Introduction
The increasingly internationalised nature of higher education has enhanced the potential for students to benefit from a more diverse student body, yet there are gaps between the rhetoric and ideals of internationalisation and the lived realities for both home and international students (Harrison 2015; Sovič 2009).

As a contribution to addressing the issue, this study drew upon two main theoretical resources: Kwame Anthony Appiah’s (2008, 2006) conception of cosmopolitan values, in imagining what kind of graduate might emerge from an internationalised higher education; and Amartya Sen’s (1992, 2009) ‘capability’ approach, as a means of both evaluating and promoting students’ intercultural development through learning environments.

Conceptualising and actualising intercultural values: the ‘capability approach’
‘Intercultural competence’ describes the acquisition of cultural knowledge, communicative skills and openness to difference through internationalised curricula and cross-cultural interactions (Alred et al. 2006; Deardorff 2006). Rather than define what should be ‘acquired’, the identification of capabilities offers all students opportunity and freedom to develop more intercultural, cosmopolitan selves through their interactions.

The ‘capability approach’ (Sen 1992; Sen 2009) promotes the quality and value of individual lives through expanding freedom and choice. A ‘capability’ is an opportunity or freedom to do or be what one considers valuable. The exercising of capability - termed ‘functioning’ - is affected by circumstance, others’ actions and individual choices. A ‘capability set’ describes one’s combination of functionings. Within education, the capability approach has been offered as a means of conceptualising and evaluating pedagogical arrangements which promote justice, and considering the role of professional higher education in helping graduates become oriented towards contributing to public good (McLean and Walker 2012; Nussbaum 2002; Unterhalter 2007; Walker 2006; Walker and McLean 2013).

Methods
This study involved formulating a provisional capability set for being intercultural and applying it to student interview data. It was conducted in a UK School of Pharmacy in a university with a strong emphasis on international higher education. Semi-structured interviews with 44 home and international students explored views and experiences of their course, friendships and social lives and, specifically, intercultural interactions.

The analytical process explored the relationship between theoretical intercultural capabilities and students’ experiences and perceptions. This was done by constructing a capability set for being intercultural, informed by capability theory, Appiah’s conception of cosmopolitanism and the empirical data. The process was iterative, moving between capability theory, capability set and pilot interview data. The four capabilities, each defined by a number of functionings, were: Social Relations and Participation; Respect, Dignity and Recognition; Mind and Imagination and Enquiry and Reflection.
Findings
Interview data was analysed for evidence of capability and functioning in each of the four capabilities. This approach helped to indicate the extent to which students did and were able to function, rather than solely their possession of capability.

Social Relations and Participation
The forming of relationships through Social Relations and Participation appeared fundamental to enabling other intercultural capabilities. Analysis by capability helped to identify personal, social and pedagogical factors which created a more enabling environment or, conversely, inhibited functioning. Group work, through requiring students to interact and work with others with whom they might not naturally mix, emerged as a powerful enabling factor. Functioning with this capability often required effort, courage and confidence, but students who made the effort to cross ‘borders’ appeared to connect the inclusion of others with their own wellbeing, helping to enhance agency and capability in others.

Respect, Dignity and Recognition
Analysis of the data against Respect, Dignity and Recognition pointed to the potential impact of educational arrangements, particularly group work, in enabling or diminishing capability. The student learning community provided a forum for developing respectful, inclusive attitudes, but also for stifling capability through disregard for others. Mutual respect featured in enhancing or diminishing students’ agency and sense of self; having the freedom to function was highly dependent upon the capability of others.

Mind and Imagination
The capability of Mind and Imagination involves the way in which one views others and the challenge that this might present to one’s self. All students had encountered some challenge to their views and opinions through the multicultural environment at university and many described the value in this. However there was some evidence of low capability for Mind and Imagination in the reinforcing or forming of negative stereotypical opinions about members of other groups, particularly in the academic environment; ‘others’ were consistently seen to be the problem. Coming from situations of relative cultural narrowness, some students had used the opportunities presented to consider difference and how it related to their own lives. This was facilitated by functioning with Social Relation and Participation as students got to know and judge the individual rather than merely associating them with the expected behaviours of a group.

Enquiry and Reflection
Intercultural friendships and working relationships provided a medium through which students could explore and develop their identities. Some (particularly international) students had embraced a cosmopolitan ethos and actively sought to explore difference. Students functioned with Enquiry and Reflection as, seeking to understand and learn from each other’s situations, they reflectively considered their own - some experiencing a transformation of self as their own lives and perspectives were thrown into contrast.

Implications
This study illustrated the potential for exploration of students’ intercultural experiences through the lens of capability and illuminated the broad spectrum of intercultural mixing that appears to exist. The capability set proved to be a good descriptor of the capabilities required for a more cosmopolitan outlook and a means of evaluating students’ intercultural capabilities. It has the potential to be used as a heuristic tool for informing thinking about creating an academic environment which enables student agency and self-development and
which helps to illuminate the features which foster agency, justice and the maximising of intercultural capability. Students’ capability can be constrained or enabled by social and pedagogical arrangements as well as by personal or relational factors and, therefore, choices made by university staff about pedagogical practices influence the opportunities and choices available to students.
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