion to education development is that advances made in country's human capital are associated with the potentiality of growth of the concerned country, similarly, chances of growth of the country are associated with the country's holistic development.

Yet another available approach is human rights-based. This approach differs from human capital approach to education development. While capital approach is instrumental in promoting only economic growth, the rights-based is instrumental in promoting both economic growth and human well-being (Sungumpta, 2006). The underlying principles within this approach such as accountability, participation, non-discrimination and empowerment are the instrumental factors that support human well-being. Further, these factors also contribute in making education inclusive and open up the pathway for the accessibility of benefits of education (Unterhalter & Brighouse, 2007). Right based approach makes this possible by considering education as a universal entitlement. This entitlement is for all human beings irrespective of who they are and where they are from, and, where they reside. This plays out to tackle inequality and deprivations faced by vulnerable groups because of their gender, socio-economic status, class, caste, or even geographical locations (Wang, 2012). The central assumption of this approach is that people are vulnerable for different

reasons in different ways. The development of education can be only materialized, provided approach to education development ensures gainful education for vulnerable groups. This is made possible by engaging in developmental processes that are based on the foundation of human rights.

An alternative to both the human capital and right-based approach to education is capability approach. Capability approach differs with respect to capital and rights based on the ground that it concerns with expansion of human capabilities of all members of society through education. While human capital and right-based approach advocates growth & productivity and advocacy of inclusion respectively for well-being, the capability approach emphasizes on holistic human development for well-being (Sen, 1997, 1998; Nussbaum, 2003; Robeyns, 2006). In this case, the government, education practitioners and policy makers work-upon and put focus on education system that translates education and training to human capabilities such as skills, opportunities, employment for the expansion of young people's choices on social, economic, political and cultural functioning.

The essence of capability approach, is human life. It is about 'being' and 'doing'⁵ of individual's life experiences rather than just earning income or consuming commodity. This approach to education does not limit to resource utility, employability and productivity through skill enhancement, growth through skill transfer or just employment through training provision. It rather focuses on opportunities in general and capabilities in particular such that people live the kind of life they value and have reasons to value. Further this approach is comprehensive, multi-dimensional and entails economic and non-economic instrumental role of education.

Apart from offering a platform for understanding education system, the capability approach offers evaluative space too. Within this evaluation space,

⁵ Walter (2006) states that doings and beings include being well nourished, having shelter and access to clean water, being mobile, being well-educated, having paid work, being safe, being respected, taking part in discussions with your peers and so on.

this approach can be put to operation for assessing well-being at individual level to group or to community level at large. Robeyns (2006) states that this is unique because such evaluations can help understand multiple aspects of well-being namely poverty, inequality, social inclusion, and even income generation through employment.

Human Capital Approach to TVET: Economic Productivity and Growth

During the 1960s, human capital approach to education was developed by scholars of University of Chicago. This approach is underpinned by a normative model popularly known as human capital theory (Katusiime, 2014). At the core of this theory is an assumption that people go through education or training to increase their productive capacity (Unterhalter, 2009). This approach was adopted by many countries in the mid-20th century. In doing so, primary focus was given to delivery of teaching and learning processes for educating the citizenry to become more productive that would have immediate impact on positive economic growth of the nation (Manion & Menashy, 2012). With the ultimate goal of economic growth, human capital approach is more concerned with enhancement of productive capacity of workers, quality of the produce and productivity. In this regard, this approach is instrumental in increasing economic productivity of the nation (Unterhalter, 2009). This implies that enhancement of people's productive capacity in terms of quality and quantity potentially advances a nation's human capital, such that, the concerned nation has more chances to realize national economic growth and holistic national development.

The main purpose of human capital approach to education development is to enhance the productive capacity of the nation's population. In this context, nations aspiring for socio-economic development, need to work upon its citizenries' level of knowledge and skill such that they raise their living standards through increase in per capita income. While nations look forward to improve their social and economic

status, prior to such actualization is accumulation of human capital. Human capital plays a vital role in economic growth of a country. At an individual level, human capital supports one's abilities, knowledge, skills, and motives. These directly relates to individual's competencies and productive possibilities. Further, human capital potentially enhances individual's resources in terms of skills and knowledge that can be put to use in productive work.

However, not all nations are in the position to realize this purpose. For those countries that are deprived of endowed resources, and hence are faced with ultimate challenge of establishing education system that could contribute to human capital generation (Fagerlind & Saha, 2016). The youths here possess fewer skills and knowledge and are not able to gain opportunities in the labour market (Fox, Senbet, & Simbanegain, 2015). This further has resulted to higher unemployment rate among the younger population (International Labour Organization (ILO), 2016). Some of the disadvantages faced by these countries are poor infrastructure, limited budgets, poor social expenditure, and multi-deprivation. There exists a general misunderstanding that economic growth in terms of higher gross domestic product would translate to better income of all citizens of the concerned nation (Sachs, 2015). Sachs⁶ claims that in such nations, availability of jobs, employment, economic opportunities and social benefits are highly unequal. This implies that human capital approach is potentially benefiting some countries and its people and not all. Further, this also entails, economic benefit and productivity of some countries and its people and not all. Hence, the institutionalization of such approach is questionable on the face of its potentiality to be inclusive and focus just on the productivity of workers and remain silent on the well-being of the workers themselves.

Moreover, the choice of using human capital approach to TVET is limited to macro-economic context of productivity enhancement. One of the many critiques

6 See the age of sustainable development, author Jeffrey. D. Sachs.

of this approach is the question on social returns of the TVET processes (Schultz, 1988). As this approach is mainly concerned with the instrumental value acquired from knowledge and skills through TVET, it is completely silent on the intrinsic value that people can harness through TVET. From this perspective, we argue that it is necessary that TVET brings about benefit in terms of jobs and productivity but this is not sufficient. The TVET system should translate to enriching people's lives. This calls for TVET to equip people with such knowledge and skills such that it potentially improves economic productivity, and income of the people, in doing so, translating these into their well-being. However, TVET today dominantly accounts to productivism (McGrath, 2012), and this implies TVET's contribution to enshrining of economic development as the ultimate goal of society. It is at this front that the human capital model calls for extended alternative which has wider coverage and implications.

Human Rights-Based Approach to TVET: Rights and Inclusion

Rights-based approach expands the capital approach on the ground that it is instrumental in promoting growth and well-being (Sungumpata, 2006). The basic assumption of using this lens is that there are vulnerable people among the universal population. This vulnerability could be the result of their gender, economic status, location, caste, class, and ethnicity (Wang, 2012). In this regard this approach rightly places its principles of accountability, participation, non-discrimination and empowerment to make education inclusive (Katusiime, 2014). The ultimate goal of this approach is to ensure that all members of the population in a concerned nation have access to benefits of education system.

This approach focuses on justice. It considers education to be universal entitlement for all human beings irrespective of whom and where they are. This approach puts its emphasis on justice to counter on the inequalities and deprivation issue experienced by vulnerable population (Unterhalter & Brighouse, 2015). It places an argument that processes which

are developmental by nature ought to be underpinned on the foundation of human rights. In this regard, it is advocated that education policy needs to consider what people value while making sure that the inequalities experienced by them are minimized. This way, governments of nations adapting this approach promise to provide and respect right to education for every child, and make education either free or, compulsory at some levels (United Nations (UN), 1948). The purpose of this stance of such governments relates to promotion of every individual by strengthening their rights and freedom through necessary education (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) & United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), 2001).

Governments abide by this approach because educational rights seek to improve education system as it concerns with human development from economic, cultural, and political perspectives. This is beneficial at different levels. Firstly, it benefits individual well-being, further; the cumulative well-being of individuals translates to well-being of the nation. Secondly, it promotes individual's capacity to be productive and that will contribute to her/his well-being and well-being of her/his nation (Unterhalter, 2007). In doing so, the governments, policy makers, implementers and planners value education as a right to every citizen. This implies that education is provided to all the citizens despite their differences.

But not all governments around the globe are promising ones who abide by rights-based approach. There are many countries where the leaders and the citizens do not value human rights, and depend on the international agencies to ensure the people's right to education is respected. Such countries also sign documents for human rights but do not abide nor commit to such agreements (Wang, 2012). It is in this context, scholars like Sen makes a clear distinction between legally institutionalized rights and rights which are founded on the grounds of 'humanity' or 'human-ness' of the concerned people.

Sen (2006) argues that it is only when people take the lens of human-ness that respecting human rights will have any sense. It is at this juncture where human-right based approach seems to be incomplete.

Apart from Sen's argument for 'human-ness' towards successful rights-based approach, scholars like Nussbaum calls for government and international agencies for discussion on human rights, which, she feels is limited. Her argument is that rights-based approach could only be effective where people know about their own rights and know how to use them such that they make better choices that affect their life (Nussbaum, 2003). The assumption put here is that governments do abide by their constitutions, the constitutions may include and commit to rights to education, but these may just be in papers. The citizens would not be able to benefit from such rights until they know about the provision of such rights and ways to exercise them. Further, this could bring about additional challenges such as the inability of parliamentarians to interpret laws and implement it, and inability of citizens to speak against the injustices in the education system and difficulties on protecting their own education rights. This suggests that human rights-based approach is more likely to be instrumental in cases where government, parliament, policy makers, planners, implementers and citizen are aware and well-informed on the legal instrument that pertain to right to education and other related rights.

Lastly, the major problem entailed in human rights-based approach is its ambition for universality (Sachiko, 2012). The strongest argument offered in this context being human rights may not be universalized (Katusiime, 2014). Criticism according to this context is that human-rights universalization is rooted in western liberal thoughts. The primary assumption is that such rootedness means imposition of western values and ideology in developing countries in the name of human rights (Manion & Menashy, 2012). This has contributed on understanding human rights as a way to subject people from the developing world to western cultures,

values and ensuring that all the other cultural values are put aside. Sen is sceptical on this Universalist approach in the ground that we live in a world of different culture, society or community. Such diversity brings about complexities for implementing rights-based approach to TVET. Sen (2005, 2006) urges human-rights based to be contextual, localized through local public reasoning. He argues that people need to reason to arrive at a concept of human rights which are meaningful to them such that they value it and have reason to value. It is in this regard that Sen (2005, 2006) recommends the rights-based approach to be less seen in terms of legality and more in terms of social ethics and public reasoning.

Though human rights-based approach can be debated over human capital approach, the literatures reveal that both possess good composite elements. These elements are directly related with enhancing individual's capacity to acquire more knowledge, skills, and education for all individuals in society ideally. However, these approaches still lack to address human dimensions of individual development as a purpose of TVET. The following sections will introduce to yet another approach to education which is capability approach. Further, how capability approach links with TVET and how it connects TVET with human development, will be elaborated.

Capability, Freedom and TVET

Sen (1999) defines development as the process of expanding the substantive freedom that people enjoy. In order to operationalize the given concept, Sen uses another concept of human capability. Human capability relates to the ability of human beings to lead lives they have reason to value and to enhance the substantive choices they have. Sen suggest that it is expansion of the capabilities of people to control their own lives that connects with development and not income growth. The major assumption in this regard being that human capability expansion improves quality of people's lives. Sen argues that at the centre of development processes is freedom. He supports this argument with two reasons. First, human development as freedom is an objective of

development because it has intrinsic importance of human freedoms, and secondly, human development as freedom has instrumental effectiveness of freedoms of different kinds, which can directly contribute to economic progress.

Hence, value of freedom such as good education, training, skills should not only be compared with income-generating capacity of the same. Sen's notion of freedom comprises of fundamental things like basic education, enjoying the freedom of employment choice, receiving or possessing skills of choice, and each opportunity to live long and healthy lives, being well-housed and even clothed. All these are developmental virtues in themselves. Besides their intrinsic value, better education, skills, health, opportunity, employment are instrumental in promoting economic growth and these further helps expand other human freedoms.

If people expand their social, economic and human capital, this coincides with increasing potential levels of one's human development. Having technical knowledge, being engaged in some vocation, having or being educated and engaging in or receiving trainings adds to one's own well-being. The TVET can potentially motivate youngsters around the world to discover new horizons. It is this intrinsic nature of TVET, and hence is an integral part of human development. The instrumental part of TVET is using skills, knowledge, and training. These offer more opportunities in terms of better work, occupation and gainful employment and income. It is assumed that acquiring such capabilities often strongly motivates people to gain more out of TVET and get involved in it.

This perspective in its own rights, is an agent-oriented approach. Here, stress is laid on the capacity and responsibility of individuals to shape their own destiny. In this context, three general mechanisms can be identified that offer understanding of linkages among capability, freedom and TVET. First, development of certain minimum level is needed for the establishment and flourishing of TVET sector.

Here, people involved need to possess certain freedoms and have access to TVET in order to gain knowledge, skills and training of their choice. This adds to the intrinsic value of the very freedom of being skilled and trained for gainful employment and productive working (Sen, 1999). Second TVET has potential to affect well-being of the individual, her/his family, communities and nation. TVET translates to gainful employment and productive work capacity can contribute to improving of living standard. This can be attributed to access of better housing, sanitation, food, clothing and health, where, gains from TVET sector employment and income can be put to use. Third, besides the intrinsic and direct well-being, enhancing potential of TVET, the freedom enhancing potentials of TVET may also have an instrumental value in increasing people's capabilities to improve their livelihoods and in contributing to general economic growth and social change.

Capability Approach to TVET for Human Development

The capability approach to education connects to human development through its focus on the ability of human beings to live the life they reason to value (Sen, 1997). This is established through reasoning processes for valuing the kind of life they prefer. This further helps enhance people's choices, which in turn, give them alternative life-choices in accordance to their preferred lifestyle. The main assumption of this approach is that people in their societies, differ across several dimensions such as personal characteristics, socio-economic background and economic circumstances. These dimensions define who people are and what they can do and be. This implies that each individual has the ability to do or be things she/he has reason to value. In this context, the approach calls for government and partners in education sector to focus on policies that directly connect to the state of being of diverse people, and, what they want to do and be for which they have reason to value.

Capability approach to education for human

development is concerned with available opportunities for individual advances. This approach differs from human capital and rights-based approach in a way that it calls for expansion of human capabilities of each member of the society. This approach puts more emphasis on human life as compared to other approaches to education. Likewise, while it primarily concentrates around human life, it puts less stress on income, consumption, expenditure and even productivity, which are necessary but not sufficient (Sen, 2009). The approach stands at the core founding principles of human well-being and human freedom. Such lens to education focuses more on the opportunities that people can have to live the kind of life they value and have reason to value. Unlike other approaches to education, which looks at instrumental roles of education being just economic, the capability approach includes non-economic and constitutive role of education too. Moreover, scholars namely Sen and Nussbaum argue for capability approach and suggest that it potentially bridges the gaps left out by other approaches to education. They claim that this approach to education is bottom-up, which, aims to address issues of equality, distributive justice, well-being and freedom of each member of society. The approach is also free of being culturally and traditionally rooted like the case of criticisms of human capital and human rights-based approach.

The human capital and rights-based approach to education disconnects from human development as it has less connection to the ‘human-ness’ that capability offers (Sen, 2006). This implies that there should not be a problem if an individual is productive as well as well educated and have a healthy life. Similarly, rights-based approach seems to be distinct from capability approach on the ground of universality but aims to have same objective of social justice. However, today the policies for any country should be such that it aims for the well-being and freedom of all citizens where ever economic productivity is taken into account but this should contribute to social change for human development.

Conclusion

This paper discusses three dominant approaches to technical and vocational education and training. It suggests that all three approaches are important but human capability approach is comparatively better. The central arguments offered are that human capital approach to TVET focuses on economic productivity, whereas, human rights-based approach extends to include universal rights, entitlements and inclusion. However, capability approach extends even further to focus on individuals, their communities and offers multidimensional perspectives on TVET. In doing so, this approach links TVET to development in general and human development in particular. Capability approach to TVET implies improvement in the lives of people so that TVET be developmental, and, contributes to enhancement of well-being of concerned population.

Nevertheless, it is difficult to suggest that TVET has a direct positive impact on the overall well-being of people and their capabilities. There are certainly other contextual factors that implicate on impact of TVET on development in general and human development in particular. The diverging impact on the lives of people, depends on the chosen type and program of TVET, the selectivity of TVET programs, other broader developmental context in which TVET sector stands and the approach chosen to design the implementation of TVET. Hence, links between TVET and human development, fundamentally, are heterogeneous in nature.

References

- Fägerlind, I., & Saha, L. J. (2016). *Education and national development: A comparative perspective*. Elsevier.
- Fox, L., Senbet, L.W., & Simbanegain, W. (2016). Youth employment in Sub-Saharan Africa: challenges, constraints and opportunities. *Journal of African Economics*, 25, i3-i15.
- International Labour Organization (2016). *World employment social outlook: trends for Youth*

2016. Geneva: International Labour Organization.
- King, K., & Palmer, R. (2011). New trends in international cooperation. *Background paper for the World Report on Technical and Vocational Education Training*.
- Katusiime, D. (2014). An enhanced human development capability approach to education: implication for technical vocational education and training policy in Uganda. (Doctoral dissertation, Kent State University).
- Kochetkova, A. (2006). The formation of human capital: the systemic conceptual approach, *Russian Education and Society*, 48(2), 5-16.
- Manion, C., & Menashy, F. (2012). The prospects and challenges of reforming the World Bank's approach to gender and education: Exploring the value of the capacity policy model in the Gambia. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, 14(2), 214-240.
- McGrath, S. (2012). Vocational education and training for development: A policy in need of a theory? *International Journal of Educational Development*, 32(5), 623-631.
- Noddings, N. (2003). *Happiness and education*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2009). Creating capabilities: The human development approach and its implementation. *Hypatia*, 24(3), 211-215.
- Nussbaum, M. (2003). Capabilities as Fundamental Entitlements: Sen and Social Justice *Feminine Economics*, 9 (2-3), (2003): 37.
- Robeyns, I. (2006). Three models of education: Rights, capabilities and human capital. *School Field*, 4(1), 69-84.
- Sachiko, T. (2012). Human rights education in Japan: an historical account, characteristics and suggestions for a better-balanced approach. *Cambridge Journal of Education* 42(1), 83-96.
- Sachs, J.D. (2015). *The age of sustainable development*. Columbia University Press.
- Schultz, W. T. (1988). Nobel Prize address: the economics of being Poor. *Journal of Political Economy* 88(4), 639- 652.
- Sen, A. (1997). Human capital and human capabilities. *World development* 25(12), 1959-1960
- Sen, A. (1998). *Development as Freedom*. New York: Anchor Books, 1999:3.
- Sen, A. (2005). Human rights and capabilities. *Journal of Human Development* 6(2), 151-152
- Sen, A. (2006). *Human rights and development, development as a human rights: legal, political and economic dimensions*. Cambridge: Harvard School of Public Health.
- Sen, A. (2009). *The Idea of Justice*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Sungumpta, A. (2006). The human right to development. In B.A. Andreassen & S.P. Marks (Eds) *Development as a Human Right: Legal, political, and economic dimensions* Cambridge: Harvard School of Public Health.
- Sharma, A.S. (2009). Integration of Technical Vocational Education and Training in General Education at School Level. *Journal of Training and Development* 1(1), 23-36.
- Tikly, L. (2013). Reconceptualizing TVET and development: a human capability and social justice approach. *Revisiting global trends in TVET: Reflections on theory and practice*, 1-39
- United Nations (1948). *The 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights*.
- UNESCO & UNICEF (2001). *A Human Rights Based Approach to Education for all*. New York:

UNICEF.

Unterhalter, E. & Brighouse, H. (2007). Distribution for what a social justice in education? The case of education for all by 2015. In M. Wlaker & E. Unterhalter (Eds.), *Amartya Sen's capability approach and social justice in education*. Springer.

Unterhalter, E. (2007). Gender equality, education and the Capability Approach. In *Amartya Sen's capability approach and social justice in education* (pp.87-107). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Unterhalter, E. (2009). Education. In S. Deneulin & L. Shahani (Eds), *an introduction to the human development and capability approach: Freedom and agency*, London: Earthscan, 207-208.

Wang, L. (2012). Social exclusion and education inequality: towards an integrated analytical framework from the urban-rural divide in China. *British journal of Sociology of Education of Education* 33(3), 414-415.