WHAT IS SOCIAL

The common term between social policy and social programme is 'social'. So far it has been difficult for scholars to define the term 'social' precisely because social aspects of development are not as tangible as economic indicators of development. Hence, what is available by way of definition is very broad and vague. For instance, according to one view of social is, "... everything that refers directly to the conditions in which people live" (UN:1966, Social and Economic Factors in Development). Myrdal (1968) refers to the same as a long term phenomenon which is not different from most of the investments in the overall capital projects like dam and power plants. Kulkarni (1979) considers it as putting back 'human element' into development. He further states that social consequences of national development are not planned, which result in social dislocations. Although various studies (Ahluwalia, 1974; and Sen 1980) have established the need and importance of including social aspects in the national
planning, the term 'social' is still left precisely undefined. It can be said that it is being treated as a) non-economic (Warham, 1970); b) more than economic (Dubey, 1973, Myrdal 1968); c) investment in human resource development (Kulkurni, 1979) and d) all conditions influencing human beings (Eyden, 1963).

SOCIAL POLICY:

Just like social, the word 'social policy' is also not yet defined precisely. Though there are many definitions both narrow and broad there is no one definition which defines social policy comprehensively.

Narrow View of Social Policy:

Narrow definitions of social policy identify it primarily with:

a) government decisions (Rein, 1970; Marshall, 1970; and Titmuss, 1976);

b) decisions by the political parties (The Concise Oxford Dictionary) and

c) society acting through its lawfully constituted government, shapes social policy thus rightly ordering
the network of relationship between men and women (Macbeth, 1957; Eyden 1969)

Hence social policy is identified with the government and/or legislations. Since this involves decisions which are political, it is influenced by influential groups in the society having control over the political power (Warham, 1970; Rein, 1970)

**The Middle Range View of Social Policy:**

The middle range view of social policy is seen as providing social purpose to economic development to help achieve a right balance between social and economic development, (Mehta, 1958; and Dubey, 1973)

This can be seen as merely improving the welfare of citizens either collectively or individually (Eyden, 1963) or broadly referring to the elimination of poverty, the maximisation of welfare and pursuit of equality as the aims of social policy (Marshall, 1970; and Titmuss 1974). In fact, the three models of social policy suggested by Titmuss – Residual Welfare, The Achievement Performance and Institutional Redistributive
- are representatives of the middle range view of social policy. These are discussed in brief here.

Residual Welfare Model:
Individual is the prime concern here. It believes in the principle of self-determination on the part of the individual and the cause for any failure is attributed solely to him and not to the social system of which he is a part. The western-oriented welfare services based on self-help fall under this model.

The Achievement Performance Model:
The stress of this model is that, though the community is obliged to provide the services, the individuals have to pay for it or avail it on the basis of merit, for which they have to work and increase productivity. The occupational and fiscal welfare services are available particularly to those who are favourably placed in the organisational structure and in respect to the ownership of other resources. The impact of these services, tend to stabilise every widening gap of inequalities in the ownership and decisions regarding means of production in
society.

The Institutional Redistributive Model:
This model is in direct contrast to the Achievement Performance Model as it is based on the principles of social justice and equality. It stresses on the obligation of the State to provide services to the citizens irrespective of whether they can afford or not. Special services are also meant for weaker and disadvantaged sections. The impact of these services are expected to bring stability and equality in the social system and to counter the 'disruptive' forces of change.

Dubey (1976) rightly regards Titmuss' models as concerning social welfare policies on social insurance, public assistance, health, housing, education and services for the handicapped and offering corrective or at best supplementary measures. In addition, he offers two other policy models - development social policy and social reform policy.

**Development social policy model:**
Development social policy, according to Dubey, aims at improving the overall quality of life of the people by allocating resources for the production of goods and services to the needy. There are two kinds of development social policies. The first one is the Populist Development Social Policy which encourages labour intensive investment, production of goods and services for mass domestic consumption, favour external mechanisms and define and maintain market morality. Policies in this category include rationing subsidised commodities to the poor, preventing adulteration hoarding essential commodities, and favouring progressive tax structure. The second is the Elitist Development social policy which favours capital intensive investment and production of goods and services for higher capital generation.

**Social reform policy model:**

Social reform policies are expected to deal with the improvement of lower sections of the society, including minorities by eradicating social, economic, political handicaps, discriminatory practices, attitudes and
beliefs. Social reform policies are conceptualised as (a) incremental (b) compensatory and (c) revolutionary. The Incremental Policy, focuses on loosening up the existing social, economic and political structures in order to permit a limited access to the disadvantaged population into the valued societal resources - civil rights to the blacks and reservation to SC, ST and other backward classes, among others.

Compensatory policies, in addition to the removal of barriers to the opportunity structure, provide compensation to the victims of past injustices. Revolutionary social reform policies focus on the replacement of old values, social relations, economic and political order by new ones based on equalitarian ideology. For example policies relating to eradication of untouchability and land ceiling are covered by it. These according to the researcher, should be taken as providing the broad scope, if not definition of social policy.
Notwithstanding any normative model, formulation of social policy in any society, according to Titmuss (1974) depends upon:

(i) the intensity of the cause;
(ii) strength of the group sponsoring it;
(iii) capacity to which already existing institutions deal with;
(iv) the degree to which the public and administrative machinery is aware of it; and
(v) other factors like time.

In other words, social policy is the continuous growth in the volume of public, quasi-public and private interventions in social life (Myrdal as cited in Marsh, 1979).

Social policy should be seen as the total well-being of all, to be achieved by measures not merely economic undertaken by agencies in society along with/or independent of government. A content analysis of different views of social policy—ranging from narrow to broad—is presented in the form of a chart covering origin, objectives and nature of social policy and points out who influences it (See Chart 1). The chart
## CONTENT ANALYSIS OF DIFFERENT VIEWS OF SOCIAL POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHO Agents</th>
<th>Narrow</th>
<th>Broad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government decisions</td>
<td>Ruling party decision</td>
<td>Other political parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social legislation and programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ORIGIN (WHY and WHERE)
- **Casuative factors**
  - Mere obligation of state
  - Any short-term exigencies of a situation
  - Party interests
  - Political faction, even opposition pressure groups
  - Beliefs, pressure group, consequence of economic policy, public opinion
  - To alleviate social problems based on Social needs
  - Based on Social societal objectives, influenced by social supply values

### OBJECTIVES (WHAT)
- **Attack on insecurity**
- **Minimum standards**
- **Elimination of poverty**
- **Pursuit of equality**
- **Maximisation of welfare**
- **Total well-being of all, other philosophical and emotional goals**

### NATURE (HOW)
- a) Benevolent
  - Benevolent
  - Benevolent
  - Benevolent
  - Benevolent
- b) Coercive
  - Punitive
  - Persuasive
- c) Negative
  - Neutral
  - Positive
- d) Economic
  - Social, including economic
- d) Present
  - Exigencies of short-term nature
  - Exigencies of long-term nature
- e) Rigid
  - Flexible

### NOTE:
The chart is an attempt to show how the concept travels from a narrow to a broad view. There need not necessarily be any relationship between the categories either vertically or diagonally, i.e., there is a possibility of a social policy being an outcome of political decisions which may be persuasive in character for short duration to achieve the aim of security. Thus, various patterns of social policy can emerge by the way of working out different combinations of the who, why and where, what and how of social policy.
is evident of empirical reality and not suggestive of any normative reference. However, the researcher believes that what is offered on the extreme right of the chart can be suggested as prescriptive social policy.

SOCIAL PROGRAMMES:
As stated in Chapter 1, howsoever, well formulated a social policy may be, it cannot by itself achieve its objectives. Social programmes translate the intent of social policy into action. Just as social policies may get formulated in narrow, middle range of broad terms, social programmes in society also seem to be contributing to objectives ranging from narrow to broad.

Not only there is a need for more social programmes in society, which will contribute to the broad objectives of social policy, but there should also be proper blending of broad social policy with broad social programmes or alternatively it should be ensured that achievement of narrow or mid range social programmes would cumulatively contribute to the achievement of broad social policy goals.
In short, objectives, scope and nature of social programme will greatly depend upon the objectives, and scope of social policy as adopted by the society. If any society adopts reformative and development-oriented social policy, but allows its programmes to be basically welfare oriented, then in the name of broad social policy very narrow objectives of providing welfare to certain disadvantaged sections in the society will only take place.

Every society needs to take residual achievement performance, redistributive welfare, reformative and developmental approaches to alleviate its social problems. Social programmes rarely serve as means towards achieving such different aims. How far and to what extent the society should follow these different approaches and how to achieve functional relationships among them so that one does not work at cross purposes with others are then the concern and the scope of social policy. If it is not taken at social policy's level, social programmes however well formulated will be
aimless exercise in wilderness. At the time of formulating social programmes, therefore it becomes essential to see whether it suits the objective of social policy on which it is made dependent and whether its achievement will lead to the success of social policy's objectives.

In any society, therefore, evaluation of its welfare measures should be seen as concomitant of evaluation of its social policy as translated into action through social programmes. If social policy is a hole and social programmes are pegs, then it should be seen whether round pegs are in round holes.