SW 415
for Class
p. 69-94

Unravelling Social Policy

Theory, Analysis, and Political Action towards Social Equality

Fourth Edition, Revised and Enlarged

DAVID G. GIL

SCHENKMAN BOOKS, INC.
Rochester, Vermont

CHAPTER THREE

A Framework For Analysis And Development Of Social Policies

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter a framework for systematic analysis of existing or proposed social policies, and for development of alternative policies, is derived from the conceptual model presented in the preceding chapter. The framework should facilitate attainment of the following separate, but related, objectives.

The first objective is to gain understanding of the issues that constitute the focus of a specific social policy which is being analyzed or developed. This involves exploration of the nature, scope, and distribution of these issues, and of causal theories concerning underlying dynamics.

A second objective is to discern the chain of substantive effects resulting, or expected to result, from the implementation of a given social policy, including intended, unintended, and short and long-range effects. This involves explication of policy objectives with respect to the focal issues, of value premises underlying these objectives, and of hypotheses guiding the strategies and provisions of a policy. It also involves specifications concerning the size, distribution, and relevant characteristics of target populations, and determination of the extent to

which actual effects of a policy match, or are expected to match, its objectives. Once the substantive effects of a policy have been clarified, implications for the structure of society and for the entire system of social policies can be discerned in terms of changes in the operating and outcome variables of social policies. This requires also exploration of the forces affecting a policy and its implementation, for understanding interactions between a policy and the social environment seems essential to predicting its likely consequences.

A third objective of policy analysts is to suggest alternative policies aimed at the same or at different objectives concerning the focal issues. Different policies can then be compared and evaluated, in terms of social policy relevant value premises, attainment of specified policy objectives, implications for social structure and the policy system as a whole, unintended effects, and overall costs and benefits.

The framework presented here is geared to the attainment of the foregoing objectives. Section A corresponds to the first objective, sections B through D to the second objective, and section E to the third objective. An analysis grows more complex as the number of objectives increases, and analysts may therefore decide that for certain purposes, a policy analysis should be limited to the first two objectives, or merely parts thereof. When it is decided to limit the scope of analysis of a specific policy, appropriate sections of the analytic framework can be used.

The proposed framework consists of a standard set of foci to facilitate systematic coverage of aspects relevant to the understanding of social policies and their consequences. The utilization of these foci should reduce differences in findings among analysts studying the same policy, since such differences seem often due to variations in the scope of issues explored.

Social policies vary in content, scope, and objectives. Hence the extent to which the foci of the framework are relevant in the analysis of any given policy will vary. Some foci may be of little or no relevance to certain policies and may consequently be omitted in the analysis. A certain measure of overlap is unavoidable among the sections and foci of the framework, since these sections and foci examine the policies from different perspectives.

The quality and reliability of available data, and the validity of specialized indicators, are likely to vary with respect to the foci of the framework. Moreover, it is possible that reliable data cannot be obtained, and that valid indicators are not available or cannot be developed, with respect to certain foci. Such negative findings concerning

the data base of certain foci are, however, in themselves, important information, since in developing predictions with the help of the framework one needs to be aware of what cannot be known.

Before a given social policy can be analyzed, its provisions should be specified. If the policy has been enacted into law, administrative regulations and judicial decisions concerning it should be taken into consideration along with the language of the law. If a policy proposal rather than an enacted policy is being analyzed, specificity concerning operational aspects of the proposed policy should be provided.

The framework is presented below, and its sections and foci are then discussed.

CHART #3.1 FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS AND DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIAL POLICIES

SECTION A: ISSUES DEALT WITH BY THE POLICY

1. Nature, scope, and distribution of the issues
2. Causal theory(ies) or hypothesis(es) concerning the issues

SECTION B: OBJECTIVES, VALUE PREMISES, THEORETICAL POSITIONS, TARGET SEGMENTS, AND SUBSTANTIVE EFFECTS OF THE POLICY

1. Policy objectives: overt objectives and covert objectives.

2. Value premises and ideological orientations underlying the policy objectives: explicit and implicit value premises

3. Theory(ies) or hypothesis(es) underlying the strategy and the substantive provisions of the policy.

4. Target segment(s) of society — those at whom the policy is aimed:
   a. Ecological, demographic, biological, psychological, social, economic, political, and cultural characteristics
   b. Size of relevant subgroups and of entire target segment(s) projected over time

5. Short- and long-range effects of the policy on target and nontarget segment(s) in ecological, demographic, biological, psychological, social, economic, political, and cultural spheres.

a. Intended effects and extent of attainment of policy objectives
b. Unintended effects
c. Overall costs and benefits

SECTION C: IMPLICATIONS OF THE POLICY FOR THE OPERATING AND OUTCOME VARIABLES OF SOCIAL POLICIES

1. Changes in the development, management, and conservation of natural and human-created resources
   a. Changes in ownership, control, and locus and criteria for decision-making
   b. Changes in types, quality, and quantity of goods and services produced
   c. Changes in priorities concerning resource allocation and conservation
   d. Other changes

2. Changes in the organization of work and production
   a. Development of new models, roles, and practices
   b. Strengthening of existing models, roles, and practices
   c. Elimination of existing models, roles, and practices
   d. Changes in criteria and procedures for access to positions in the work and production system
   e. Changes in the definition of work
   f. Changes in the design of work processes and in the quality of work life
   g. Other changes

3. Changes concerning exchange and distribution of goods, services, rights, and responsibilities
   a. Changes in the quality and quantity of general and specific entitlements, task- or role-specific rewards, and general and specific constraints
   b. Changes in the proportion of rights distributed as entitlements and as rewards, or in the extent to which the distribution of rights is linked to specific roles in work and production
   c. Changes in the proportion of rights distributed directly, in kind (e.g., public provisions and services), and rights distributed indirectly, as "right equivalents," purchasing power, or money
   d. Changes in the specifications of minimum levels of rights, e.g.,

"official poverty line," and in the extent to which the distribution of rights actually assures coverage of such a minimum level
   e. Changes in the relative distribution of rights, the terms of exchange of work products, and the degree of inequality of rights among individuals, groups, and classes
   f. Other changes

4. Changes in processes of governance and legitimation

5. Changes concerning reproduction, socialization, and social control

6. Consequences of changes concerning resources, work and production, rights, governance and legitimation, and reproduction, socialization, and social control, for:
   a. Circumstances of living of individuals, groups, and classes
   b. Power of individuals, groups, and classes
   c. Nature and quality of human relations among individuals, groups, and classes
   d. Overall quality of life

SECTION D: INTERACTIONS OF THE POLICY WITH FORCES AFFECTING SOCIAL EVOLUTION

1. History of the policy's development and implementation, including legislative, administrative, and judicial aspects

2. Political groups in society promoting or resisting the policy prior to, and following, its enactment: their type, size, organizational structure, resources, strength, extent of interest, value positions, and ideological orientation

3. Attributes of the natural environment, and changes in it

4. Intrinsic attributes and tendencies of people and their socially shaped elaborations

5. Basic and perceived needs of people

6. Demographic developments and changes in the ratio of population size to available natural and human-created resources

7. Economic surplus and its disposition

8. Social, occupational and spatial differentiations, and differentiations of rights and perceptions of interests; class structure and class consciousness; conflicts concerning resources, work, rights, and the disposition of the economic surplus

9. Development of ideas, knowledge, science, technology, skills

10. Prevailing symbolic universe and consciousness including images of established ways of life; customs and traditions; systems of ideas, beliefs, and meanings; conventional wisdom; perceptions of needs and interests; value positions; ideology

11. Critical consciousness and alternative visions

12. Interactions with other societies and exposure to alternative ways of life and consciousness

13. Social and foreign policies relevant to the focal issues of the policy

14. Summary and conclusions concerning the policy's interaction with the forces affecting its development and implementation

SECTION E: DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVE SOCIAL POLICIES; COMPARISON AND EVALUATION

1. Specifications of alternative social policies
   a. Aimed at the same policy objectives, but involving alternative policy measures
   b. Aimed at different policy objectives concerning the same policy issues

2. Comparison and evaluation: each alternative policy should be analyzed in accordance with the framework and compared with the original policy and other alternative policies.

DISCUSSION OF THE FRAMEWORK

The main sections of the framework are designed to elicit answers to five basic questions concerning a policy:

A— Which of the many domains of concern to a society constitute the focus for this policy?

B— How would the policy affect this domain in substantive terms?

C— How would society as a whole be affected by the substantive consequences of the policy?

D— What effects may be expected from the interaction of the policy with various forces within and outside the society?

E— What alternative policies could be designed to achieve the same or different policy objectives concerning the specified domain?

A—Both policy analysis and policy development should begin with the identification and exploration of the issues to be dealt with by given policies. The use of the term "issues" rather than "problems" in this context may require clarification, since social policies are usually considered to be measures for the solution or amelioration of specific social problems. According to the conception presented here, however, social policies are not merely societal responses to perceived problems, but constitute a system of human-designed principles for shaping the quality of life, the circumstances of living, power and social relations within society. Consequently, while many social policies are indeed designed to solve or reduce specified, perceived social problems, such as poverty, many others deal with issues which are not necessarily perceived as social problems, such as the provision of education, the maintenance of health, etc. It seems therefore preferable to denote the general focus of social policies not as "problems," but as "issues." Obviously, this latter term includes also the notion of "problems."

Two related propositions are implied in the title of the first section of the analytic framework. One is that each social policy does have specific, identifiable foci—the issue or issues with which it deals. The other is that the various issues with which specific social policies deal are all components of the general domains of social policies. The purpose of the first section of the analytic framework is to identify and examine the specific issues dealt with by a policy as basis for the analysis of this policy and for the development of alternative policies. Such identification and examination involves two sets of questions, one set on a descriptive level and the other on an analytic-dynamic level.

A-1—The manner in which given issues are to be identified and described will depend to a considerable extent on their intrinsic nature and on the state of established knowledge concerning them. In general,

issues should be identified and described within the context of the operating and outcome variables of social policies, rather than in terms of specific provisions of given policies. Thus, a given policy may make provisions for retirement income for a specific occupational group, e.g., railroad employees. The issue with which this policy deals should be defined as "retirement income maintenance," or perhaps even more comprehensively as "rights distribution through income maintenance," rather than as "railroad retirement income." Broad definitions of issues make it possible to examine and evaluate the effectiveness of policies in relation to generic societal functions instead of merely in their own limited and fragmented terms. Broad definitions of issues also facilitate the development of alternative policies. It can be seen from these comments that the way policy issues are defined is crucial for the entire analytic process. Care should therefore be taken to avoid definitions which are likely to limit policy analysis, and development of alternative policies, to the same assumptions and patterns of reasoning which led to the formulation of earlier policies.

One further caveat with respect to the proper identification of issues concerns the fact that policies may at times deal with covert issues rather than merely with overt ones. Thus, public assistance policies may deal overtly with income maintenance for economically deprived segments of a population but may, at the same time, deal covertly with the supply of cheap, unskilled workers.[1]

Descriptions of policy issues should identify and clarify major variables concerning the issues. If indicated, a classification or typology of the issues should be developed, problem areas should be specified, and the background and history of the issues should be reviewed. The scope and social significance of issues should be assessed in general terms, and, if appropriate, also in terms of prevalence and incidence rates throughout society, as well as relative prevalence and incidence rates among relevant subgroups of society.

A-2—Policy analysis and policy development require not only descriptive knowledge of issues but also insights into their underlying dynamics. Such insights can usually be derived from theories or hypotheses concerning the configuration of forces involved in the issues. This focus of social policy analysis and development involves, accordingly, a critical review of relevant scientific writings aimed at ascertaining the existing state, and the validity, of applicable theory.

B—The second section of the framework focuses on the objectives of a

given policy with respect to the issues it deals with, values relevant to social policy underlying these objectives, theoretical positions underlying the strategy and provisions of the policy, and the substantive effects of the policy on target and other segments of the population.

B-1—The objectives of social policies constitute key criteria for the evaluation of their social significance and the analysis of their effectiveness. Objectives of policies need, therefore, to be explicated as clearly as possible. The importance of specification of objectives for policy analysis and development is widely recognized but, nevertheless, such specifications are often neglected. One reason for this seems to be the tendency of some analysts to be more concerned with the technical aspects, or means, of a policy than with its objectives. Technical aspects of policy implementation are, of course, important, and alternative means need to be evaluated and compared in terms of their respective effectiveness and efficiency. However, unless objectives have been explicated, and are kept in mind constantly as yardsticks for policy evaluation, the examination of means and of technical aspects is likely to be of questionable utility.

One consequence of the dominant interest in policy means is the tendency to substitute technical means for social goals. Thus, for instance, "constructing houses" may come to be viewed as a policy objective, replacing the socially more appropriate objective of "housing people." Constructing houses is, no doubt, an important means toward the objective of housing people. However, when this means is elevated to the level of an objective, its pursuit may, under certain conditions, produce adverse consequences for the policy objective of "housing people." This has actually happened in the United States when several decades of public housing, slum clearance, and highway construction policies resulted in a net decrease of adequate housing for the population. This is not the place to explore the fascinating process of social policy goal displacement and the social forces underlying it. The process is mentioned here merely in order to alert analysts to its existence, and to the importance of distinguishing clearly between social policy objectives and social policy means when attempting to explicate the former.

One further difficulty concerning the identification of social policy objectives is the distinction between overt and covert objectives. This distinction corresponds to the one made above between overt and covert issues dealt with by policies. Overt objectives tend to be expressed in the preambles of policy documents, while covert objectives

can only be inferred from provisions in the operational sections of such documents, or from administrative regulations and practices, and subsequent court decisions during the implementation of a given policy. Frequently overt and covert objectives conflict with each other, and awareness of such built-in conflicts is, therefore, important in analyzing the consequences of a policy. Policy means designed originally for the achievement of overt policy objectives are occasionally transformed into covert policy objectives by way of the earlier mentioned substitution process. Thus, policies aimed at the elimination of hunger in the United States were gradually shifted in emphasis toward subsidizing agricultural production and disposing agricultural surpluses.

B-2—Next to be examined in social policy analysis and development are values relevant to social policy implicit in the overt and covert objectives of a given policy. Clarification of these values is likely to encounter difficulties similar to those discussed in connection with the specification of policy objectives. Values underlying overtly expressed objectives are likely to be openly stated or clearly implied in these objectives. On the other hand, values which underlie covert objectives will have to be inferred in the same way that these objectives are inferred, namely, on the basis of detailed aspects of the policy and the manner of its implementation. Once the two sets of values have been discerned, the extent of conflict between them, as well as of possible conflict between them and the dominant value orientation of society, needs to be assessed.

Clarification of value premises underlying the objectives of given social policies, and of the extent to which these value premises may be in conflict with a society's dominant value premises, is of crucial importance for social policy analysis and development since dominant value premises act as constraining forces with respect to the malleability of social policy systems. Knowing the value premises inherent in a policy seems, therefore, to be a prerequisite for predicting the manner of its implementation and its actual consequences for society.

At any point in time a society upholds many different values. The extent to which these different values influence social policies varies widely. Some values exert considerable influence on the policy system while the influence of others may be negligible. For purposes of social policy analysis consideration should be given mainly to value dimensions which are most likely to affect attitudes, decisions, and actions concerning resource control, work organization, and rights distribution. These value dimensions, denoted here as social policy relevant value dimensions, were identified in Chapter Two. The value premises of given policies should be

examined in relation to these specific value dimensions.[2]

B-3—Once the objectives and value premises of a policy are clarified, theories or hypotheses underlying its strategy and its concrete provisions should be made explicit, and their scientific validity should be examined. The extent to which the strategy and the concrete provisions of social policies are derived from theory is likely to vary from policy to policy. Some policies may not involve any theories or hypotheses. Others may have been intentionally designed in accordance with specific theories, while still others may not have been designed in accordance with theory, but may nevertheless reflect certain theoretical positions in their strategy and concrete provisions. Whatever the extent and nature of the theoretical underpinning of a given policy may be, the analysis should bring it to light. Furthermore, the analysis should also clarify whether the theories that underlie the strategy and the provisions of a given policy are compatible with the theories that explain the dynamics of the issue with which this policy is expected to deal. These latter theories, it will be recalled, are to be explored under the first section of the framework.

A few illustrations may aid in clarifying the connection between social theory and social policy. Social science offers several theories to explain the phenomenon of poverty. One theory views poverty as resulting from a deviant subculture—the "culture of poverty"—which supposedly is handed down from generation to generation. Another theory interprets poverty as the result of economic reality factors, such as economic depressions and extended unemployment, and adaptation to these factors on the part of population segments exposed to them for some time. A third theory explains poverty as the result of socially structured and legitimated inequalities with respect to the control of resources, the organization of work and the distribution of rights in society. Social policy measures aimed at combating poverty can be devised in accordance with each of these theories. Educational approaches such as "Headstart," "Upward-bound," and various work training and work experience programs are anti-poverty policies derived primarily from the "culture of poverty" theory. Income maintenance programs, work guarantee programs, and minimum wage laws reflect a theory interpreting poverty as the outcome of particular economic realities and antidiscrimination policies, and other policies eliminating obstructions to equal access to resources, work and rights, reflect the poverty theory of "socially structured and legitimated inequality."

While compatibility between a theory explaining the dynamics of a policy issue, and a theory underlying the strategy and concrete provi-

sions of that policy, seems to be a necessary condition of policy effectiveness, it is not sufficient to assure such effectiveness, since both theories may be invalid, or since policy objectives may be set at an inadequate level. Such inadequacies in the level of policy objectives may in turn reflect the values underlying the objectives. It can be seen, thus, that policy objectives, value premises underlying them, and theoretical positions concerning the strategy and provisions of a policy, have to be examined as interacting variables which affect policy outcomes jointly, rather than singly as independent forces.

B-4—In theory, every social policy affects every member of a given society to some extent. For purposes of social policy analysis and development not all effects are of equal significance, however. Every social policy tends to be aimed primarily at specific groups of a society who constitute the "target segment(s)" for the intended effects of the policy. The remainder of the population, "the nontarget segment," is likely to be subject to indirect effects, most of which may be unintended, and some of which may be of limited significance only. No doubt, this division of a population into target and nontarget segments, and of policy effects into intended and unintended ones, is a somewhat arbitrary dichotomization. It seems, however, to be a useful device for social policy analysis, provided analysts do not interpret these divisions as valid representations of reality but merely as schematic approximations.

Before the effects of a given social policy can be explored, the characteristics of target segments within a society must be investigated with respect to the following spheres which are relevant to social policy: ecological, demographic, biological, psychological, social, economical, political, and cultural. The more complete and reliable the information obtained in each of these spheres, the more reliable can be the analysis of the policy and the prediction of its effects. In gathering information on the target segments in these spheres, analysts should proceed from general toward specific levels, but should avoid specificity beyond a level expected to be utilized in the analysis. The optimum scope of information concerning the several spheres, and the optimum level of specificity, will also depend on the nature of the issue dealt with by the policy, the policy objectives, the policy strategy and provisions, and the theoretical position underlying the strategy and provisions.

Besides describing relevant characteristics of target segments of the population, their numerical size (as well as the size of appropriate subgroups among them) should be clarified, both in absolute terms and

relative to the size of the entire population. Furthermore, projections into the future of these absolute and relative numerical sizes should be calculated as a basis for predicting long-range consequences of a given social policy. Published census data and, when indicated, special complications of raw census data, available from the Bureau of the Census, are the best source for this type of information in most instances.

B-5—The final focus of the second section of the framework calls for an examination of the chain of effects set in motion by a given social policy throughout the target and nontarget segments of society. In this examination analysts should review first the intended effects of a policy, the "policy objectives," and the extent to which these intended effects actually occur. However, not less important than the review of intended effects and the degree of their realization is a search for possible occurrence and scope of unintended and unanticipated effects of a policy. Both types of effects may occur in the spheres of population characteristics mentioned above. Obviously, not every single policy will have noticeable effects in all these spheres. However, checking each sphere for possible effects will reduce the probability of errors due to oversight.

Once the intended and unintended effects of a policy have been established, they should be examined in terms of their overall costs and benefits. This examination should discern not only economic costs and benefits, but also social costs and benefits, although it may be much more difficult to estimate the latter. The translation of policy effects into cost-benefit terms may be useful for comparing alternative policies dealing with the same policy issue with respect to their relative effectiveness and efficiency.

C—The third section of the framework is based on the conceptual model of social policies and is designed to explore the effects of specific social policies on the structure and dynamics of society as a whole by discerning the extent to which the provisions and consequences of these policies result in significant modifications of the operating and outcome variables of social policies.

C-1—Important issues to be examined under this focus are whether the concrete provisions of a policy cause changes in ownership and control of resources; in participation in decisions concerning use, allocation, and conservation of resources; and in the criteria by which these decisions are made. Ownership, control, and decision making can be concentrated or dispersed, public or private, centralized or

decentralized, regulated or unregulated. Changes in social policies can cause shifts and different combinations concerning these dimensions. Policy controversies concerning ownership, control, and decision making regarding resources are illustrated by eminent domain and zoning laws, rent control, worker ownership, and capital gains and inheritance taxes.

Criteria for decision making concerning resources may be modified by social policies along such dimensions as individual vs. public interest, short-term vs. long-term goals and interests, maximization of profits vs. satisfaction of people's needs and promoting consumer interests, and maximum exploitation of resources vs. use of resources in harmony with requirements of conservation.

Priorities concerning resource allocation tend to reflect the preferences of individuals, groups, and classes, who own and control the resources, and who are, therefore, in a privileged position to make decisions concerning them. Priorities tend to change when policies effect changes in the relative power of interest groups and corresponding shifts in patterns of ownership and control. Shifts in value premises may have to precede such changes in policies. Movements for peace and economic conversion, which aim to shift resources from military uses toward meeting human needs and protecting the environment, illustrate intrasocietal conflicts concerning priorities in resource allocation.

Social policies effecting changes in the types and quality of goods and services are illustrated by policies promoting shifts from large, energy-wasting to small, energy efficient cars; from transportation by private cars to public transportation by trains and buses; from privately purchased medical care to publicly maintained health services; from products made of nonrenewable and nonbiodegradable materials (e.g., plastics), to products made of renewable and biodegradable materials (e.g., wood, wool, and cotton); and from low-quality products with built-in obsolescence, to be discarded and replaced after relatively short use, to high-quality products, designed for long-term use. Qualitative changes may result also from policies conducive to the development of new products and services, and to the discontinuance of existing ones, such as the introduction of personal computers and their penetration into many spheres of life, and the closing of public libraries on weekends, respectively.

Policies supportive of qualitative changes in resource use will usually result also in quantitative changes, since the introduction of new or modified goods and services tends to be followed by changes in utilization

patterns and in demand for earlier products. In turn, policies promoting significant changes in quantity of production will often lead to qualitative changes, as illustrated by declines in quality and increase in waste associated usually with shifts to mass production.

An important social policy issue concerning resource use is whether the quantities produced of such goods and services as food, clothing, housing, health care, education, recreation, and transportation correspond to the actual levels of need in a population or merely to "effective demand" or "purchasing power" as manifested in "free markets." Whenever the scope of production of such goods and services is geared to effective demand, the needs of many people with insufficient purchasing power will simply not be satisfied. Hunger, homelessness, and disease are some of the unintended, though usual, consequences of resource allocation policies which set production levels without regard for levels of need.

C-2—The organization of work can be affected and changed by social policies in many ways. Old patterns, such as serfdom and slavery, were abolished, and new patterns, such as democratically managed worker-cooperatives, may be established. Policies may also strengthen established models of work organization—private or public enterprises involving wage labor—and inhibit the development of alternative models through mechanisms such as licensing, incorporation, and taxation.

Social policies can facilitate or inhabit the representation of workers by unions, and they can promote or retard health and safety and other qualitative aspects of work life, such as the length of work days, weeks, and years; rest and vacation periods (including paid parental leave, educational leave, and sabbaticals); and provisions for the care of children of working parents.

Policies can also change the very definition of the concept of work, by expanding or narrowing the range of activities which are regarded and rewarded as work. Are people "working" when they care for their own children or when they nurse disabled parents or relatives, or are such activities considered work only when carried out by nonrelated persons? Are people working when they engage in activities which damage or endanger other people or the environment and its resources? Policy solutions of such definitional issues and dilemmas have implications for inclusion of activities within the GNP, or their exclusion from it, and for social recognition and economic rewards for persons engaging in the activities, by choice or necessity.

A major policy issue concerning the organization of work is whether all people are expected and entitled to participate in accordance with their capacities, or whether some people may be excluded from participation through delayed entry, forced unemployment, or forced retirement. A related issue concerns the criteria societies use for selection, preparation, and assignment of individuals and groups to different positions within their system of tasks and functions. Access to all positions may be open to everyone on an equal basis, as would be the case in an egalitarian, democratic society, or access may be determined almost completely by birth and origin, as in caste systems. Between these extremes, many intermediate types of access to tasks and positions are possible, and can be designed by social policies. Policies dealing with socialization, education, training, apprenticeship, and inheritance, and with discrimination by age, sex, race, ethnicity, religion, political views, etc., are relevant to this important issue. Modifications of these policies would, therefore, be reflected in gradual changes concerning people's access to tasks and positions in a society's work system.

One other issue concerning work which social policies influence is the design of processes of work and production. Designs vary in consequences for human development and self-actualization. Designs will inhibit development, when people are not expected to use their intellectual faculties and creativity in their work, as is the case when workers are viewed as "factors of production" and "attachments to machines." Automated assembly lines and minute subdivision of processes of production illustrate such dehumanizing designs.[3] On the opposite end of this dimension are work designs and contexts of creative artists who use their intellectual, emotional, and physical faculties in an integrated manner while working, and who exercise a relatively high degree of control over their work. Many variations are possible between these extremes, and social policies can reduce dehumanizing tendencies and facilitate the emergence of development-conducive ones.

C-3—Analysis of the effects of social policies on the exchange and distribution of goods, services and rights involves several aspects. One of these is the discernment of changes in general and specific entitlements, in task-specific rewards, and in general and specific constraints. Illustrations of such changes in policies are: the establishment of a universal national health service, or health services for retired, aged individuals—a general or specific entitlement, respectively; increases in the

legal minimum wage and in the compensation of members of Congress—task-specific rewards; and changes in the rates of income tax and capital gains tax—general and specific constraints, respectively.

Related to policy changes concerning entitlements, rewards, and constraints are consequences of these changes for the ratio of rights distributed as entitlements to rights distributed as task-related rewards. Were a society to establish a system of free food distribution or a minimum annual income as general entitlements, the ratio of rights distributed as entitlements to rights distributed as task-specific rewards would change significantly, and the extent to which the distribution of rights is linked to people's specific positions in the work system would be greatly reduced.

Another ratio relevant to social policy is that of rights distributed directly, in kind (e.g., publicly supplied provisions and services), to rights distributed indirectly in the form of right-equivalents (such as money, which recipients can transform into a variety of rights at their discretion). Using the foregoing illustrations, a system of free food distribution would increase the proportion of rights distributed in kind, while a guaranteed cash income would increase the proportion of rights distributed in the form of right-equivalents or purchasing power.

A society's changing concepts of the levels of minimum rights which it guarantees to all its members is an important aspect of its system of rights distribution. The specifications of such levels, and changes in these specifications over time are, therefore, important social policies. These specifications have taken different forms throughout history. Major policy instruments such as the Magna Carta, the U.S. Constitution, and the Bill of Rights defined basic levels of civil and political rights. A more recent administrative method of such specifications are "official poverty lines."[4]

Social policies do not merely specify the levels, nature, and scope of minimal rights, but determine also the extent to which coverage of these levels is to be provided in practice. This latter function of social policies is perhaps even more significant for the actual distribution of rights in a society than the formal designation of the minimum levels. Obviously, social policy analysis and development need to be concerned with both aspects, the specifications and the extent of coverage.

A further aspect for analysis concerning the distribution and exchange of goods, services, and rights is whether a policy causes changes in prevailing relative distributions or in degrees of inequalities among individuals, groups, and classes. The ultimate source of inequalities are coercively initiated and maintained differences in social and

economic valuations of the work and products of different people and classes. These are reflected in consistent imbalances in exchanges of work and work products within and among societies. For policies to effect changes in relative distributions of goods, services, and rights, and in degrees of social inequalities, they would have to involve changes in the social and economic valuations of all types of work and workers, and they would have to reverse the coercive perpetuation of imbalances in exchanges of work and work products. For real social equality can be achieved only by policies which equalize the social and economic worth of all necessary work, and which eliminate structurally enforced imbalances concerning control over resources and exchanges of work and goods, services, and rights.

C-4—Social policies may effect changes in structures, processes, and responsibilities of governments at various levels, as well as in criteria for election and access to, or participation in, government bodies and institutions. Policies should, therefore, be examined for possible changes concerning these aspects of governance.

Legitimation can be accomplished through simple, formal processes, as well as through complex, subtle, symbolic, and informal ones. Analysis of social policies should discern possible changes in all these types of legitimation.

C-5—Social policies can affect and change processes of reproduction, socialization, and social control in many different ways. In fact, this diversity is so broad, that anticipating and mapping it does not seem possible. Analysis of discrete policies requires thorough exploration of their possible effects on these important variables of social life and societal evolution.

C-6—Once the effects of a policy on resource management, work organization, rights distribution, governance, legitimation, reproduction, socialization, and social control have been identified, the combined effects of these variables on circumstances of living, power, social relations, and the quality of life should be examined. These effects would be reflected in the spheres discussed above concerning the "target segments" of populations (Section B, 4 & 5). Information developed at that stage of an analysis, should be used here from a social structural perspective, to trace possible shifts in the circumstances and power of various groups and classes, and their consequences for social relations and the quality of life. Clearly, not every policy will affect every sphere.

Nevertheless, each sphere should be examined for possible effects.

In discerning policy effects on the circumstances of living and power of people, and on the overall quality of life, a distinction between objective indicators and subjective perceptions is required. Illustrations of objective indicators of various spheres are: pollution levels, highways, housing, and parks—ecological; population density, rates of births, deaths, marriages, divorces, and migration—demographic; infant morality, morbidity rates, and genetic disorders—biological; incidence of mental illness and suicide—psychological; social participation, social alienation, and social deviance—social; levels of production, distribution of goods and services, distribution of income and wealth, employment rates, and cost of living—economic; citizen participation, civil and political rights—political; science, education, recreation, art—cultural.[5]

Measures of subjective perceptions of the quality of life, circumstances of living, and power, are usually not readily available unless special surveys are conducted. When surveys are conducted, they should elicit feelings, attitudes, and opinions before and after the implementation of specific social policies. Responses of individuals obtained by such surveys can be aggregated into quantitative measures of subjective perceptions. Eventually such surveys could be carried out routinely.

A comment seems indicated concerning the difference between the concepts "quality of life" and "circumstances of living." The former refers to phenomena on an aggregate level as encountered by society as a whole. The latter, on the other hand, refers to specific living conditions of individuals and social classes. The concepts are related, yet they refer to different aspects of the same reality.

While objective changes in quality of life, circumstances of living, and power can be observed and often measured directly, changes in intrasocietal relations may be less noticeable, especially when the changes are merely minor. Some of these changes will be on the level of formal, institutionalized relations, such as changes in doctor-patient relations upon the establishment of a national health service, or changes in relations between employers and employees, once social policies sanction labor unions as bargaining agents. Other changes may be more subtle, such as changes in informal and formal intrafamilial relations upon the introduction of income maintenance schemes, such as children's allowances, parents' wages, retirement benefits, negative income taxes, or universal demogrants.

A useful approach toward detecting changes in human relations involves identification of sets of intrasocietal relations which are likely

to be affected by specific social policies. Once these sets are identified, possible changes in their relations may be discerned.

D—The fourth section of the framework examines social policies in relation to forces represented in Chart #2.2 of the preceding chapter. The purpose of this analysis is to study the effects of interactions between specific policies and forces within and outside a society which surround the development and implementation of social policies.

D-1—In preparation for studying these interactions, the history of specific policies should be reviewed. Attention should be given to political, legislative, administrative, and judicial aspects. Information gathered for Section A, when analyzing issues dealt with by specific social policies, is likely to be relevant to the historical review.

D-2—The second item of this section is actually part of the historical review. Yet, because of the importance of political forces for the development of social policies, they should be examined separately. Not all political forces in a society are, however, relevant to the analysis of every social policy. Only those political forces should be examined which were involved in the evolution of specific policies, or are likely to become involved in the future.

D-3 and *D-4*—Next, interactions of a policy with facilitating and limiting aspects of the natural environment, and of biological, psychological, and social attributes of people should be examined. The importance of the former can be grasped by studying differences in the evolution of social policies among nomadic societies living on the fringes of deserts, and sedentary societies inhabiting the fertile valleys of major rivers. As for the latter, biological, psychological, and social characteristics of people are relevant to social policy analysis since they underlie specific behavioral and motivational patterns. Assumptions concerning these patterns tend to influence the design of social policies. Thus, for instance, work incentive features in income maintenance policies, and tax reduction features as incentives to philanthropic gifts or capital investments, reflect certain assumptions concerning human behavior and motivation implicit in the notion of "rational, economic individuals" who act to maximize perceived self-interests.

While human attributes reveal usually a high degree of continuity, they are nevertheless subject to change under the influence of different societal patterns and social policies. This plasticity of human characteristics is revealed in the development of individuals who are transplanted

from one societal context to a vastly different one. Behavior and motivation should therefore not be regarded as unchangeable factors in the analysis and development of social policies. Biological properties of people and of the natural environment, on the other hand, seem to be less plastic than psychological and social characteristics, and physical properties of the natural environment tend to be most resistant to change through human intervention. These differences in plasticity should be kept in mind when examining interactions of social policies with the facilitating and limiting characteristics of people and of natural environments.

D-5—Basic and perceived human needs are assumed to be the sources of social evolution, social change, and social policies. In accordance with this assumption, it was suggested in Chapter Two, that the extent to which people are able to realize their needs was an appropriate criterion for evaluating ways of life and social policies.[6] Analysis of interactions between specific social policies and basic and perceived human needs should, therefore, discern possible changes, associated with the implementation of the policies, in the extent to which people of different groups and classes can satisfy their needs. Analysis should also trace changes in people's perceptions of their needs associated with given social policies, and how policies, in turn, are shaped by people's basic and perceived needs.

D-6—Demographic developments may cause changes in the aggregate level of needs of a population and affect thus the interactions of social policies with basic and perceived human needs. Changes in population size and in age distribution, can cause conflicts related to emerging imbalances concerning resources, production, and distribution of goods and services. These conflicts and imbalances are often dealt with through policies aimed at restoring a balance and managing the conflicts. Analysis should trace demographic trends and examine whether, and how, they are reflected in specific social policies and changing societal practices. It should also examine how policies, in turn, affect demographic trends.

D-7—The capacity of human groups to produce more than necessary for survival and reproduction has posed challenges to them ever since they succeeded in generating a regular economic surplus. Major policy questions in this regard include: how, and by whom, is the surplus produced; what should be its form; who should share in its use and consumption; and how are rules concerning the production and distribu-

tion of the surplus to be enforced. Many social policies deal directly or indirectly with these issues. Analysis should, therefore, discern how the dynamics of surplus production and disposition are reflected in given policies, and how these policies influence and change these dynamics.

D-8—Differentiations within societies by occupation, location, rights, life style, social class, consciousness and perceptions of interests are results of historic processes, set in motion and perpetuated by the production of economic surplus, and conflicts and struggles over its allocation and distribution. Social policies serve as ex-post-facto ratifications and legitimations of these intrasocietal differentiations. Some differentiations may benefit everyone in a society (e.g., improvements in productivity and in the overall quality of life due to competence gained by specialization), while other differentiations may benefit only special groups and classes who monopolize control over resources and access to privileged roles, functions, power, and life styles. While differentiations which benefit all people in a society evenly tend to evolve without coercion, differentiations which serve mainly the interests of special groups and classes, are usually established and perpetuated through the use of overt and covert coercion.[7]

Policy analysis should examine the influence of established intrasocietal differentiations, and of tendencies and conflicts inherent in them, on new policies. It should also examine likely consequences of new policies for prevailing differentiations, their reinforcement, and possible changes in them.

D-9—Ideas, knowledge, science, technology, and skills are products of intrasocietal differentiations, which have important implications for social evolution, social change, and social policies. Social policies, in turn, affect the development of ideas, knowledge, science, technology, and skills. Societies at different stages of development concerning these cultural dimensions, generate different systems of social policies, which, in turn, are reflected in differences concerning the development of ideas, knowledge, science, technology, and skills. These interactions are not always taken into account in social policy analysis and development. Disregarding them has often resulted in unintended and unexpected consequences of specific social policies. A well-known illustration of this is the invention, and subsequent evolution, of the automobile, and the sequence of social policies which this invention stimulated. Interactions between this invention and these policies on the one hand, and many aspects of life in the United States and in foreign countries on the other, have gradually revolutionized the overall quality of life, the circum-

stances of living, and the nature of human relations on an unprecedented and unexpected scale. Had the attention of policy makers been focused on these multifaceted interactions when they formulated social policies which subsequently became important factors in the evolution of the automobile, many undesirable side effects of the unrestrained development of the automobile could, perhaps, have been prevented.

To prevent unintended consequences such as these, analysis of new social policies should examine whether, and how, they are influenced by established ideas, knowledge, science, technology, and skill; whether they reinforce them, and if so, with what consequences; or whether they transform them, and if so, in what ways.

D-10—The "symbolic universe" or "socially constructed reality" of people, including the major themes of consciousness reviewed in Chapter Two, exert a constraining influence on the formulation of new social policies and on modification of established ones.[8] Analysis should therefore examine the effects of themes of consciousness on new policies, and consequences of new policies for the reinforcement or modification of prevailing consciousness. It is especially important to clarify whether the value premises and perceptions of interests implicit in a policy are internally consistent and compatible with the dominant beliefs, values, perception of interests, and ideology of society. Internal inconsistencies and lack of compatibility concerning these aspects, should alert analysts to likely difficulties and conflicts during the implementation of a policy.

D-11—Critical consciousness and alternative visions of social life are among the major themes of consciousness.[9] Their influence on social policy development should nevertheless be examined separately because of their crucial role in social evolution and change. The spread of critical consciousness among members of a society is a necessary element of all significant social change. The influence of critical consciousness on new policies, as well as consequences of new policies for the expansion of critical consciousness, should therefore be examined in any policy analysis.

D-12—The ways of life of nearby and distant societies have always exerted an influence on the consciousness of people, and, therefore, on the development of social policies. This influence has intensified greatly in the twentieth century, due to technological improvements in transportation and communication, and resulting increases in intersocietal contacts and flow of information. Policy analysis should discern the

extent of this influence in relation to specific social policies, as well as the influence of new policies on the scope of ongoing intersocietal relations. Illustrations of policies reflecting mutual influences among societies are worldwide similarities of programs for social security. Illustrations of policies designed to inhibit intersocietal contacts and the flow of information on different ways of life are restrictions on the entry into a country by individuals espousing "undesirable" views, and censorship on foreign newspapers and books.

D-13—From a theoretical perspective every social policy interacts to a certain extent with every other social and foreign policy. From a practical perspective, however, analysis should be limited to interactions with policies which are likely to result in significant rather than in minor effects. Policies which deal with the same and with related societal issues should certainly always be considered.

Interactions between social and foreign policies are not always considered in the analysis of social policies, although, especially during periods of foreign wars, foreign policies exert considerable, manifold influences over decisions concerning intrasocietal resource management, organization of work, and rights distribution. And, in turn, social policies exert similarly important influences over foreign trade and other aspects of foreign policy, such as economic aid, capital investments, cultural relations, territorial expansion, migration, and war and peace. Examining effects of actual and potential interactions between specific social policies and relevant foreign policies is, therefore, as important an aspect of social policy analysis and development as the study of interactions among the various social policies of a society.

D-14—The substantive items of section D of the framework are closely interrelated since they all focus on interactions between specific social policies and various sets of forces within and beyond the same society. They are thus dealing with the same question from different perspectives. It seems, therefore, important to go through the analysis of all the substantive items of this section before predicting the probable fate of specific social policies, rather than attempting such predictions on the basis of information gathered in relation to merely one or some of the items.

E—Section E moves beyond the analysis of specific social policies to the development and study of alternative policies, and to the systematic comparison of these social policies, in terms of specified evaluative

criteria. The development and study of alternative social policies is perhaps the most important aspect of policy analysis, and thus the most constructive use to which the framework may be put. For ancient social problems which have defied solution when attacked through conventional, incremental policy strategies, may yield to innovative approaches involving significant restructuring of the major processes of social policies, the existing configurations of which maintain the alienating status quo and sustain its social problems.

E-1—In general, the development of alternative social policies involves determination of the nature and scope of changes which need to be made in the policy processes of resource management, work organization, rights distribution, governance, and socialization, in order to attain selected objectives on the outcome variables of social policies. These changes are then transformed into substantive program elements which are incorporated into newly generated policies. It should be reemphasized that specified policy objectives depend for their realization on specific configurations of the policy processes, and that unless these specific configurations are attained by means of appropriate modifications, the objectives can simply not be realized.

More specifically, development of alternative social policies involves one or the other of two approaches, or combinations of these approaches. The first approach is concerned mainly with assuring effectiveness and increasing efficiency in relation to constant policy objectives. Alternative policies developed along this path are unlikely to result in significant social-structural breakthroughs or major modifications of social policies. They will merely increase the probability that specified policy objectives are indeed achieved, that resources are not wasted in the process, and that undesirable side effects are minimized.

An illustration of policy alternatives of this type would be different policies aimed at the identical objective of closing the official "poverty gap." Closing the poverty gap involves transferring income from groups in the population with incomes above the official "poverty line" to groups with incomes below that line in amounts sufficient to close the income gap for all persons whose income is below the poverty line. A number of approaches are available to achieve this objective. Income could be transferred through "negative income taxes" involving work incentive features at varying levels, and administered through different procedures; through "universal demogrants" at, or above, the level of the poverty line, distributed to all members of society, with surplus income recouped through various provisions in the tax laws; through a

combination of measures including increases in minimum wages, creation of public service and other jobs, extending social security to currently not covered groups of the population, and increasing minimum social security payments to the poverty level. Obviously, several other policies could be devised to close the poverty gap. Analysis by means of relevant sections of the framework would indicate the extent to which each approach achieved the specified objective of eliminating the poverty gap, what other consequences would occur, and what overall societal costs and benefits would be involved. All these alternative policies would, however, accept, by implication, the closing of the poverty gap as an appropriate policy objective in relation to the underlying policy issue of income distribution.

The second approach to the development of alternative social policies begins with questions concerning the appropriateness of given policy objectives with respect to the issues to be dealt with by these policies. If existing objectives do not seem suitable, alternative, more suitable ones are specified, and policies corresponding to these alternative objectives are then generated. Thus, in relation to the issue of income distribution discussed above, questions could be raised concerning the appropriateness of the objectives of eliminating the poverty gap. Such an objective might be considered inappropriate by some analysts as it could, in their view, undermine motivation to work and to support oneself and one's family, and lead to a general decline of individual responsibility. Proponents of such views might suggest, as alternative policy objectives, (1) closing merely a portion (e.g., one half) of the poverty gap in order to protect poor individuals and families against extreme hardships while maintaining pressures on them to seek employment; or (2) closing the poverty gap only for groups in the population who are not expected to support themselves by working, such as children, aged individuals, and people with disabilities. Other analysts might view the objective of closing the poverty gap as inadequate since its redistributive effects may seem to them insignificant in terms of equalizing rights and opportunities throughout society, and since, even as a minimum standard of living, the poverty level would be judged by them to be totally inadequate and inhumane. Proponents of these latter views might suggest, as an alternative policy objective concerning the issue of income distribution, to close the income gap up to an objectively measured standard of decent living, such as the Bureau of Labor Statistics' "low" standard of living which is nearly twice the amount of the official "poverty line." It is clear from these illustrations that the selection of policy objectives tends to be influenced by value premises,

ideological positions, and theoretical assumptions of different policy analysts, and that such selections are therefore based only partly on objectively established facts.

Value premises, ideological positions, and theoretical assumptions concerning human behavior and motivation influence not only the selection of policy objectives but also the selection of policy means. Illustrations of this would be differences in the scope of work incentive features and in procedures for verifying resources of recipients and establishing eligibility, among alternative income maintenance policies geared to the identical policy objective of eliminating the poverty gap. Another illustration would be the choice between "selective" approaches (such as the negative income tax) and "universal" approaches, (such as parents' wages and children's allowances) as means of closing the poverty gap. Selective approaches would maximize the economic value of efficiency, while universal approaches would sacrifice economic efficiency to the value of social integration.[10]

E-2—Alternative policies developed at this stage of an analysis, be they aimed at attaining originally selected policy objectives or newly suggested alternative objectives, should be analyzed in accordance with relevant foci in sections B through D of the framework, and compared throughout this analysis with the original policy and other alternative policies. These comparisons and evaluations constitute the summation of a policy analysis, and should answer the following questions:

- What values would be maximized by the original and the alternative social policies in terms of social policy relevant value dimensions?
- What are the objectives of the different social policies with reference to the issues dealt with by them, and how effective would each policy be in realizing its respective objectives?
- What would be the impact of these different policies on the structure of society, the processes of social policies, and the entire system of social policies?
- What unintended side effects could be expected from the several policies?
- And, finally, what would be the overall benefits and overall real costs to society as a whole of every one of these policies?

SUMMARY

To conclude the discussion of the framework for the analysis and

development of social policies, several general observations seem indicated. First of all, it needs to be reemphasized that the framework is not meant to yield automatic solutions to policy questions. It is definitely not designed as a substitute for informed and critical human intellect, but merely as an important aid to it. The more thoroughly policy analysts understand the complex dynamics of their society and the substantive issues dealt with by specific policies, the more useful the framework could be in their work.

Few policy analysts can be expected to have sufficiently mastered all the relevant scholarly disciplines dealing with societal dynamics and substantive policy issues such as biology, ecology, demography, psychology, sociology, anthropology, economics, political science, history etc. It would appear, therefore, that in order to achieve optimal results with the aid of the framework, policy analyses should, preferably, be carried out by multidisciplinary teams rather than by individual analysts working independently. Such teams, because of the collective competence of their members, will be skilled in identifying and utilizing the types of data needed to carry out complete policy analyses, and they will know where and how these data can be secured efficiently. Moreover, teams of policy analysts working under the auspices of government bureaus, policy institutes, or of citizens' organizations, could develop and maintain permanent files of relevant series of data, instant availability of which would greatly facilitate and accelerate the systematic analysis and development of social policies.

While, then, the implementation of comprehensive, valid, and reliable policy analyses requires considerable resources because of the complex nature and scope of the task, it is nevertheless possible to utilize the framework in a flexible manner on a lesser scale of effort and investment. This can be done by individual analysts or by small ad hoc teams working outside well equipped organizations. Such less complete analyses may often be sufficient for purposes of orientation concerning specific policies. Abbreviated analyses should utilize the five general questions listed on page 70 and 71, each of which corresponds to one section of the framework. From these general questions analysts could proceed to deal with the first-order (numbered) items of relevant sections of the framework, by-passing the second-order (lettered) subitems. The reliability of shortened analyses will be lower than that of the complete analyses, and interpretations, conclusions, and predictions based on them will have a wider margin of error. Yet, nevertheless, there are likely to be many instances when such shortened analyses will be all that is required, and when it would even be wasteful to

carry out more comprehensive analyses.

One further comment concerns differences in the use of the framework in the analysis of existing or proposed policies, and in the development of new ones. In either case, it is important to start with a study of the issues to be dealt with by a policy—section A of the framework. However, when analyzing an existing or proposed policy, the remaining sections of the framework are followed in proper sequence from B through E, while in developing new policies work on section A is followed by sections, E, B, C, and D, in that order. Also, when generating new policies it is important to develop specific statements of the provisions of the proposed policies before proceeding with sections B through D of the framework. Without such specific policy statements the analysis could not be carried out properly.

The foregoing discussion of the framework and its utilization in the analysis and development of social policies has probably left several unanswered questions in the minds of readers. These questions, it is hoped, will be clarified in the next chapter through an illustration of the application of the framework in the analysis and development of one specific social policy. This illustrative analysis was carried out by one analyst working by himself, and it is, therefore, not as thorough and reliable as it could be, were it undertaken by a multidisciplinary team, competent in all relevant social and life sciences. Shortcomings of the following policy analysis reflect thus limitations of the analyst, but not of the method, and are, therefore, not expected to thwart the purpose of the illustration, which is to further clarify the analytic approach, rather than to fully analyze one specific social policy.

NOTES

1. Piven, Frances Fox and Cloward, Richard, *Regulating the Poor: The Function of Public Welfare* (New York: Pantheon Books, Random House, 1971).
2. See Chapter Two, pp. 48-52.
3. Braverman, Harry, *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*, (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974); Pope John Paul, II, *Encyclical on Human Work* (Boston, MA: Daughters of St. Paul, 1982).
4. Orshansky, Mollie, "Counting the Poor: Another Look at the Poverty Profile," *Social Security Bulletin*, January 1965.
5. Eleanor B. Sheldon and Wilbert E. Moore, ed., *Indicators of Social Change—Concepts and Measurement* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1968); Otis Dudley Duncan, *Toward Social Reporting: Next Steps* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969); U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, *Toward a Social Report* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969); Raymond A. Bauer, ed., *Social Indicators* (Cambridge, MA, an London, England: The M.I.T. Press, 1966); Jan

Drewnowski, *Studies in the Measurement of Levels of Living and Welfare*, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, Report No. 70.3 (Geneva 1970); Jan Drewnowski, Claude Richard-Proust & Muthu Subramanian, *Studies in the Methodology of Social Planning*, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, Report No. 70.5 (Geneva 1970); Donald V. McGranahan, "Analysis of Socio-Economic Development Through a System of Indicators," *The Annals*, Vol. 393 (January 1971); Jan Drewnowski, "The Practical Significance of Social Information," *The Annals*, Vol. 393 (January 1971).

6. See Chapter Two, p.18.
7. See Chapter Two, p.57.
8. See Chapter Two, pp. 41-54.
9. See Chapter Two, p.54.
10. Reddin, Mike, "Universality Versus Selectivity," in William A. Robson and Bernard Crick, ed., *The Future of the Social Services* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books Ltd., 1970).