After 2015: ‘3D Human Wellbeing’

‘3D Human Wellbeing’ is emerging as a complement to the more traditional and material ways of conceptualising and measuring poverty and deprivation such as those implicit in the MDGs. But human wellbeing is not simply a new banner. It stands at the heart of the argument for a more human-centred approach to development and helps us to rethink indicators and policies for pro-poor policy.

What is ‘3D human wellbeing’?

Wellbeing arises from a combination of:
- what a person has
- what a person can do with what they have
- and how they think about what they have and can do.
It involves the interplay of:
- the resources that a person is able to command
- what they are able to achieve with those resources and what needs and goals they are able to meet
- the meaning that they give to the goals they achieve and the processes in which they engage.


What does refocusing development on 3D human wellbeing offer for pro-poor policy and practice?

Refocusing development on 3D human wellbeing offers critical ways of reflecting on the adequacy of our currently accepted wisdom concerning how we think about and do development.

There is much nervousness about a policy focus on human wellbeing. It is argued by some that wellbeing is too personal for public policy. Others point out how complicated the concept of wellbeing is and that this makes it difficult to work with. It is increasingly recognised that we need more complex understandings of human development, yet policy and practice is struggling to find ways to cope with this observation. A 3D human wellbeing focus represents a coherent way of framing this complexity so that it is more amenable for policy thinking.

This means that we must work to develop indicators of each dimension and find ways of integrating these into development policy design and into monitoring and evaluations systems. The
We need more complex understandings of human development, yet policy and practice are struggling to find ways to cope with this observation.

Indicators that flow from a 3D definition differ from those that currently dominate development practice. Income-based and even human development indicators deal primarily with material and objectively observable (or reportable) dimensions of human wellbeing. Here we require a combination of ‘needs satisfaction indicators’, ‘human agency indicators’ and ‘quality of life indicators’ (see Gough and McGregor, 2007).

Using the 3D wellbeing framework we can construct a simple matrix to illustrate the types of analysis and policy choice when considering the combinations of personal ‘capabilities’ and societal ‘conditions’ interventions that the focus on human wellbeing requires (see Table 1, above). For example, a focus on improving the material wellbeing of sections of the population may involve the establishment of a credit programme but must also consider whether market reforms are necessary to ensure that any credit received is not immediately eroded by unfair market conditions in which poor people might operate.

Equally, however, the approach encourages us to consider whether such efforts to improve the material dimensions of wellbeing must be accompanied by actions in relation to the other two dimensions in order to have overall effect on human wellbeing outcomes.

Post-2015 development policy should continue in its emphasis on material wellbeing but place this in its proper three-dimensional human wellbeing context. More attention is needed to the subjective and relational domains of human wellbeing and particularly to how these relate in the spheres of human values, relationships, norms and behaviours.

Table 1: Interventions for 3D Human Wellbeing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Intervention</th>
<th>Material Dimensions of Wellbeing</th>
<th>Relational Dimensions of Wellbeing</th>
<th>Subjective Dimensions of Wellbeing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capabilities</td>
<td>Asset transfer schemes; credit and savings schemes (e.g. MDG 1)</td>
<td>Human and skills development schemes; Empowerment programmes (e.g. MDG 2)</td>
<td>The social and cultural dimensions of education programmes (e.g. MDGs 2, 3, 5, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions</td>
<td>Land reform; The regulation of markets (e.g. monopoly regulation, moneylending, trading weights and measures)</td>
<td>Legal reform; Rights-based approaches; Governance reforms</td>
<td>Societal campaigns for social and cultural reform (e.g. dowry campaign)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Credits

This In Focus Policy Briefing was written by J. Allister McGregor and Andy Sumner from the Vulnerability and Poverty Reduction Team at IDS. The series editor is Clare Gorman. For other briefs on the crisis see: www.ids.ac.uk/go/infocus9

This In Focus Policy Briefing series has been funded by the UK Department for International Development (DFID). This briefing does not necessarily reflect the position of DFID.

Readers are encouraged to quote and reproduce material from issues of In Focus Policy Briefing in their own publications. In return, IDS requests due acknowledgement and a copy of the publication.

© Institute of Development Studies, 2009, ISSN 1479-974X

Further reading

OECD Measuring the Progress of Societies, see www.oecd.org/progess