DILLA UNIVERSITY

Collage of Social Sciences and Humanities

Department of Sociology

Teaching material for the course: Social Policy, Planning andProject (SOCI3181)

By: Shentema Dandena (MA)

Melkamu Gezehany (MA)

Jan 2020

Dilla, Ethiopia

Contents

UNIT ONE: SOCIAL POLICY

Objectives

After completing this unit students will be able to:

- *Define policy and social policy*
- *Understand different meaning of social policy*
- *Identify elements of social policy*
- *Differentiate different ways of defining the term social*
- *Identify different policy purposes*

1.1 Introduction

Social: This term 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.

A).The word social is associated with entertainment or leisure: For instance, we can talk about a person's social life or the need for social activities in a particular setting (music, sport, drama, theatre etc).

B).it is used as antonym or opposite of individual: That is, the word social represents or describes a group of people, society, community, etc .In other words, it has the implication that a group is more than just the sum of the total number of individuals. What is good for the individual may not be necessarily good for the group as a whole. We have to work for the good of the society.

C).The word social is used to indicate relationship or social relations: In our everyday language we talk about sociable and non-sociable persons. A person who can mix easily with others is said to be extrovert (someone who is very confident, lively and happy in social situations). On the other hand, a person who cannot mix easily with others can be called introvert person (a person who tends to concentrate on his/her own thoughts and feelings rather than communicating with other people).

D).The word social is used as antonym of economic: Here, social development is contrasted with economic development. However, both social and economic developments are complementary and essential for the overall development of a particular country.

E).The word social is something which people have intrinsic rights: It refers entitlements as members of society. For example, the right to speech, the right to get social services, justice, etc.

1.2 The Meaning of Policy and Social Policy

Social Policy is a plan of action adopted/persuaded by an individual, government, party, business groups, etc. It can also be defined as general guideline formulated at macro-level (e.g. Social and economic policies). 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.

Activity1. Can you define social policy?
You can use the space provided below for your response

_____

_____

 It can be defined in different ways. In one sense it can be defined as the aims of a group of citizens in a particular problem. For example, we can talk about 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.

Social policy is an instrument applied by governments to regulate and supplement market institutions and social structures.

Social policy is often defined as social services such as education, health, employment, and social security. However, social policy is also about redistribution, protection and social justice. Social policy is about bringing people into the center of policy-making, not by providing residual welfare, but by mainstreaming their needs and voice across sectors, generating stability and social cohesion. Social policy is also instrumental in that governments use it pragmatically to

secure the political support of citizens, and to promote positive economic outcomes by enhancing human capital and productive employment.

Social policies can also create a virtuous circle linking human and economic development that, in the long run, will benefit everybody by boosting domestic demand and creating stable cohesive societies.

The term social policy is popularly used with varied and ambiguous meanings. Policy generally interpreted as an organizing principle to guide action and social policy is action to influence the course of social change to allot societal resources among various groups. It is also the area of organized human activity which somehow sought to impose reason and order on a mass of rapid and often untidy change.

Activity2. Social policy can be defined in at least four different ways. Can you mention two of them? Use the space provided below for your response.

_____

_____

Though there are different meanings, at least four of them are identified as in the following way.

1.2.1 Social policy as the sum of society's actions: societal policy

Social policy is sometimes considered to be the sum of all choices made in society governing the nature of relationships among individuals and social units. As David G. Gil puts it, social policies constitute a society system of interrelated relationships among individual units and society as a whole. Social policies regulate the development, allocation and distribution of statuses, role and their accompanying constraints, rewards and entitlements among individuals and social units within a society. This broad use of the term means that the social policies of society follow from the behavior of individuals, laws, acts of groups, etc. such usage might be better termed societal policy or social norms.

1.2.2 Social policy as an appeal to do something comprehensive

In another usage, social policy is defined as the aim of a group of citizens for action on a particular problem. Thus, it is frequently argued that the nation requires a family policy, a national health policy, an income policy. In its more elementary sense, this usage simply identifies an area of human relationships in which advocates action want society, through its mechanisms of government, to respond to a need, although the direction and details of action are not specified. In this usage, a comprehensive approach is usually preferred to a piecemeal one. A comprehensive approach is one in which all aspects are logically connected and neatly packaged, at least on paper, with no loose ends.

1.2.3 Social policy as acts of government

In a third sense, social policy seems to refer to a set or group of programs, developed either by government or by private organizations, to deliver particular health or welfare services or a combination of health and welfare services to achieve some loosely defined general aim.

1.2.4 Social Policy as daily administrative guidance

The term policy may also be used to refer to the rules and regulations which govern the day-by-day delivery of specific services, in other words, policy is 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 alcohols and drug addicts or on the contrary, of especially trying to reach alcoholics and drug addicts.

In effect, the broadest definitions of social policy are so general that defy any attempt to construct a professional discipline or a governmental structure which can simultaneously handle all of the dimensions of life. The broader use is, therefore, most valuable in trying to identify a state of affairs in society at a given time without doing more than suggesting tension points requiring action. Similarly, the narrowest definition does no more than deal with minor organizational symptoms of the basic social problems with which we are concerned.

1.3 Multidisciplinary nature of social policy

Social policy is developed in the early part of the 20th century as a complement to social development studies, aimed at people who would be professionally involved in the administration of welfare. The field of study has grown overtime and it stretches rather more widely than at might first appear, but the social services are where the subject began, and they are still at the core of what the subject is about. The social services are mainly understood to include social security, housing, health, social work and education—the 'big five'—along with others which are likely social services, including employment, prisons, legal services or drains (Spicker, 1995). The principal areas relate to policy and administrative practice in social services, including health administration, social security, education, employment services, community care and housing management:

- social problems, including crime, disability, unemployment, mental health, learning disability, and old age;
- issues relating to social disadvantage, including race, gender and poverty; and
- the range of collective social responses to these conditions.

Social services are services that government provides to citizens of a state, especially for needy groups or individuals, such as poor, weak or those with special vulnerability context, through welfare system. A welfare system, in this context, is the range of institutions that together determine the welfare of citizens. Amongst these are the family and the community networks in which the family exists, the market, the charitable and voluntary sectors, the social services and benefits provided by the state, and, increasingly international organizations and agreements. Mainly the services in social policy (social services) include:

- Health services   -Unemployment welfare
- Social security   -Family welfare
- Welfare for children, aged and disabilities

In modern-day social policies may also deal with the issues like:

- Abortion, and regulation of its practice,
- The rules surrounding the issues of marriage, divorce and adoption,
- The legal status of recreational drugs,
- The legal status of prostitution etc.

Social Policy is a subject area, which borrows from other social science disciplines in order to develop study in the area. The contributory disciplines include sociology, social work, psychology, economics, political science, management, history, philosophy and law. It is an interdisciplinary or eclectic and applied discipline which is concerned to analyze the distribution and delivery of resources in response to social need. The issue is whether this is all it is, or whether the subject has a sufficiently distinct knowledge base to be judged a discipline in its own right. As a discipline in its own right, social policy studies the ways in which societies provide for the social needs of their members through structures and systems of distribution, redistribution, regulation, provision and empowerment. Thereafter, the statement itemizes a wide range of subject areas, each of which can be said to contribute to the study of social policy although many of these areas are clearly relevant to other social science disciplines – the study of citizenship, for example, or issues concerning 'globalization' or global governance. Perhaps the most significant feature, however, is the way in which the academic study of social policy combines theoretical discussion with 'applied' issues. For example, how is the concept of human need best defined and what kind of policies may be required to ensure that human needs are adequately met?

Social policy is a multidisciplinary approach that shares issues with many disciplines. The best way to conceptualize the relationship between these other disciplines and social policy is to regard them as providing core subject matter that is subsequently interpreted by social policy researchers and academics to suit their particular interests. Therefore, for example, different socio-economic conditions – including class structures, ethnic mixes and demographic structures; perceptions of the role of women; degrees of economic development, urbanization and industrialization – can be studied and understood in a range of ways. The same can be said for political systems: for example, the role of organized labor or the nature of constitutional arrangements. If political science was the focus of analysis for all of these areas, they would be researched, discussed and written about from the viewpoint of types of government, the political representation (or lack of it) of marginal and minority groups, the position of trade unions and so on. In the case of social policy, the focus differs: social divisions are perceived in terms of ease of access to necessary goods and services (well-being), and the analysis of which social groups tend to face poverty, exclusion and inequality becomes significant. Again, the role of organized labor in the development of institutions that help to mitigate core risks could be a further

dimension of analysis, as could the ways in which economic development and forms of industrialization and urbanization affect levels of poverty, wealth and income. To understand this subject in its fullest sense, then, it is necessary to appreciate how the following social science disciplines 'connect' with social policy analysis.

A. **Social administration:** Social Administration is very closely related to social policy. It examines the core areas of social policy formulation, such as health, housing, education, income support and the personal social services, taking account of policy processes particularly in the central and local state, but also in private and voluntary organizations – and indeed in international and supranational organizations. Social administration is also concerned with the analysis of the effects (intended and unintended) of policies on particular social groups. It is worth pointing out that social administration was the original label for the subject that has come to be known as social policy – the (contested) change of name being sanctioned in the UK in 1987. The original title represents a clearly defined approach to the study of social welfare and continues to have a significant presence in research into, and the analysis of, contemporary welfare institutions.

B. **Sociology**: Sociology contributes to an awareness of the causes and effects of social divisions (e.g. class, gender, disability and race) and the ways in which social policies can either heal or exacerbate them. Sociological theories, perhaps particularly Marxist thinking but also 'postmodernist' ideas associated with Foucault and others, provide critical insights into the nature of welfare in contemporary societies. They examine the nature of welfare state development under organized capitalism and the changing nature of welfare in an era of 'disorganized' or 'late modern' capitalism (see Giddens, 1994; Jessop, 1994; 2002). Again, sociologists are also interested in how notions of 'welfare' and 'well-being' are socially and culturally constructed through different discourses and practices.

C. **Political economy**: political economy (the study of political ideologies and the assumptions underlying their approach to economic management) encourages an awareness of the political arguments that govern much economic and social policy making. So, for example, debates between Left and Right tend to center on disagreements about levels of public and social spending, and the role of the state, arising from the very different conceptions of human well-being held among conservatives, neoliberals, social democrats and Marxists. An understanding of political economy is particularly important for the study of the impact of

globalization on welfare states – much of the subject matter is concerned with the ways in which governments perceive the challenge of global economic competition and their attempts to alter (or preserve) existing welfare institutions in order to protect their economies.

D. **Economics**: Economics provides insights into efficiency and equity issues along with a focus on the costs and benefits of 'welfare' for the economies of particular states as wholes. Whatever the political beliefs of policy makers, they need to argue that social policies are 'efficient' – that is, they are not too costly for the economy to bear and benefit those for whom they are intended. Economists would also argue that social policies need to be 'equitable' or fair – in other words, they treat those in similar categories of need in similar ways (it is important to be aware, of course, that economists can hold very different views about equity, some arguing that virtually all social policies above a basic minimum can damage economic productivity, while others believe that high levels of welfare spending can be economically efficient).

E. **Political Science**: Political science provides an understanding of the constitutional arrangements existing in different countries and the impact of different governance structures on policy formulation. It also introduces the student of social policy to key political ideas such as 'equality', 'social justice', 'liberty' and 'citizenship' – which make up the policy objectives that social policies are intended to bring about.

F. **Human Geography**: Human geography is concerned with certain issues that have a direct bearing on social policy. Perhaps the best example is 'demography' and particularly the contemporary challenge of population ageing, which threatens to undermine old-age pension systems in different parts of the world. Geographers also highlight the importance of 'space' and the ways in which where people live can influence how they live, their life chances and quality of well-being.

In view of the close relationships between social policy and other social science disciplines, how reasonable is it to suggest that social policy is a discipline in its own right? There are significant difference between social policy administration and other social sciences, while clearly borrowing from them. Social policy differs from sociology because it focuses on 'the development and implementation of policy measures in order to influence the social circumstances of individuals rather than the more general study of those circumstances themselves'. In contrast to economics, while social policy is certainly concerned with matters of

equity and efficiency, the interest stems from a focus on the well-being of individuals and social groups rather than the productive capacity of a nation's economy.

Much the same can be said about social policy in relation to the other disciplines mentioned above. In each case, the core focus of social policy is on the nature of well-being and welfare, and the mechanisms different societies have developed to deliver (or fail to deliver) particular social goods and services to their citizens. The theoretical and policy issues involved – and debates about them – draw from many other social science disciplines, but they are used by social policy academics in ways that illuminate these key concerns.

1.4 Elements of Social Policy

The idea of social policy has several elements, each of which needs separate attention and each of which has an effect on the rest. It includes;

- Society's aspiration: The aspirations of a society are in the nature of preamble goals for a society, much like the statement in the American declaration of independence that 'all men are entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

- Social norms or societal policy: social policy represents the accumulation of values and normative standards which a society builds up over time. These norms determine what a society will allow its organized structures of governance to do on behalf of its members. They are an unwritten blend of what a people think their society ought to be, what they wish to do collectively for the good of all, and how they prefer to act to achieves such ends. Thus policy as social norms means the premises, values, and general mind set of the country. Such values shape out political choices, and our scientific and technological pathways for exploration.

- Public policy: public policy provides a guide as to the aims of governing to which priority is assigned and as to the means which are acceptable to or preferred by a particular government. These guides are general in that they indicate which problems a government will choose to deal with and which way a government will choose to move when it is confronted with the necessity to take action. They are useful over time to assure some continuity in governmental behavior; they assure a sense of direction and provide a base from which to confront new or unexpected situations. In this sense policies are guiding principles for a government.

- Sectorial public policy: in the guidance sense, policy is not only general, applying to all of government. It can be sectorial, in that policy affects only a segment of a society, as in the case of health or child welfare policy.
- Administrative policy: policy also includes the rules and regulations which are adopted by private or by governmental agencies or units to govern their day to day activities. Much of the recent discussion of social policy has assumed that development takes place as a result of political controversy, and this is essentially correct if, by politics

1.5 Values and principles in social policy

Activity 3: Explain the relationship and differences between values and principles.

For you answers use the space given below.

_____

Traditionally scholars have attempted to define values in many Ways. For Graham values are somewhat amorphous concepts, they do no more than embody certain preferences and goals. However, Griffin (1996) whilst accepting their heterogeneity, argues that the values are neither necessarily capricious nor short lived objectives. He points to their historical quality: values are handed down from generation to generation and exhibit both durability and tenacity. Griffin argues that this persistence is not drawn from any natural stability in the expression of preferences or tastes, instead such degree of permanency as there may be springs from different sources: that of utility. The values most likely to persist are those that prove useful either in sustaining life in preventing pain or in promoting happiness. However, because people may stand in circumstances different one from another they may espouse different values. It is common therefore to discover contradictions between different set of values whether they be voiced as preferences or as ethics (Boucher and Kelly, 1994; Moore, 1959; Russel, 1949)

The Oxford English Dictionary defines a principle as an origin or source of action and as fundamental source from which something precedes, a primary element, force or law which produces or determines particular results. In a further definition the OED declares a principle to be a general statement or tenet forming the ground of or held to be essential to a system of thought or belief.

1.6. Political ideology: clusters of values

What kinds of principles have philosophers and politicians placed at the heart of the doctrine they espouse? History has given us a number of distinct schools of thought including anarchist, fascist, liberal, social democratic, socialist and communist. What separates these doctrines is their view of society, their beliefs about the proper role of state and particularly the extent to 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. Hence each person commands absolutely the conduct of his/her own life and bows to no other individual or corporate authority. So for example, Rousseau(1762)argued that true liberty was to be found only in obedience to self-imposed law and a social contract was a matter of voluntary agreement between free individuals. The state is in this sense subservient to the individual. At the opposite end of spectrum, a state may treat individuals as chattels, allowing them to be bought and sold the property of other people or even making them slaves of the state itself.

Other values and beliefs about the relationship between the state and the individual occupy territory somewhere between these two extremes. We may consider briefly a number of systems of political thought: liberalism; neo conservatism; conservatism; socialism; communism, communitarianism and finally, fascism.

1.6.1 Liberalism

Vincent (1992) describes liberalism as a complex notion shaped by certain schools of thought. He argues that classical liberalism comprises: a blend of ideas and strategies about how to acquire or defend liberty. It was pledged to uphold liberty and the equal right of all individuals to equal freedom. Conventionally this freedom was understood negatively, namely as freedom from arbitrary coercion.

Scruton(1982) concurs ,describing liberalism as a loose term used to mean a body of modern political doctrine that will guarantee the individual's right against the invasion of the sovereign power. Accordingly, he describes liberal state as one in which the individual has strong objections to and substantial rights against the interference of the state. Those who believe in liberalism will thus seek to curtail the range and magnitude of government intervention.

Clearly within a liberal state the individual is paramount and the scope for state intervention in the form of social policy is much constrained. The principle of equality in this kind of regime is likely to be constrained to equality of potential scope for freedom.

1.6.2. Neo conservatism and conservatism

Liberal doctrines which promote the autonomy of the individual have been represented by conservatism political groupings. At their simplest we may identify two main strands of conservatism: 'hard right or neo conservatism and moderate or (in Britain) one nation conservatism. The key differences between the two strands are of degree rather than quality. Neo conservatives put their faith in the free market and desire to minimize state intervention through welfare programmers. Privatization of state asset is the major plank of neo conservatism policy. Moderate conservatism shares an impetus towards the individual and market and away from state provision and control. Accordingly, within moderate conservatism the state has some role in securing the welfare of the needy, though without hindering the operation of commerce in a free market.

1.6.3. Socialism

For socialists the collective features are as largely as individual and the state have a far more significant role to play. Just as liberalism is understood in a multifaceted way, Vincent (1992) contends that there is a variety of socialism. Crick (1984) argues that three values stand at the heart of socialism. These are liberty, equality and fraternity. He is careful to draw the distinction between; liberal and socialist understanding of liberty. He argues that a socialist view of liberty is not merely negative but also carries positive connotations of freedom to engage in society to participate and help choose and fashion social futures. In tackling the meaning of equality as it is used by socialists Crick rejects the notion that equality means sameness and instead speaks of equality treatment consideration and opportunity. As fraternity Crick describes this value as an attitude of mind in favor of tolerance cooperation, mutual help, engaging together in common tasks and the generation of friendship.

Socialism may entail at least in some degree the administration of a communities' wealth on behalf of all. In particular, some things (such as the means of production) may be held in common ownership rather than possessed by any single individual or subgroup of population.

Where these circumstances hold true, social policies may be enormous importance in state's mechanisms for distributing material, economic, social and other resources.

1.6.4. Social democracy

Sullivan (1994) describes social democracy (in the British context) as a model evolutionary (as opposed to revolutionary) socialism. He argues that social democracy as practiced by the British Labor party stemmed from two key influences, the incremental and expert administrative approach towards collective aims advocated by the Fabian movement and the strong brand of ethical socialism which imbued the labor party with a moral and religious sense of obligation in the early 20th century.

1.6.5. Communism

If social democracy represents an evolutionary form of socialism, then communism consists in a revolutionary form of socialism. For Scruton (1982), communism represents a more stringent and regulated strand of collective politics than socialism does. It follows in such regimes liberalism in the sense of individual autonomy is minimized. Communities' assets are held in common ownership rather than in (unequal distribution of) private property. Scruton notes that was thought to be merely a stage on the path towards communism but the recent collapse of communist regimes in Eastern Europe has cast profound doubt on the viability of communism as a workable doctrine. Speaking theoretically, within ideal communist states social and welfare policy would either not exist at all or social and welfare policies and practices would comprise the normal distribution mechanism of those basic goods.

1.6.6. Fascism

Fascism is a difficult ideology to pin down. It is often spoken as phenomena of the past. Sullivan (1983) asks whether fascism was an ideology at all or merely a cult of action without any doctrinal commitment. Sternhell (1994) argued that although fascism was a political force, It was born out of the desperate economic depression and chaotic social and cultural forces of the interwar years: it was a revolt against rational or enlightenment thought. In terms of policy principles, fascist doctrines are based on the differentiation of human beings. In the 20th century

under fascist dictatorships In Germany, Italy and Spain distinctions were drawn between individuals on the basis of their religion, ethnicity, race or color, their mode of living and their bodily state of being. Even the most fundamental human rights including the rights to live were denied people because they might be Jewish or Slavic or they were Roman gypsies or they had cognitive impairments. Under fascist, words like freedom, equality or fairness, if used at all could only apply within social categories after people had been differentiated and segregated according to the classification imposed upon them. The privileged groups might expect to be treated equally well; the oppressed groups deal with equally badly.

1.6.7 Communitarianism

Kymlicka(1990) has argued that communitarians criticize the traditional pattern of left/right ,collective/individual liberal politics. First, the very notion of independent individuals must be questioned. Communitarians reject the liberal or atomized view of the self and subscribe to a theory of the social construction both of the self and of social reality: individuals are never independent of society. Communitarians argue that liberal political theory is wrong in conceiving of the person as someone who exists autonomously and in particular independently of the social context which gives life its meaning and value.

Second, communitarians argue that a number of important issues are left out of the traditional politics. Whilst government and economy stand at the center of traditional structures of [political belief less attention is given to gender roles, the private versus public spheres of life and roles within the domestic as opposed to the industrial and commercial spheres. Accordingly, Kmlicka (1990) points out that communitarians belief that the evaluation of political institutions cannot be a matter of judging them against some independent, historical standard. Political judgment is a matter of interpreting the traditions and practices we already find ourselves in.

1.7 Policy purposes

There are five opposed and general policy objectives

1. To keep things as they are or to effect change
2. To privilege a specific group or to treat all people equally
3. To promote equality or to extend inequality

4. To promote a set of specific values or to accommodate diverse values

5. To change individuals or groups or to change environments

1.7.1 Stability or change

Activity4. Policy may be developed for the purpose of keeping things as they are or to effect change. Explain by your own words. Use the space below for your answer.

_____

_____

_____

Principle may be developed in order to bring about certain changes or, instead, may be intended to resist change and uphold the way things are. Principles and policies designed for stability will support the prevailing norms, values and beliefs. In doing so, these prevailing principles and policies will lend itself 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 it is that is being preserved. Equally principles and policies may be designed to preserve the preeminence of a single, narrowly defined group within a population through maintaining discriminatory policies which afford privileges to some whilst disadvantages others. In this instance, the aim of stability would serve the interests of particular, powerful groups and would affirm their values and beliefs to the detriment of other citizens.

1.7.2 Privilege or equal treatment

Activity5. Policy may be developed for the purpose of privileging specific group or to treat all people equally. Can you explain this fact by taking into consideration the current Ethiopian Educational policy? Use the space given below for your answer.

_____

_____

_____

Policy principles may either seek or resist change. But beyond this they may also influence the way a government acts towards the population at large. Principles may foster the equal treatment of all citizens or may reserve privileges for some to the detriment of others. For example we may

recall the era of apartheid in South Africa. At that time policies across the entire spectrum of the 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 of 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. The principle of racial discrimination is particularistic in the sense that it supports the idea that one group of people should be treated differently from another group on a single criteria (in the example above race, or more particularly skin color). Moreover, this criterion is not intrinsically relevant to the areas of policy affected. Crucially, the principles of racial differentiation fail to be plural in that it can accommodate no other value system. To recap, policies may protect or promote privilege on the one hand or they may support equal treatment on the other.

1.7.3 Equality versus inequality

Activity6. Policy may be developed for the purpose of promoting equality or to extend inequality. Can you explain this by taking into account the expansion of Hospitals in different regions of Ethiopia? Use the space provided below for your response.

_____

_____

_____

Within a state whose values promote individual autonomy as opposed to group collectivity, principles and policies will not attempt to ensure equal outcomes. Instead individuals will be encouraged to make their own way in the world 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 to flourish in these conditions and it would not be deemed problematic within a state so organized. 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 or at least centralized provision of certain basic welfare services such as education, health and social security.

1.7.4. The individual or the environment: the focus of change

Activity7. One purpose of developing policy is to change the individual or to change the environment. Can you explain this by taking your own example? Use the space given below for your answer.

_____

_____

_____

Finally principles may shape policies which intervene at the level of the individual or may change the structures and environments within which people live or may have an impact on both the individual and the environment. In anarchic states individuals up to the limits of their influence bring about such changes as they wish. These changes may affect other people or may transform that part of an environment over which they exercise dominion. In more collectively run states however, joint decisions may determine whether a change must take place in individual behavior or alternatively in the configuration of the (physical or social) environment. The question here is one of conformity. First, a state may have very strict and all-pervading laws with which individuals must comply or alternatively a state may have very few rather vaguely drawn rules which allow individuals considerable liberty. In this latter case the only discipline may be of the self-imposed variety. But beyond the matter of external or internal authority, there is a further key question about the location of change. For any given sets of circumstances, the question is whether it is the individual or group that must change (behavioral, altered.

1.7.5. Uniformity or diversity

Activity8. Another purpose of developing policy is to promote a set of specific values or to accommodate diverse values. Explain by your own understanding**.** Use the space given below for your response.

_____

_____

_____

Many western societies are increasingly multidimensional. They embody different communities, race, creeds and cultures. Within these states there are values and principles that may call plural inasmuch as they support and encourage diversity. But there are also values and principles that tend to the imposition of conformity or even uniformity. These we may call particular or particularistic principles. Here diverse groups are invited or compelled to submit to the norms, ideologies, and policies of the most powerful or dominant social, political and economic groupings. The main difference between policies governed by particularistic and plural principles is to be found in their focus, composition and intension. Particularistic principles demand conformity to one set of prevailing values, whereas plural principles acknowledge and encourage a diversity of values and cultural norms.

1.8 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.

1.8.1 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.

1.8.2 Family policy

❖ The normal family

"Normal" does not mean "average"; it means "conforming to social norms". The 'normal' 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:

- *Divorce*, which has been increasing as women have gained independence in finance and career;
- *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.
- *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.

UNIT TWO

Public Policy

Objectives

After completing this unit students will be able to:

- *Define public policy*
- *Understand difference between Social policy and public policy*
- *Comprehend the stages of policy making*
- *Understand Theories of Decision-Making*

2.1 Definition of public policy

What is Public Policy?

Despite the multiplicity of definitions for a policy as raised above, the brief definition is the one provided by Anderson: *A relatively stable, purposive course of action followed by an actor or a set of actors in dealing with a problem or matter of concern. This statement focuses on:* **what is actually done** instead of **what is only proposed or intended**, and it differentiates **a policy** from **a decision**, which is essentially a choice among competing alternatives.

Public policies are those developed by governmental bodies and officials. Nongovernmental actors and factors may of course influence public policy development. The special characteristics of public policies stem from their being formulated by the "authorities" in a political system. In short, public policies are those produced by government officials and agencies. It would be helpful now to consider some of the implications of the concept of public policy as a relatively stable, purposive course of action followed by government in dealing with some problem or matter of concern i.e., there are a few key implications of such a conceptualization.

First, the definition links policy to *purposive or goal-oriented action* rather than to *random behavior or chance occurrences.* Public policies in modern political systems do not, by and large, just happen. They are instead designed to accomplish specified goals or produce definite results, although these are not always achieved. In actuality, the goals of a policy may be

somewhat loosely stated and cloudy in content, thus providing general direction rather than precise targets for its implementation. Therefore, a policy (public or private) is aimed at changing, achieving or solving something. It does not refer to a random act.

Second, policies consist of *courses or patterns of action* taken over time by governmental officials rather than their *separate discrete decisions*. A policy includes not only the decisions to adopt a law or make a rule on some topic but also the subsequent decisions that are intended to enforce or implement the law or rule. Therefore, they should not be viewed as single, isolated events – it is important to contextualize policies within the greater scheme of things, as continual outcomes rather than individual outputs. As such, a policy is the outcome of a political process that involves *negotiation, bargaining, persuasion and compromise-policies* should be conceptualized and implemented in a broad enough sense that they need not be replaced and reformulated every year. It is clear that policy has a cyclical nature and arises from a process over time.

Third, public policies are the result of some *societal public demand*. The latter may originate with private citizens, groups of individuals, pressure groups, lobbyists, civil society organizations, or within public officials itself. These actors demand that public/governmental action be taken to solve a problem or address an issue of concern in society. This issue of concern will most likely be of common interest to citizens of that state – for instance, a call for the improvement of public roads to provide antiretroviral drugs to HIV positive individuals in government service, or take a position and legislate on the scourge of infant rape.

Fourth, policy involves what governments actually do, not just what they intend to do or what they say they are going to do. That is, what government actually does with regards to a problem?

Fifth, a public policy may be either positive or negative. Some form of overt governmental action may deal with a problem on which action is demanded (positive), or governmental officials may decide to do nothing on some matter on which government involvement was sought (negative). In other words, governments can follow a policy of laissez-faire, or hand off, either generally or on some aspects of economic activity. Such inaction may have major consequences for a society or some groups.

Inaction becomes a public policy when officials *decline to act on a problem*-that is, when they decide an issue negatively. This choice differs from non-action on a matter that has not become a public issue, has not been brought to official attention, and has not been considered or debated.

Finally, public policy, at least in its positive form, is based on *law and is authoritative*. In other words, a policy should ideally be legitimate (enacted or acted upon by a legitimate government) and can be legally enforced by the state (having the monopoly over the legitimate use of coercion). Thus public policy has an authoritative, legally coercive quality that the policies of private organizations do not have. Some public policies may be widely violated even though they are authoritative. Moreover, enforcement may be limited, piecemeal, or sporadic. Are these still public policies? The answer is yes, because they are either were or currently are on the statute books and enforcement was provided for. Whether such policies are effective or wise is another matter. **Authoritativeness** is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for effective public policy.

2.2 The Policy-making stages

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 public 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). On the whole, the policy process is messy, replete with considerable randomness, but careful research can have an important impact- from problem identification through the implementation stage. Most theorists view the policy process as a series of stages. This is important, since the different values and perspectives brought to bear von each phase of the policy process can determine the definition of the issue at that point. This process or series of stages should be contextualized within a policy environment. According to Anderson (2000:44), the policy environment in its broadest sense includes factors such as natural resources, demographic variables such as population size, race and age distribution, spatial location, political culture, the regime type of the state in question, social structure, class system, other nations, geopolitical position and the economic system.

In this section, we begin to analyze three policy-making processes as a sequence of functional activities. The basic stages in the policy process approach include problem identification, agenda setting, policy formulation, policy adoption, policy implementation and policy evaluation.

1. Problem Identification

Problem identification is probably the most undervalue stage in the policy-making process. Normally grouped with 'agenda-setting', it is ignored by many analysts in its entirety. 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 tat 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 public policy-making. For instance, HIV/Aids prevalence might be an issue, but it does not in itself equal an addressable problem. Rather, the actual problem might be the impact of the disease on the economy, in response to which government cloud then design a policy.   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 – if there is no solution to such an issue, no policy would bring about any change: the attempted drafting of such a policy would therefore be superfluous (unnecessary). **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 public problems at one point in history might not be perceived as such by a government 20 years later. For instance, the South African government had detailed policy responses to the 'problem' of sexual mixing amongst the races in 1980, while this problem has become a non-issue in contemporary, democratic South Africa. 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. For centuries in Ethiopia, wife-beating, child abuse, and other forms of family violence were private matters except, perhaps, when the regular criminal laws, as against homicide, were violated. They are no longer so treated. Problems and the perception thereof can, therefore, change over time - as Dunn (1994:299) states,**Problem structuring** does not occur once, at the beginning of the analysis, but occurs at many points throughout the analysis yielding information about the potentially relevant goals, objectives, alternatives, criteria, target groups, costs, and benefits to guide the analysis.

The important point here is that public 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.

In general, for our purpose, 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.

And a problem is a problem only if something can be done about it. For example, hurricanes and earthquakes as such are not likely to become public problems because government can do nothing to prevent them. However, the conditions of human distress and property destruction caused by hurricanes do become public problems. Relief programs, building regulations, and early-warning systems are devised to prevent or reduce hurricanes' adverse consequences.

2. **The Agenda-setting Process**

Not all public problems make it onto the public policy agenda. Of the thousands and thousands of demands made upon government, only a small number will receive serious consideration by public policy-makers. In other words, each problem must compete for official attention because legislators and executives have limited time and resources. 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 public 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 public 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 public 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. Policy-makers may decide not to take positive action on a problem, but instead to leave it alone, to let matters work themselves out. Or they may be unable to agree on what to do.

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. It is important to note that this entire process is iterative, in other words, one stage of the policy formulation process might not neatly follow on any previous stage: the process might be interrupted, with novel variables impacting on the outcome of the policy formulations at the end. Important in this regard is the impact of scenario planning, forecasting, and cost-benefit analyses in general.

Based on the above, the policy decision-makers will decide on their preferred policy alternative. The criteria applied in this last process (which may, in turn, be fed back into the policy formulation for the purposes of policy refinement) would then be measured in terms of envisaged effectiveness (is the policy able to actually solve the problem?), efficiency (how much effort will this require?), adequacy (are societal needs met?), equity (are these needs met across the board?), responsiveness (are those most affected by the problem shielded from any negative future impacts?), and 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, public policy adoption means political support from the 'powers that be' – the government. The latter may adopt a policy and sell it to the public and various individual stakeholders through command, persuasion, bargaining (yet again, it should be pointed out that this is a non-exclusive, iterative process which might encompass more than the adoption of a particular strategy, especially given the particular political culture in a state and the specifically of the policy problem in question). 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. Thus persuasion involves the marshaling of facts, data, and information, the skillful construction of arguments, and the use of

reason and logic to convince another person of the wisdom or correctness of one's 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.

A *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. There are two main ways of thinking about policy implementation:-

1. Top down approach- implementation of policy describes a process of top-management driving at the attainment of predetermined goals. In this view, a policy is only successful to the extent that it reflects pre-set outcomes. That is, top-downers focus on the actions of top-level officials, the factors affecting their behavior, whether policy goals are attained.

2. Bottom-up approach- bottom uppers contend that this approach gives too much attention to top-level officials and either ignores or underestimates the efforts of lower-level officials to either avoid policy or divert it to their own purpose.

The main premise of 'bottom-up' approach is that implementation is not so much the preserve of senior officials who know exactly what the policy objectives are; rather, the implementation stage is and should be defined as a heuristic device – appropriate and flexible policy interventions should be discovered by the actual implementers (more junior officials) as implementation happens. **Implementation studies**, they argue, should focus on lower-level officials and how they interact with their clients. State and local economic conditions, the attitudes of local officials, and the actions of clients are among the factors affecting implementation.

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 too the success or failure of a policy. Policy evaluation is learning about the consequences (positive and negative) of public 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 programme effectiveness, conduct public hearings, evaluate citizens' complaints and compare outputs with professional standards.

Forms of policy evaluation

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. 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.

Third Systematic and intended objective evaluation of programs. This form of evaluation, which I will refer to as 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.

Elements of Policy Analysis:-

There are a number of reasons for policy analysis some of the major ones are sorted as follows we Analyze Policy **first** to understand the origin, evolution and effectiveness of the policy, **secondly** To understand impacts on people, **third** To consider what exists and what alternatives there might be, **fourthto** think about other needs that might be anticipated, **fifth** to look for negative consequences of policies, even if they are useful, **sixth** 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, and 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

There are six categoriesof analysis**:** Each will have specific items and evaluative criteria. You need to keep them all in mind as a policy is being considered:- What To Look For *Historical analysis, Goals and objectives, Forms of benefit, Entitlement rules, Service delivery systems, financing methods,*

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

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, Latent goals – those which are not stated but can be deduced from some aspects like; The political context, The "tone" of the policy, Its relationship to other policies, The way that supporters or opponents talk

Evaluative Criteria: 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

Forms of Benefits: All policies contain some form of benefit, 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

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,

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, and 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

2.3 The country's national development plan

Poverty reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs)

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 in2000 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

2.4 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.

2.4.1 History of Ethiopian national development plan

Before the PRSPs came to existent 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'.

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 main streaming flourishing democracy and good governance vests decision making power to the majority.

2.5 Theories of Decision-Making

Decision-making, as stated earlier, involves making a choice from among alternatives. Given the fact that policy adoption is the actualization of decision analysis, Anderson's (2000:130-34) typology of the theories of decision-making is instructive of the dynamics involved at this point. Three theories of decision-making that emphasize the procedure and intellectual activities

involved in making a decision are presented here. *The rational-comprehensive theory, the incremental theory, and multiple advocacies.*To the extent that these theories may describe how decisions are actually made by individuals and groups, they are empirical.

A. The Rational-Comprehensive Theory

Perhaps the best-known theory of decision-making is the rational-comprehensive theory. It draws considerably from the economist's view of how a rational person would make decisions as well as from theories of rational decision-making developed by mathematicians, psychologists, and other social scientists. It should not be confused with rational-choice theory. Whereas rational-choice theory is used for developing deductive models of self-interested decision-makers, the rational-comprehensive theory specifies the procedures involved in making well-considered decisions that maximize the attainment of goals, whether personal or organizational. The rational-comprehensive theory usually includes these elements:

1. The decision-maker is confronted with a problem that can be separated from other problems or at least considered meaningfully in comparison with them.

2. The goals, values, or objectives that guide the decision-maker are known and can be clarified and ranked according to their importance.

3. The various alternatives for dealing with the problem are examined.

4. The consequences (costs and benefits, advantages and disadvantages) that would follow from selecting each alternative are investigated.

5. Each alternative, and its attendant consequences, is then compared with the other alternatives.

6. The decision-maker will choose the alternative, and its consequences, that maximize attainment of his or her goals, values, or objectives. Rational decisions may make either large and basic or limited changes in public policies

The result of this procedure is a rational decision-that is, one that most effectively achieves a given end. In short, it optimizes; it is the best possible decision. The rational-comprehensive theory has had substantial criticism directed at it. The theory is criticized for assuming that the policy problem is a clear-cut, readily cognitively separable that can quantitatively evaluated on its own and it has been argued that the problems faced by public policy decision-makers are

rarely so well defined and articulated. Also, the theory is criticized for assuming that the policy decision-maker is (1) rational and (2) that sufficient information is available to make a circumspect (careful) decision. That is it assumes that he or she will have enough information on the alternatives for dealing with a problem, will be able to predict their consequences with some accuracy, and will be capable of making correct cost-benefit comparisons of the alternatives.

B. The Incremental Theory

The incremental theory of decision-making is presented as a decision theory that avoids many of the problems of the rational-comprehensive theory and, at the same time, is more descriptive of the way in which public officials actually make decisions. Incremental decisions involve limited changes or additions to existing policies, such as a small-percentage increase in agency's budget or a modest tightening of eligibility requirements for university admission. 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 public 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. This process or series of stages should be contextualized within a policy environment.

Chapter Three: Principles of Social Policy

Objectives

After completing this unit students will be able to:

- *Define the major principles in social policy*

- *Understand the concept of justice*

- *Identify the role of government in social policy*

3.1 Values and principles

Values are somewhat broad concepts that embody preferences and goals. Values are handed down from generation to generation and are persistent. The values most likely to persist are those that prove useful either in sustaining life, in preventing pain or in promoting happiness. However, because people may stand in circumstances different one from other, they may develop different values.

Values are socially defined conceptions of worth. They order our experience of what is good and bad, right and wrong, beautiful or ugly. Therefore, values are standards of worth held in common by the members of a society or any of its subgroups. On the other hand, principle is defined as *a moral rule or a strong belief that influences your action. It is an origin or source of action and as a fundamental source from which something precedes, a primary element, force or law that produces or determines particular results*. Further definition of a principle is "a general statement or tenet forming the ground of, or held to be essential to a system of thought or belief." A fundamental assumption is forming the basis of a chain of reasoning. In this context, principle embodies the values and beliefs to which a group or government subscribes. A principle thus transposes a general set of values in to tenets guiding the formulation of doctrine and policy.

This section discusses some of the principles and values that are applied to social policy. It is difficult to give a clear account of this kind of issue without oversimplifying. None of the topics outlined here has a simple, unambiguous meaning; the concepts are often said to be 'essentially contested'.

3.1.1 Individual and social well-being

As discussed in foregoing sections, social policy is category of public policy involving goods and services that government authorities commit themselves to provide for their citizens in order to secure the wellbeing of their citizens. However, the political ideologies and capacity of government inform how the governments conceptualize and implement these values on the way to addressing these public demands. The general value every social policy intends to address, despite difference in meanings of such, is social well-being. Philosophers, sociologists, economists and others define social well-being differently and accordingly well-being is agreed to be a multi-faceted concept referring to one or more of the following:

- *needs* - the things which people must have such as food, shelter, … and other basic needs highly essential for the life of individuals, groups or communities
- *interests* - things which are good for people, or
- *Wants* - the things that people choose for themselves.

Despite the ambiguity, some generalizations are possible. In each sense, *poverty* can be identified with a lack of well-being.

Poverty is one indication of lack of well-being and is defined as *the condition of lacking vital resources* – is often qualified as 'relative' and 'absolute'. By absolute poverty, we mean lacking the truly basic necessities for subsistence: food, water, clothing and shelter. By relative poverty, we mean lacking in those things that most people in a society would regard as the minimum requirements for a normal life. As a society prospers, the yardstick for relative poverty changes. Relative poverty need not be just a measure of inequality (as it would be if, for example, we expressed it as having an income below 50 per cent of the modal income). It can still, for any given society, define a point below which people cannot minimally function as that society would expect. For example, people need clothes to stay warm but they also need clothes of sufficient smartness and suitability to be able to get and retain a job. People may not literally 'need' a phone but unless they can get access to a phone they may not be able to access information about social security provisions, phone in their electricity meter readings or participate in society in numerous other ways.

Governments have moral and legal responsibility to maintain the well-being of their citizens. That is why, for example, governments design different poverty reduction programs and strategies. Individualists (and economists) define well-being as a property of 'individuals'. Social well-being is the interests of people in groups, which is not always the same as the people within it; there are often conflicts between the interests of individuals, families and communities. For example, it is generally considered to be in the interests of a nation to defend itself against attack, even where people within it suffer directly as a result. Individual and social welfare coincide because people are interdependent, social creatures, and people rely on social mechanisms (like social interaction, exchange, the division of labor, and education) for their personal development and well-being.

3.1.2 Solidarity

The idea of solidarity is referred to in Catholic social teaching as "a firm and persevering determination to commit oneself to the common good, which is ... the good of all and of each individual, because we are all really responsible for each other.

The basis of solidarity is mutual obligation. This is mainly expressed through reciprocity, or exchange. "Balanced reciprocity" occurs where people make a direct return for the things they receive. Often, though, reciprocity is "generalized"; there is no simple balance, but people give because they have received something in the past, or because some future reciprocity is possible. For example, parents give to children because their own parents gave to them; people support pensioners in the expectation that future generations will support them when they are pensioners. Generalized reciprocity is the norm within families, but it also occurs in mutual insurance.

Solidarity can be difficult to distinguish from 'altruism', but there is no reason to suppose that the motivation is unselfish. The central problem of solidarity is that it is often exclusive - confined to a special group.

3.1.3 Justice

Justice is a philosophical and political concept referring to "fair treatment" of individuals or groups in wider social, economic and legal affairs. Nevertheless, differentiating what is "fair"

from "unfair" is equally challenging as defining "justice". In social policy principle, government's definition of justice and unjust act or principle is related to their concept of equality and inequality and ways of ensuring equity and definitely all are subjective and are not conclusive in their understanding.

There are different philosophical perspectives of *justice*. What is conclusive, however, is that both absolute freedom of individuals and governments constrain on individuals choice to ensure collective wellbeing is equally tyrannical. There are two main approaches to justice. In the following paragraphs, there will be an overview of meanings of justice and its implication on social policy.

A. Justice as Utility-Bentham and Mill

For Bentham and Mill, justice is what produces a great happiness for great number. In this sense it is decided on the amount of happiness and pain for the great majority; any activity or decision that produces more happiness with no or little pain for the great number is justice and injustice otherwise. This perspective, when applied as a principle of social policy, is that government should opt for the alternatives that produces wellbeing for the great majority and that decision may distrust few individuals/groups. In this perspective, what makes an activity "just" or "unjust" is not in act or process of the action; but the outcome of that action for the majority of the subjects. By implication, some may be treated in injustice way and they may be "scapegoat" for the pleasure of the majority, which is still considered as justice principle. In this way, government is encouraged to act selectively for interventions in the form of social welfare and services that produce wellbeing for the majority even if few may remain disfavored. Justice is, therefore, distributive.

B. Justice as Entitlements- Nozick

For Nozick, what makes some act "justice" or not is based on the opportunity or entitlements than the outcome of such. For him, injustice prevails when there is monopoly of opportunity and when the transaction (be it economic, political or social) is made involuntarily. That is, if the opportunity is monopolized by an individual or state and curtails subjects' free choice, it is injustice. Conversely, if the opportunity is open to all and individual choose an act without any correction, the outcome, whatever the kind- equality or inequality- is justice. This is basically, the conception of justice by governments of liberal political ideology, who describe justice by *processes* and hence *equality of opportunity* than *equality of outcome (we treat this in more detail under section 3.3 Political ideologies: Clusters of values"* below").

C. Justice as Contracts- Johan Rawls

Contract refers to voluntary legal and possible agreement between two or more parties each contributing something which the other party is in need from such relationship and in which, at the end, each benefits from such relationships. If *justice* is defined in terms of contract, therefore, it should be regarded in terms of both Justice *in the process forming the contract and its implementation* and *justice in the outcome from the contractual relationships.* Rawals (1972) in Drake (2001:63-4) elaborated his concept of "justice" in two Principle:

First Principle

> *Each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive total system of equal basic liberties compatible with similar liberty for all*

Second Principle

> *Social and economic inequalities are to be arranged to that they are both*

> *(a) To the greatest benefit of the least advantaged, consistent with the just savings principle, and*

> *(b) Attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity*

When one see the concern of Rawals, in his second principle, some kinds of inequality are consider justice and the central issue is rather based on for whom that unequal treatment is; that is, if it is for the benefit of the least advantage, impliedly to help the poor and the powerless, then the act is justifiable. That is expressing *justice* as "treating different individuals differently" for the benefit of the weak, the poor and the powerless. Definitely, Rawals concept of justice encourages special treatment for the weak and vulnerable, in the form of social welfare programs and services.

D. Justice as Contextual definition- Kymlicka

For Will Kymlicka (1990), the traditional dichotomy of justice as respect for individual freedom/liberty (as the liberals believing in free market argue) and justice as government's collective intervention in the form of collective social welfare and services for the benefit of all by constraining individuals free will (as socialists' political ideology argue) fails to reflect more complex reality. The leftist, who are socialists and opt for equality of outcome (as opposed to equality of opportunity), usually fail to understand the experience in domestic life that individual seek some kind of freedom and privacy. On the other hand, the rightists, pro-free market and less interested with government's intervention in production and distribution of goods and services, denounces the reality that structural arrangements may not entertain individuals equally and hence the outcome of such inequality may lead to social instability and social problems.

For Kymlicka, therefore, justice is created in a living way- domestic life, within different cultures and unique spheres of social life. This view is close to *Communitarianism* thought that encourages political thought to be embedded in the ways of interpreting the traditions and practices we already find ourselves in.

E. Justice and social policy

Any government, whatever its actual practice is, declares that its social, economic and political polices are to ensure "justice". That is, whatever the concept of justice, it is uncommon for government to call their public polices "injustice". This notifies the centrality of the concept of justice in social policy planning.

The major difference in the concept of "justice" for governments pertaining to different political ideology revolves around defining "the proper role of governments". For some, welfare is regarded as "unfair" as any welfare service is distributive, that involves re-allocation of resources through government intervention and it is entitling the unproductive and weak to basic services by taxing the producers who are competent and deserving the economic reward of their effort. Welfare policy and programs are, therefore, regarded as unfair system designed to extort wealth from those who benefit from the inequality that have been arisen from voluntary transfer. The view has no track with intervention to redistribute wealth. This view is highly indebted to Spenserian Social Darwinism and Nozick reflects their view of justice in "justice as entitlement".

Rawals, on the other hand, impliedly expressed welfare right as legitimate and necessary guarantee of basic wellbeing and equality of opportunity. Hence, welfare right serve to fulfill certain critical needs which stand prior to, and are control of, basic liberty and opportunity. Therefore, it is advised that governments should serve the needy section of the society- those who with the least advantage from the system, to get special protection and better benefit through redistribution system of welfare policy and programs.

Rights

The concept of right depends on our view of *justice.* Right is a legal and political concept referring*entitlements* on has due certain legal or political situation. The meaning of *right* , therefore differs contextually. Some rights are inalienable and are universal, which are categorized under *human or natural right* and your entitled to enjoy them simply because you are human being. For example, a right to life. Other type of right is what we call *political* or *democratic rights,* that depends on the political and legal stauts of the individual and which may be deprived of under certain condition. For example, a right to vote or voted. Generally, rights are rules: they can protect liberties or impose duties on other people. Moral rights are rights that are backed by a moral claim; legal rights are backed by a legal sanction.

Rights to welfare can be *general* (applying to everyone) or *particular* (applying only to specific people). The welfare states of continental Europe have mainly developed particular

rights, related to membership of schemes and individual rights; the model followed by the UK attempted to extend rights to everyone, on the basis of citizenship.

Initially, citizenship was used by the Greeks to denote members of that small elite within a city-state that had political rights and it was contrasted with a 'subject': someone who had a master. Until the rise of the nation-state, citizenship was either entirely absent or restricted to a very few. The modern nation-state represented an important break with earlier formations in that its legitimacy was based on its ability to embody the will and aspirations of an entire people who were in some sense all equal participants in a horizontal fellowship. This egalitarian rhetoric was eventually given substance in the expansion of the franchise until, by the early part of the 20th century, most industrial democracies gave the vote to all their members.

T.H. Marshall expanded the idea of citizenship by defining it as the status of a person who is a full member of a community and arguing that it had three components. First, there were *civil rights* (such as the right to freedom of expression, access to information, freedom of association and equality before the law); second, political rights (expressed mainly as the right to choose the government); and third there were *social and economic rights*. Marshall regarded the right to social welfare as an important safeguard against sections of the population being enfranchised in theory but in effect excluded from society by poverty.

Marshall tended to assume that the three components are acquired in the order set out above. However, feminist authors have noted that women's acquisition of citizenship entitlements has not necessarily followed that of men with, for example, voting rights often preceding full equality before the law. Since the collapse of communism in the late 1980s there was been renewed interest in the notion of citizenship. With socialism no longer seeming a viable alternative to capitalism and the old rhetoric of state intervention unpopular, critics of capitalism have turned again to the ideas of civil society and citizenship. In short, citizenship is the right to have rights. This idea, like solidarity, can be exclusive; it can be used to deny people rights, as well as to include them.

There are four general functions of right. *First*, rights may confer benefits. It is a benefit, for example, to have right not to be assaulted. *Second*, they may afford choices. The very notion of right to vote involves choice in who should lead or govern a society. *Third*, rights may establish entitlements, our power to call on something or someone for support. If we have, under

certain conditions, a right to money from some state, we are ipso facto entitled. Clearly, then, this kinds of right are particularly relevant to social policy. *Finally,* rights may confer duties or powers of sanctions. For example, we may have a right to deny something to someone.

A right to welfare has been in debate for centuries depending on the political ideologies in mind. For those political ideologies defining *justice as process*, specifically, those tilted towards capitalism varieties of liberalism, a right to social welfare is questionable as the government has entitled equal opportunities for citizens and taxation for the seek of social welfare is *forced theft.* On the other hand, since some misfortunes are involuntary and humanly damaging that may affect our inter-personal relationship, the government has moral obligation to recover the needy society in forms of social welfare programs. Stoljar, quoted in Drake (2001:89) argues that:

> *Any human being ... has to make his [sic] own life according to his capabilities and his wants. We are not equal, nor do we want to end up with the same lives. What distinguishes our humanity is that we can do accept personal differences and that we can grapple with them through moral argument. Yet even if it is false equality to make us the same, there are differences that are humanly damaging and deeply affect our inter-individual relationships. A person, for example, can, through no fault of his own, suffer misfortune; illness, accident or economic loss, can seriously disable his possibilities of acting or working.*

This, position, therefore demands interventions from public agencies to prevent the misfortunes, or/ and design social welfare programs for those who are experiencing the misfortunes. Governments defining *justice* as *equality of outcome* tend to favor this stand, despite the indefinite redistribution of government through public financing.

Freedom

In daily usage, *freedom* refers to the right to do or say what you want without any one stopping you, for example freedom of speech, thought or expression or worship. It also refers to state of being able to do or say something without interference of any body, be it individual or corporates in any from. In both cases, freedom has three elements. *A person* must be free *from* restraint, *to do* something. Freedom is, then involves three major components: psychological, negative freedom and positive freedom.

i. *Psychological -people must be able to make a choice.*

That is, to express your freedom to choose among the different alternative processes or ends, there should be alternative menu of processes or outcomes from an individual should choose. Let me give you one of the daily encounters in our daily social relationships. Suppose someone promises you to invite a lunch and you are granted to order any kind of foods and drinks of whatever quantity. But the restaurant he took you has no other food than "*kei- wet"* no other drink than Coca-Cola. Now, are you free to enjoy your appetite? Definitely, No. You are not free not because eating *keyi-wet* and drinking Coca-Cola is a problem by itself; but because you couldn't choose either from alternative foods and drinks in the restaurant or because you couldn't express your alternative restaurant. Psychological freedom is therefore, being *free to* think and choose without actual or implied external restrains. Notice that "*free to"* do something without any constraint is one dimension of *freedom.*

ii. **Negative - people MUST NOT be prevented from doing something**

In our ordinary definition of *freedom,* we have said that *freedom* is the right to enjoy your need without external constraint in any form from anybody. Here, the expectation is that you are "*free from"* any constraint. This is the second aspect of freedom, which limits any one, be it individual or state NOT to interfere in your decision and hence this is negative in its connotation. If you see, for example, the different legal provisions, some permit individuals to enjoy their disposal whereas at the same time limit the power government not to interfere in such individuals' decisions. For example, government should not limit the right of expression through any ordinances. Of course, anyone can express *freedom* in any of *freedom to* and *freedom from;* for example, to be "free to" selling newspaper is the same as "freedom from" not to be prevented from selling newspaper.

iii. **Positive - people must be able to act.**

This third element of "freedom" is about positive intervention of individuals or government to *empower* the individual or the person in perspective. The mere existences of rights are not the end in themselves; the individuals or citizens have to have *capacity* to act as well as the *scope* to exercise that right. An opportunity is not unless there is some feasible way of taking it. For

example, the constitution may grant women a right to access to government offices. Nevertheless, in Ethiopian context for example, the traditional legacy of the society did not favor women as it did for men and hence even if there is an opportunity to public office for women as men do, the impartial requirement for the office such as educational level and relevant experience indirectly discourage or make the women "unfit" for the position. So, if the government is to make women really equally beneficial from the system, there should be some steps to make them "able to act" in addition to constitutional declaration of the rights. Women policy, which aims mainly "*to empower women*" may, therefore, work on eradicating traditional beliefs and practices that prevent women from attending education and having equal economic footing as men do. This realizes the rights expressed in the constitution and hence "freedom" in real sense brings actual touch on the life of the citizens.

Individualists argue for a model of freedom where people's freedom depends on their independence. Social welfare and state intervention are seen as undermining independence, and so freedom. A social model of freedom begins from the view that freedom depends on interdependence. To be able to act, people have to have the power to choose in society. In this model, poverty negates freedom. Social welfare empowers people and enhances their freedom.

3.2 Political ideology: clusters of values

Policy is, as discussed in proceeding section, enviably involves deliberation and negotiation, which is presumably influenced by the economic, political or social power the group possess. That is, policy formulation and implementation is political process enunciated to achieve certain social, economic and/or political ends. Therefore, philosophical and doctrinal perspectives towards the proper role of government towards its citizens'' wellbeing is fundamental in the study of social policy.

Historical records show variations and evolutions on the different doctrines and beliefs about the proper role of government, the ways and extent to which a state may intervene in the lives of its citizens. At one extreme, the government's authority is reduced to zero so that individuals have a paramount right and each person commands absolutely the conduct of his or her own life and bows to no other individual or corporate authority. In this sense, state is subservient to the individual. On the opposite extreme, collective right is appreciated and government is supposed to ensure the collective end of the society by limiting "egoistic" need of

individuals. In this context, government acquire a lion share of decision and individuals are subservient to the corporate body, government, through the social contact they enter to ensure collective right and social wellbeing. In reality, neither of this extremes exist but values and beliefs about the relationship between the state and the individual occupy territory between these two extremes. In the following subsections, we brief a number of political thoughts and their implication on social policy of particular government with sets of these political ideologies: liberalism, neo-conservatism, conservatives, socialism, communitarianism and finally fascism. But before dealing with details of these political ideologies and their implication on policy planning, let us discuss on the responsibility of state.

3.2.1 Responsibility of the state

The idea of the 'welfare state' suggests that social policy is mainly a governmental responsibility, though in practice many of the functions of welfare states are undertaken by agencies beyond the government. If governments are concerned about the welfare of their citizens (some are not), they will have some responsibility for social protection. This responsibility may be residual (confined to those who are unable to manage in other ways), but most states have found that it is impossible in practice to confine their actions only to support in the last resort (the model of the Poor Law). The reasons are partly administrative (strict selectivity is costly and inefficient), but mainly political: the pressures for expansion are irresistible.

The welfare states are institutional forms of social protection, where the state has come to set the terms on which social protection is delivered. Some writers have argued that states should confine themselves to a more limited range of activity, but if the same activities can legitimately be undertaken by non-state agencies it is difficult to see why they cease to be legitimate if a properly constituted government does them.

UNIT FOUR: Social Planning

Objectives

After completing this unit students will be able to:

- *Define the concept of social planning*
- *Identify the difference between growth and development*
- *Comprehend the relationship between policy and planning*
- *Understand the concept of Development Planning*

4.1 The concept of Social Planning

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: The identification of goals or objectives (policy), The formulation of broad development strategies to

achieve these objectives. The translation of the strategies in to specific programs and projects. The implementation of these programs and projects, 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. During Apartheid the economy of South Africa was on the rise, but that alone could not be considered as development. 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.

4.2 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 1933, 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 have to set out strategies to achieve the overall objectives or goals. When one sets strategies she/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.

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

4.3 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. A country may have different development plans at different times. The nature of a country's development planning is influenced by many elements. Such as; the availability of resources, skilled man power, level of technical, administrative and managerial competence and level of development.

Types or approaches to planning

- ✓ Centralized planning;
- ✓ Decentralized planning,
- ✓ Mixed Economy planning

4.3.1 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?

Here there are some main points that the central planning authorities like, mainly practice 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.

1, the need to mobilize resources to industrialization

2, 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

Scarcity of important commodities is observed in centrally planned economies. Thus, central controlling of every aspect of enterprise operations stifles initiative, creativity and reduce quality of products. 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. or 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.

4.3.2 Decentralized Planning

It is practiced in countries with market economies such as USA, Japan, and 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 monitory 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.*

4.3.3 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 importations. 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 in to 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.

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.

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.

Unit five: Social Planning and Provision of Social Services

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.

5.1 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 nonproductive 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 wellbeing of the population.

5.2 Roles of social planning

Social planning plays three important roles:

- ✓ Planning social services,
- ✓ Taking account of social factors and considerations in development planning and
- ✓ 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.

5.3 Stages in the process of planning social services

The following are the main stages in the process of planning social service

1. Data collection and analysis; an important component of social service planning. There are two types of data necessary to planning

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.

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 on future need /demand of services should also be gathered.   This involves making forecasting and projections based on the existing data.

2. 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**:

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.

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 has to be made to choose among different social services including:

- ✓ Education   Health

- ✓ Rehabilitation center   Water

- ✓ Lodge   Prisoners

3. Preparation of Detailed Programs/project documents: This is a document proposed for the development of the services. Eg, 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.

4- 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**

A. 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 in terms of equity among individuals, groups, communities and regions.

For eg. If a health center is established, for which individuals, groups or regions it is accessible?

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

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 for popular participation

A. It is a means of obtaining information about local conditions, needs and attitudes without 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 all sorts of planning the most important of which are: Decision making skill, Implementation skill

1. *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: Forecasting; Comparing alternative courses of action; forecastingsince planning involves making decisionsabout 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

 A. 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.

B. 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 steps in the process of planning is how to implement a

particular project or program. Implementation skills are; The process of operational zing, Budgeting, Monitoring and Evaluation

 A)**Operationalizing requires**

1. Ensure that all relevant steps (components) of the plan are identified, e.g. to construct a clinic steps are; -Securing the land, Getting the contractor (Engineer), Follow up, Equip the clinic with necessary facilities, 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: -*Process evaluation, Impact evaluation and Comprehensive evaluation*

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

   A. 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.

B. 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.