Well-being as Conscious Capacity: A Paradigm Shift in Human Development in an Era of Uncertainty

Shachi Abhijitsinh Ghelot
Research Scholar
Department of English
Veer Narmad South Gujarat University, Surat
Email: ghelotshachi@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0009-0002-1363-5657

Dr. Kruti M. Trivedi
Assistant Professor
Z.F. Wadia Women's College and
N.K. Jhota College of Commerce, Athwalines, Surat
Email: kruti504@yahoo.com

Abstract:

The current paradigm of well-being in development economics and public policy is largely outcome-oriented, relying on indicators such as income, health, education, and subjective life satisfaction. While essential for measurement, these indicators remain inadequate for understanding the internal capacities that shape economic behaviour under conditions of uncertainty, precarious employment, and psycho-social stress. This paper proposes a conceptual shift toward understanding well-being as conscious capacity, a meta-functional capacity encompassing reflective self-awareness, emotional regulation, and intentional decision-making under constraint. Drawing on the capability approach, human capital theory, and global health perspectives, it demonstrates the epistemic limits of indicator-based models and argues for the integration of capacity-based constructs into human development theory. Conscious capacity is conceptualized as an intangible form of human capital that enables the translation of resources into resilient functioning and productive agency, thereby repositioning well-being from an outcome to a foundational developmental input.

1. Introduction:

The study of human development has worked in recent decades to shift from specific economic metrics, like income and educational attainment, to more comprehensive assessments of advancement. Subjective measures of life satisfaction, years of education, and life expectancy are examples of modern tools. These indicators are useful because they track overall trends, establish policy priorities, and offer measurable benchmarks. However, in a time of increased volatility with sudden job losses, climate-related disasters, and widespread economic uncertainty these steps seem more and more insufficient. They record accomplishments or self-reported assessments, but they don't provide much information about the processes that distinguish different people's reactions to hardship. Why do some people adjust, persevere, and even grow personally when faced with similar challenges, while others find it difficult to continue functioning? The internal dynamics that shape resilience under pressure are not explained by conventional indicators, which only record results at the surface level. Contemporary research in behavioural economics demonstrates that scarcity and uncertainty significantly constrain cognitive bandwidth, thereby affecting decision-making and long-term planning (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013; Kahneman, 2011). This paper intervenes in contemporary debates in welfare economics and human development by arguing that prevailing frameworks remain insufficiently attentive to the internal processes through which individuals convert resources into adaptive and purposeful action under conditions of uncertainty.

One of the most significant contributions in this field is the capability approach developed by Amartya Sen and later expanded by Martha Nussbaum. According to this approach, well-being is measured in terms of freedoms that allow individuals to function in order to lead a life that they have reason to value rather than just in terms of resources or utilities though this approach leaves one essential aspect unaddressed, particularly when external conditions are limiting and unpredictable. What internal processes allow people to use their skills in the face of increasing adversity? Human capital theory, particularly in its expanded form, which includes non-cognitive characteristics such as perseverance and self-regulation, provides some insight. According to research, these qualities predict socioeconomic outcomes in the same way that cognitive skills do. However, such characteristics are often regarded as relatively stable rather than as dynamic, cultivable capacities that can be deliberately developed.

Here, this paper proposes a new concept: conscious capacity, which may be understood as a cultivable meta-capacity encompassing reflective awareness, emotional regulation, and intentional action under constraint. It is about being able to reflect on oneself, manage emotions, and make deliberate decisions, even when things are uncertain. The concept is based on Indian Knowledge Systems (IKS), which in this context serve as solid theoretical frameworks rather than cultural wisdom. Three concepts are important here: reflexive consciousness (cit), which allows one to step back and observe one's own thoughts as they come and go; dharma enables one to act ethically while remaining aware of context; and karma reminds one that habits accumulate and shape subsequent actions. Taken together, they demonstrate the dynamic interplay between environmental demands and individual resilience.

This conceptual shift is particularly relevant in the contemporary context of systemic uncertainty because uncertainty is built into everything: economic stress, political chaos, climate change, and technological disruptions. In stable circumstances, people generally rely on markets and institutions to provide security and maintain order but, when conditions are uncertain or rapidly changing, external systems alone are not enough; individuals must rely on their own ability to reflect, adapt and act with purpose at such times. Without these capacities, even those with abundant resources may struggle to respond effectively and can become immobilized. Developing these internal skills enables genuine agency to emerge, even amid apparently limited options.

The paper first examines the major approaches to human capital theory, the capability approach, and global health perspectives on psycho-social functioning to determine what they offer and where they fall short. Then it focuses on the real blind spot: how people transform

their resources into resilience under stress, which is something we rarely discuss. The central claim of the argument is that conscious capacity is no longer optional, bringing in insights from IKS and established theories into a single framework and examines psychological concepts from Indian traditions. Ultimately, it conceptualizes what follows when conscious awareness is regarded not as a contingent accident of circumstance, but as a capacity deliberately cultivated. By reconceptualising well-being as a dynamic and cultivable capacity, this paper advances a pluralist and process-oriented framework that bridges development economics, behavioural theory, and Indian Knowledge Systems.

2. Literature Review

To track well-being, development economics and public policy have always relied on measurable outcomes such as test scores and income growth. This mindset is central to human capital theory. Gary Becker argued in 1964 that education and job training are real investments, just like machines and factories. The resulting outcomes include increased productivity, higher earnings, and broader economic growth.

The original theory focused primarily on formal knowledge and skills, but people did not stop there. Later studies broadened the scope to include "soft skills." Empirical work by Heckman and Kautz (2012) demonstrates, using hard data, that traits such as perseverance, self-control, and how well you get along with others are just as important, if not more, than IQ in predicting life outcomes. These ideas helped to broaden human capital theory, taking it beyond test scores and diplomas. Subsequent developments have also highlighted the role of psychological constraints and bounded rationality in shaping economic behaviour, challenging the assumption of fully rational agents (Kahneman, 2011).

There has been a significant shift with Amartya Sen's capability approach. Sen argued that measuring well-being solely based on income or resources misses the point. What really matters, he said, are people's true freedoms, the things they can do and be in their lives. Martha Nussbaum picked up on this thread and expanded on it, outlining a set of core competencies that everyone should be able to achieve. This way of thinking altered the game for organizations such as the United Nations, whose Human Development Reports now include health, education, and even elements of subjective well-being to paint a more complete picture of progress. Further elaborations of the capability approach have emphasised its flexibility as a normative framework while also acknowledging the need to better account for internal conversion factors that shape how individuals utilise available opportunities (Alkire, 2005).

Global health research adds a new layer: the psychological impact of poverty. It's not just about not having enough money or material possessions; living in poverty also eats away at one's mind. Patel and Kleinman demonstrated in 2003 that poverty and mental illness go hand in hand, particularly in low-income countries. It is more than mere misfortune; it's about how chronic insecurity, exclusion, and powerlessness can wear people down. More recent research, such as that conducted by Ridley and colleagues in 2020, strengthens these links even further. They demonstrate how the stress of adversity can trap people in a cycle, limiting how well they function, even when their basic needs are met. These findings align with broader arguments that scarcity imposes cognitive and psychological burdens, limiting individuals' ability to make optimal decisions even when opportunities are present (Mullainathan & Shafir, 2013).

Among all of this, Indian intellectual traditions appear from time to time, albeit not always prominently. Recently, scholars have used Karma Yoga, the concept of selfless action, to help people develop resilience and agency in therapy (Keshavan et al., 2024). Others use broader concepts from yoga or Vedanta to discuss flourishing, moving beyond "health" to a more integrated sense of psychological and existential well-being (Satija, 2013). Anand Paranjpe, for example, has advocated for Indian psychology to be given a legitimate seat at the table, highlighting its emphasis on consciousness, self-regulation, and self-realization. These perspectives provide detailed ways of thinking about inner life that can supplement Western approaches.

Still, when it comes to big discussions in development, non-Western frameworks, particularly those based on Indian Knowledge Systems, are often treated as peripheral folklore, rather than primary drivers of theory. These perspectives are rarely used as the primary lens for understanding how people convert limited resources into lasting personal agency. By treating them as optional or secondary ideas, scholarship overlooks deeper explanations of how individuals adapt, endure, and flourish under serious real-world constraints. However, these contributions have not yet been fully integrated into mainstream theories of development. They are most often discussed in therapeutic, philosophical, or spiritual contexts rather than as part of a broader framework for understanding economic behaviour. As a result, there remains a significant gap in explaining how internal capacities shape people's ability to respond to constraints and make effective economic decisions.

2.1 Research gap

Traditional measures of development, such as income, health, and education, primarily assess achieved outcomes. The capability approach broadens this perspective by focusing on

what people are genuinely able to do and become, given their resources and social environment. Human capital theory further enriches this understanding by recognising the importance of non-cognitive attributes, including self-efficacy, perseverance, and emotional regulation. Together, these perspectives provide valuable insights into outcomes, opportunities, and the factors associated with individual success.

An important question remains insufficiently addressed despite these advances: how do individuals transform available resources into sustained and adaptive action, particularly when faced with uncertainty? People living under similar economic or social constraints often experience very different life trajectories. While some adapt, recover, and continue to make constructive decisions, others struggle despite having access to comparable resources and opportunities. Existing frameworks explain much about the resources people possess and the opportunities available to them, but they provide only limited insight into the internal processes that produce these different responses.

During periods of disruption this limitation becomes especially evident when institutional support weakens and external conditions become less predictable. Behavioural economics points out that scarcity and stress affect how people make decisions by placing greater demands on their mental resources. This means that successful adaptation relies on more than access to material resources (Ridley et al., 2020).

Thus, the ability to navigate uncertainty increasingly relies on internal capacities such as reflective awareness, emotional regulation, and context-sensitive judgement. These capacities help individuals interpret changing circumstances, regulate their responses, and act purposefully even when external support is limited. Yet their role remains underdeveloped within mainstream theories of economic development, highlighting the need for a framework that places these internal capacities at the centre of developmental analysis. Yet mainstream development frameworks rarely theorize these processes in a systematic or integrated manner.

Although emerging interdisciplinary work has begun to engage with internal dimensions of resilience and cognition, these insights remain fragmented and are not incorporated into the core architecture of development theory. As a result, the question of how agency is generated, sustained, or eroded in real-time conditions of uncertainty remains insufficiently addressed.

This study addresses this gap by proposing conscious capacity as a conceptual framework that foregrounds the internal, processual mechanisms by which individuals translate resources into meaningful and adaptive action. This absence reflects a broader limitation in

development theory: the systematic under-theorisation of internal regulatory mechanisms as constitutive, rather than derivative, components of human development.

3. Objectives

1. To critique indicator-based approaches to well-being in development discourse.
2. To conceptualize *conscious capacity* as a developmental resource.
3. To integrate Indian Knowledge Systems with modern theories of human development.
4. To examine *conscious capacity* as an intangible form of human capital.
5. To propose a revised framework for well-being under uncertainty.

4. Theoretical Propositions

P1: Conceptualising well-being as *conscious capacity* provides a more comprehensive framework for understanding human development than outcome-based models alone.

P2: Internal capacities of reflexive awareness, ethical orientation, and intentional action enhance human agency under conditions of uncertainty.

5. Methodology

This study adopts a conceptual-theoretical research design, situated within interdisciplinary inquiry across development economics, psychology, and Indian Knowledge Systems (IKS). Rather than empirical data collection, the paper employs analytical synthesis and comparative framework analysis to examine the limitations of dominant models of well-being and to develop an alternative conceptual construct.

The methodological approach proceeds in three stages. First, it critically reviews established frameworks, including human capital theory, the capability approach, and global health perspectives on psychosocial functioning, identifying their explanatory strengths and limitations in conditions of uncertainty. Second, it undertakes a conceptual integration, drawing selectively from Indian philosophical and psychological traditions particularly the constructs of cit, dharma, and karma to articulate a process-oriented model of internal capacity formation. Third, it develops the construct of conscious capacity as a meta-functional category that links internal psychological processes with externally observable developmental outcomes.

This approach is interpretive rather than positivist, aiming not to test hypotheses but to reconfigure the conceptual architecture of well-being by foregrounding the internal mechanisms through which individuals convert resources into meaningful agency under constraint. Accordingly, the propositions advanced in this paper are intended as theoretically grounded claims rather than empirically tested hypotheses.

6. Conceptual Framework

Conscious capacity is conceptualised as an intangible yet foundational enhancement to human capital, an additional stratum that operates atop conventional cognitive, technical, and professional competencies. This layer functions unobtrusively, continuously shaping perception, regulation, and purposeful action while remaining largely invisible within standard measures of skills and knowledge. It is not simply a list of characteristics or outcomes. Instead, it shapes how people use what they have, including resources, opportunities, and even setbacks, to take meaningful action. This is primarily about how people adapt and maintain stability, particularly when life becomes chaotic and traditional support systems fail. Here, conscious capacity provides an answer to the question of how human development is operationalised in conditions of uncertainty. It involves intentional and context-sensitive regulation of cognition and action, making your potential a reality, and maintaining your sense of agency even when routines and automatic habits fail.

This framework draws on the main ideas of Indian Knowledge Systems (IKS), not as a set of rules to follow, but as tools for understanding how people manage themselves and make decisions. At its core, the framework is structured around three interconnected dimensions: First, consciousness is defined as reflexive witnessing. This refers to the capacity to adopt a reflective stance toward one's own cognitive and emotional processes and observe your own thoughts and feelings as they arise, rather than reacting immediately.

In Indian Knowledge Systems (IKS), this capacity is rooted in the concept of cit (pure awareness), the witnessing consciousness that observes thoughts and emotions without becoming identified with them. This idea is central to the Yoga Sutras of Patanjali and is also reflected in the Katha Upanishad, both of which describe awareness as distinct from the fluctuations of the mind. Cultivating this witnessing awareness creates an important psychological buffer during periods of stress and uncertainty. Instead of reacting automatically to immediate fears or emotional impulses, individuals can pause, observe their mental state, and respond more thoughtfully. This creates the space to shift attention away from short-term anxieties and toward choices that support long-term goals. Absent such meta-awareness, individuals remain ensnared in reactive cognitive patterns, allowing valuable opportunities to dissipate amid unexamined mental turbulence.

Next in this framework is dharma, which functions as an ethical and situational compass rather than a rigid code of rules.

Derived from traditions such as the Bhagavad Gita, dharma emphasises context-sensitive right action: determining what is appropriate given one's role, responsibilities, relationships, and present circumstances (Bhagavad Gita 2.47; Bhagavad Gita 3.19; Bimal Krishna Matilal, 2002). It calls for conduct guided by integrity, purpose, and a sense of duty, irrespective of whether outcomes remain uncertain or beyond personal control. Dharma thus prioritises responsible, value-aligned behaviour over ego-centred notions of success or failure. For example, in the face of precarious employment while supporting dependents, dharma directs individuals to balance immediate survival needs with sustained obligations to family and community. In doing so, it anchors action in meaning and coherence, preserving inner grounded-ness amid external instability and disorder.

Ensuing is karma, which should not be misconstrued as fatalistic predestination but rather as a principle of cumulative causation: the understanding that actions, repeated over time, generate patterns that condition future possibilities.

Karma operates as a dynamic feedback mechanism in human development, as reflected in the Bhagavad Gita (3.9; 4.17). Deliberate, value-aligned choices cultivate constructive habits and behavioural momentum, progressively expanding the range of viable options and adaptive capacity. Conversely, unreflective or harmful patterns reinforce limitations, narrowing pathways and eroding resilience. In this framework, karma constitutes the temporal dimension of conscious capacity. Present acts of intentionality particularly small, consistent exercises of self-regulation under adversity accumulate into enduring dispositions, strengthened relational networks, and enhanced long-term adaptability. Far from a static endowment or isolated intervention, conscious capacity thus becomes a compounding resource: one that grows incrementally through sustained, purposeful action across time.

These three elements do not function independently; rather, they interact with one another. Reflexive witnessing provides you with mental space to regulate yourself. Dharma gives that space direction and meaning. Karma binds everything together over time, transforming one good decision into a habit, and habits into actual capacity. They work together to create a system that allows people to not only survive, but also thrive in the face of adversity. What began as a potential weakness can become a true source of strength. The incorporation of Indian Knowledge Systems in this framework is analytical rather than cultural, aimed at extending the conceptual vocabulary of development theory rather than offering civilizational commentary.

This framework seamlessly integrates with the existing models, but it doesn't stop there. It takes the core idea from the capability approach, freedom and valued functionings (Sen,

1999; Nussbaum, 2011), and goes deeper. Instead of simply assuming that people can exercise their freedoms, it investigates what happens inside, particularly when people face constraints. Capability theory typically ignores such details, but in this case, they are given special attention.

And when it comes to human capital, the framework modifies the investment logic (Becker, 1964; Heckman & Kautz, 2012). It treats conscious capacity as if it were a skill that could be developed, but it is much more than that. This is not just another tool in the toolbox; it is the thing that allows you to use all of your tools more effectively, especially when life becomes unpredictable.

Ultimately, this approach yields a more integrated conceptual model one that effectively bridges external opportunity structures with the internal dynamics of human functioning, including deliberate choice, emotional and cognitive regulation, and the core motivations that drive purposeful action. Such integration addresses a pressing gap in contemporary development theory. In an era characterised by deepening and pervasive uncertainty, theoretical frameworks that remain focused predominantly on structural and resource-based determinants increasingly fall short of explaining adaptive resilience and sustained agency under real-world volatility.

6.1 Distinguishing *Conscious Capacity*

Concepts such as resilience, self-efficacy, emotional intelligence, and metacognition have made important contributions to our understanding of how people think, learn, adapt, and perform. Rather than extending these concepts, conscious capacity offers a broader and qualitatively different way of understanding human functioning. It differs from them in three important ways.

First, it is integrative rather than modular. Existing constructs typically isolate specific traits or competencies, such as emotional regulation or cognitive awareness. Conscious capacity refers to the dynamic interaction between awareness, ethical orientation, and action.

Second, it incorporates an explicitly normative and ethical dimension. Unlike psychological constructs that remain descriptively neutral, conscious capacity includes value-guided decision-making, aligning action with context-sensitive ethical judgment, akin to the principle of dharma.

Third, it is inherently temporal and accumulative. Drawing from the concept of karma, conscious capacity emphasises how repeated acts of intentional regulation and decision-making consolidate into durable behavioural patterns over time. In this sense, it is not merely a state or trait but a developmental process.

Thus, conscious capacity should not be understood as a re-labelling of existing psychological variables but as a meta-capacity that governs how such variables are activated, integrated, and sustained under conditions of uncertainty.

6.2 Psychological Perspectives

Indian philosophical traditions articulate these concepts with exceptional precision and depth; a clarity not always matched in contemporary Western frameworks. According to Paranjpe (2011), consciousness extends beyond mere cognitive processing; it is conceptualised as a luminous substratum that both enables experiential awareness and maintains an independent existence. This "witness" stance, termed "shakshi", affords a meta-perspective, permitting detachment from the flux of entangled thoughts and reactive patterns. Such disidentification proves particularly salient under conditions of uncertainty, where anxiety and impulsive overreaction frequently arise.

Dharma is frequently misconstrued as rigid adherence to prescribed norms. In reality, it entails context-sensitive discernment and situational appropriateness. In the Bhagavad Gita, Arjuna is not absolved of responsibility when paralysed by moral conflict; rather, he is guided to exercise discerning judgment while remaining unattached to results. This non-attached yet engaged mode of action sustains agency: it liberates the individual from paralysis induced by fear of consequences, enabling purposeful conduct amid ambiguity.

Karma, far from a deterministic doctrine, adopts a longitudinal perspective on human development. It posits that repeated, intentional actions accumulate into stable dispositions and trajectories. Consistent practice strengthens inner capacities over time, whereas fragmented, impulse-driven behaviour dissipates energy and erodes resilience. In an environment marked by volatility and unpredictability, the principle of karma underscores the value of sustained, long-term orientation over reactive pursuit of short-term relief. These concepts find clear expression in contemporary contexts as well. Karma Yoga has been applied in therapeutic settings to assist individuals in managing psychological distress and restoring a sense of control (Keshavan et al., 2024). More broadly, Yoga practices enhance attentional regulation in ways that parallel findings from modern mindfulness research, yet they draw from older, more comprehensive philosophical and psychological frameworks.

6.3 Conscious Capacity as Developmental Input

This framework is distinctive in that it challenges the conventional assumption that conscious capacity emerges as a byproduct of economic growth or broader social development. Instead, it repositions conscious capacity as a foundational and constitutive dimension of human development, rather than a derivative outcome of structural progress. Most people still

regard resilience and agency as side effects of improving schools, healthcare, and putting more money into people's pockets. However, when conscious capacity is conceptualized as a foundational investment rather than a subsequent outcome, the developmental paradigm is fundamentally reoriented. The objective shifts from merely enhancing material provision or improving external living conditions to fostering individuals' active cultivation of the internal capacities required for self-regulation and meaningful engagement with their social and structural environments, beginning at the level of inner development.

6.4 Policy Implications

This shift opens space for more innovative and multidimensional approaches to policy-making as the focus extends beyond the redistribution of resources or the restructuring of institutions toward cultivating the internal capacities individuals require to navigate uncertainty and complexity effectively. Viewing well-being through the lens of conscious capacity is especially important in a world which is increasingly shaped by recurring crises, economic uncertainty, and ongoing social and environmental disruption where instability is no longer an exception but a recurring feature of everyday life. In such conditions, individuals who cultivate self-regulation and reflective awareness are better able to make sense of adversity, adapt constructively to changing circumstances, and turn difficult experiences into opportunities for learning, growth, and future progress.

Educational institutions provide a useful illustration. Rather than treating mindfulness or ethics as optional add-ons, such as an elective course or occasional seminar, embedding such elements within core institutional structures would enable reflexivity, and ethical reasoning could be taught not only in philosophy but also in science laboratories, social studies lessons, and vocational training programs. For instance, mindfulness practices or Indigenous approaches like cit, which involves observing one's own mind during problem-solving, could help students make sounder decisions under pressure. Similarly, engaging with concepts such as dharma might encourage learners to prioritize what is right in collaborative projects, rather than simply choosing the easiest path. This approach does not increase workload; its purpose is to foster greater personal agency, enabling individuals to adapt effectively and apply their knowledge in rapidly changing workplaces. Such integration aligns with growing recognition in well-being research that education must extend beyond skill acquisition to include the cultivation of reflective and emotional capacities (Layard, 2005).

For those facing greater challenges such as residents of low-income communities, workers in informal economies, or populations impacted by climate-related disasters a blend of conventional and innovative strategies is essential. Material support remains critical,

including financial aid, skills development, and mental health services. At the same time, principles from Karma Yoga, which stresses action without excessive attachment to outcomes, could be integrated. In group sessions, participants might examine entrenched habits (karma) that limit progress while strengthening ethical decision-making (dharma) to sustain community resilience during hardship. The aim is not to replace practical assistance but to enhance its impact by helping people recognize and pursue new opportunities while maintaining long-term motivation.

Assessing "conscious capacity" presents difficulties, as it cannot be captured through conventional metrics like income or health indicators alone. Alternative methods are required. Validated mindfulness scales could measure the ability to observe and detach from automatic reactions, while ethical reasoning assessments could evaluate responses to complex dilemmas. Longitudinal interviews and reflective journals might track shifts in behavior over time, including personal narratives of overcoming adversity and recurring adaptive patterns. These instruments must be thoughtfully designed to minimize cultural bias, yet such integration is feasible and they could be added to existing human development surveys alongside more traditional measures.

Extending this further, longitudinal studies could examine the effects of deliberately cultivating conscious capacity. Do participants show improved ability to apply skills and knowledge in real-life contexts, especially during setbacks? Although this remains largely a research question at present, it points to the possibility that conscious capacity accumulates and compounds similarly to other forms of human capital. In this case, however, the focus lies on inner depth and the cultivation of enduring psychological strength that proves valuable regardless of external circumstances.

6.5 Limitations and Theoretical Considerations

While the framework of conscious capacity offers a conceptual reorientation of well-being, its scope and application require careful qualification.

First, the model is primarily theoretical and therefore calls for systematic empirical validation through both qualitative and quantitative research. The main contribution of this study is to clarify key concepts rather than draw broad conclusions from empirical evidence.

Second, the applicability of this framework beyond its original context requires further attention. Since it is based on Indian Knowledge Systems, more comparative and cross-cultural research is needed to assess its effectiveness across different socio-cultural settings.

Third, while internal capacities are important, there is a risk of placing too much responsibility for well-being on individuals. This framework does not deny the importance of

structural issues such as inequality, poverty, or institutional failure. Instead, it is designed to work alongside material and policy interventions, rather than replace them.

Finally, the operationalisation of conscious capacity presents an important avenue for future research. Developing reliable and culturally sensitive tools to assess reflexive awareness, ethical orientation, and behavioural accumulation remains an open and necessary task. Future research should focus on empirical validation through longitudinal and cross-cultural studies, as well as the development of robust measurement instruments for operationalising conscious capacity.

7. Conclusion

Merely counting accomplishments or charting theoretical possibilities is insufficient when external circumstances become unstable, when institutions falter, economic structures sway, or everyday life becomes unpredictable. Capability frameworks describe what may be achievable, while outcome indicators document what has already been obtained. However, neither adequately addresses the deeper question: what enables individuals to respond purposefully and adaptively when their accustomed supports are removed?

Conscious capacity is crucial in this situation. It provides a realistic and theoretically sound approach to bridging this enduring divide when viewed through the analytical prism of Indian Knowledge Systems. The framework turns inward by viewing reflexive awareness, ethical orientation, and the cumulative logic of action as cultivable processes. This is not done to avoid structural realities, but rather to fortify the internal underpinnings that enable people to interact with those realities more successfully. This inner regulatory strength becomes the difference between meaningful adaptation and mere survival during turbulent times when agency must be actively maintained and predictability erodes.

This viewpoint fundamentally reinterprets well-being. It presents well-being as active, self-directed agency, the continuous ability to observe, regulate, choose, and act in accordance with one's values, even in the face of constraint, instead of seeing it as a passive state that results from favorable circumstances. The concept of well-being as something that "happens to" people is abandoned in favor of a model that acknowledges people as agents with the power to influence how they react to their environment.

Moreover, the approach integrates non-Western intellectual resources into the core of global development theory without apology or marginalization by emphasizing ideas from Indian Knowledge Systems, such as cit (reflexive consciousness), dharma (contextual ethical grounding), and karma (intertemporal behavioral patterning). These traditions are used as serious conceptual tools that shed light on aspects of human functioning that are frequently

ignored in prevailing Western frameworks, not as extra color or cultural curiosity. The discussion is enhanced by this inclusion, which makes it more pluralistic and sensitive to the various ways individuals in fact maintain agency in various contexts.

Conscious capacity does not seek to redefine the ultimate aims of human development but to make them substantively attainable under conditions of uncertainty. By foregrounding the internal processes through which individuals interpret, regulate, and act upon their circumstances, this framework shifts the analytical focus from what people possess to how they meaningfully engage with what is available to them. In doing so, it complements and extends capability-based approaches by addressing the internal conversion mechanisms that mediate between resources and outcomes. This reconceptualisation is not merely additive but transformative: it reorients development theory toward the cultivation of adaptive, reflexive, and ethically grounded agency as a foundational input rather than a derivative outcome. In an era marked by volatility and structural instability, such a shift is not optional it is essential for ensuring that human development remains both resilient and realizable in practice.

REFERENCES

- Alkire, S. (2005). Why the capability approach? *Journal of Human Development, 6*(1), 115–135.
- Becker, G. S. (1964). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education*. University of Chicago Press.
- Easwaran, E. (Trans.). (2008). *The Bhagavad Gita*. Nilgiri Press.
- Easwaran, E. (Trans.). (1996). *The Upanishads*. Nilgiri Press.
- Haq, M. ul. (1995). *Reflections on human development*. Oxford University Press.
- Heckman, J. J., & Kautz, T. (2012). Hard evidence on soft skills. *Labour Economics, 19*(4), 451–464. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2012.05.014
- Kabat-Zinn, J. (2003). Mindfulness-based interventions in context: Past, present, and future. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice, 10*(2), 144–156.
- Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Keshavan, M. S., Deshpande, S. N., & Gangadhar, B. N. (2024). Doing good well (Karma Yoga, the path of selfless action): Psychotherapeutic lessons from the East. *Asian Journal of Psychiatry, 101*, 104201. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajp.2024.104201
- Layard, R. (2005). *Happiness: Lessons from a new science*. Penguin.
- MacIntyre, A. (1981). *After virtue*. University of Notre Dame Press.
- Masten, A. S. (2014). *Ordinary magic: Resilience in development*. Guilford Press.

- Matilal, B. K. (2002). *Ethics and epics: The moral philosophy of the Mahabharata*. Oxford University Press.
- Mohanty, J. N. (2000). *Classical Indian philosophy*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Mullainathan, S., & Shafir, E. (2013). *Scarcity: Why having too little means so much*. Times Books.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). *Creating capabilities: The human development approach*. Harvard University Press.
- Paranjpe, A. C. (2011). Indian psychology and the international context. *Psychology and Developing Societies, 23*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1177/097133361002300101
- Patel, V., & Kleinman, A. (2003). Poverty and common mental disorders in developing countries. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization, 81*(8), 609–615.
- Ridley, M., Rao, G., Schilbach, F., & Patel, V. (2020). Poverty, depression, and anxiety: Causal evidence and mechanisms. *Science, 370*(6522), eaay0214. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aay0214
- Satija, S. (2013). Striving beyond healthy development: An insight from Indian wisdom. *Journal of Human Values, 19*(1), 39–52. https://doi.org/10.1177/0971685812470345
- Sen, A. (1985). *Commodities and capabilities*. North-Holland.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.
- Stiglitz, J. E., Sen, A., & Fitoussi, J.-P. (2009). *Report on the measurement of economic performance and social progress*. Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress.
- United Nations Development Programme. (2022). *Human development report 2021/2022: Uncertain times, unsettled lives: Shaping our future in a transforming world*. https://hdr.undp.org
- Vivekananda, S. (2001). *Raja yoga*. Ramakrishna Mission. (Original work published 1896