

Erik Jansen, Maurice Magnée, Jan Pieter Teunisse and
Niels Zwikker

Capabilities, Technology and the Social World

Challenges and Opportunities for Social Workers and Social
Work Education

Ressourcen, Technologie und Soziale Welten

Herausforderungen und Chancen für die Soziale Arbeit

Der Artikel widmet sich den sozialen Konsequenzen neuer Technologien und entwickelt eine Perspektive auf die sich verändernden Rollen und Verantwortlichkeiten der Sozialen Arbeit. Wenngleich neue Technologien positive Wirkungen für das soziale und gesundheitliche Wohlergehen der Menschen intendieren, können unbeabsichtigt nachteilige Konsequenzen die Folge sein. Die Autoren nutzen den „Capability Approach“ als normativen Rahmen, um die Effekte, die durch den Einsatz neuer Technologien in den Handlungsfeldern der Sozialen Arbeit wirksam werden, beurteilen zu können. Zur weiteren Operationalisierung dieses Ansatzes greifen die Autoren auf die Ethik der Sozialen Arbeit und den Empowerment-Ansatz zurück. Da Kompetenzen in Hinblick auf neue Technologien in der Aus- und Weiterbildung der in der Sozialen Arbeit Berufstätigen aktuell noch wenig bzw. unzureichend ausgearbeitet sind, wird abschließend die Forderung nach einer stärkeren strukturellen Verankerung dieser Kompetenzen im Ausbildungsbereich formuliert.

Starting from a reflection on the social consequences of new technologies this article offers a perspective on the roles and responsibilities of professionals in care and wellbeing regarding technological innovations. Whereas intended consequences of technology are generally beneficial for human wellbeing, unintended consequences may also be harmful. We embrace the Capability Approach as a normative framework for the integral assessment of technology outcome, but acknowledge that it needs further operationalization to concretely guide social interventions. For the social domain we therefore propose social work ethics and empowerment theory as consistent and important directions for further operationalization of the capability framework. As technological competencies are currently underspecified and underemphasized in the training of social professionals, it is argued that they should be embedded in care and wellbeing education more structurally.

1. Introduction: aims and consequences of the application of technology

The purpose of this article is to reflect on the social and psychological consequences of technological innovations for persons in their context, and the

potential roles and responsibilities of social professionals in questions involving the application of these innovations. Whereas technology is generally intended to be beneficial for its users, in practice there may also be unintended and negative outcomes.

Let us start with three examples in which the outcome of technological innovations is ambivalent. The first example concerns an integrated service area in Didam, The Netherlands, in which older people are housed in assisted living homes (De Kam, et al., 2012). The front door of each housing unit was provided with an electronic key system, that could be used by professional carers to allow them to enter clients' homes in case of an emergency. This was expected to increase feelings of health safety by allowing care to be provided instantly and efficiently. However, within months rumours circulated among dwellers regarding theft from people's homes without leaving any break-in traces. Plots of dwellers' narratives strongly suggested the electronic keys as a faulty security system, because home owners themselves could control nor oversee who had obtained access to their homes. Although these stories were hard to verify (no actual reports of theft or burglary were filed), it led to some home owners reportedly taking action to replace the electronic locks with mechanical cylinders of which only they had the keys. Thus, this example shows that the electronic key technology's intended enhancement of health safety had adverse unintended effects on psychological safety and perceived autonomy.

The second example pertains to innovative on-line services such as Uber and AirBnB that tap into new business models for the sharing-economy. Uber acts as an on-line broker of transportation services by providing car owners with persons needing transportation and vice versa (Uber, 2015). AirBnB does something similar as a broker between people offering and those needing hotel accommodation based on private homes (AirBnB, 2015). These on-line services consist of the effective and efficient use of webbased software to connect service providers and service clients, thereby facilitating a transactional contract. However, with Uber the protection of workers' economic and social rights is not secured by the company nor the government, because each deal is considered a private transaction and Uber waives all responsibility for drivers being heavily underpaid even to minimal standards (Persson, 2014). Similarly, with AirBnB safety and other regulations in the tourism sector may not apply, while legality issues arise (Guttentag, 2013). Furthermore, both services shirk costs that professional and traditional businesses have to make to conform to these norms and tend to introduce a race-for-the-bottom in which fundamental rights are not necessarily secured by institutional or government monitoring (Edelman & Luca, 2014).

As a third example, Big Data approaches as convincingly put forward by Pentland (2014) allow for the analysis and behavioural pattern detection in large scale databases of interactions between people, for instance with social media. The strategic use of the information flow analyses of this type may lead to increased productivity and enhanced creative output on a societal level (Pent-

land, 2014). In the same vein, various companies such as Apple and Google announced open-source software frameworks for health researchers to globally gather and share data (Rebaie, 2015; Evans, 2015), both for commercial and non-commercial purposes. However, such an approach induces new tensions between the individual protection of personal privacy and personal freedom and gains on a societal level (Pentland, 2014, p. 177). Although initiatives like these open up new opportunities for care and research, they also raise fundamental questions about data ownership, patient rights and ethical guidelines possibly compromising personal freedoms and human rights. There are no guarantees that non-public data in possession of commercial companies will not be used for money-making to the disadvantage of the consumer.

The examples above exemplify that the rise of new technologies in today's network societies has repercussions for traditional social relations (Castells, 2000). This may be beneficial but it may also create new inequalities between technology users and non-users, for instance based on the degree to which innovations are actually available to some but not to others, either because they are expensive to use, require advanced skills, or go within certain social circles. Although these effects are unintended, rising inequalities are known to hamper economic growth (Berg, Ostry & Zettelmeyer, 2012), threatening the creative and innovative potential of societies (WRR, 2013).

In short, at this point it cannot be unequivocally clear to what extent new technologies promote or hamper wellbeing, social equality and justice. As technological developments are intended to contribute to the facilitation of human potential both for individual wellbeing and for the social quality of our societies, the question is: how can we adequately and critically address such a perspective of human flourishing in a socially healthy society? In this article we contend that social professionals have an important role in assessing the use of technology for the wellbeing of (vulnerable) people. To answer the call, social professionals should adopt an integral framework for evaluating the application of technologies from the perspective of development and flourishing of people in their context and should develop the competency to apply such a framework. Thus, the social professions should address the following main questions: 1) *how does the application of technologies in the care and wellbeing domain contribute to human flourishing* and 2) *what competencies should workers in care and wellbeing acquire to effectively and efficiently apply technology for human flourishing*. In what follows we elaborate on these questions.

2. Capabilities as framework for wellbeing

In order to address the first main question, a broad people-centered perspective that also allows for the assessment of contextual and social factors is needed. The integral conceptual framework of the Capabilities Approach (CA; Sen, 2001; Nussbaum, 2000, 2011; Robeyns, 2005) may provide such a frame. In the CA the assessment of wellbeing, equality or justice as well as the level of

development of persons and groups are operationalized as “*the substantive freedoms – the capabilities – to choose a life one has reason to value*” (Sen, 2001, p. 74). For reasons of clarity, the CA may be summarized with three essential components, without claiming comprehensiveness. The first essential component regards the normative assumption that each individual and the life she values is an end in itself, also referred to as ethic individualism: well-being of the individual person is the primary source of moral concern (Robeyns, 2005). This is related to acknowledging human diversity, because what matters as valuable for one person’s life, can ultimately only be determined by that person and therefore will differ substantially across individuals. Moreover, life contains many facets, most of which will turn out important to us all (for instance bodily health, enjoying social relations, having a productive life) or in the specific account of Nussbaum (2011), consists of ten basic, but specific and essential capabilities. Thus, the CA takes a pluralistic stance in which diversity of valued lives is key.

The second essential component is that the CA distinguishes between the *fundamental freedoms* (or capabilities) of a person to establish the life she values, and the actual realization of those freedoms in practice, referred to as *functionings*. To start with the latter, functionings are the “*various things a person may value doing or being*” (Sen, 1999, p. 75). Capabilities are then defined as “*the alternative combinations of functionings that are feasible for [a person] to achieve*” (Sen, 1999, p. 75). One may be able to do all kinds of different things (e.g. lie about, go biking or read a book), but only actually choose to do one (e.g. write an article). Thus, capabilities make up the total set of realistic possibilities for a given person, providing her with the freedom to choose the preferred ones and thus converting her capabilities into functionings. This makes freedom and personal choice fundamental concepts in the CA (Sen, 1999, p. 38). Moreover, the CA assumes a fundamental distinction between intrinsically valued *ends* and instrumentally valuable *means* to achieve these ends. As capabilities are valued opportunities, they are generally ends in themselves, but they may also facilitate the achievement of other goals, in which case they are to be considered means as well. This is for instance the case with the capability to form social ties: as social animals it is in itself valuable to uphold social relations, but those relations may also form essential channels to receive various kinds of support or resources such as to live a healthy life or participate in political activity.

The third essential component is the acknowledgement that a person’s capabilities may be limited or expanded by different situated variables. This entails three types of factors affecting the conversion of an individual’s capabilities into functionings (Sen, 1999, p. 74; Robeyns, 2005): First, personal conversion factors pertain to individual characteristics such as bodily condition, psychological character or personal disadvantages. Second, environmental conversion factors originate in the physical surroundings of the person, such as climate or housing situation. Third, social structures and social relations also influence the conversion of capabilities into realization of one’s valued life.

All of these conversion factors may influence relations with others directly, but also by way of artefacts or persons that affect social interactions. Technologies, for instance, may sometimes act as conversion factors but also contribute to human wellbeing in more complex ways (Oosterlaken, 2011): its purpose is to increase the reach of human freedoms, by design or by intended outcome, although it is imaginable that a particular technological innovation in practice actually compromises other particular freedoms, as also suggested in the examples above.

Oosterlaken (2011; 2012; 2015) applies the CA to technology and design and proposes that it provides a powerful conceptual framework for technology assessment (Oosterlaken, 2015, p. 9). However, as yet the CA has not been applied as a framework for reasoned action for social professionals. As several social scholars have argued that currently many people, particularly those from vulnerable groups, have trouble keeping up with the pace of technological and other developments in society (Bauman, 2006; Van Ewijk, 2014) such a normative frame is needed more than ever to guide professional action in the social domain. As social professionals have an important role in signaling social inequalities, with the use of technology in modern society and healthcare they should be alert to trace new social inequalities arising from new technologies.

Although the CA provides an overarching framework, it requires domain specific explanatory theories for practical application (Robeyns, 2005; 2006). An example of such a specific account in the social domain is empowerment theory that provides a more specific model for the increase of an individual's realistic choice possibilities in a complex interplay of societal and individual factors, such as power and agency (Boumans, 2012; Van Regenmortel, 2009; Drydyk, 2013), by way of social connections enabling her to take control, become self-conscious and increase participation. In this way, empowerment theory provides mechanisms explaining whether a particular technological innovation enables or disables functioning and helps in expanding capabilities. Furthermore, social theories generally express specific models regarding the capacities of persons to engage in social bonds with other persons, which extends what Nussbaum (2000) views as the capability of *affiliation*: being able to develop social ties is both intrinsically valuable as an instrumental requirement for expanding other human capacities such as enjoying education or working in teams.

Concluding so far, the CA forms a potentially strong framework to evaluate whether and how technological innovations contribute integrally to wellbeing and a socially just society, but it requires further operationalization with more specific social theories. It yields the normative, empirical and technical concepts for a theoretical space in which existing and mainstream social theories may provide specific explanatory mechanisms. In this way the CA provides the means to make technology-associated behaviour of actors in the social, care and wellbeing domains predictable, in light of the ethical and instrumental purposes of the social professions.

3. Technology and social work ethics

A well-functioning society constitutes stable and viable social structures and relations in a healthy democratic climate. Such a climate promotes processes of public reasoning and collective action allowing people to build up social capital (Ahn & Ostrom, 2007). This may be particularly important in network societies in which being able to participate fully and contribute to the collective processes of value creation are essential skills (Kuchinke, 2010). There is evidence that if people are indeed able to participate in economic processes of a nation, these economies perform better in promoting the wellbeing of citizens, and sparking innovation (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012; Sen, 2009; Stiglitz, 2014). Currently, however, technological developments rapidly change interpersonal relations and societal organisation and it can be argued that the effects on social structures are uncertain. Therefore, it is essential to assess the implications of technological innovation for the broader social processes in society. It is at least in part technological skills that enable persons to handle their ever complexifying surroundings, threatened by new inequalities arising between competent and incompetent individuals (Bauman, 2006; Van Ewijk, 2014).

All forms of technology may be viewed as fundamentally social, implying an intrinsic entanglement of social processes and the development of technology, sometimes referred to as socio-technical systems (Ruivenkamp, 2014). This underlines the relevance of technology for social professionals, because it acknowledges technology and technological developments and artefacts as intertwined with social processes. According to Oosterlaken (2011) technological artefacts may gain such roles in human lives, that extend their function as mere instrumental means. Thus, the function of technology may well be analysed in terms of the actor-network theory by Bruno Latour permitting the representation of meaningful relations between and across human and non-human entities (see Kullman & Lee, 2012; Oosterlaken, 2011).

Such an analysis permits the integral evaluation of effects on human capabilities induced by particular technologies. Usually, intended effects of technology are enabling, i.e. they are beneficial for individual development and participation because they expand choice options for individual functioning. However, if the evaluation indicates that implicit or unintended effects of new technology actually create or enlarge inequalities or induce social injustice by restricting realistic choice options, then action should be undertaken to repair or avoid these effects altogether. This type of normative evaluation is in line with a social work ethics of professional life (see Banks, 2010) in that a social professional should do whatever is in her power to counteract such effects.

This brings us to an important role for the social professional, whose core tasks are to foster individual wellbeing and to facilitate social change aimed at social justice (Zavirsek, Rommelspacher & Staub-Bernasconi, 2010). As was argued above, an essential aspect of a vital society is its ability to promote human flour-

ishing and foster human and social capital. Whereas institutions create and safeguard the required conditions at the societal level, social professionals monitor the actual social practices constructed by individual people and their interactions. Furthermore, social and wellbeing professionals at all levels of proficiency are concerned with maintaining and supporting street-level democracy (Spierts & Oostrik, 2014) by empowering citizens and citizen groups to lead the lives they value. Banks (2010) introduces the notion of a social work ethics of professional life in which ethical thinking is integrated in social work practice involving both a more instrumental and procedural case-based ethics (*are my actions according to professional standards?*) and a more integral and moral ethics (*do my actions promote individual autonomy and social justice?*). In line with this, social professionals should constantly reflect on and evaluate the actual realized local practices for arising inequalities. We contend that this applies just as much for practices involving innovative technologies.

In sum, the ethical underpinnings of social professions also apply to the new social practices that develop from technological innovations. This moral ethics of social work practice fits well with the moral basis of the CA, in particular its ethic individualism and its overall concern for social justice.

4. Technological competencies of the social professional

As was already mentioned, technological advances result in intended and unintended effects on wellbeing and the social quality of society. In line with the ethical basis of the social work professions, this requires professionals to expand their competencies for technology assessment. Not only need they be competent in dealing with technologies themselves but they also have to support others in developing technological skills. This boils down to empowering (non-) marginalised individuals and groups in need to participate in 21st century societies. Particularly in network societies care and wellbeing professionals provide indispensable support for marginalised groups to develop their capacities. This is in line with the notion that current societies have become extremely complex and actually require people to function in constant state of interaction and negotiation trying to find their own spot in the world (Van Ewijk, 2014). Thus, technological innovation challenges the competencies of social professionals (and of others) in many different ways.

Applying a CA perspective places emphasis on the redistribution in terms of the realistic opportunities of people to allow them to arrive at the functioning states of their choosing (Sen, 1979). As it was argued above, technology and technological artefacts may or may not be helpful in expanding these opportunities. Based on the rationale delivered so far we contend that the instrumental value of technology in the social domain should not be assessed by concrete problems it solves or issues it addresses, but by its effect on people's realistic opportunities. In other words, social technology assessment should be performed on the level of *capabilities* rather than that of *functionings* (see

also Oosterlaken, 2015). Ideally social professionals should be competent at intervening in both the productive and counterproductive effects of socio-technological innovation.

However, apart from gaining insight in the mechanisms regarding how technologies in the care and wellbeing domain contribute to human flourishing, professionals in care and wellbeing also need to explore ICT and other technologies to cope with the tasks associated with empowering individual citizens and civic groups. As current social work curricula for these professions are barely covering the topic of technology and its effects on social processes and in healthcare, newly trained and working professionals are largely at lag with the extensive fast-paced technological innovations. Moreover, although training for using technology in healthcare and wellbeing (as in eHealth) is starting to develop, technological skills are not structurally embedded in vocational education (Zwicker, Pijnenburg & Van Hattum, in preparation). We therefore expect that the question which competencies workers in care and wellbeing should acquire to effectively and efficiently apply technology for human flourishing will gain momentum in the training of social professionals in the next few years.

Summing up, it may be questioned whether current practices in the social sector adequately facilitate the development of technological abilities both in social work practices and in social work education curricula. On the one hand, this may be due to the virtually nonexistent literature on social work and technology. On the other, what also appears to be lacking is an appropriate operational framework to evaluate the effects of technology in social processes. Such a framework will be an essential tool to guide an ongoing and constructive theoretical and practical discourse on social effects of technological advances and should at least be instrumental in: 1) the contextualized identification of relevant capabilities; 2) a procedure or instrument to evaluate the effects of the technology on those capabilities; and 3) the (identification and development of) adequate competencies of social professionals and clients to apply technology.

5. Conclusion: challenges and opportunities for the social professional

With over 15 years of societal experience with eHealth, ambient assisted living and other technology in (mental) healthcare and the social sector it has now become clear that the use of technology has broad implications for the way people interact and social professionals are connecting to their clients. Communication through online means differs from face to face communication, while relations between professionals and clients change as new tools for assessment, contact and social intervention become available. However in the education of social professionals there appears to be too little attention for the role of technology in social processes. We suspect that this is due to the lack of a widely acknowledged theoretical framework by which social profession-

als connect to the core of their profession: promoting social equality and individual autonomy. Social professionals are confronted with a whole new set of required skills and competencies regarding technology use, many of which are not fully defined. But they should consider it their task to find ways to master them in order to continue to foster human flourishing and social quality in society both for their own and for their clients' sake. We think the CA can provide social professionals with a solid theoretical framework on which researchers and educators can build a foundation to provide social professionals with the competencies required for a technology-driven 21st society. Social work educators should provide future social professionals with the skills, knowledge and instruments necessary. We believe the CA and a firm consciousness of social ethics to be indispensable components for the social professional's task promoting individual wellbeing in a socially just society.

References

- Ahn, Toh-Kyeong, & Ostrom, Elinor (2007). Social capital and collective action. In: Castiglione, Dario, Van Deth, Jan Willem, & Wolleb, Gulielmo (eds.), *Handbook of Social Capital*, Oxford University Press.
- Acemoglu, Daron & Robinson, James (2012). *Why nations fail: the origins of power, prosperity and poverty*. London: Profile Books.
- AirBnB (2015). *How it works*. Downloaded 18 september, 2015, from: https://www.airbnb.com/info/how_it_works.
- Banks, Sarah (2010). From professional ethics to ethics in professional life: Reflections on learning and teaching in social work. In: Zavirsek, Darja, Rommelspacher, Birgit, & Staub-Bernasconi, Silvia (eds.), *Ethical dilemmas in social work: international perspective*, Ljubljana: Faculty of Social Work, University of Ljubljana.
- Bauman, Zygmunt (2006). *Liquid times: Living in an age of uncertainty*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Berg, Andy, Ostry, Jonathan, & Zettelmeyer, Jeromin (2012). What Makes Growth Sustained? *Journal of Development Economics*, 98(2), 149–66.
- Boumans, Jenny (2012). Tussen regie en repressie: een verkenning van het begrip empowerment [Between control and repression: an exploration of the empowerment concept] *Tijdschrift voor rehabilitatie*, 1, 28-42.
- Castells, Manuel (2000). *The information age: economy, society and culture, vol 1: The rise of the network society (2nd ed.)*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Drydyk, Jay (2013). Empowerment, Agency and Power. *Journal of Global Ethics*, 9, 249-262.
- Ewijk, Hans van (2014). *Omgaan met sociale complexiteit: professionals in het sociale domein* [Dealing with social complexity: professionals in the social sector]. Amsterdam: SWP.
- Edelman, Benjamin, & Luca, Michael (2014). *Digital Discrimination: The Case of Airbnb.com*. Harvard Business School Working Paper, No. 14-054.
- Evans, K. (2015). *Apple and IBM say Big Data will save lives*. Downloaded September 18, 2015, from: <http://www.computerworld.com/article/2909663/apple-and-ibm-say-big-data-will-save-lives.html>.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1981). *The Theory of Communicative Action (Vol. 2): The Critique of Functionalist Reason*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Kuchinke, Peter (2010) Human development as a central goal for human resource development. *Human Resource Development International*, 13(5), 575-585.
- Kullman, Kim, & Lee, Nick (2012). Liberation from/Liberation within: Examining One Laptop Per Child with Amartya Sen and Bruno Latour. In: Oosterlaken, Ilse & Van den Hoven, Jeroen (eds.), *The Capability Approach, Technology and Design*, Dordrecht: Springer.

- Nussbaum, Martha (2000). *Women and human development: the capabilities approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Nussbaum, Martha (2011). *Creating capabilities: The human development approach*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press.
- Oosterlaken, Ilse (2011). Inserting technology in the relational ontology of Sen's Capability Approach. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, 12, 425-432.
- Oosterlaken, Ilse (2012). The capability approach, technology and design; Taking stock and looking ahead. In: Oosterlaken, I. & Van den Hoven, J. (eds.), *The Capability Approach, Technology and Design*, Dordrecht: Springer.
- Pentland, Alex (2014). *Social Physics: How Good Ideas Spread-The Lessons from a New Science*. Penguin.
- Rebaie, Ali (2015). *Big data: one thing to think about when buying your Apple Watch*. Downloaded September 18, 2015, from: <http://www.wired.com/insights/2015/03/big-data-one-thing-think-buying-apple-watch/>.
- Regenmortel, Tine van (2009). Empowerment als uitdagend kader voor sociale inclusie en moderne zorg [Empowerment as challenging framework for social inclusion and modern care]. *Journal of Social Intervention: Theory and Practice*, 18, 22-42.
- Robeyns, Ingrid (2005). The capabilities approach: a theoretical survey. *Journal of Human Development*, 6, 93-117.
- Robeyns, Ingrid (2006). The capability approach in practice. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 14, 351-376.
- Ruivenkamp, Guido (2014). Technologie-ontwikkeling vanuit welk paradigma [Technology development from which paradigm]. Key-note lecture at conference *Verkeerd Verbonden: sociale technologie als bindmiddel [Wrong connection: the binding function of social technology]*, April, 23-24, Nijmegen: HAN University of Applied Sciences.
- Sen, Amartya (1979). *Equality of what?* The Tanner Lecture on Human Values, delivered at Stanford University, May 22.
- Sen, Amartya (2009). *The Idea of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press.
- Sen, Amartya (1999). *Development as Freedom*. Oxford University Press.
- Spierts, Marcel, & Oostrik, Hans (2014). Democratische wortels: Over de professionele logica van het sociaal werk [Democratic roots: on the professional logic of social work]. *Maatwerk*, 15(6), 21-23.
- Stiglitz, Joseph (2014). The future of globalization. *Annual lecture of the Scientific Council for Government Policy*, The Hague, November 6.
- Uber (2015). *About us*. Downloaded september 18, 2015, from: <https://www.uber.com/about>
- Zavirsek, Darja, Rommelspacher, Birgit, & Staub-Bernasconi, Silvia (2010). Introduction. In: Zavirsek, Darja, Rommelspacher, Birgit, & Staub-Bernasconi, Silvia (eds.), *Ethical dilemmas in social work: international perspective*, Ljubljana: Faculty of Social Work, University of Ljubljana.
- Persson, Michael (2014). *AirBnB, Uber: ze hebben maling aan alles [AirBnB, Uber: they don't care at all]*. De Volkskrant, November 22.
- WRR, Scientific Council for Government Policy (2013). *Towards a learning economy: Investing in the Netherlands' earning capacity*. WRR-report nr. 90. Amsterdam University Press.
- Zwikker, Niels, Pijnenburg, Huub, & van Hattum, Marion (in preparation). Oog in oog met Digitale Technologie in de Jeugdsector: Een overzicht van toepassingsmogelijkheden in Praktijk, Onderwijs en Onderzoek. [Eye to eye with digital technology in the youth sector: an overview of applications in practice, education and research].

Erik Jansen, Research Centre HAN SOCIAAL, HAN University of Applied Sciences
PO Box 6960, NL 6525 GL Nijmegen, erik.jansen@han.nl

ingereicht 01.05.2015

überarbeitet 25.09.2015

angenommen 02.10.2015