

Constructing Capacities

Constructing Capacities:
Building Capabilities through Learning
and Engagement

Edited by

Patrick Alan Danaher, Linda De George-Walker,
Robyn Henderson, Karl J. Matthews,
Warren Midgley, Karen Noble, Mark A. Tyler
and Catherine H. Arden

CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS

P U B L I S H I N G

Constructing Capacities:
Building Capabilities through Learning and Engagement,
Edited by Patrick Alan Danaher, Linda De George-Walker, Robyn Henderson, Karl J. Matthews,
Warren Midgley, Karen Noble, Mark A. Tyler and Catherine H. Arden

This book first published 2012

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2012 by Patrick Alan Danaher, Linda De George-Walker, Robyn Henderson, Karl J. Matthews, Warren Midgley, Karen Noble, Mark A. Tyler, Catherine H. Arden and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-4179-X, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-4179-5

For all those who strive to construct their own and others' capacities.
And who in doing so help create a more peaceful, sustainable
and transformative world.

“It would be impossible to find a deeper sense of education in discovering and developing personal capacities, and training them so that they would connect with the activities of others.”

—John Dewey, *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*, Macmillan, 1916, chapter 7

“In a nutshell constraints to building capacity point to issues of power (including institutional power), contested values and mixed expectations. These can be hidden by a belief that shared language spoken conveys shared values, understandings of ‘community’ and open agendas. It can often be quite the opposite.”

—Fiona Verity, *Community Capacity Building – A Review of the Literature*, Department of Health, Government of South Australia, 2007, p. 25

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|-----------------------------|------|
| List of Illustrations | x |
| List of Tables | xi |
| Foreword | xii |
| Preface | xiii |
| Acknowledgments | xiv |

Part I. Conceptualising and Contextualising Capacities

| | |
|---|----|
| Introduction | 2 |
| Patrick Alan Danaher | |
| Chapter One..... | 4 |
| Analysing Approaches to Constructing Capacities | |
| Catherine H. Arden, Margaret Baguley, Patrick Alan Danaher, Andrew Davies, Linda De George-Walker, Roderick J. Fogarty, Robyn Henderson, Janice Kathleen Jones, Karl J. Matthews, Peter McIlveen, Brad McLennan, Warren Midgley, Karen Noble, Mark E. Oliver, Karen Peel, Michelle Turner and Mark A. Tyler | |
| Chapter Two | 31 |
| Capacities, Connections, Capital and Capabilities: Considering Bioecological and Electrical Engineering Perspectives | |
| Linda De George-Walker, Karl J Matthews and Patrick Alan Danaher | |
| Chapter Three | 51 |
| What is Capacity-Building and Why Does it Matter? Developing a Model of Workforce Capacity-Building through the Case of Education Commons | |
| Karen Noble and Robyn Henderson | |

| | |
|--|----|
| Chapter Four | 69 |
| A Dialogic Approach to Capacity-Building: An Example from a Study with Saudi Students at an Australian University | |
| Warren Midgley | |

Part II. Constructing Students' and Teachers' Capacities

| | |
|----------------------|----|
| Introduction | 82 |
| Patrick Alan Danaher | |

| | |
|---|----|
| Chapter Five | 84 |
| The Fundamentals of a Potentiating Learning Milieu: Expanding Capacity for Student Internalisation and Self-Regulated Learning | |
| Brad McLennan and Karen Peel | |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Chapter Six | 107 |
| Creating Capacities: Teachers' Perceptions of Professional Development and the Role of the University | |
| Margaret Baguley and Martin Kerby | |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Chapter Seven..... | 124 |
| Where Have All the Students Gone? Developing Capacity and Competence in Online Teaching and Learning | |
| Roderick J. Fogarty | |

Part III. Constructing Workers' Capacities

| | |
|--------------------|-----|
| Introduction | 142 |
| Warren Midgley | |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Chapter Eight..... | 144 |
| Transformative Career Development Learning: Building Capacity for Self-Determination | |
| Peter McIlveen | |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Chapter Nine..... | 160 |
| Creating and Consolidating Capacities among Australian Show People | |
| Patrick Alan Danaher | |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Chapter Ten | 178 |
| Constructing Defence Worker Capacity with Cyber Capability: Learning from Experience Karl J. Matthews | |

Part IV. Constructing Researchers' Capacities

| | |
|--------------------|-----|
| Introduction | 198 |
| Warren Midgley | |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Chapter Eleven | 200 |
| Constructing Capacity through Knowledge Management Practice: A Research Team Case Study Karl J. Matthews | |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Chapter Twelve | 218 |
| Weaving the Threads of Time: Narrative Methods in Participatory Research Janice Kathleen Jones | |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Chapter Thirteen | 240 |
| Building Capacity for Collaborative Research: Revisiting a Collaborative Concept Mapping Exercise within the Context of a Research Team Linda De George-Walker and Mark A. Tyler | |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Chapter Fourteen | 256 |
| Evaluating Our Research Team's First Three Years to Identify Broader Strategies for Effective and Sustainable Capacity Constructions Mark A. Tyler, Michelle Turner, Karen Peel, Mark E. Oliver, Karen Noble, Warren Midgley, Brad McLennan, Peter McIlveen, Karl J. Matthews, Janice Kathleen Jones, Robyn Henderson, Roderick J. Fogarty, Linda De George-Walker, Andrew Davies, Patrick Alan Danaher, Margaret Baguley and Catherine H. Arden | |

| | |
|-----------------------|-----|
| Epilogue..... | 276 |
| Professor J. G. Maree | |

| | |
|-------------------|-----|
| Contributors..... | 280 |
|-------------------|-----|

| | |
|-------------|-----|
| Index | 285 |
|-------------|-----|

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

| | |
|--|-----|
| 2-1. Bronfenbrenner's bioecological model of human development..... | 35 |
| 2-2. Capacitors connected in a parallel arrangement..... | 39 |
| 2-3. Capacitors connected in a series arrangement..... | 40 |
| 2-4. Corporate organisational chart showing parallel and series connections between humans..... | 41 |
| 3-1. A model of workforce capacity building in context..... | 60 |
| 5-1. A potentiating learning milieu model..... | 97 |
| 8-1. Career development learning as a two-way mirror | 150 |
| 10-1. The CUSSLASHEPT architecture for the defence community..... | 181 |
| 11-1. The CISUS knowledge management architecture..... | 204 |
| 12-1. Theories and themes emerging from the bricolage | 224 |
| 12-2. Time and engagement: Phases of a participatory research study ... | 226 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|---|-----|
| 1-1. Analytical framework for interpreting “capacity-building” | 9 |
| 5-1. Categories of elements and student indicators | 95 |
| 6-1. Participants’ school teaching experiences | 113 |
| 10-1. Documenting a decade of defence community cyber integration implementation | 185 |

FOREWORD

Constructing capacities is at the centre of the work of university faculties of education. Capacity-building is a core element of pre- and in-service teacher education, of research into formal and informal education, and of the multiple forms of service and engagement that education faculties initiate. From this perspective, capacity-building's focus on the acquisition of learning and on the development of the power to act effectively in the world today resonates strongly with many of the challenges and issues facing contemporary society.

The University of Southern Queensland Faculty of Education is committed to capacity-building as an important goal in its own right and also as contributing to its aim of producing global educators for contemporary learning communities. The Faculty's inaugural faculty research centre, the Capacity-Building Research Network (CBRNetwork), is well-placed to play its part in helping to fulfil that aim. Established in July 2011 and growing out of the Capacity-Building, Pedagogy and Social Justice Research Team, CBRNetwork represents one important dimension of a broader set of strategies implemented by the Faculty to develop carefully focused and engaged research activities and outcomes, clustered around our organising theme of global educators for contemporary learning communities.

Constructing capacities: Building capabilities through learning and engagement provides a snapshot of current research about capacity-building as it is experienced across a wide range of educational contexts and settings. It also highlights how complex and diverse capacity-building is as an educational concept and phenomenon. And it demonstrates how effective and powerful capacity-building can be when the constellations are aligned appropriately. I commend the members of CBRNetwork and their co-authors for writing this book, and I wish them well for their future endeavours in conducting and publishing rigorous and useful research on behalf of the Faculty of Education and the University of Southern Queensland.

Professor Nita Temmerman
Dean of the Faculty of Education
University of Southern Queensland

PREFACE

Humans are inherently social animals. Communities are a natural construct that both responds to this need for humans to interact, participate and collaborate, and provides the basis for how the benefits of these social behaviours can be fully realised. However, strong and healthy communities do not happen by accident. As such, the search for ways to secure effective capacity-building is an aspect of human endeavour that is as old as our species itself.

In the contemporary context, successful communities are underpinned by a broad range of services, including in areas such as education, health and community services; extensive infrastructure to support effective communications, transport and leisure; an economy based on wealth generating industries; and effective knowledge and information systems to support the appropriate allocation of resources and forward planning. Even more fundamentally, successful communities require people who are motivated, enthusiastic and engaged; competent and committed local leaders; a clearly articulated and agreed vision for the community; and a robust mechanism for securing that vision in practice.

At its core, community capacity-building is about communities coming together to address issues of local significance and importance. Understanding how these processes work in practice requires an exquisitely complex array of multidisciplinary analyses underpinned by a solid grounding in interpersonal dynamics, group learning and local contexts. It requires investigators to look honestly and objectively at the best and worst aspects of communities to identify what makes them work, what challenges and hurdles they face and how these are overcome and, ultimately, how strong, innovative and resilient communities are built and sustained.

Constructing capacities: Building capabilities through learning and engagement makes a significant contribution to the field of capacity-building by considering a range of concepts, analysis types and contexts within a single frame. As such, it will prove useful as both a reference work and a resource book for academics, students, community service professionals, policy-makers and others interested in the dynamics of communities.

**Professor Jan Thomas
Vice-Chancellor and President
University of Southern Queensland**

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The editors and authors are very grateful to the following individuals, without whom this book would not have been published:

- Ms Carol Koulikourdi, Ms Amanda Millar, Dr Andy Nercessian, Ms Emily Surrey and their colleagues at Cambridge Scholars Publishing for being encouraging and facilitative publishers of the book
- The scholars who provided double-blind peer reviews of one or more submitted chapters in the book:
 - Mrs Phyllida Coombes, Independent Scholar, Bundaberg, Australia
 - Mr Trevor Cooper, Independent Scholar, New South Wales, Australia
 - Dr Mike Danaher, CQUniversity, Rockhampton, Australia
 - Professor Fred Dervin, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland
 - Dr Helen Farley, University of Southern Queensland, Toowoomba, Australia
 - Ms Susan Goodall, University of Southern Queensland, Toowoomba, Australia
 - Professor André Grace, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada
 - Dr Lisa Gunders, Independent Scholar, Brisbane, Australia
 - Ms Jillian Guy-Smith, University of Southern Queensland, Toowoomba, Australia
 - Dr Ian Hardy, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia
 - Associate Professor R. E. (Bobby) Harreveld, CQUniversity, Rockhampton, Australia
 - Associate Professor Mary Keefe, La Trobe University, Bendigo, Australia
 - Ms Sherilyn Lennon, University of Southern Queensland, Toowoomba, Australia
 - Mr Warren Litfin, University of Southern Queensland, Toowoomba, Australia
 - Dr Sarah McDonald, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia
 - Ms Michèle McGill, University of Southern Queensland, Toowoomba, Australia
 - Dr Wendy Madsen, CQUniversity, Bundaberg, Australia
 - Ms Simone Mooketsi, University of Southern Queensland, Toowoomba, Australia

- Dr Richard Niesche, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia
- Ms Catherine O'Mullan, CQUniversity, Bundaberg, Australia
- Dr Shirley Reushle, University of Southern Queensland, Toowoomba, Australia
- Dr Brian Ridge, University of Southern Queensland, Toowoomba, Australia
- Dr Sam Sellar, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia
- Ms Lyn Sherington, Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia
- Dr Donna Velliari, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia
- Dr Craig Willis, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia
- Dr Wenli Wu (Wendy), PolyU Hong Kong Community College, Hong Kong
- Ms Jodie Gunders and Ms Joanne Keleher for managing the project and typesetting the manuscript with consummate skill and timely efficiency
- Professor Nita Temmerman for writing the Foreword
- Professor Jan Thomas for writing the Preface
- Professor Kobus Maree for writing the Epilogue
- Our colleagues in the University of Southern Queensland Faculty of Education, particularly our Dean, Professor Nita Temmerman, for continuing support for and encouragement of the Capacity-Building Research Network (CBRNetwork) Faculty Research Centre, and their counterparts at CQUniversity and Griffith University where CBRNetwork adjunct members are located
- Our families and friends for their invaluable love and interest

PART I:

**CONCEPTUALISING AND CONTEXTUALISING
CAPACITIES**

PART I INTRODUCTION

PATRICK ALAN DANAHER

A crucial element of seeking to contribute new understandings to the complex field of scholarship focused on constructing capacities is the simultaneous articulation of multiple approaches to conceptualising and contextualising those capacities. That simultaneity is vital: it helps to anchor potentially esoteric theoretical insights in experientially bounded and grounded phenomena and situations, and it also assists in highlighting the broader connections and implications of otherwise individualised and solipsistic perceptions. The multiplicity of these approaches is also significant: capacities are constructed and capabilities are built for and through learning and engagement in a sometimes bewildering array of circumstances and conditions that eschew unidimensional analysis and evade superficial description. It is therefore important to set down some conceptual and contextual markers in the four chapters constituting this first part of the book that are elaborated in subsequent parts and chapters.

In Chapter One, all 17 current members of the Capacity-Building Research Network Faculty Research Centre, located in the Faculty of Education at the University of Southern Queensland, Australia, contribute to the process of identifying and analysing a number of contemporary approaches to constructing capacities. Employing a method facilitated by first-named chapter author Catherine H. Arden, each author was asked to write a brief text outlining what capacities are and how they are constructed from the respective perspective of her or his principal research paradigm/s, discipline/s, method/s and/or content area/s. The chapter presents a provisional synthesis of these texts as a snapshot of selected contemporary scholarship related to constructing capacities.

Chapter Two, written by Linda De George-Walker, Karl J. Matthews and Patrick Alan Danaher, analyses the theoretical and empirical intersections among capacities, connections, capital and capabilities as one approach to conceptualising and contextualising capacities. Specifically, they provide detailed accounts of bioecological and electrical engineering perspectives on capacity-building, then elicit the convergences and divergences between those models to highlight both the commonalities and the diversity reflected in multiple understandings of building capabilities in particular contexts.

At the same time, the authors caution that multidisciplinary syntheses of perspectives need to be thought through carefully for what they can reveal that is new about how capacities can—and perhaps should—be built in varied circumstances and situations.

Karen Noble and Robyn Henderson use Chapter Three to outline a different model of capacity-building, one centred on workforce readiness and the development of teachers' professional development. The model is framed through Education Commons, an innovative approach to induction into the teaching profession from the outset of pre-service teacher education programs. Assisted by a four-step model of critical reflection, the authors articulate five key themes related to workforce capacity-building drawn from extensive sets of interview data with participants and linked with the broader conceptualisation and contextualisation of capacity-building: choice; interactions and relationships; belonging and connectedness; a personal dimension; and a professional dimension.

Finally in Part One, Chapter Four, written by Warren Midgley, mobilises the Bakhtinian conceptual lens of dialogic engagement and the concept of unfinalisability to present another account of the conceptualisation and contextualisation of capacity-building. The site of that account is the author's research into experiences of Saudi students at an Australian university, and the chapter's focus is on a particular ethical-methodological dilemma that the author encountered in conducting and reporting the research. The chapter concludes by explaining how a provisional definition of capacity-building stated at the chapter's outset is insufficient to explain the complexity and richness of the issues generated by the dilemma, thereby explicating a major proposition of the book as a whole.

CHAPTER ONE

ANALYSING APPROACHES TO CONSTRUCTING CAPACITIES

CATHERINE H. ARDEN, MARGARET BAGULEY,
PATRICK ALAN DANAHER, ANDREW DAVIES,
LINDA DE GEORGE-WALKER, RODERICK J. FOGARTY,
ROBYN HENDERSON, JANICE KATHLEEN JONES,
KARL J. MATTHEWS, PETER MCILVEEN, BRAD MCLENNAN,
WARREN MIDGLEY, KAREN NOBLE, MARK E. OLIVER,
KAREN PEEL, MICHELLE TURNER AND MARK A. TYLER

Abstract

If effective ways of constructing capacities are to be understood, several means of identifying and assessing multiple approaches to conceptualising and contextualising such capacities need to be developed. This chapter explores and evaluates some of those approaches, adopting an eclectic and culturally diverse approach that considers each approach simultaneously from the perspectives of its proponents among the chapter authors and of scholars researching in one or more fields informing capacity constructions. Thus the chapter uses an analytical research framework, drawing on the principles of hermeneutics, whereby authors' individual analyses are interpreted and synthesised against the backdrop of identified contemporary literature. Based on the application of this framework, the authors elicit several elements that appear to be commonly accepted aspects of capacity-building, while acknowledging some areas of disagreement about defining and theorising capacities.

Introduction

In this book, *Constructing capacities: Building capabilities through learning and engagement*, the editors and authors are seeking to fulfil a

number of goals simultaneously. Firstly, the book constitutes a snapshot of the individual and collective understandings of capacities and capacity-building held by the current members of the Capacity-Building Research Network (CBRNetwork), which was established in July 2011 and which at the time of writing was the inaugural faculty research centre in the Faculty of Education at the University of Southern Queensland, Australia. When the book was conceptualised, CBRNetwork had 17 full, adjunct and affiliate members, all of whom have contributed to writing this chapter and a number of the following chapters. Inevitably 17 academics and researchers have multiple, multifaceted and sometimes competing views of what capacities are and of why, how, by and with whom, when, where and with what effects and effectiveness those capacities are constructed. We see these areas of convergence and divergence as usefully encapsulating equivalent wider diversity in the fields of scholarship that work with notions of capacity-building. We see them also as composing a hoped for breadth and depth of engagement with those fields of scholarship that might—in concert with other scholars operating in the same intellectual space—help to add some kind of richness and strength to the existing literature.

Secondly and relatedly, the book takes up some of the debates and ideas presented, necessarily provisionally and selectively, in its forerunner, *Sustaining Synergies: Collaborative Research and Researching Collaboration* (Arden, Danaher, De George-Walker, Henderson, Midgley, Noble, & Tyler, 2010). The earlier text was the work of seven of the 17 authors of this book, who constituted the Capacity-Building, Pedagogy and Social Justice Research Team (CBPSJ), also established (in March 2009) in the Faculty of Education at the University of Southern Queensland, Australia, and the predecessor of the CBRNetwork. This book therefore affords an opportunity for revising some of those earlier propositions, particularly about research that is focused on capacity-building and that is also concerned with using research findings to enhance the capabilities of research participants. It also provides a framework of dialogue between the seven original members of CPBSJ and the 17 members of the CBRNetwork. We seek to extend that dialogue, both among ourselves and with other researchers nationally and internationally, in future publications of this kind.

Thirdly, and extending from the final sentence in the previous paragraph, we see this book as operating simultaneously at a number of levels. One of those levels is national and international: we seek to locate our individual and collective work in the broader landscape of contemporary scholarship across a wide range of disciplines and paradigms, principally in

education research but also encompassing other domains such as cultural studies, educational psychology and the sociology of education. From that perspective, we aspire to expand our understandings of capacity-building as they are enacted and exemplified in a diversity of scholarly areas. On a different level and from a separate perspective, our view is more personal: we are interested in how engaging with such diverse fields of literature can augment our understandings of one another and ourselves, and of how groups of researchers can coalesce in research centres and teams in ways that are effective, efficient and equitable—not necessarily an easy task given the competitiveness, the complexity and the challenges of the current university landscape in Australia as well as overseas.

This chapter fuses those dual perspectives. In it, the CBRNetwork members identify a number of contemporary approaches to conceptualising, contextualising and constructing capacities with which they are familiar individually, and also present a preliminary analysis of the commonalities and potential contradictions among those approaches. In this way, the chapter authors are applying a hermeneutical research design in an attempt to illuminate the concepts of ‘capacity’ and ‘capacity-building’ via a focused examination of texts constructed by the authors. In so doing, we aim to engage the reader in our hermeneutic project, which—borrowing a metaphor from Heywood and Stronach (2005)—can be described as: “A circle rather than an arrow, moving from the detailed to the general, the local to the global in a series of trials of understanding, circling the business of knowing in a series of refining, rather than defining, approximations” (p. 116).

The chapter therefore consists of the following three sections:

- Situating capacity constructions in broader fields of scholarship
- The authors’ separate analyses of what ‘capacity’ and ‘capacity-building’ mean to them
- A provisional synthesis of those analyses.

We begin with an initial snapshot of the concept of capacity-building that situates the chapter within a wider, multidisciplinary body of scholarship.

Situating Capacity Constructions in Broader Fields of Scholarship

As a point of departure for situating constructions of capacity and capacity-building in broader fields of scholarship, capacity-building, when viewed through a Weberian lens, can be seen to constitute “meaningful

social action with a purpose” (Neuman, 1997, p. 68), and as such can be considered a project worthy of the attention of social researchers. Certainly the rationale for this book, and the *modus operandi* of the editors’ and authors’ separate and shared research projects reported in the following chapters, are animated by the conviction that diverse understandings of capacities and their constructions encapsulate broader debates about learning, engagement and other sites of capability-building within and across specific social contexts, and that it behoves researchers to contribute to those broader debates through their individual and combined research projects.

In a review of perspectives related to capacity-building distilled from current literature in a number of disciplines, Jolly and Jolly (2011) identified three broad fields of praxis in whose scholarship the concept of capacity-building was explicitly defined and analysed: (1) Aid and development; (2) Public management/social policy; and (3) Health policy and planning. In this scholarship, capacity-building is largely viewed as a particular approach to *social work*—in the sense of “meaningful social action with a purpose” (Neuman, 1997, p. 68)—informed by a number of related ideological positions (such as social justice, self-improvement, managing change, inclusion, participation, partnership, empowerment and social sustainability), but often without “clear theoretical foundation” (Jolly & Jolly, 2011, p. 6).

Looking more widely, it is possible to make connections between capacity-building and a number of macro-, meso- and micro-level social theories such as social capital theory (Bourdieu, 1986; Putnam, 2000), structuration theory (Giddens, 1984), community capital theory (Adams, 2005) and what Williamson (1998) refers to as the “sociology of lifelong learning” (p. 17). Much of the literature dealing with the concept of capacity-building focuses on the meso level of community, defined in a number of ways (including culturally, geographically and virtually), identifying a range of definitions, types, levels and domains of action targeted at building community ‘capacity’, ‘capital’, ‘capability’ and ‘resilience’ (see for example Adams, 2005; Shaver & Tudball, 2001; Verity, 2007; Williamson, 1998). The increasingly significant role played by information and communication technologies (ICTs) as both driver and enabler of capacity-building for individuals, organisations and communities is also acknowledged in the literature, and has seen the emergence of new fields of scholarship such as Community Informatics (Gurstein, 1999) and new theorising and philosophising about the character of learning itself (see for example Hase & Kenyon, 2007; Siemens, 2005).

Importantly, providing a timely contrast to what might appear to be a somewhat “celebratory account” (Groundwater-Smith & Mockler, 2007, p. 20) of capacity-building, there emerges strongly from the literature a critical perspective that views the discourse of capacity-building as jargonistic and paternalistic and as reinforcing existing power imbalances, thereby serving what Dewey would have called utilitarian ends (see for example Black, 2003; Labonte & Laverack, 2001; Mowbray, 2004, 2005; Williamson, 1998). This is something of which the members of CBRNetwork have been aware from the outset of the group’s formation: the need to mobilise the productive and useful elements of capacity-building as a number of concepts and associated explanatory theories while eschewing the “celebratory account[s]” (Groundwater-Smith & Mockler, 2007, p. 20) that can readily arise from them. This approach seeks partly to straddle, or at least to travel across, the three separate types of capacity-building scholarship—in this case related to communities—identified by Verity (2007): “. . . literature written for those intent on building community capacity, literature exploring how the notion is understood and explained, and literature that critically analyses the intentions and practice” (p. 5).

What is exciting about the project that is the focus of this chapter—and of the book as a whole—is the anticipated richness of the conceptual resources—and the valuable contribution to our understandings of the concepts of capacities and capacity-building—that will potentially emerge. Based on the above selective review of the capacity-building literature, the following analytical framework presented in Table 1-1 is proposed as a starting point for interpreting the multiple articulations of capacity-building outlined in the next section of the chapter. The framework links organising questions that are (or should be) posed when researching capacity-building and associated theoretical perspectives that are often evident in publications drawing on those questions and perspectives.

Table 1-1: Analytical framework for interpreting “capacity-building”

| Question | Theoretical Perspectives |
|--|---|
| Why should we study capacity-building? | Philosophical, epistemological and teleological questions |
| What do we mean by “capacity”? Capacity for/to do what? | Ontological and epistemological questions |
| Who is doing the “building”? Who is having their capacity built? | Critical theory Macro, meso, micro (social theory) |
| To what end? | Teleological question |
| By what means? | Approach/Method |
| Whose needs and interests? | Critical theory Axiological question |

Individual Analyses of Capacity Constructions

CBRNetwork members were asked to write individually a relatively brief response to the following stimulus question: “How is the concept of ‘capacity-building’ reflected/represented in your main field/s of scholarly interest?” Their separate responses are presented in this section of the chapter, and a provisional synthesis of those responses appears in the next section.

Adult and Vocational Education, Lifelong Learning and Capacity-Building

In the fields of adult and vocational education and lifelong learning, the concept of *capacity-building* is reflected in diverse ways. In the lifelong learning literature, for example, the importance of individual agency in a democratic, civil society is emphasised, focusing on the “capacity of people to engage creatively and critically with the decisions which shape their lives” (Williamson, 1998, p. 31). Here capacity-building is about creating the conditions under which all citizens can be empowered to “acquire the skills they need continually” to become “active and effective agents of their own fate” (Williamson, 1998, p. 49). This understanding of capacity-building resonates with concepts of lifelong learning articulated in the 1996 Delors Report (Delors, 1996) and in Amartya Sen’s capabilities approach to human development, where education can play a role in “broadening human capability” as well as building human capital (Saito, 2003, p. 24).

In the literature on informal and non-formal learning in community and workplace settings, the terms *capacity-building* and *capability development* are explicitly used to refer to strategies and processes of individual and collective development and empowerment through people's active engagement in learning and collaborative creation and sharing of knowledge, with a view to enacting desired change at community, organisational and individual levels (see for example Hickman, 1998; Verity, 2007), and with an emphasis on building social and community forms of capital (Adams, 2005; Faris, 2005). The increasingly significant influence of emerging ICTs is reflected in an emphasis on the promotion of diverse literacies, generic skills, competencies and attributes at the individual level, as described by Hase and Kenyon (2007), and on learning networks, ecologies and communities at the organisational and community levels (Caroll, 2009).

Understandings of capacity-building reflected in the literature, policies and practices of vocational education and training and workforce development have traditionally focused on the capacity of individuals to perform effectively in job roles—referred to as “competence” specified within skills and competency frameworks (Eraut, 1994), and developed and recognised through highly regulated education, training and workforce development programs and strategies designed to support economic growth and productivity. Criticised by some for its narrow and reductionist approach, this conceptualisation of vocational competency has been contrasted with a more holistic and futures-focused concept of capability that is seen to be a more appropriate approach to conceptualising and building workforce capacity (Hase & Davis, 1999). **(Catherine H. Arden)**

Arts Education and Capacity-Building

Daniel Pink in *A Whole New Mind* (2005) proposed that society is moving from the “knowledge economy” to the “conceptual age” and noted that fundamental to operating in this society successfully will be the concept of creativity. This concept was explored further by Davis (2008) in Australia’s National Review of Visual Education. She argued that the current global shift of communication to the visual requires educators to build the capacity of students in relation to skills that would enable them to “create, process, critique and appreciate the spectrum of visual phenomena in the individual’s external and internal environment” (p. 11). The review also proposed that “the curriculum stalwarts of literacy and numeracy are no longer sufficient to equip students with the basics they

need to operate in the innovation oriented, digitally wired twenty-first century” (Davis, 2008, p. 10).

Many educators have advocated the value of arts-based pedagogies, multiple ways of knowing and multiple intelligences (Bamford, 2006; Eisner, 2002; Gardner, 1993; Wright, 2003). As Davis (2008) notes, high level creativity is “becoming an essential skill for students to cultivate in an increasingly competitive contemporary society” (p. 162). This is supported by Oakley (2007), who comments in her report, *Educating for the creative workforce: Rethinking arts and education*, that, if creativity and innovation are now of more importance in the workplace, “then there is clear evidence that arts education and creative practice have a particular role in developing these attributes” (p. 42).

As an arts educator, I seek to enhance both individual and collective capacity by creating supportive environments in which participants are able to take risks and to build upon their skills and expertise. Through reflective practice I also constantly assess the effectiveness of my approach in order to build my capacity in a context that values originality, creativity, resilience and lateral thinking. (Margaret Baguley)

Capacity-Building among Mobile and (Sometimes) Marginalised Communities

Among its other applications, capacity-building highlights the culturally mediated and politically constituted elements of contemporary social life. It does this by drawing researchers’ attention to specific current contexts and practices that are variously valued and valenced, some much more positively than others. This situation in turn raises questions about access and equity, power and social justice in relation to such issues as educational policy-making and provision.

A striking illustration of this politicised dimension of what capacities are and how they are constructed is provided by different types of mobile communities who regularly travel from place to place for reasons of occupation and/or lifestyle. Groups like defence force personnel are generally praised for their work. By contrast, itinerant workers such as fairground or show and circus people and Gypsy Travellers or Roma have experienced generations of mistrust and marginalisation because their mobilities have been negatively valenced.

Regardless of how valued or otherwise particular mobile communities are, they highlight what is also evident in other groups: a distinction—and sometimes a disjuncture—between those capacities that the formal education system is designed to develop and those capacities that are

acquired, sometimes implicitly and intrinsically, in situ within the distinctive contexts in which the members of those communities live their lives. Thus mobile and (sometimes) marginalised communities accentuate the politicised and situated character of capacities and capacity constructions. **(Patrick Alan Danaher)**

The Yoga Community and Notions of Capacity-Building

Education is not a static, known quantity, but rather a growing, dynamic arena of testing, trialling, imagining, conceptualising. Similarly, the notion of capacity-building is a broadly discussed, multidisciplinary concept that is adapted, reconsidered and reconceptualised to aid the understandings of groups, industries and organisations. The very act of reconceiving and positioning a new educational notion or field of scholarship provides opportunities for education researchers to deepen their understandings of their specialisations.

The new educational field of research in this case is Yoga and its pedagogical practices that are required to enact its many aspects. The Yoga community is at once a conceptual understanding and a marketable, physical presence in the spiritual wellness industry. Yoga teaching and Yoga teacher training, which help to form and inform this community, are both very new representations of adult and lifelong educational practices where currently scant pedagogical research exists. Utilising a lens such as capacity-building to explore and consider current understandings of Yoga, its community, Yoga teaching and Yoga teacher training affords me the privilege of burrowing more deeply within my educational specialisation. Employing this reflective potential of capacity-building facilitates the evolution of more ways of knowing and understanding Yoga and its community. **(Andrew Davies)**

Teacher Self-Efficacy Research and Capacity-Building

Teacher self-efficacy, or “the teacher’s belief in his or her capability to organise and execute courses of action required to successfully accomplish a specific teaching task in a particular context” (Tschannen Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998, p. 233), has consistently been found to be associated with positive teacher attitudes, effective teacher performance and improved student learning (Henson, 2001). Four key sources or antecedents of efficacy have been proposed: enactive mastery experiences (previous accomplishments); vicarious experiences (observed or modelled experiences); verbal persuasion (verbal or social feedback associated with

experience); and physiological and emotional states associated with experience (Bandura, 1977a, 1977b, 1997; Tschannen Moran, et al., 1998). It is not the information from the four sources of efficacy per se that influences teachers' self-efficacy development, but rather the cognitive processing and appraisal of these sources in light of the requirements of a particular teaching task or context.

Theories and models of teacher self-efficacy, and in particular the sources of efficacy, have implications for teacher capacity-building in that the effectiveness of teacher education and professional development might be maximised if the mechanisms associated with the sources of efficacy information were exploited. This could mean, for example, incorporating opportunities for in situ mastery experiences and in-depth feedback processes and mentoring as part of in-service teacher professional development, rather than reserving such practices for initial pre-service teacher education. In the specific area of developing teacher capacity to support the mental wellbeing of students, Rowling (2009) asserts that effective training should include opportunities for: teacher reflection on experience and practice; teacher peer-to-peer interaction and discussion; and teacher self-awareness of emotional responses to mental health related topics—all features that align well with the mechanisms associated with enactive mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological and emotional states. **(Linda De George-Walker)**

Online Learning and Teaching Environments and Capacity-Building

If one thinks of capacity in purely mathematical terms, it means the total amount that a vessel can hold—its volume. The container is capable of holding less than its full capacity but, unless one does something to the container to add to its dimensions, the maximum capacity remains fixed. My current research explores the development of academics' competencies, capabilities and capacities as they move away from a familiar teaching paradigm of face-to-face, synchronous teaching to an unfamiliar one of asynchronous, online learning environments. Initially individuals feel that their capabilities, and therefore their capacity in and for online learning, are limited. However, over time, within a supportive mentoring environment, this attitude changes to one of realising or surpassing expectations of one's abilities, skills and capabilities. As a critically reflective practitioner, I feel that as an educator my skills, knowledge and practice will never truly reach full capacity; that is, there is always something new to learn and improve. Capacity-building is therefore about

not only filling the vessel but also allowing the vessel to realise its potential to grow, change and exceed its own self-limiting expectations as technologies change the ways that university academics go about the business of developing and delivering teaching and learning to contemporary learners. **(Roderick J. Fogarty)**

Literacies, Teachers and Capacity-Building

Capacity-building is an important element of teacher education, particularly in relation to the preparation of literacy teachers. Literacy education is a rapidly changing and evolving field and ongoing technological change has impacted on the literacies and literacy practices that we use on a daily basis. Increasing opportunities for social networking and sharing information have accompanied changes to how we communicate and express ourselves (Johnson, Smith, Willis, Levine & Haywood, 2011). Being able to cope with multiple modalities and associate elements of design—not just linguistic, but also visual, audio, gestural, spatial and tactile (Cloonan, 2012; The New London Group, 1996)—and to shift from one form of literacy to another are important skills, as is the ability to accommodate emerging, new and hybrid forms of text. The conventions of print literacy, while still important, are not a sufficient basis for being literate in today's world.

As a result, it is vital that future literacy teachers develop flexible repertoires of knowledges and strategies. This means being flexible in several senses: to be able to use and move across a wide range of literacies, to be able to engage in evolving and new literacies and literacy practices, and to be able to teach students how to be literate, regardless of the literacies encountered. In these respects, the role of teacher educators is to ensure that future teachers develop these capacities—to build their capacity to know, use and teach a wide range of literacies. Capacity-building, then, is 'bread and butter' work of teacher educators and future teachers in the literacy field. **(Robyn Henderson)**

Arts Education, Community-Engaged Practice and Capacity-Building

Teacher education calls for university lecturers and the pre-service teachers with whom they work to enact socially just, community-focused and theoretically informed practices in ways that Kemmis and McTaggart (2005) describe as driving agency in both “system and lifeworld” (p. 595) for self and others. Researchers in their roles as teacher educators may use