

CHAPTER ONE

SOCIAL POLICY AND PLANNING

1.1.THE WHY OF SOCIAL POLICY

What do you think the rationale of taking policy/ social policy?

In response to this question different individuals provide different explanation for it but generally irrespective of its type and characteristics its rationality is related to the relation to government and its citizen.

What is the nature of the relationship between government and citizens? Modern government and citizens –contractual agreement that means citizens support the government with paying taxes and seeking for good of the government and government secures the interest of citizens through formulating public policy. However, clash between policy makers and citizen’s interest result in –policy malfunctioning, inequality, poverty, authoritative rule, exclusion and deprivation which result in the development of social policy/ social policyto fill those gaps.

1.2.Definition of Concepts

1.2.1. Social

The term social can be seen in different ways. It can be used very widely and has different meanings. We can group these various definitions into five categories:

- ❖ The word social is associated with entertainment or leisure
- ❖ It is used as antonym or opposite of individual
- ❖ The word social is used to indicate relationship or social relations – extrovert or introvert individuals
- ❖ The word social is used as antonym of economic
- ❖ The word social is something which people have intrinsic rights- the right to speech, the right to get social services, justice, etc

1.2.2. Policy

There seems to be as many definitions of policy as there are many policy analysts. For instance;

- ❖ Ranney (1968:7) defines *policy* as ‘a declaration and implementation of intent.

- ❖ Easton (1953:129) defines policy as ‘the authoritative allocation, through the political process, of values to groups or individuals in the society.
- ❖ It is a plan of action adopted/persuaded by an individual, government, party, business groups, etc.
- ❖ It can also be defined as the course or principle of action proposed by the government, group or an individual.
- ❖ Anderson (2000:4) defining policy as ‘a relatively stable, purposive course of action followed by an actor or a set of actors in dealing with a problem or issue of concern’.

Generally, policy refers to a plan of action, statement of aims and ideals specially one made by a government, political party, business company, etc. policies can be determined by custom, law or voluntary group action. Social policy can be defined in different ways. In one sense it can be defined as the aims of a group of citizens on a particular problem. For example we can talk of family policy, health policy, education policy, etc. It can also be defined as a set of programs developed either by government or private organizations to deliver particular welfare services.

The term policy may also be used to refer to the rules and regulations, which govern the day-to-day delivery of specific services. In other words policy can be defined as the operating guidelines for formal organizations, which deliver human services. Thus an income maintenance program can be governed by a policy, which requires that able-bodied recipients register for work or take any work, which is offered. Mental health services may have a policy of not accepting chronic alcoholics and drug addicts or, on the contrary, a policy of especially trying to reach alcoholics and drug addicts.

Debate on Economic development Vs Social development

Is growth alone enough? What is the contribution of social development for economic development and the vice versa?

The first view on the debate

Social policies should not be a primary policy objective for developing countries. Economic growth should be the first priority, as the benefits of growth will “trickle down” eventually to the poor.

What are the rationales?

Growth is a pre-requisite for poverty reduction. The benefits of growth will eventually trickle down to the rest of society. The rich save more; higher inequality means higher rates of savings, investment and future growth. Poverty keeps the labor force cheap and thus encourages investment.

Minimal social policies and regulations make labor markets flexible, and employment more likely.

Taxation on higher income groups should be limited to maximize the retained income available for investment. Later, as the country becomes richer, defenders of this view argue, governments may invest in social development. Such views are still influential in development debates, mostly in the form of a vague *“trickle down plus”* approach: **growth as first priority, with some basic education, health and other limited social development interventions.** Such arguments serve to delay social development and other equitable policies. **However, a considerable amount of recent research shows that economic growth and social development policies must be pursued simultaneously, rather than sequentially, as:**

The second view on the debate

Poverty and inequality inhibit growth, depress domestic demand and hinder national economic development. Developing countries with high inequality tend to grow slower. A low-wage policy has adverse effects on productivity, encouraging countries to compete on the basis of cheap labor, in a "race to the bottom", further depressing real wage levels. While sustained high rapid growth may lift people out of poverty, growing inequality may undermine its impact on poverty reduction, as in China recently. For the vast majority of developing countries, more modest growth and growing inequality have limited, even no, poverty reduction impact, the greater the inequality, the less the “trickle-down” effect.

- Only 4.2% of the world's growth reaches the poorer half of the world's population.
- Poverty and inequality is an obstacle to social progress, and can lead to social conflict and political instability.
- Historically, social development accompanied industrialization and economic development in most countries. In much of Europe and elsewhere, popular struggles led social development.

In East Asia's ‘late industrializers’, social investment was an integral part of modernization processes, nation building, and productive development.

Concluding remarks on the debate

There is now a consensus on the urgency to promote robust social and economic policies in **parallel**, in a **complementary and mutually reinforcing manner**. Economic growth permits sustained

investments in social development; and human development raises the capacities of people to contribute to growth. Sustainable growth and poverty reduction require socially inclusive National Development Strategies.

What are the possible justifications for Social policy?

1. Social policies are necessary because the benefits of economic growth do not automatically reach all.
2. Inadequate social policies ultimately limit growth in the medium and long term.
3. Social policies are justified not only from a humanitarian viewpoint; they are an economic and political need for future growth and political stability, minimally to maintain citizen support for their governments. :

Specifically, the arguments for equitable development policies are

Investing in people enhances the quality and productivity of the labor force, thus improving the investment climate and, hence, growth.

Raising the incomes of the poor increases domestic demand and, in turn, encourage growth; greater consumption ratios among lower income groups contribute to expanding the domestic market.

Highly unequal societies are associated with lower rates of growth.

Among children, poverty and malnutrition damage health, reduce body weight and intelligence, resulting in lower productivity in adulthood, a high tax for a country to pay.

Investing in girls and women has numerous positive multiplier effects for social and economic development.

Unequal societies are not only unjust but also cannot guarantee social and political stability in the long term, which is a barrier to economic growth.

Gross inequities and their associated intense social tensions are more likely to result in violent conflict, ultimately destabilizing governments and regions, and may make people more susceptible to terrorist appeals and acts.

Not least, inequality is inconsistent with the United Nations Charter, the Millennium Declaration and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights according to which everybody is entitled to minimum standards of living (food, clothing, housing, education, medical care, social security and others).

Therefore, **economic and social policies** need to be promoted in parallel, in a mutually reinforcing way, from an early development stage, as part of the country's national development strategy and the social contract between government and citizens.

1.2 Back ground of Social policy

In the 1980s and 1990s, the scope of social policy, focused on delivery of limited services and welfare was insufficient to achieve balanced social and economic development.

Social policy was considered **residual, secondary** to the focus on growth as then mainstream development theory focused on “**economic growth first**”. As such, social policy was given **lesser importance and funding**, and often was centered on mitigating the unintended consequences of economic change. This residual approach was dominant for about two decades, and led to increasing social tensions and malaise. This minimalist vision of social development was not common in earlier times in the 20th century. On the contrary, today’s high-income economies invested heavily in social development, and the populations of Europe, Japan, North America, Australia and New Zealand experienced a level of prosperity unseen in history.

Following their example, many developing countries also saw the need to apply social policies as an instrument for nation building. East Asia's social policies or the comprehensive social security systems in some Latin American countries are examples of these initiatives. These governments saw that social investments were essential not only to modernize and develop a country, but also to achieve **social cohesion and political stability**.

After having been pared to a minimum, social policies were reconsidered during the 1990s with the renewed attention of development policies to poverty reduction.

Even then, social policies were treated as **marginal, reduced** to little more than the idea of social safety nets in times of economic crisis as in the Asian Financial Crisis and the extension of basic education elsewhere, often left to donor-funded social investment programs.

These were well-intentioned initiatives by committed professionals but not adequate as lasting solutions.

These interventions did not address the structural causes of social tensions or build institutions to ensure equitable and sustainable development, decent work and social cohesion.

In the early 21st century, a consensus has emerged that social policy is part of the primary function of the state, and that social policy is more than a limited set of safety nets and services to cover market failure. Well-designed and implemented social policies can powerfully shape countries, foster employment and development, eradicate marginalization and overcome conflict. Social policies are an essential part of any National Development Strategy to achieve growth and equitable social outcomes. Social policy is also necessary in a globalizing world.

The extreme inequality in the world distribution of income and assets seriously undermines the effectiveness of global growth in reducing poverty. The magnitude of distribution asymmetries is significant: In 2000, the richest 1 % of adults alone owned 40 % of global assets, and the richest 10 % of adults accounted for 85 % of total world assets; In contrast, the bottom half of the world adult population owned barely 1 % of global wealth. This argues need to **reduce poverty, exclusion and conflict** have brought social policy to the forefront of the development agenda.

Redistribution is Critical to Reduce Poverty and Sustain Growth

Sustained poverty reduction is a twin function of the rate of growth and of changes in income distribution.

Redistribution has faster impacts on reducing poverty than growth, but economic growth is necessary to sustain the process over time. An exclusive focus on distribution leads to inflation and stagnation, leaving populations worse-off – the fate of some “populist” governments. An exclusive focus on growth leads to large inequalities, as many countries experienced in the 1980s and 1990s.

Redistribution is not antagonistic to growth; it stimulates consumption, Raises productivity and is important to sustain growth itself. What is needed is to find combinations of instruments and policies that will deliver both **growth and equity**. World Bank Chief Economist F. Bourguignon stresses that income distribution matters as much as growth for poverty reduction.

Redistribution is a legitimate goal of public policy, to balance the tendency of the market to concentrate resources.

Redistribution may be achieved through Domestic taxation, increased development aid and New proposed international sources such as taxes on short-term speculative financial transactions, on arms trade, pollution and others. **Without equitable policies, poverty will not be eradicated. The key that addresses appropriate policy on appropriate poverty should be involving political commitment**

Importance of Political Commitment:

The World Summit for Social Development (1995), Residual approaches to social policies and its adverse consequences, The need for comprehensive universal social policies to ensure a “society for all”, in which economic and social development are mutually reinforcing.

Their concerns and recommendations were incorporated into the Millennium Declaration, which restates international commitments to core values of freedom, equality, solidarity and peace.

Adopted in 2000 by a vote of 189 member nations of the UN, it serves as the basis for the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs),

MDGs: a set of quantifiable and time-bound targets that measure progress in achieving public goods essential to the welfare and cohesion of a society.

These were reaffirmed at the 2005 World Summit, with governments' pledging more ambitious National Development Strategies, backed by increased international support.

To achieve the MDGs, political commitment is necessary, particularly at a time when governments have a reduced national "policy space" (a constriction of domestic policy-making capacity in an open economy), less autonomy in public sector interventions and reduced fiscal capacity.

To be sustainable, social policies also require the creation of supportive political coalitions, and need to be designed with an eye to constituting such coalitions, while resisting policy capture by elite or vested interests.

Successful social policies require the political commitment of a country's leadership, and cannot be imposed by donor-driven conditionality's.

There is no "one-size-fits-all" policy. Choices ultimately depend on

- ✓ country context,
- ✓ domestic needs,
- ✓ internal political agreements/alliances,
- ✓ fiscal space, and
- ✓ Government motivation.

A state's underlying **motives for social policy** may include Nation building, Fostering domestic development, Social cohesion and Political stability.

Varying values and principles in social policy

In market economies (capitalist) countries, social policy usually targets selected population groups, problems or functions of society. It tends to be decentralized to regional and local authorities, eclectic in goals and programs, and associated mainly with social welfare, the poor and the disadvantaged. In contrast in non market economies (socialist oriented) social policy is centralized at the national bureaucratic level and usually provides universal coverage. The reasons behind the variation of social policies in different contexts include

1. ***Social problems are in the eyes of the beholder***: social problems are subjective, as they result from norms, values and priorities. For instance, government statistics that show increasing unemployment may constitute a problem for certain groups of people but not for others. Certainly, an unemployed person perceives unemployment as a problem, but employers who see unemployment as an opportunity to renew their labor force at a lower cost and to increase their profits may consider it as an opportunity, not as a problem.

2. ***political Ideology- a cluster of values***

There are members of distinct schools of thought including anarchist, fascist, liberal, social democratic, socialist and communist. What separates these doctrines is their views to society, their beliefs about the proper role of the state, and particularly the extent to which (and the ways in which) a state may intervene in the lives of its citizens. At one extreme, it may be thought that there should be no authority beyond the individual. Each person commands absolutely the conduct of his/her own life and bows to no other individual or corporate authority. At the opposite end of the spectrum, a state may treat (at least some) individuals as chattels, (assets) allowing them to be bought and sold as property of other people, or even making them slaves of the state.

Liberalism: Those who believe in liberalism seek to curtail the range and magnitude of government intervention. Clearly, with in a liberal state the individual is paramount and the scope for state intervention in the form of social policy is likely to be minimal.

Socialism: emphasizes an equality and fraternity and supports much state intervention to ensure the values of equality and fraternity.

3. ***Policy purposes***. Social policies may vary due to the varying purposes they may be intended to satisfy. Policy purposes emanate from the general ideologies and believe. Policy purposes could be:

- a. To keep things as they are or to effect change
- b. To privilege a special group or to treat all people equitably
- c. To promote equality or extend inequality
- d. To promote a set of specific values or to accommodate diverse values

Stability or change: policies may be developed in order to bring about certain changes or may be intended to resist change and maintain the status quo. Policies designed for stability will

support the prevailing norms, values and beliefs. In doing so they will tend to exclude or subordinate any competing sets of values and norms.

Whether one believes that the maintenance of stability is good or bad will depend on what is being preserved (pluralism + tolerance + privilege + discrimination). Sometimes, it may serve for good and at other times it may serve only the interests of particular powerful groups.

Privilege or equal treatment- policies may either seek or resist change. But beyond this they may also influence the way governments act towards the population at large. Policies may foster equal treatment of all citizens, or may preserve privileges for some to the detriment of other. **For example:** Apartheid in South Africa.

At that time, policies across the entire spectrum of government were constructed on the basis of racial differentiation, and in particular were built on the assertion of white superiority; consequently, in politics black people and those mixed race were disenfranchised. In education, the apportionment of resources heavily favored those schools attended by white children, and in terms of access to health services, priority was reserved for white people.

Equality versus inequality Policies in their actualization either reduce or enhance differences between people. In states where the values of individual autonomy are promoted as opposed to collective values, policies will not attempt to ensure equality. Individuals will be encouraged to make their own way, and in so far as they abide by the law, they will be free to increase their wealth, property and scope of activity. Inequality is almost certain to flourish in such conditions. However, in other states where more collective values hold sway, gross inequalities will be regarded as both problematic and undesirable.

In reality, many western nations, whilst accentuating the autonomy of the individual in recent years, still subscribe to some collective provision of certain basic “welfare” services such as education, health and social security.

Uniformity or diversity Many societies embody different communities, races, creeds and cultures. Within these states, there are values and principles that we may call “plural” as much as they support and encourage diversity. But there are also values and principles that tend to impose conformity or even uniformity. These we call “particular” or particularistic principles. Here diverse groups are invited or compelled to submit to the norms and ideologies of economic groupings.

Social Policy in National Development Strategies

Governments launch National Development Strategies to build countries that are :

- ✓ **Socially inclusive,**
- ✓ **Employment generating,**
- ✓ **Economically robust and**
- ✓ **Politically stable.**

To be effective, national strategies have to be articulated in an integrated manner and supported by a coalition of social and political forces, or social pacts, involving state, business, and organized civil society. This shared vision is the critical factor to sustain development processes. Ultimately, it is the willingness of different social groups to pursue a common interest that allows development to succeed.

Chapter Two

Historical Development of Social Policy: A Comparative Perspective

In this section we will see the paths that social policy has taken from sixteen century to the present. The section will especially try to give a comparative perspective on social policy as experienced and practiced in:

- i. Western capitalist countries
 - ii. Socialist countries
 - iii. Third world countries
- a. Social policy and social welfare state in western countries

After wwII the welfare state came in to being. Welfare state refers to the provision of social services by the state to its citizens. The major benefits include education, health care, and income maintenance programs like pension, family allowance, and unemployment compensation for jobless people.

In 19th century Britain, there were two sources of help for the poor: **1.** the state system of the poor relief dating from 16th century and **2.** Charity provided by voluntary organizations and individuals. The state system of the poor relief was based on the poor law amendment acts. (poor law = group of laws relating to the relief and care of the poor, now replaced by social security services). The major assumption behind the poor laws was that if one was fit and pauper, then it was his fault. Able bodied poor should work and they do not deserve any help.

In late 19th century, there was a growing realization that poverty among able bodied people was not necessarily the individual's fault. Even if people work hard, impersonal forces could be the cause of poverty. So, middle class socialists, trade unions, radical thinkers, philosophers and academicians start to push the state to do interventions. Laissez faire thinkers used to advocate the idea that any state intervention would diminish individual liberty.

Socialist thinkers on the other hand replied that liberty does not simply mean freedom for investment, but doing what one desires. So, the state could actually increase liberty by removing obstacles to do what one desires. Poverty by itself is an obstacle for the individual liberty.

This was the theoretical justification for the coming of the welfare state. The welfare state provides social services because it believes that poverty is not necessarily personal problem and that the society has the responsibility to handle it. In western industrial countries, social policies were thus introduced by the welfare state to provide social services for the needy. But what are the factors for the development of the welfare state and social policy?

1. Advancing Industrialism(migration factor)
2. Capitalist Development
3. Labor Movements(Trade unions)

1. Advancing Industrialism: Modern social policy has its roots in the dissolution of feudalism and the rise of capitalism. In the transition from feudalism to capitalism, poverty became a concern of the state. The emerging capitalist production system required a large number of wage earners. These wage earners were a new social class constituted out of the old feudal peasantry. when feudalism broke down and peasants were uprooted not all of them were needed in production all the time. Capitalists profited from this surplus of wage earners, because it depressed the cost of labor owing to supply and demand forces of the market. On the other hand, the labor surplus was detrimental to workers, for it meant unemployment and lower wages.

As a result, workers as a group developed interests that were inimical to the capitalist labor market: their slogans were “work for all at an adequate wage, and income security when work was not an option”.

Capitalist production was eventually predicated on the concentration of wage earners in to an urban factory system. This concentration provided capitalists with powerful production advantages such as mass production and the use of machines.

With the advancement of industrialization increasing proportion of the labor force has been out of self employment. More and more people were exposed to unemployment, sickness, industrial injury, etc. Along with industrialization, the proportion of senior citizens increased and the question of retirement benefits became crucial (Demographic factor).

Increasing industrialization had also meant progressively greater urban development.

The coming of urbanization brought the question of regulated urban environment. The intervention of the state in housing and land planning became a prerequisite of urban life.

Through all these developments, the advancement of industrialization had facilitated the emergence of the welfare state and their intervention in to the market through social policies.

The capitalist Development

The capitalist economy is characterized by severe periodic fluctuations of booms and depressions. This is one of the major contradicting natures of the capitalist system. So, in order to regulate the crisis brought about by the collapse of the economic system, governments were forced to make interventions through social policy. In effect, therefore, the capitalist system has contributed to the development of social policy.

Labor movements

The fact that wage earners had been uprooted from their peasant communities and concentrated in urban districts threatened capitalist production: unlike peasants, workers had nothing to fall back on during times of unemployment and underemployment. Lacking the cushion of food production, they were more likely to suffer. This was a strong incentive for political activism.

Their concentration in urban localities produced social interaction which facilitated a sense of solidarity among workers. This was the basis for the development of labor unions. Such organization allowed desperate workers to collectively mobilize and improve their situations.

Such anti-capitalist mobilization of workers was facilitated by their increased literacy, a development that was promoted by the requirements of the industrial production.

Workers waged centuries of struggle to expand jobs, wages, and income security. Capitalists responded by legislation of social policies, not out of altruism, but because of the political threat represented by organized workers.

The ruling classes also saw social policy legislation as an antidote to socialism. Labor unions themselves favored social policy legislation as a means of improving the life chances of the working people. Socialists also had supported these measures as a step towards the ultimate goal of socialist society.

The major reason for the first social insurance program in Germany in the late 19th century was Bismarck's desire to provide workers with an alternative to socialism. In Britain the political influence of the working class through trade unions and the labor party was decisive in the creation of the welfare state. In the United States unions, especially the industrial unions, and the Democratic Party played a similar role. Thus, the ruling capitalist class was forced to expand social policy in order to guarantee its security in the face of growing working class political strength. Although other factors were important for the emergence of the welfare state, the role of working class political organization was crucial.

We can, therefore, identify urban based class struggle of industrial capitalism as the central factor for the emergence and development of the welfare state and social policy. In addition to producing the modern class struggle, industrial capitalism was the basis for demographic changes, such as the aging of population.

Critics to the Welfare State

The welfare state has been criticized by liberal and Marxist theorists alike. Liberals take an individualistic perspective by supporting price competition, private enterprise, free trade and laissez-fair economic policy. For them government intervention in the market brings harmful

results. Market theorists like Fred rich hike, Daniel usher, Milton Friedman perceive that welfare state leads to lower economic efficiency, and less individual freedom. By enacting high taxes, authorizing large expenditure for social services, establishing huge bureaucracy, making plan for the total economy, etc it decreases savings, deter industrial investment, reduce the incentive to work hard.

Marxists also severely criticize the welfare state. Marxists see the welfare state both in positive and negative terms; the positive feature is that services like education and health enhance individual welfare. On the other hand the state uses the services to ensure social control and conformity of the mass. The state provides all these services in order to produce productive labor force for capital accumulation.

Variations in Welfare States

The consensual goal of welfare state social policy is to reduce income inequality and poverty. More advanced welfare states have less income inequality, more income redistribution, and less poverty than do less advanced welfare states. The sources of variation in welfare states is due to its racial and cultural heterogeneity, its political decentralization and its lack of feudal past, all of which have helped to produce less clearly defined class politics. We have seen that class struggle and the maturity of working class political strength are prime movers in welfare state development.

The United States has relatively weak labor unions and no working class political party. In comparison, Sweden is ethnically homogeneous, politically centralized and a nation with feudal past. These characteristics helped to produce more clearly defined class politics in Sweden, including a relatively strong labor movement and a working class /social democratic/ political party. Compared to other welfare states, US social policy has been constrained by political decentralization. The pronounced localism or provincialism of the US society has contributed to its more laissez-faire approach to social needs. Also individualism is a stronger value in the US than in other welfare states. In the US, it is more

difficult to achieve any objective that relies upon cooperation. Another factor for the backwardness of us as a welfare state is the miniaturization of its economy. US devote a considerably higher proportion of its resources to warfare (versus welfare) than do other welfare states. World Bank data shows that it ranked first among fifteen welfare states in the percent of total central government expenditure going to defense, while Sweden ranked seventh.

Social Policy in Socialist Countries

There are basic differences and similarities between social policy in socialist countries and capitalist welfare states. In capitalist welfare states, social policies are accessories to the market. One outcome of this difference is that in capitalist nations social policies go through a cycle of expansion and contraction, following the ups and downs of the economy and the ins and outs of parties, with in socialist nations their development is more even.

Data consistently demonstrate that socialist nations despite their lower level of economic development make a grater social welfare effort than do capitalist nations. In this sense socialist nations are truer welfare states than are developed capitalist nations. Socialist nations also show lower level of income inequality than do welfare states. There are several reasons for the generally higher social welfare effort of socialist nations. Their goals of social policy greatly differ from those of welfare states. In welfare states social policy aims to provide for minimum human need, while maintaining the essential differences between social classes. In socialist nations, social policy is directed toward the reduction of differences between social classes. Socialist societies heavily subsidize the provision of basic social needs such as education, healthcare, housing, and transport so that these goods are either free or very cheap. Additionally, socialist nations promote a full-employment economy and exert control over wages to reduce income inequality.

In capitalist countries social services developed in a piecemeal and pragmatic fascine. But in socialist societies the development of social services has been more planned and deliberate inspired by Marxist ideology. In the west, change has occurred in the context of political and

ideological pluralism. In contrast in socialist countries, social policy has been determined by the top leadership within the context of unitary social ideology. In the ex-soviet union, the Bolshevik government proclaimed extensive provision of social services. Income security system envisaged by Bolshevik leaders was to be

- universal (cover all members of the community),
- Comprehensive (meet all major forms of income need)
- Adequate (high level of benefit)
- As a right (with no condition of legibility)

Health commissariat was formed to ensure free and qualified medical and pharmaceutical assistance to all. Education was declared free and compulsory until the age of seventeen. But due to practical problems there were retreats from the above principles. For instance, social insurance was modified to cover only employed persons because of lack of resources. So, the vast majority of peasants and artisans were left out. In 1926, sickness benefit becomes conditional on the evidence of work. A25 years of work record was made a condition for old age pension. In 1930, the government abolished unemployment benefits.

In conclusion, we can see the influence of ideology on the type of social policy, and the constraints steaming from low level of economic development.

Social Policy in the Third World

Third world countries comprise poor countries of the world that are primarily agricultural. This category includes the bulk of Asia, Latin America and Africa. It is the world of colored people (Black, brown, yellow and all shades in between). It comprises the over whelming majority of the world's population. Most contemporary third world countries experienced direct colorectal rule and exploited by the first world. They had been providing cheap natural resources and labor for the historic development of the first world capitalism. Many of them got independence relatively recently. Countries in Asia got independence in 1940s, most African countries in 1960s (Latin American countries in the first half of 19th century). Thus, the growth of social policy in these countries is related with colonialism. Most important feature of colonial society was the administration directed by and in the interest of foreigners

Let us see health services

Many argue that the present health services in developing countries have grown out of colonial medical systems. Observers state that the pattern of health services was designed to meet the needs of Europeans and their families. Hospitals and health centers were established in the major European settlement. These institutions were made essentially curative. The objectives of colonial policy were to provide a safer environment for Europeans. The pattern was designed in the desire to spread the scientific or “modern” methods of western medicine, because the indigenous system was considered as “backward” or traditional.

The approach was inimical to the development of an appropriate health system. After independence, governments tried to expand health services in the manner designed by colonialists. Health services remained urban based and tailored to the needs of educated middle classes. More recently, many countries advocated preventive services giving priorities to rural communities. But in practice it is found to be the other way round, i.e. the pattern is curative and urban based, preventive strategies emphasize health education while the curative one is the provision of medical facilities. The later is costly which can be difficult to afford for poor countries. A study by WHO and UNICEF, indicated that the existing approach in developing countries is not in the right direction. It stated that:

1. Basic health needs of the majority remained unsatisfied.
2. In many countries less than 50% of the rural population and other privileged groups have access to health services.
3. The strategy adopted by many developing countries has been modeled with that of developed countries.

In conclusion, the study emphasizes the need for clear national health policies and strategies, the need for massive redistribution of resources and re-orientation of health services to community based health workers.

CHAPTER THREE

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES AND SOCIAL POLICY

The theoretical approaches discussed here include:

- I. Political systems theory,
- II. Group theory,
- III. Elite theory,
- IV. Institutionalism, and
- V. Rational choice theory.

Although most of these approaches were not developed specifically for analyzing policy formation, they can readily be bent to that purpose. They are useful to the extent that they direct our attention to important political phenomena, Help clarify and organize our thinking, and Suggest explanations for political activity or, in our case, public policies.

Political Systems Theory

Social policy may be viewed as a political system's response to demands arising from its environment. The political system, as Easton defines it, comprises those identifiable and interrelated **institutions and activities** (what we usually think of as governmental institutions and political processes) in a society that make authoritative allocations of values (decisions) that are binding on society.

The environment consists of all phenomena –

- the social system,
- the economic system,
- The biological setting-that are external to the boundaries of the political system.

Thus at least analytically one can separate the political system from all the other components of a society.

Inputs into the political system from the environment consist of ***demands and supports***.

Demands are the claims for action that individuals and groups make to satisfy their interests and values.

Support is rendered when groups and individuals abide by election results, pay taxes, obey laws, and otherwise accept the decisions and actions undertaken by the political system in response to demands. The amount of political support for a political system indicates the extent to which it is regarded as legitimate, or as authoritative and binding on its citizens.

Outputs of the political system include *laws, rules, judicial decisions*, and the like.

Regarded as the authoritative allocations of values, they constitute public policy. The concept of feedback indicates that public policies' (or outputs) made at a given time may subsequently alter the environment and the demands arising there from, as well as the character of the political system itself. Policy outputs may produce new demands, which lead to further outputs, and so on in *a never-ending flow of social policy*.

Limitation of the political system theory

- The usefulness is limited by its highly general and abstract nature.
- It does not, moreover, say much about the procedures and processes by which decisions are made and policy is developed within the "black box" called the political system.

Indeed, systems theory depicts government as simply responding to demands made upon it, and its results are sometimes characterized as "input-output studies." Nonetheless, this approach can be helpful in organizing inquiry into policy formation. It also alerts us to some important facets of the political process, such as these:

- How do inputs from the environment affect the content of social policy and the operation of the political system?
- How in turn does social policy affect the environment and subsequent demands for policy action?
- How well is the political system able to convert demands into social policy and preserve itself overtime?

Group Theory

According to the group theory of politics, social policy is the product of the group struggle. One writer states, "What may be called social policy is the equilibrium reached in this [group] struggle at any given moment, and it represents a balance which the contending factions or groups constantly strive to weight in their favor." Many public policies do reflect the activities of groups. Group theory rests on the contention that interaction and struggle among groups are the central facts of political life.

A group is a collection of individuals that may, on the basis of shared attitudes or interests, make claims upon other groups in society. It becomes a political interest group “when it makes a claim through or upon any institutions of government.” And many groups do just that. The individual is significant in politics only as a participant in or a representative of groups. It is through groups that individuals seek to secure their political preferences. A main concept in group theory is that of **access**. To have influence and to be able to help shape governmental decisions, a group must have access, or the opportunity to express its viewpoints to decision-makers. Obviously, if a group is unable to communicate with decision-makers, if no one in government will listen to it, the chances that it will be able to affect policymaking are slim.

Access may result from the groups being organized, from its having status, good leadership, or resources such as money for campaign contributions. In the nature of things, some groups will have more access than others. Social policy at any given time will reflect the interest of those who are dominant. As groups gain and lose power and influence, social policy will be altered in favor of the interests of those gaining influence against the interests of those losing it.

Limitation/ Short coming of group theory of policy

- It seems both to overstate the importance of groups and to understate the independent and creative role that public officials can play in the policy process. Indeed, many groups have been generated by public policies.
- In actually many people (e.g., the poor and disadvantaged) and interests (such diffuse interests as natural beauty and social justice) are either not represented or only poorly represented in the group struggle. Those who are not represented will have little voice in policymaking and thus their interests are likely to be slighted therein.
- Finally, from the methodological perspective, it is misleading and inefficient to try to explain politics and policymaking solely in terms of interests and the group struggle. This bias leads to neglect of many other factors, such as ideas and institutions, which abound and which independently affect the development of policy.

Elite Theory

Approached from the perspective of elite theory, social policy can be regarded as reflecting the values and preferences of government elite. The essential argument of elite theory is that social policy is not

determined by the demands and actions of the people or the “masses” but rather by ruling elite whose preferences are carried into effect by public officials and agencies.

Professors Thomas Dye and Harmon Zeigler provide a summary of elite theory:

1. Society is divided into the few who have power and the many who do not. Only a small number of persons allocate values for society; the masses do not decide public policy.
2. The few who govern are not typical of the masses who are governed. Elites are drawn disproportionately from the upper socioeconomic strata of society.
3. The movement of non-elite to elite positions must be slow and continuous to maintain stability and avoid revolution. Only non-elites who have accepted the basic elite consensus can be admitted to governing circles.
4. Elites share a consensus on the basic values of social system and the preservation of the system.
5. Social policy does not reflect demands of the masses but rather the prevailing values of the elite. Changes in social policy will be incremental rather than revolutionary.
6. Active elites are subject to relatively little direct influence from apathetic masses. Elites influence masses more than masses influence elites. So stated, elite theory is a provocative theory of policy formation.

Policy is the product of elites, reflecting their values and serving their ends, one of which may be a desire to provide in some way for the welfare of the masses. Elite theory does focus our attention on the role of leadership in policy formation and on the reality that, in any political system, a few govern the many. Whether the elites rule and determine policy, with little influence from the masses, is a difficult proposition to handle.

It may be that elite theory has more utility for analysis and explanation of policy formation in some political systems, such as developing or Eastern European countries, than in others, such as the pluralist democracies of the United States and Canada.

Institutionalism

Traditionally, the institutional approach concentrated on describing the more formal and legal aspects of governmental institutions: their formal structure, legal powers, procedural rules, and functions or activities. Formal relationships with other institutions might also be considered, such as legislative-executive relations.

Usually little was done to explain how institutions actually operated as opposed to how they were supposed to operate, to analyze public policies produced by the institutions, or to discover the relationships between institutional structure and public policies.

Institutionalism, with its emphasis on the formal or structural aspects of institutions, can nonetheless be usefully employed in policy analysis. An institution is, in part, a set of regularized patterns of human behavior that persist over time and perform some significant social function or activity. It is their differing patterns of behavior that really distinguish courts from legislatures, from administrative agencies, and so on.

These regularized patterns of behavior, which we often call rules or structures, and the like, can affect decision-making and the content of public policy. Rules and structural arrangements are usually not neutral in their effects; rather, they tend to favor some interests in society over others and some policy results over others.

In summary, institutional structures, arrangements, and procedures often have important consequences for the adoption and content of public policies. They provide part of the context for policy making, which must be considered along with the more dynamic aspects of politics, such as political parties, groups, and public opinion, in policy study. By itself, however, institutional theory can provide only partial explanations of policy.

Rational-Choice Theory

The rational-choice theory, which is sometimes called social-choice, public-choice, or formal theory, originated with economists and involves applying the principles of microeconomic theory to the analysis and explanation of political behavior (or non market decision-making).

Perhaps the earliest use of rational-choice theory to study the political process is Anthony Downs's *Economic Theory of Democracy*. In this respect, Downs assumes that voters and political parties act as rational decision-makers who seek to maximize attainment of their preferences. Parties formulated whatever policies would win them most votes, and voters sought to maximize the portion of their preferences that could be realized through government action.

In attempting to win elections, political parties moved toward the center of the ideological spectrum to appeal to the greatest number of voters and maximize their voting support. Thus, rather than providing voters with "meaningful alternatives," parties will become as much alike as possible, thereby providing an "echo rather than a choice."

Let us now look more closely at the major components of rational-choice theory. One of its basic axioms is that political actors, like economic actors, act rationally in pursuing their own self-interest. Thus economist James Buchanan, a leading proponent of rational-choice theory, contends that politicians are guided by their self-interest rather than an altruistic (unselfish) commitment to such goals as statesmanship or the national interest.

“This could be no surprise,” says Buchanan, “because governments are made up of individuals, and individuals operate from self-interest when they are engaged in a system of exchange, whether this is in the market economy or in politics.” Being rational, individuals are able to comprehend and rank their preferences from most to least desired.

In making decisions (whether economic or political), they are guided by these preferences and will seek to maximize the benefits they gain. In short, people are self-interested utility maximizers, not the uninformed, confused, or irrational choice-makers often depicted in analyses of political behavior.

A second basic axiom of rational-choice theory involves methodological individualism. The individual decision-maker is the primary unit of analysis and theory. The individual’s preferences or values are assumed to be more important than other values—collective, organizational, or social. Conversely, rational-choice theorists argue that the actions of organizations and groups can be satisfactorily explained in terms of the behavior of a model individual.

Some rational-choice theorists have begun to explore the effects of incomplete or imperfect information and uncertainty on policymaking. Political decision-makers are said to be possessed of differing amounts of information (a condition called information asymmetry) and are uncertain about the outcomes or consequences of laws and policies when they are implemented.

Rational-choice studies of political behavior are often characterized by rigid and narrow assumptions, mathematical equations, abstractions, and remoteness from reality.

Rational-choice theory both alerts us to the importance of self-interest as a motivating force in politics and policymaking, and provides a better understanding of decision-making processes.

Many contend, however, that politics is not as devoid of altruism and concern for the public interest as the rational-choice theorists assume.

The adoption of “good public policy,” for example, is frequently a goal of members of Congress.

Concluding Remarks

Although individual political scientists often manifest strong preference for one or another of these theoretical approaches (or others, such as incrementalism), I cannot authoritatively state which is the

“best” or the most satisfactory. Each approach focuses one’s attention on different aspects of policymaking and politics, and thus seems more useful for understanding some situations or events than others.

Group theory and elite theory are mutually exclusive explanations of how the policy process operates and, most important, of who controls or dominates and benefits from it. Or, briefly: Who rules? Sharp intellectual struggles have been waged between group (or pluralist) theorists and elite theorists about who controls decision-making on public policy.

Systems theory and institutionalism both focus on the process of policymaking, albeit in different ways, and are not incompatible. Institutionalism can be used to help explain what goes on within the “black box” (the political system), which is neglected by systems theory. Because neither theory directly confronts the question of who rules, either group or elite theory could be combined with them to some degree.

Rational-choice theory, because of its narrow focus, must stand pretty much by itself. Institutions appear as the individual writ large: little attention is given to the policy environment, how issues are brought to the attention of government, or how policy preferences are developed. Like institutionalism, however, rational-choice theory does show much interest in how rules and structures help determine the outcomes of decision-making.

On the question of who rules, rational-choice theory asserts that democratically elected officials will promote their own interest rather than the people’s. This conviction frequently leads to the normative (and conservative) conclusion that less government is better government. Group theorists feel that the interests of dominant groups (however determined) prevail, and for elite theorists the few (a ruling class) govern in their own interest, perhaps with some concern for the condition of the masses.

The various theories thus raise some controversial questions about politics and policymaking process. They also tend to skew research findings. Not surprisingly, pluralists find groups in control, elite theorists detect dominance by an elite, and rational-choice theorists find that self-interest dominates. These theories are therefore not merely neutral alternatives for guiding analysis.

It seems wise not to be bound too dogmatically or rigidly to one model or approach. A good rule for the policy student is to be eclectic and flexible, and to draw from theories or concepts that seem most useful for the satisfactory and fair-minded description and explanation of political events and policies. The objective explanation of political behavior rather than the validation of one’s preferred theoretical approach should be the goal of political inquiry.

Each of the theories discussed, if drawn upon skillfully and selectively, can contribute to a better understanding of policymaking.

CHAPTER FOUR

POLICY-MAKING PROCESS

Social policy is the general guideline, rules and regulations by which social service provision can be undertaken to promote social well-being. Mainly the intention of a social policy is to promote the good life of individuals or groups by providing the necessary assistance for the needy. Therefore, policy formulation is one of the aspects which need special focus to promote the social well-being. Therefore, it is necessary to explicitly differentiate amongst the various stages that delimit the process of policy-making. Such a differentiation is beneficial in that theorists on social policy tend to refer to or apply these stages in their models without necessarily clarifying their use, or explicitly stating how one stage in this process follows on another (or not). This is important, since the different values and perspectives brought to bear up on each phase of the policy process can determine the definition of the issue at that point.

Stags in policy process

The basic stages in the policy process approach include

- VI. Problem identification,
- VII. Agenda setting,
- VIII. Policy formulation,
- IX. Policy adoption,
- X. Policy implementation and
- XI. Policy evaluation.

1. Problem Identification

Problem identification is probably the most undervalued stage in the policy-making process. Upon reviewing the definition of 'policy' early in this paper, it is clear that policy-making always occurs in response to a societal ill – it aims that purposefully solving/changing something. The implication is that some issue in society has to be identified for amendment or amelioration. If there were nothing to solve, policy responses would not be necessary.

Parsons (1997:87) makes a related point, noting that the genesis of a policy necessarily involves the recognition of a problem.

However, not all troubling issues in society constitute problems to be addressed via social policy-making.

The accurate- definition of the problem is therefore of paramount importance in terms of the drafting of an appropriate policy response.

In order to qualify as a public problem, an issue has to be

- (1) deemed unsatisfactory by a significant group in the public domain, and
- (2) Something that can be addressed by government action –

Problem identification is further complicated by the fact that one person's problem might not be another person's problem. Furthermore, conditions that are treated as social problems at one point in history might not be perceived as such by a government 20 years later. On the other hand, conditions that at one time are accepted as the normal order of things may later, because of social change, be treated as problems.

The important point here is that social policy analysis cannot offer solutions to problems when there is no general agreement on what the problems are. But who should decide when 'sufficient consensus' has been established on the definition of a public problem? In addition to underlining the inherently political nature of problem identification, this question brings the issue of values to the fore.

What is a policy problem?

A policy problem can be defined as a condition or situation that produces needs or dissatisfaction among people and for which relief or redress through governmental action is sought. For instance, dirty air, the practice of abortion, urban congestion, food insecurity, and global warming are conditions that may become problems if they produce sufficient anxiety or dissatisfaction to cause people to seek a remedy.

A problem is a problem only if something can be done about it.

2. The Agenda-setting Process

Not all public problems make it onto the social policy agenda. Of the thousands and thousands of demands made upon government, only a small number will receive serious consideration by social policy-makers. Decisions to consider some problems mean that others will not be taken up, at least for the time being.

The demands that policy-makers choose to or feel compelled to act on at a given time, or at least appear to be acting on, constitute the policy agenda

To get onto the social policy agenda, a problem must be converted into an issue that the government actually responds to Cobb and Elder (1983:85) qualify this further by differentiating between the systemic public agenda and the institutional, or governmental, agenda. The former refers to those

issues on which there is general political consensus as to what merits public attention (e.g., high levels of property crime in Addis Ababa), while the latter denotes those issues on which the government and its institutions feel compelled to act (e.g., the approval of treaties, or government departmental budget requests).

Clearly, the media, lobby and other interest groups, and the head of state him/herself play important roles in establishing both systemic and institutional agenda items, and expanding the issue from a rather contained nature into the ambit of the general public. In addition, individual members of parliament, agency representatives and citizens who push policy proposals also act as so-called policy entrepreneurs in the agenda-setting process. But the converse is also possible that some individuals or groups in society might work against certain issues attaining agenda status. If such a play were to work, an issue could lose its status as a problem to be addressed by government, and the issue might then actually lose its agenda status, slipping from the social policy domain

3. Policy Formulation (The formulation of policy proposals)

Once an issue has become a problem, and the problem has made it onto the social policy agenda, it is incumbent upon the government to strategize an appropriate response to that public problem. Policy formulation involves developing pertinent and acceptable proposed courses of action (often called alternatives, proposals, or options) for dealing with public problems.

Policy-makers may be confronted with several competing proposals for dealing with a problem; or they may have to struggle with devising their own alternative.

In making choice, officials would be taking into account the policy environment and the input from various policy entrepreneurs in society. The final choice of policy would take into account the constraints posed to every alternative and the government needs to decide which policy alternative would (in their opinion) have the most fortuitous outcome and outputs. Based on the above, the policy decision-makers will decide on their preferred policy alternative.

The criteria applied in this last process would then be measured in terms

1. Effectiveness (is the policy able to actually solve the problem?),
2. Efficiency (how much effort will this require?),
3. Adequacy (are societal needs met?),
4. Equity (are these needs met across the board?),
5. Responsiveness (are those most affected by the problem shielded from any negative future impacts?), and

6. Appropriateness (are the assumptions underlying the policy's objectives attainable?).

4. Policy Adoption

This is the stage during which a selected policy, once formulated, is legitimized and formalized.

Policy adoption therefore, has direct correlates with decision-making- who decides on any specific policy alternative, what the variables are those impacts on that decision-maker, and so on.

Clearly, social policy adoption means political support from the 'powers that be' – the government.

The Government may adopt a policy and distribute it to the public and various individual stakeholders through command, persuasion, bargaining

Here we examine the three styles of collective decision-making: bargaining, persuasion, and command. Each entails action to reach agreement and induce others to comply.

Bargaining can be defined as a process in which two or more persons in positions of power or authority adjust their at least partially inconsistent goals in order to formulate a course of action that is acceptable but not necessarily ideal for all the participants. In short, bargaining involves negotiation, give-and-take, and compromise to reach a mutually acceptable position. For bargaining to occur, the bargainers must be willing to negotiate, they must have something to negotiate about, and each must have something (i.e., resources) that others want or need.

Persuasion, on the other hand, occurs when those in power decide on a specific policy alternative and then attempt to convince others (stakeholders, the public) of the correctness of the decision, thereby causing them to adopt it as their own position.

Unlike bargainers, persuaders seek to build support for what they favor without having to modify their own positions. This task may involve striving to convince others of the merits or soundness of one's position, or the benefits that will accrue to them or their constituents if they accept it, or some combination of the two. Accurate information, reason and logic, and effective argument are the instruments of persuasion; deception, and bullying and hectoring (intimidating, threatening) are beyond its bounds.

Command strategy involves a policy decision by those in power that is then projected onto the rest of the populace without necessarily the latter's consent (a tax hike might be taken as a fiscal example of such a policy decision).

In this regard, bargaining involves interaction among peers;

Command involves hierarchic relationships among super ordinates and subordinates.

Command is the ability of those in superior positions to make decisions that are binding upon those who come within their jurisdiction. They may use sanctions in the form of either rewards or penalties, although usually sanctions are thought of as penalties, or reinforce their decisions.

5. Policy Implementation

This stage of the policy-making process entails the translation of decisions into action. When the adoption of phase of the policy process has been completed and, for instance, a bill has been enacted into law by a legislature, we can begin to refer to something called public policy.

Policy implementation (or administration), which can succinctly be defined as “what happens after a bill becomes law”. The uncertainty that typically prevails concerning what a policy will accomplish and the consequences that it will have for the society makes the study of policy implementation both interesting and worthwhile from a policy studies perspective. Policy implementation is neither a routine nor a highly predictable process.

Predominantly there are two approaches in social policy implementation are the Top-down and Bottom-up approaches.

The top-down approach initiatives start from top leadership commitment, a high level strategy is developed, complete with vision, mission and goals. Such approaches are often based on programs. It is ideal to uniformly approach the issues and seems to be manageable for implementation. But the problem is it may miss the actual reality from the very beginning and also by the time it gets to the bottom, it is often interpreted very differently.

Bottom-up approaches starts from the grass root level by making individuals to be involved in the policy development process and it is more or less based on the empirical reality. Policy is developed to address the individual person problems. Of course it seems difficult to manage it. Here it allows one to be very specific about their problems, and to create the policy that can help to tackle the problems.

Key features of a bottom-up approach

Focus on the individual

Recognizing that change happens one person at a time and that everyone is different (e.g. have had different experiences), a bottom-up approach develops different learning solutions and

strategies to meet individuals where they are. For example, white males often feel excluded from the diversity and inclusion equation. There is a need to understand their issues and concerns.

Accountability at all levels

Often, accountability is viewed as the responsibility of top management. A bottom-up approach puts the onus on every individual to see his/her role in advancing the diversity initiatives. The age old: "What's in it for me?" has to be answered and often top-down approaches provide a punitive rather than opportunistic answer. For example, a zero tolerance policy is sometimes translated from the bottom as: "I better not say anything to someone who is different. I might say the wrong thing and be fired." In a bottom-up approach, a natural work team learning community can facilitate a better understanding of the parameters of zero tolerance for that team. It is an opportunity to learn how to work more effectively with co-workers.

Community building

There are cultures within cultures in large organizations. Every department has its own unspoken and unwritten rules. One-size implementation will not fit all. Every discrete community in the bottom-up approach is required to "translate" the top-down message and develop its own diversity and inclusion strategies that are consistent with the spirit and intent of the corporation.

Developing the potential of every individual to be a better community citizen is the goal. Weekly one-hour learning sessions which focus on how the group works as a community, listening, learning about each other's similarities and differences can dramatically increase productivity.

Leaders as Coordinators

The issues of diversity and inclusion are complex. They are related to many other aspects of business performance including marketing, manufacturing, mergers and acquisitions etc. Consultants are not the answer to getting to a sustained way of life that recognizes the power of diversity.

Every leader in the organization, from the team leader through the top leaders becomes a teacher, both formally and informally in the bottom-up approach. Rather than sending employees off to

classes to learn about diversity and inclusion, leaders become the primary teachers not only through their own behavior (walking the talk) but as thought leaders. A key leadership requirement should be diversity competence. Diversity competent managers are ideally suited to facilitate learning community discussions and promote an inclusive community.

Ownership

Top-down approaches are seen as belonging to the office of the higher leaders and therefore garner little real investment beyond compliance. Bottom-up approaches are owned by the team. Consequently, those most impacted by the company culture, employees at the grass-roots level, will have a say in improving it. Peer influence can be powerful in altering up close and personal interactions between co-workers. This also gives the initiative a more voluntary nature, which may foster greater employee participation.

6. Policy Evaluation

Final stage is policy evaluation

More of an art than a science, policy evaluation encompasses the estimation, assessment, or appraisal of a policy, including its content, implementation, goal attainment, and other effects. Evaluation may also try to identify factors that contribute to the success or failure of a policy. Policy evaluation is learning about the consequences (positive and negative) of social policy. As a functional activity, policy evaluation can occur throughout the policy process, not simply after a period of policy implementation.

Evaluation may identify problems or shortcomings that cause the policy process to recycle (problem definition, formulation, adoption, and so on) in order to continue, modify, strengthen, or terminate a policy.

Government may evaluate its own policies by instructing officials to provide reports, do site visits, measure program effectiveness, conduct public hearings, evaluate citizens' complaints and compare outputs with professional standards.

Forms of policy evaluation

1. The first one is that legislators, administrators, judges, pressure-group officials, media commentators, and citizens have always made judgments about the worth or effects of particular policies, programs, and projects. Most of us are familiar with this style of policy evaluation and

have perhaps enjoyed doing a bit of it ourselves. Much conflict results from this sort of evaluation, however, because different evaluators, depending upon the values or criteria they employ, may reach sharply divergent conclusions on the merits of the same policy.

2. The second form of policy evaluation centers on process, on the operation or administration of a policy or program (a program can be defined as a set of rules, routines, and resources created to implement a policy or portion thereof).

This kind of evaluation, which may involve much monitoring of agencies and their officials, will tell us something about whether there is honesty or efficiency in the conduct of a program, but, like the first kind of evaluation, it will probably yield little or nothing in the way of hard information concerning the societal effects (outcomes) of a program. **-Process**

evaluation is often helpful to program managers wanting to improve the administration of their programs and reduce their potential for political criticism.

3. **Systematic and intended objective evaluation** of programs.

This form of evaluation, systematic evaluation, employs social science methodology to measure the societal effects of policies or programs and the extent to which they are achieving their goals or objectives.

Systematic evaluation seeks information on the effects of a policy or program on the public need or problem at which it is directed. Utilizing particularly the talents of social scientists, it involves the specification of goals or objectives; the collection of information and data on program inputs, outputs, and consequences; and their rigorous analysis, preferably through the use of quantitative or statistical techniques.

Policy Contents

Policies are typically promulgated through official written documents which usually contain certain standard components including:

- ❖ A purpose statement—outlining why the organization is issuing the policy—effect /outcome.
- ❖ An applicability & scope statement— who the policy affects & which actions are impacted by the policy—inclusion/exclusion of targets.
- ❖ An effective date – which indicates when the policy comes into force.

- ❖ A responsibilities section—indicating which parties & organizations are responsible for carrying out individual policy statements.
- ❖ Background— indicating any reasons, history, & intent that led to the creation of the policy, which may be listed as motivating factors.
- ❖ Definitions— providing clear & unambiguous definitions for terms & concepts found in the policy document.

CHAPTER FIVE

SOCIAL POLICY ANALYSIS

Why To Do Social Policy Analyze?

- To understand the origin, evolution and effectiveness of the policy
- To understand its impacts on people
- To consider what exists and what alternatives there might be
- To think about other needs that might be anticipated
- To look for negative consequences of policies, even if they are useful
- To foster the development of the discipline

Types of Analysis

Structural

What the policy contains – how it will work – what elements are included in this policy and perhaps not in others

Process

How the policy came about – what forces drove it and/or tried to stop it. Both types are necessary for a complete analysis

Motivating Forces

- Client concerns (but rarely)
- Media investigations and reports
- Issues raised with parliamentarians by key constituents
- Research reports and studies
- Concerns raised by service providers
- International pressures

- General Considerations

Adequacy- how completely does this policy respond to the social need being addressed?

Equity- how fair this policy is: to the target population and the general population

Efficiency- does this policy produce the best result for the expenditure?

THE CATEGORIES OF ANALYSIS

Each will have specific items and evaluative criteria. You need to keep them all in mind as a policy is being considered

1. **Historical analysis**- What has been tried in the past, what worked and what failed, what has been proposed in the past but not tried, How can we avoid making the same mistakes as in the past?
2. **Goals and objectives**- Goals, Abstract, Not measurable, Objectives Specific Measurable
Some people treat them as the same thing – they are not Manifest Goals – those which are expressly stated in the policy and latent goals – those which are not stated but can be deduced from some aspects. The political context, the “tone” of the policy, its relationship to other policies, the way that supporters or opponents talk, Evaluative Criteria and Goals, Stated in general terms, Clarity / understandable to the reader, Objectives, Must be stated in a way that can be assessed specifically, Clear language that allows an analyst to determine success or failure
3. **Forms of benefit**- All policies contain some form of benefit such as Cash, Expert services, Material goods and services, Protective regulation, Legal relief, Loan guarantees. Benefits Evaluative Criteria, Target efficiency, Cost effectiveness, Cost efficiency, Universal vs. selective or targeted benefits
4. **Entitlement rules**- The procedures that determine who can get the benefit and who cannot
Prior contributions Means testing Administrative rules, Professional discretion, Administrative discretion, Judicial decision, Evaluative Criteria Target efficiency / off-targeting, Stigmatization potential, Over-utilization, Under-utilization, Potential to create work disincentives, Consumer sovereignty
5. **Financing methods**- many but not all policies have a financing method attached or implied in the nature of the policy. General revenue appropriations, Voluntary contributions, Grants

and contracts, Fees for services. Financing Evaluative Criteria, Protection against demographic change, Protection against inflation, Cash flow issues, Cost benefit analysis, Cost effectiveness analysis, Service Delivery Systems, Centralized, Decentralized, Contracted services, Services designed for specific populations, Ethnic groups, Specific priorities, Delivery Evaluative Criteria, Accessibility, Affordability, Appeal rights, Client empowerment, Continuity of Care, Other important points, Strategies employed, The Effectiveness of current policy, other options that could be anticipated, Positive and negative effects, Monitoring and evaluating Criteria,

Literature that could support specific policy implementation, General issues concerning the policy under analysis, Social welfare

Welfare

Welfare commonly refers to well-being. In welfare economics, welfare is understood in terms of utility; people's well-being or interests consist of the things they choose to have. Welfare also refers to the range of services which are provided to protect people in a number of conditions, including childhood, sickness and old age.

Welfare is often associated with needs, but it goes beyond what people need; to achieve well being, people must have choices, and the scope to choose personal goals and ambitions. Thus, welfare is social assistance, help and empowerment that is given to the needy citizens. This social assistance is mainly based on the redistribution of resources and opportunities. In such activities and actions government has a great role and responsibility, especially to facilitate, guide and regulate the social services delivery.

In general social policy is decisions and actions intended to enhance progress and human wellbeing mainly, the concern of social policy is: to identify social problems, to assist the needy or to solve the problems and to promote human wellbeing. All social policies are government policy or within the framework of government policy, but all government policies are not social policies.

In the historical patterns of welfare, the classic welfare states are made up of or classic social policies are made up of the “Big five” areas.

1. Policy of income maintenance and social security

2. Health policy and services
3. The personal social services
4. Education and training policy
5. Employment policy and housing policy

But the contemporary social policies consists of various areas in the social phenomena directly or indirectly.

Welfare and Equality

Social inequality: Inequality is not difference. Saying that people are unequal is saying that some are disadvantaged relative to others; inequality is disadvantage in a social context. The main inequalities in society are class, gender, race and inequalities in income and wealth. Inequalities are usually represented in one of three patterns: **Hierarchical inequality**-Inequalities stretch from the top to the bottom, with everyone ranked in a relative position. This is the main pattern of inequality in income and wealth. **Stratification**-People are ranked in groups, set at different levels. This model is mainly used in discussions of class and gender. **Social division**- Societies can be seen as almost divided between groups - 'black' and 'white', men and women, rich and poor. A society which was genuinely 'divided' would not be a society any more, but the image of division is a powerful one: the 19th century politician Benjamin Disraeli, for example, wrote of the rich and poor as 'two nations'.

These issues are discussed further in the page on welfare and society. Social inequality is associated with social problems. *The Spirit Level* shows that societies which are more unequal tend to have not just more poverty, but more crime, more mental illness, more teenage pregnancy and so on.

Policies for equality

The inequalities which people are concerned with, Rae suggests, can concern individuals- the comparison is made, for example, between rich and poor people in society - like women, racial minorities, and old people or regions segments - for example, a distinction confined to children or to women. A policy which corrects one inequality (e.g. between women and men) can aggravate another (e.g. between rich and poor, if the beneficiaries are richer women). For

example, there is a current argument in India that attempts to avoid gender discrimination will discriminate between castes.

Policies for equality can aim at *equality of treatment*. This is treatment without bias, prejudice or special conditions applying to people. (It is not treating everyone the same - equality of treatment in health services does not mean that everyone gets a tracheotomy!). *Equal opportunity*: This can be the opportunity to compete (in which case it is the same as equal treatment), or the chance to compete on the same footing as others (which may require some redress before the competition starts). *Equality of outcome*: Policies which are concerned with inequalities of income or health status are generally concerned with removing disadvantage in outcome.

Redistribution

A measure is redistributive if the people who receive goods or services from a measure are not the same as the people who pay. All welfare provision is, by definition, redistributive in some way. Redistribution does not have to be from rich to poor. Redistribution is conventionally classified as vertical or horizontal. Vertical redistribution may be progressive (from rich to poor) or regressive (from poor to rich). Regressive is not a way of welfare provision. Horizontal redistribution goes from one kind of group to another - from men to women, households without children to families with children, tenants to owner-occupiers. Egalitarian redistribution is progressive, but there are many ways to achieve equality, with different effects.

The social division of welfare: Titmuss identified several different kinds of redistributive process, arguing that it was not possible to understand the redistributive impact of social policy without taking them fully into account. He referred to a 'social division of welfare', including three main types of welfare:

1. Social welfare (the social services);
2. Fiscal welfare (welfare distributed through the tax system); and
3. Occupational welfare (welfare distributed by industry as part of employment).

The classification is fairly crude. The category of fiscal welfare bundles together subsidies, incentives and transfer payments (including income maintenance). Occupational welfare includes perks, salary-related benefits, measures intended to improve the efficiency of the workforce and

some philanthropic measures. The classification excludes legal welfare (redistribution through the courts), the voluntary sector and the informal sector. The importance of the idea was, however, to draw attention to different patterns of redistribution to explain that different kinds of redistribution (for example by tax or by benefits) can have similar effects, and to broaden the scope of social policy as a subject.

The strategy of equality

Tawney argued that public spending is the most effective way of redistributing resources. The aim, he writes, is not the division of the nation's income into many million fragments, to be distributed, without further ado, like cake at a school treat, among its many million families. It is, on the contrary, the pooling of its surplus resources by means of taxation, and the use of the funds thus obtained to make accessible to all, irrespective of their income, occupation or social position, the conditions of civilization which, in the absence of such measures, can only be enjoyed by the rich.' The provision of universal benefits helps to create equality in its widest sense - the reassurance provided by social protection.

Julian Legrand argues against this that the universal social services are not available equally to all. The universal National Health Service in welfare states (for example UK) gives health care disproportionately to middle class people. The state provision of education tends to be regressive, partly because people are poorest when the children are young, but mainly because it is the middle classes who gain most from education after the age of 16. Transport subsidies are worth most to people who travel the greatest distances, who tend to be middle class. And housing subsidies tend to favor home owners, who are more likely to be wealthy. In his view, the 'strategy of equality' proposed by Tawney has failed. **Social Expenditure**

Social expenditure is pertinent tool to implement social policy and realize the intended goal of the policy. Social expenditure refers to the provision by public and private institutions of benefits to households or individuals in order to provide support during circumstances which adversely affect their welfare.

The Social benefits include **1) cash benefits** (e.g. pensions, maternity benefits, and social assistance); **2) social services** (e.g. medical care, child care, care for the elderly and disabled) and

3)tax breaks with a social purpose (e.g. tax reductions or credits that favors families with children or favorable tax treatment of contributions to private health plans).

These benefits and services are called social protection. They exclude direct purchases of goods or services (such as medical or social care) by individuals and families and entirely private insurance, or saving, contracts which are additional to payments required by government and therefore, voluntary. There are two key aspects to the definition of social expenditure:

1. Social expenditure is the result of explicit government laws or legislations that require the payment of taxes or contributions to meet the costs of adverse circumstance that may affect individuals or households.
2. Social expenditure involves a degree of redistribution from the less needy to the more needy. The important point is that this definition is defining as social expenditure those expenditures made as a result of government policy requiring certain welfare needs to be met.

Arguments for Welfare

Welfare, as social provision or assistance has been under strong debate and there have been dialectical arguments concerning welfare. The basic arguments for collective provision are:

- **Humanitarian.** Concerns about poverty and need have been central to many developments.
- **Religious.** Several of the world's major religions make charity a religious duty. Beyond charity, Catholicism recognizes a duty of social solidarity (or mutual social responsibility); Judaism, Islam and Lutheran Christianity require collective responsibility for one's community.
- **Mutual self-interest.** Many welfare systems have developed, not from state activity, but from a combination of mutualism activities, gradually reinforced by government.
- **Democratic.** Social protection has developed in tandem with democratic rights.
- **Practical.** Welfare provision has economic and social benefits. Countries with more extensive systems of social protection tend to be richer and have less poverty. (The main difficulty of evaluating this knows which comes first, wealth or welfare.)

There is scarcely a government in the world that does not recognize the force of these arguments and make some form of collective social provision. The real disputes are not about whether welfare should exist, but about how much provision there should be, and how it should be done.

Arguments against welfare

The main objections to the provision of welfare come from the radical right. They are against welfare in principle, on the basis that it violates people's freedom. Redistribution is theft; taxation is forced labor. (1) These arguments rest on some questionable assumptions:

People have absolute rights to use property as they wish. People in a society are interdependent, and the production of property depends on social arrangements. Rights to property are conventional. Liability to taxation is part of the conventions.

People do not consent to welfare provision; redistributive arrangements are based in compulsion. This is not necessarily true. Several countries have developed welfare systems, in whole or in part, on a voluntary, mutualist basis - Denmark, Finland and Sweden have moved to compulsion only recently.

The rights of the individual are pertinent. Property rights are certainly important, but few people would argue that property rights are more important than every other moral value. If one person owns all the food in a region while everybody else is starving, do the others have no moral claim on it?

The radical right also claims that the welfare state has undesirable effects in practice. Economically, it can be argued that economic development is more important for welfare than social provision. Dollar and Kraay for the World Bank have argued that property rights and a market economy are essential for growth and so for the protection of the poor. The other main argument is that the welfare state undermines economic performance. However, this position is not supported by the evidence. In *social* terms, the welfare state is accused of fostering dependency and trapping people in poverty (2) Evidence on the dynamics of poverty shows that poverty and dependency are not long-term, but affect people at different stages in the life cycle; the population of welfare claimants is constantly changing. (3) Where poor people are separated

and excluded by welfare, this is mainly the product of the kinds of restricted, residual system the radical right has been arguing for.

Who is welfare for? Would you explain it?

Residual welfare: Welfare provision is often seen as being for the poor. This was the dominant model in English-speaking countries; the English Poor Law (1598-1948) was exported to many other countries. This has been taken as the model of a residual system of welfare, in which welfare is a safety net, confined to those who are unable to manage otherwise.

Solidarity: Welfare in much of developed countries is based on the principle of solidarity, or mutual responsibility. The responsibilities which people have to each other depend on their relationships; people in society are part of solidaristic social networks. Many of the rights which people have are particular, rather than general - they depend on a person's circumstances, work record or family relationships, not on general rights protected by the state. Those who are not part of such networks are said to be 'excluded'.

Institutional welfare: An institutional system is one in which need is accepted as a normal part of social life. Welfare is provided for the population as a whole, in the same way as public services like roads or schools might be. In an institutional system, welfare is not just for the poor: it is for everyone.

Industrial achievement/performance: Welfare has often been seen as a 'handmaiden' to the economy. It helps employers, by preparing and servicing the capacity of the workforce, and it acts as an economic regulator, stimulating demand when production is low.

Universality and selectivity: Universal benefits and services are benefits available to everyone as a right, or at least to whole categories of people (like 'old people' or 'children'). Selective benefits and services are reserved for people in need. The arguments refer to the same issues as 'institutional' and 'residual' welfare, but there is an important difference. Institutional and residual welfare are principles: universality and selectivity are methods. A residual system might use a universal service where appropriate (e.g. a residual system of health care might be associated with universal public health); an institutional system needs some selective benefits to ensure that needs are met.

Universal services can reach everyone on the same terms. This is the argument for public services, like roads and sewers: it was extended in the 1940s to education and health services. The main objection to universal services is their cost. Selectivity is often presented as being more efficient: less money is spent to better effect. There are problems with selective services, however: because recipients have to be identified, the services can be administratively complex and expensive to run, and there are often boundary problems caused by trying to include some people while excluding others. Selective services sometimes fail to reach people in need.

Models of Welfare

Espying-Andersen has described three main types of welfare régime: corporatist regimes are work-oriented and based on individual contribution.

Social democratic regimes favor Universalist values.

Liberal regimes tend to be residuals.

The grouping of particular countries tends to be unreliable, but the classification may help to understand some of the main patterns of provision. As literature shows, social protection in the UK and Sweden is institutional; the UK covers less of its population, but the shortfall is not as great as in Sweden. France is solidaristic, but its performance has still secured coverage as good as the institutional welfare states. The German system is work oriented: it excludes some people who have not contributed, and it does not extend to those on the highest incomes. The system in the US has substantial residual elements, and social policy is often hostile to the poor.

Arguments for welfare

The basic arguments for collective provision are

1. **Humanitarian** - concerns about poverty and need have been central to many developments
2. **Religious**. Several of the world's major religions make **charity** as a religious duty.
 - Beyond charity, Catholicism recognizes a duty of social solidarity (or mutual social responsibility);
 - Judaism, Islam and Lutheran Christianity require collective responsibility for one's community
3. **Mutual self-interest**- Many welfare systems have developed, not from state activity, but from a combination of mutualist activities, gradually reinforced by government
4. **Democratic** - Social protection has developed in tandem with democratic rights

- **Note** - welfare provision has economic and social benefits
 - Countries with more extensive systems of social protection tend to be richer and have less poverty

Arguments against welfare

The main objections to the provision of welfare come from the 'radical right'. They are against welfare in principle, on the basis that

- It violates people's freedom.
- Redistribution is theft;
- Taxation is forced labor.

These arguments rest on some questionable assumptions:

4. People have absolute rights use property as they wish.
 5. People in a society are interdependent, and the production of property depends on social arrangements.
 6. Rights to property are conventional.
 7. Liability to taxation is part of the conventions.
- People do not consent to welfare provision; **redistributive arrangements** are based in **compulsion**. This is not necessarily true.
 - Several countries have developed welfare systems, in whole or in part, on a voluntary, mutualist basis - Denmark, Finland and Sweden have moved to compulsion only recently.

Argument against

1. The rights or the individual are paramount.

- Property rights are certainly important, but few people would argue that property rights are more important than every other moral value.
- If one person owns all the food in a region while everybody else is starving, do the others have no moral claim on it?

2. The radical right also claim that the welfare state has undesirable effects in practice.

Economically, it can be argued that economic development is more important for welfare than social provision.

3. The welfare state undermines economic performance.

In social terms, the welfare state is accused of fostering dependency and trapping people in poverty.

Evidence on the dynamics of poverty shows that

- ✓ poverty and dependency are not long-term, but affect people at different stages in the life cycle;
- ✓ The population of welfare claimants is constantly changing.

Models of welfare

Esping-Andersen has described three main types of welfare regime:

1. **corporatist regimes**-Work-oriented and based on individual contribution
2. **Social democratic regimes**-Favor Universalist values
3. **Liberal regimes**-Tend to be residualist

What examples are there with regard to welfare?

- France is solidaristic, but its performance has still secured coverage as good as the institutional welfare states.
- The German system is work oriented: it excludes some people who have not contributed, and it does not extend to those on the highest incomes.
- The system in the US has substantial residual elements, and social policy is often hostile to the poor.

Food for thought

How does the country's policy address it?

Social need

Need

The idea of need refers to the kinds of problem which people experience; Requirements for some particular kind of response; and a relationship between problems and the responses available. A need is a claim for service.

Bradshaw identifies four main categories of need:

1. **Normative need**

Need which is identified according to a norm (or set standard); such norms are generally set by experts. Benefit levels, for example, or standards of unfitness in houses, have to be determined according to some criterion.

2. **Comparative need**

Concerns problems which emerge by comparison with others who are not in need. One of the most common uses of this approach has been the comparison of social problems in different areas in order to determine which areas are most deprived.

3. **Felt need:** - need which people feel that is, need from the perspective of the people who have it.

4. **Expressed need:** - need which they say they have. People can feel need which they do not express and they can express needs they do not feel.

WELFARE AND SOCIETY

Social policy draws on sociology to explain the social context of welfare provision. If we are trying to improve people's welfare, it is helpful to try to understand something about the way that people are, and how welfare policies relate to their situation. Some writers have gone further, arguing that because welfare takes place in a social context, it can only be understood in that context. This has been particularly important for 'critical social policy', which begins from a view of social policy as underpinned by social inequality - particularly the inequalities of class, race and gender.

The social structure

Societies are 'structured' in the sense that people's relationships follow consistent patterns. Fiona Williams has argued that social policy is dominated in practice by the dominant values of society - the issues of family, work and nation.

Family A range of policies are built around the idea of the 'family' as a man, woman and children. Examples are child benefits, education and child care. Some countries have policies built on the idea of the man as 'breadwinner', with support based on the idea that the marriage is permanent and the woman will not work. Families which deviate from the norm - for example, poor single mothers - are likely to be penalized, though there may also be anomalies in the organization of benefits (e.g., when promiscuity is accepted and stable cohabitation is not).

Work Many systems of social protection depend on a stable work record for basic cover in unemployment, ill health and old age. Workers who misbehave - for example, by striking or being dismissed - may be penalized.

Nation Most systems discriminate against non-citizens, and many have residence rules for particular benefits or services. Immigrants are likely to have different, and often second-class, services. These issues are discussed further in the sections which follow.

Family Policy

The Normal Family in Modern World

"Normal" does not mean "average"; it means "conforming to social norms". The 'normal' or nuclear family consists of two parents with one or more children, but it is increasingly untypical in developed countries. Several factors have contributed to this trend:

- ageing populations, which mean that increasing numbers of households consist of elderly people without children;
- the delay in undertaking childbirth, which means that more households consist of single women or couples without children;
- the growth of single parenthood; and
- Household fission - the tendency for households to split, because of divorce and earlier independence for children.

Social policies sometimes seek to reinforce the normal family, by rewarding normal conduct or penalizing deviant (non-normal) circumstances. Rewards include subsidies for married dependants and children; penalties include requirements to support one's family, and legal and financial deterrents to divorce. At the same time, the assumption that couples live more cheaply than single people may lead to two single people getting greater support: cohabitation rules, treating people living together as if they were married, are used to ensure equity with married couples.

Single Parents

The rise in single parenthood is mainly based on three factors:

4. *Divorce*, which has been increasing as women have gained independence in finance and career;
5. *Unemployment*. Unemployment is correlated with divorce, partly because it strains the marriage, and partly, perhaps, because it has undermined the role of the traditional male breadwinner.
6. *Cohabitation*. This effect is a statistical artifact, rather than a real change in parental status.

There is no reason to attribute the rise to teenage motherhood (which, like other forms of motherhood, has tended to fall).

The position of single parents who receive social benefits has been controversial. The liberal individualist position is that if people choose to have children it's then up to them to look after their family. The collectivist position, and to a large extent the dominant position in continental Europe, is that children are other people's business as well. There is also a strong body of opinion which considers that the interests of the children override any moral concerns about the status of the parents.

Teenage Pregnancy

Teenage pregnancy was the norm in previous generations, but it has become more common for women to delay childbearing. The reasons for the delay, and for falling birthrates, include

- the effect of urban society on the cost of having children;
- the changing role of women;
- the economic effect of female employment, which leads to a loss of income if women leave the labor market to have children;
- increasing education and later marriage; and
- the availability of contraception.

Teenage pregnancy is highest when these factors do not apply to the same degree. This accounts for the apparent association of some social problems with teenage pregnancy.

Work: Patterns of Work

The incorporation of people into the formal labour market has been central both to policies to deal with poverty and exclusion, and to the development of social protection. However, in many circumstances people are only partly integrated into the labour market. Their situation is characterized as

- a "dual labour market", distinguishing the social position of secure employees on regular pay from others;
- "peripheral" workers, whose role in the economy is more marginal, and who are liable to displacement during economic cycles; and
- "Precariousness", the role of marginal workers who move between casual and part-time work and joblessness.

Economic marginality has implications for social inclusion. Unstable economic conditions lead to social instability - marginal employment is associated with family breakdown - while also reducing the level of social protection available.

Social policy and the Ethiopian Context

Social Policies

Policies are usually made at macro level. To this effect, the Government of Ethiopia has formulated different economic and social policies

- Education and Training Policy; Health Policy;
- Youth Policy; Women's Policy;
- Population Policy; Social Welfare Development Policy;
- Cultural Policy; Sport Policy, etc.

Poverty reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs)

The country's national development plan

Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) were undertaken in 1999 and aim to describe a country's macroeconomic, structural and social policies and to promote growth and reduce poverty. PRSPs tend to span over a 5 year period and are often linked to countries' longer term development visions. Ethiopia has its own national plan, which mainly focuses on poverty eradication. Although the PRSP process started in 2000 as a process largely between government and the donors, it has now evolved beyond that, and the PASDEP (a plan for accelerated and sustained development to end poverty) is national plan for guiding all development activities.

- The current Ethiopian Government ruled by the EPRDF has had a PRSP/ MDG based National Development Plans since 2001. Before that the GoE had different strategy/program documents to manage and guide the recovery and transformation of the economy.
- In 2001 the GoE had the Interim PRSP which was approved by the IMF and the World Bank and hence paved the ground for the emergence of the first PRSP.

The first PRSP under the current Government was from 2002/03-2004/05 (Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction Program- **SDPRP**);

The Second PRSP from 2005/06-2009/10 which is called **Plan for Accelerated and Sustained Development to End Poverty** ([PASDEP-I](#)) and

The current and the third one which is called **PASDEP-II Growth and Transformation Plan** 2010/11-2014/15. [Growth and transformation plan PASDEP-II.doc](#)

The main feature that may distinguish the Ethiopian PRSPs from other African countries is the country has had PRSPs which are **an MDG based**

DEVELOPMENT PROGRESS IN ETHIOPIA

- ❖ From a low base, Ethiopia's growth and expansion of basic services have been among the most impressive in Africa in recent years.
- ❖ Since 2000, Ethiopia has recorded the second fastest improvement in human development in the world.
- ❖ One of the Millennium Development Goal Summit in New York was the latest international event to showcase the significant progress that Ethiopia is making towards the MDGs.

History of Ethiopian national development plan

- Before the PRSPs came to exist we had our versions of the National Development Plans since the Emperor's regime during the late 1950's which plans are of a five year development.
- The Derge /Military Junta/ with the Marxist-Leninist ideology had its own successive five year development plans since the late 1970's to the early 1990's. It shows that the country has a long history of preparing different national development plans with different focuses or interests of intervention areas.
- For Example, the Development Plans during the Emperor regime focuses more on Industrialization and the progress that had been seen in that sector was tremendous. The Military Junta had its own led by the Marxist-Leninist socialist ideology. The current one has a major focus on Alleviating poverty, Ensuring equal opportunity for citizens-men and women, Enhancing the social service, employment creation and building the infrastructure, etc.
- The 2nd PRSP of Ethiopia forward important strategic directions perused under the first PRSP (SDPRP-related to infrastructure, human development, rural development, food security and capacity building.
- The 2nd PRSP embodies some bold new directions such as
- greater commercialization of agriculture,
- private sector enhancement,
- Focusing on industry urban development and scaling up of efforts to achieve the MDGs to reduce poverty by half. The Ethiopian government PRSP are country driven broad based and requires all inclusive participation. The government launches this principle as 1st and most important pillar strategy to end poverty as it states 'building all inclusive implementation capacity'.

2. Accordingly, the government's effort is **becoming a middle income country by the end of 2025**; that is why Ethiopia now invests mainly on pro-poor sectors gender mainstreaming flourishing democracy and good governance vests decision making power to the majority

PART II Social Planning

Planning

Definition

Planning is an organized, conscious and continual attempt to select the best available alternative courses of action to achieve specific goals. It is the art of getting future things done. It is the rational application of human knowledge to the process of reaching decisions which are to serve as the bases of human action.

All definitions of Planning commonly imply that planning involves **making decisions or choices** about how best to use available resources to achieve particular aims or objectives sometime in the future.

Planning and Policy

Planning is part of a complex process of decision making which begins with the formulation of broad policy goals and objectives and then extends through a series of stages in which these goals are translated into detailed plans for specific programs or projects which are then actually implemented. Thus, planning and policy making are closely related and the planner should therefore have some understanding of the policy decisions which s/he is trying to implement.

One may say that policy making means making decision about the type of change or development which is required, while planning is the process of deciding how best to bring about this change or development. In most cases the actual policy decision will be made by the politicians rather than by the planners. However this decision will be based on information and alternatives presented by planning staff. Thus, planning is viewed not as an isolated activity but as part of a complex process of decision making which involves a number of related activities including:

1. The identification of goals or objectives (policy)
2. The formulation of broad development strategies to achieve these objectives.
3. The translation of the strategies into specific programs and projects.
4. The implementation of these programs and projects

5. Monitoring their implementation and evaluating their impact in achieving the stated goals and objectives

Development planning

What it meant to you?

Growth Vs Development

Development is simply defined as the process of improving the qualities of human lives.

Todaro has indicated three important aspects of development.

1. ***Raising people's living standard*** - increasing the incomes and consumption levels of food, medical services, education, etc, through relevant economic growth.
2. ***Creating conditions conducive for the growth of people's self esteem.***

Development should create self-esteem through different social, political and economic institutions.

Self esteem refers to human worthiness. If there is no respect for humanity, economic growth could not be considered as development.

E.g.1. during Apartheid the economy of South Africa was on the rise, but that alone could not be considered as development.

2. Until recently women had no right to elect and to be elected, while the economy of Kuwait is better off. Thus, we cannot say that Kuwait is a developed country.

3. **Increasing people's freedom to choose by enlarging options to choose or increasing varieties of consumer goods and services.**

There have been changes in the scope or content of development planning which can be attributed to changes in the concept of development itself. Immediately after WWII, development was primarily seen in economic terms, and the achievement of economic growth was the main focus of development planning. However, since 1970s, development is seen in much broader terms involving a complex of social, political and environmental as well as economic factors.

As a result, development planning has become a much more complex process with a wide range of goals and objectives. This led to the rise of social planning as part of the practice of development planning.

The Spread of Development Planning

Prior to WWII, Soviet Union was the only country engaged in systematic development planning introduced in 1929 for the first time. Influenced by the Soviet Union, India introduced a ten years Development Plan in 1953, which was intended to double the national economy in ten years.

After WWII, the European Recovery plan (Marshal Plan) was introduced in 1948 to facilitate the recovery of European countries from the effects of the war. The World Bank was created to assist this task of recovery. Countries participating in marshal plan were expected to draw a comprehensive four years plan.

USA actively supported the formulation of plans and provided financial and technological assistance to war torn countries.

Marshal plan was meant for western European countries. **Eastern European countries were under the influence of USSR.** The planning techniques of USSR were adapted to eastern European countries.

In Asia, the Philippines prepared five year plans to recover from the effects of the war. In India, planning commission was established in 1950. Similar developments have taken place in south East Asia such as Pakistan, Singapore, and other countries.

China adopted the Soviet model of 5 year planning. The World Bank has been an important agency in initiating organized planning since 1960s. Other aid donors had been promoting planning in developing countries. Countries like China, Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Korea made plans to fulfill the requirements of donors.

In order to get loans or grants, poor countries had to prepare development plans.

The planning process

There are different approaches and procedures of development planning, but the common elements in the planning process include the following.

1. Attempting to define policy objectives.

This has to be seen from the political view of the government (ideology). Policy determines planning and the reverse is not true.

2. Stating out the strategy by means of which it is intended to achieve the objective.

Planners has to set out strategies to achieve the overall objectives or goals.

When one sets strategies s/he has to know the objectives and available resources.

3. Attempting to present principles and policies:

The planner attempts to present centrally coordinated sets of principles and policies.

- All governmental policies should be centrally coordinated (education, health, economic, Agricultural policies etc.)
- Policies of various ministries and branches should be integrated or should be consistent.

➤ If the economic policy requires more educated human labor, the education policy should be in a manner to be able to produce the required quality of labor.

4. **Comprehension of the whole economy:**

Understanding and analyzing the dynamics of the macro economic situation of the country.

5. **Use of micro economic model:**

Understanding the details of the economy in terms of micro economic analysis, i.e., at the household and firm level.

4. **Covering a certain period:**

Development plans typically cover a certain period of time that can be long term, medium or short term.

Types of Development Planning

Development planning takes many forms, i.e. It is not the same for all countries nor to a country for all times.

4. A country may have different development plans at different times.

5. The nature of a country's development planning is influenced by many elements. Such as

- a. the availability of resources,
- b. skilled man power,
- c. level of technical, administrative and managerial competence and
- d. Level of development.

Types or approaches to planning:

Centralized planning

Decentralized planning

Mixed Economy planning

1. **Centralized planning**

➤ Is practiced in command Economies.

➤ The state controls through directives and regulations the following things:

Level of savings

Amount and composition of output and investment

The structure of prices.

What are the practices of Central planning authorities?

➤ Issue detailed directives and instructions to enterprises.

- Specify what and how much they have to produce.
- The raw materials and supplies are regulated by price settings.
- The amount of labor required, how costs are to be determined, what prices to be charged for products, and where it is to be delivered, what investments are to be made, etc are determined at the center.

Such type of planning is said to be appropriate at the early stage of development.

Advantages of centralized planning

- It can conserve scarce resources or ensure the efficient allocation of scarce resources for development and
- Help transform the social and economic structure.

Some people argue that central planning is necessary at early stage of development for the following two reasons.

2. The need to mobilize resources to industrialization.
3. To respond to the grave shortage of managerial personnel in development.

If developing countries are interested in promotion of industries, they need experienced and qualified managerial personnel. Since there is lack of such personnel in Third world countries, development activities should be directed from the center where experienced personnel are found.

In developing countries economies are simple and planners find it easy to direct the whole economy.

So in simple economies and at the early stage of development, central planning is very important.

So where is the problem?

When the economy becomes complex, i.e., when industries and services sectors are enormous.

At this stage planners would find it difficult to take account of frequent changes of the economy, and to predict the performance of the economy.

Disadvantages

1. Scarcity of important commodities is observed in centrally planned economies. Thus, central controlling of every aspect of enterprise operations, initiative, creativity and reduce quality of products.
2. The allocation of resources to different sectors of industries will be distorted; consumption and capital investment targets will not be balanced.

So, central planning has failed in many instances and countries abandon the exercise of central planning. For instance countries like Yugoslavia, Poland, USSR, Czechoslovakia had abandoned their

plans (5 yr or 6 yrs plans). Gradually Eastern European countries realized the problems of central planning.

Socialist leaders admitted the failure of central planning and start to take measures to decentralize their economies. Yugoslavia was the first to take the initiative of decentralization followed by other Eastern European countries, USSR and china.

2. Decentralized Planning

It is practiced in countries with market economies such as USA, Japan, UK etc. In these countries planning plays vital roles in the economy, although it is done relatively **indirectly**. Governments make conscious efforts to attain rapid economic growth, high employment and stable prices through various fiscal and monetary policies. Governments have realized that they should not leave the economy to market forces, The market does not govern the economy completely. Governments have to play roles to create conducive conditions that would prevent economic instability through policy instruments including.

- Expansionary monetary policy
- Increased government spending
- Tax rate adjustment

Tax rate adjustment balances the profit of people. When there is high profit, people can invest and employ workers. Inflation and deflation are controlled by **interest rate adjustment** (monetary Policy) and **wage price** (government spending).

Balance of payment (import-export balance) is controlled by

- ✓ adjusting tariffs,
- ✓ exchange rates,
- ✓ import quotas, and
- ✓ Tax incentives.

Such policy instruments are **indirect** but active measures to dictate the economy in the desired direction. They are indirect because they create favorable conditions that influence private decision makers without direct involvement in the economy. Decentralized planning do not involve in detailed development planning. Governments exercise limited development planning mainly focusing on the analysis of tax performance of the economy and projection of the future. The plan is indicative, i.e., indicates the future.

3. Mixed Economy Planning

Most of the third world countries are referred to as mixed economies. In such countries a substantial portion of the economy is owned and controlled by the public sector, and the remaining part is controlled privately. In this institutional arrangement we can identify two principal components of development planning.

1. Government's deliberate utilization of domestic savings and foreign finance to carry out public investment projects and to mobilize and channel scarce resources to achieve long-term objectives.
2. Government policies like taxation, import quota, wage and prices policy, etc which are designed to stimulate, direct or to control private economic activities.

This is done to create harmonious relationships between the private businessmen's desire and social objectives of the central government.

Rationale for Development Planning in the Third World Economies

Development planning in the third world countries is a tool for development. Why third world countries accepted mixed development planning? There are a number of fundamental economic and institutional arguments.

✓ The Market failure argument.

Markets in less developed countries are characterized by structural and operational imperfections. That is, their commodities and factor markets are poorly organized and the prices are distorted. The structure of the market is imperfect and, producers and consumers lack the necessary information in order to carry out efficient production and distribution.

✓ Absence of well-organized capital markets and specialized financial institutions performing variety of monetary functions is also an important reason for market failure.

This is a serious problem which makes it difficult to channel private savings into loan markets. The banking service is poor as far as distribution is concerned. Where there is no banking service, people cannot save and capital cannot be accumulated. This has made the economic system inefficient. To make the economic system efficient, governments should intervene through development planning (micro financing). Third world countries cannot afford to waste their limited finance and skilled labor. So, investment projects must be chosen within the content of an overall development program which takes account of external economies and long term objectives.

3. Attitudinal or Psychological Argument

Development plans are comprehensive as it encompasses social development. Plans include the construction of roads, clinics, schools, certain percent of economic growth, an increase in precipitate

income by certain amount, etc. Such plan document has important attitudinal /psychological impacts on the general population which is diverse and fragmented.

The development plan makes people happy because the plan contains the development of social services for the general population. This will help to secure the cooperation of the society in the struggle against backwardness.

4. The Foreign Aid Argument

Countries or government formulate development plans with specific projects. Thus donor countries give aid /financial material/ in order to implement the projects. So in order to secure aid, governments prepare development plans.

Social planning

The term social planning was first used in developed countries to refer to the provision of social services. It used to denote social welfare planning.

A UN report published in 1970, defined social welfare planning as the body of activities designed to enable individuals, families, groups and communities to cope with social problems of changing conditions. There are specific services in social welfare planning such as family counseling, daily care services, nursery, caring the aged, services to migrants and refugees, child care services, parent education, etc. These groups of activities are known as social work or social welfare work. The current usage of social planning is different from welfare planning. Currently when we say social planning it is related to development planning. The fact that social planning was viewed as social welfare planning reflects that developed nations do not normally practice development planning.

Emergence and meaning of social planning

Before 1970 it was generally accepted that the primary goal of development was to increase the rate of economic growth as fast as possible. The assumption behind this goal was that rapid economic growth would result in significant improvements in the lives of the general population of the third world. This idea was supported by historical experiences of western nations. Because of industrialization, they were able to transform their subsistence economy.

Economists emphasized the need for mass capital investment in the industrial sector and the application of modern technology in production. Any expenditure on social services was assumed to be non productive and wastage of resources. Neo-classical political economists argued that social needs should be satisfied through individual efforts in the market place. Because of such reasons,

social planning was given a marginal place in development planning. However, the above assumptions could not come true due to:

1. Economic growth could not be achieved in third world countries as expected.
2. Even in countries where economic growth was achieved, governments were not able to guarantee improved level of living for the general population.
3. Governments were faced with a growing demand primarily in urban areas to extend modern social services such as education and health. Economists also start to support such ideas because it is an investment in human capital.

As a result, many changes occurred in the field of development planning dating 1970, and one of the most significant changes was the increasing emphasis placed on the social aspect of planning. This has resulted in the rise of a discipline and profession called social planning.

Social planning is concerned with planning for and by people with the non-economic aspects of development (distribution, gender, education, health). The practice of social planning in the context of development planning is a process of policy formulation, plan design and implementation, which attempts to meet basic human needs, solve specific social problems, and bring about better equity and social justice.

Social planners are those who are trained to formulate policies, and design plans, which seek to achieve these objectives in collaboration with planners, administrators and those in political authority. They are generally interested in the well being of the population.

Roles of social planning

Social planning plays three important roles:

1. Planning social services
2. Taking account of social factors and considerations in development planning
3. Ensuring popular participation in development planning.

1. Planning social services

The most straight forward use of the term social planning refers to planning the provision of such social services as education, health, water supply, sanitation, housing, recreation and other services.

Stages in the process of planning social services

- A. Data collection and analysis
- B. Policy formulation
- C. Preparation of specific programs and projects

A. Data collection and analysis

An important component of social service planning. There for two types of data necessary to planning

7. Data on the existing provision of social services.

In the case of health, for example, one has to know the number of hospitals, clinics and other relevant information on the available facilities and personnel in terms of qualification.

2. Demographic data on the patterns of the population in terms of age sex composition, fertility, mortality, etc

The prevalence of disease or epidemiology, morbidity, the cultural life of the people in relation to the heath, the economic situation, type of occupation, level of income etc should be understood. Generally all relevant information should be obtained. Data an future need /demand of services should also be gathered. This involves making forecasting and projections based on the existing data.

B. Policy formulation

The planner should be familiar with relevant policy issues. S/he should provide information, which helps for policy decision and implementation.

Some of the policy issues include:

i. Importance of the social service:

Justifying the relative importance of the services, in relation to national resources and practices. The planner has to weigh up the social and economic benefits of the service/project.

ii. Choosing between different kinds of services.

Since there is a great need for social services, with scarce resources all services cannot be provided.

Hence, decision as to be made to chose among different social services including:

- | | |
|-------------------------|-----------|
| ✓ Education | Health |
| ✓ Rehabilitation center | Water |
| ✓ Lodge | Prisoners |

iii. Distribution of services

- Gender, Ethnicity, Age, Regional

C. Preparation of Detailed Programs/project documents

This is a document proposed for the development of the services. E.g., construction of primary schools in North Gondar zone. The proposal document should be worked in detail. It should indicate the number of students to be enrolled, resources required like staff, capital and recurrent expenditure, construction facilities and budget breakdown.

II- Taking Account of Social Factors and Considerations

In development planning social factors must be considered so that the plan should bring comprehensible socioeconomic transformation.

Major social factors include

1. The Human Factor:

Refers to people's cultural and social environment, which influences the way they perceive their needs and react to development programs. People have their own Knowledge/perception toward something. For example to what extent the people of rural Ethiopia will accept family planning programs? What strategy shall be used to convince the people that the program is important? That means what methods should be used to change the negative attitude towards family planning.

Many programs like irrigation and resettlement need the same consideration.

B. Provision of social needs like health, housing, education, water etc.

C. Social Equity/Justice-

We have to see the impact of development programs interms of equity among individuals, groups, communities and regions. For eg. If a health center is established, for which individuals, groups or regions is it accessible?

D. Integral Human Development-

Development should be man-centered. This means, human beings should be the focus of any development effort.

III- Ensuring popular participation in Development planning

The responsibility for ensuring that local people are adequately involved in the planning is often placed in the hands of the social planner. Many countries have recognized the need for popular participation in planning and this is reflected in the common use of terms such as

- ✓ "bottom up planning"
- ✓ "grass roots involvement"
- ✓ "Democratic planning",
- ✓ "participatory planning"

Reasons why popular participation is considered to be so important:

A. It is a means of obtaining information about local conditions, needs and attitudes with out which development programs are likely to fail.

- B. People are likely to be committed to development programs if they are involved in its planning.
Participation gives sense of ownership. (eg. Many development programs during the dears regime)
- C. Popular participation is viewed a basic democratic value by its own right.

Planning Skills

There are many planning skills relevant for allsorts of planning the most important of which are:

1. Decision making skill
2. Implementation skill

Decision Making Skills

Planning is a process of decision making, and the decision must be rational. Rational means that one should exercise his reasons rather than emotional impulses or reactions. Here we are talking about social rationality, which means that the planner is expected to ensure social goals, values and objectives are given sufficient priority and weight. Decision making process involves.

2. Forecasting
3. Comparing alternative courses of action

A) Forecasting

Since planning involves making decisions about the future the planner is constantly faced with the task of forecasting, i.e., knowing what is likely to happen in the future. Eg. At what rate is the population likely to grow over the next ten years? What improvements can be expected from the provision of health services by hospitals and clinics?

Forecasting techniques

1. Trend extrapolation

If we collect data for the last 20 years about the conditions of the population, we can investigate the growth trend of the population. The major shortcoming of this method is

- ✓ it assumes that future friends are unlikely to be different from the past. Since it cannot take into account the future population conditions, it merely considers the trend of the past.
- ✓ It requires reliable quantitative data.

In Developing countries the availability of reliable data is impractical or not feasible. Since trend extrapolation is subject to such limitations other methods of forecasting are required which are less quantitative.

C. Comparing alternative courses of action-

Planner must compare alternative actions. Most of the techniques are related to the general concept of cost benefit analysis. Cost benefits of each alternative are calculated and priority is given to the one in which the rate of benefits to costs is highest.

2. Implementation Skills

The purpose of planning is not to produce plans but to achieve practical results. One of the most critical step in the process of planning is how to implement a particular project or program.

Implementation skills

1.3 The process of operational zing

1.4 Budgeting

1.5 Monitoring and Evaluation

Operational zing requires

1. Ensure that all relevant steps (components) of the plan are identified

E.g. to construct a clinic steps are

- b. Securing the land
- c. Getting the contractor (Engineer)
- d. Follow up
- e. Equip the clinic with necessary facilities
- f. Recruit health personnel

2. Ensure that sufficient fund and manpower are available for the implementation of the above steps.

3. Assigning responsible personnel to Cary out each step.

B) Budgeting:

When we try to implement programs we need money; and when we utilize the money we have to know the various coherent of the budget. When the plan is prepared, budget preparation is part of it. There are various budget components in to which the budget is broken down. You have to utilize properly the appropriate budget.

C) Monitoring and Evaluation:

Evaluation is the act of discovering how successful we are in achieving our objectives. It is the analytical process which attempts to determine as systematically and objectively as possible the effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of ongoing and accomplished projects by comparing plans with accomplished projects and explaining significance differences between the two.

Evaluation represents an attempt to learn from the collective experience of persons knowledgeable about or involved in the project. It should be constructive effort rather than judiciary review. It can take many forms depending on the purpose/objective of evaluation, and It can be carried out by consultants, donor representatives, staff personnel or a combination of all these.

Levels of Evaluation.

1. Process evaluation
2. Impact evaluation
3. Comprehensive evaluation

1. **Process Evaluation** is generally concerned with two questions.

B. Whether or not a particular program, or intervention was implemented according to its stated guidelines. That means whether programs are executed or implemented in the way originally designed.

C. Whether or not the program has been directed at the appropriate target population or area.

2. **Impact evaluation** is concerned with gauging the extent to which the program resulted in the desired change. It implies that there is a set of pre-specified, operationally defined goals and criteria of success. For instance a health project may have such goals or criteria of success as.

- Morbidity rate will decrease by 20% in 5 yrs
- Mortality rate will be reduced by 10% in 5 yrs

3. **Comprehensive Evaluation** refers to evaluation activities that include both process and impact evaluation.

Monitoring Vs Evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation are basically different though complementary. Evaluation assesses objectives against achievements to maximize the impact of a project and to provide guide lines for the planning of a new one. In contrast, monitoring is primarily concerned with overseeing the process of implementation to verify that inputs are made available on time and properly utilized.

