

طريقة دراسة نسق الرعاية الاجتماعية على المستوى المفاهيمي

د . جلال الفزاوي

يحاول هذا البحث تحديد نسق او جهاز الرعاية الاجتماعية على المستوى النظري بواسطة استخدام طريقة تحليل النسق . كما يهدف الى تسهيل ادراكنا لمفهوم الرعاية الاجتماعية الذي يعرف بأنه جهاز يتكون من المؤسسات الاجتماعية المترابطة والتي تتميز باتحادها مع بعضها البعض بواسطة مجموعة من القيم الشائعة والاهداف والمبادئ التي تعبر عن النواحي المعترف بها كجزء اساسي من حضارة وثقافة المجتمع المتمثلة في الاهتمام الجماعي للمجتمع برفاهية اعضائه على مستوى الافراد والاسر والجماعات .

ويفترض البحث ان جهاز الرعاية الاجتماعية يتميز بسلوك وانشطة خاصة يمكن من خلالها اقامة الحدود التي تفصله عن باقي الاجهزة الرئيسية التي توجد في اي مجتمع مثل الجهاز الاقتصادي ، الجهاز السياسي التشريعي والجهاز الديني . وكنسق فان للرعاية الاجتماعية من مدخلاتها وعملياتها ومخرجاتها وتفنيتها المرتدة مما يساعد على تحديد كيانها في المجتمع وذلك عن طريق فصلها — نظريات — عن باقي الاجهزة الاجتماعية الرئيسية ، يصبح من السهل الاجابة عن الاسئلة التي تتعلق بأين تبدأ واين تنتهي الرعاية الاجتماعية .

وفيما يختص بالمدخلات فانها تتمثل في الحاجات والموارد الخاصة بالرعاية الاجتماعية . والحاجات تعبر عن الفرق ما بين الرفاهية الاجتماعية والشقاء الاجتماعي وهي تنحصر في ذلك النوع من الحاجات التي لا يمكن اشباعها عن طريق التعامل في السوق الاقتصادي الحر — اما الموارد فانها تتمثل في الوسائل التي بها تعبر المجموعات عن مدى اهتمامها باشباع حاجات الرعاية الاجتماعية للافراد والاسر والجماعات . وتنطلق فكرة الحاجات والموارد من المسئلة التي تؤكد بأن الاصل الحقيقي للحاجات والموارد ينبثق من الانسان نفسه .

اما العمليات فالمقصود من هذه الدراسة تلك الانشطة وانواع السلوك

THE SOCIAL WELFARE SYSTEM: A CONCEPTUAL APPROACH

G. Elghazzawy *

INTRODUCTION :

The purpose of this paper is to introduce a theoretical framework based on system analysis in order to provide the grounds for understanding social welfare behavior and actions as an integral part of the major social systems in society; namely, the politico-legal, the economic and the religious systems. The ultimate goal behind this statement is to establish a conceptual framework for social welfare activities. This model is supposed to represent a constructed image through the expression of an orderly arrangement of concepts and principles into a single whole about the real world of social welfare.

JUSTIFICATION FOR THE STUDY :

Knowing about social welfare does not necessarily imply that we can prove what we know. This is why I believe that we ought to develop a broad theoretical orientation to enable us to confirm or invalidate our conceptions. In other words, it seems to me, that we should not limit ourselves to the area of interpreting social welfare activities, but rather, we need to expand beyond the narrowly dynamic notion of social welfare policy and service through which we usually try to discover who shares in the meeting of social welfare needs, and how social welfare resources are developed and allocated.

As students of social welfare, we have usually tended to limit ourselves to the study of the variables which play an important part in implementing various presumed functions that sustain social welfare activities. However, there is no doubt that we can attempt to comprehend social welfare institutions by viewing each of its

*G. Elghazzawy is lecturer in Social Work at Kuwait University

aspects piecemeal. We can examine the operations and the results of such institutions as Social Security programs; we can study the nature and consequences of such practices within other social welfare programs such as child welfare services; and we can seek to reveal the structural and functional roles of organizations in which these practices occur.

In combining these results, however, there is already implicit the notion that each part of the larger social welfare canvas does not stand alone, but is related - in one way or another - to each other part; or, to put it positively, that the operation of no one part can be fully understood without reference to the way in which the whole itself operates. Here, I am suggesting that it may be important to adopt this implicit assumption as an articulate premise for theoretical research by viewing social welfare behavior and actions as a social system of interrelated activities which derive their relatedness or systemic ties from the fact that they all more or less influence the way in which social welfare resources are developed to meet social welfare needs.

Much of what we have said is supported by David Easton's ideas which indicate in part that :

Empirical knowledge is not enough, yet in one sense it threatens to become more than enough. The headlong pace at which empirical data can now be accumulated threatens to inundate the scientific enterprise with an overwhelming and virtually irresistible flood. Some powerful counterforce is required to spare the "discipline" from being buried under an avalanche of knowledge that can only gain momentum through the decades if it thunders on unchecked.²

The above quotation should make it amply clear that we should concern ourselves with the synthesizing of the materials we collect from the field of social welfare as well as illustrating the usefulness of a conceptual model. Such a scheme may help in identifying the social welfare system from other major social systems as a set of interactions abstracted from the totality of social behavior and distinguished by behavioral attributes through which social welfare resources are systematically allocated to meet social welfare

needs. Thus, the conceptual model I am referring to represents a device which serves to guide the formulation, and solution, of social welfare problems. The proposed conceptual scheme, regardless of the defects it might have, can operate on a tentative level as a reliable device mirroring the process through which the collective expresses its concern for the welfare and well-being of the individual, in families, groups and communities. For me, a social system approach provides the light for the search for truth while scattering my steps in to the narrow paths of empiricism.

THE IDEA OF A SOCIAL SYSTEM :

As an instrument with distinguishable parts; input, process, output and feedback the social system approach should help us to conceptualize social welfare as a social discipline in regard to where it begins and where it ends; and as social behavior, in terms of how it might be distinguished from other established behavior. Here, we ought to keep in mind that none of the broad social systems stand completely independent of each other. Each of these systems is coupled with another in some way, however slight it may be. But for our purposes we have to conceive of a social welfare system as analytically separable from all other social systems, and frequently empirically differentiated as well, through an independent social welfare structure.³ However, in terms of its functional aspects, it must be understood that the social welfare system functions as a network of complicated relationships and interchanges with other social systems including the so called "client system" which encompasses those who depend for their living and/or for their survival on the provision of programs and services established by the system.

In addition, the idea of conceiving of social welfare behavior and activities as a social system serves as "a device of help us to understand a defined and redefinable area of human behavior, not as a strait jacket to imprison analysis permanently within a pre-conceived mold or model"⁴ For this reason, it seems to fit harmoniously into the present orientation toward theory construction as a relatively new intellectual trend in the fields of social welfare and social work. In our world of reality, it is quite obvious that not everything is significantly or closely related to what we can call

social welfare activity, certain elements of behavior seem to be more prominently associated with it than others. But the most important thing which needs to be mentioned in this regard is that the interaction between these elements does represent a unique type of significantly independent sets of social behavior. This behavior is distinguished by a marked social welfare relevance to an extent that in no way could be preceived as accidental.

In my judgement, if this type of behavior is randomly performed, therefore, there would be no justification for making any effort to systematize social welfare as an independent discipline. In this respect however, I should emphasize that there is evidence which suggests that the elements of social work activities and other helping professions represent, in part and under specific circumstances a close enough interaction that could represent a sizeable proportion of the total social welfare structure.⁵ In other words, while the social welfare system designs its policies, programs and services to focus on helping people with identifiable needs and problems, we find that the task of social work as a profession is designed to help people solve their problems and satisfy their needs through social work and social welfare institutions.

THE PROBLEM :

Of the many categories of questions that can legitimately be asked about the social welfare system, one of the most pertinent is the need for a "general framework" that can delineate the structure and analyze the function of that system. In other words, what seems to be the major problem of social welfare is the failure to clarify its role as a discipline in social life. This means that the processes of converting needs into satisfactions, and transforming dependency into independency should be analyzed. In addition, the interaction between the social welfare system and its environment needs to be put in perspective. Tolman describes the use of this approach as wholly 'pragmatic'. It can, he says, "be defended only as far as it proves helpful in explaining and making understandable already observed behavior and in so far as it also suggests new behavior to be looked for".⁶ Moreover, Tolman's approach seems to lend itself to an economy of thought and effort in organizing presently disconnected parts and promises a systematic presenta-

tion that may result in better understanding of the roles played by each of these parts. In this connection it is vital to realize that if social welfare literature continues to provide us with studies on public and private social welfare institutions, their policies, programs and services, no "discipline" as distinct as social welfare will emerge.

**PROPERTIES USED FOR IDENTIFYING SOCIAL WELFARE
AS A SOCIAL SYSTEM :**

In order to distinguish the social welfare system from other social systems, we must be able to identify it by describing its fundamental units and establishing the boundaries that demarcate it from units outside the system. Parsons and Shils have indicated that "for most purposes, the conceptual unit of the social system is the role". They defined "role" as "a sector of the individual actor's total system of action".⁷ In our case, the units could be conceived of as the elements which we can say a system is composed of. They are the social welfare actions. Normally, it is useful to look at them as being structured in social welfare policies, programs, and services, and carried out through the conscious activities of various kinds of collectivities concerning themselves with one or more areas of social welfare.

If we accept the above approach in establishing a framework for a wide range of ideas centered around the undelineated field of social welfare, we are further committed to define, in the first place, social welfare as a concept. For this reason, and throughout this study, social welfare will be defined as :

A related system of social institutions in any society, a system unified by common values, goals, and operational principles : those institutional aspects of social life which express the collective concern of the society for the well-being of its members as individuals and in family and community groups.⁸

As we may notice, this definition deals with the theoretical constructs of social welfare as a concept : that is, in terms of its constituent elements which have theoretical significance (not ordinarily observable) such as : system, values, principles and collec-

tive concern. In other words, this definition encompasses abstract operations by which social welfare behavior and activities could be identified or distinguished from other kinds of activities that are found in the politico-legal, economic and religious systems. At any rate, it seems to me that the ideas expressed in the definition are structurally related so that they may limit one another.

Within this framework, it follows that when we conceive of the social welfare system as a system of action, that is, a system of "behavior oriented to the attainment of ends in situations by means of the normatively regulated expenditure of energy"⁹ we must stipulate then, that in order to maximize the social welfare of a given community, "its productive resources should be utilized in such a way that it is impossible to make any one person more satisfied without making at least one other person less satisfied".¹⁰ In other words, as a system of action there should be an indication that social "welfare increases whenever one or more individuals becomes more satisfied without any other individual becoming less satisfied."¹¹

What seems most apparent about the above quotations is the implicit notion of the concept of equilibrium. For Parsons, this concept is considered as :

A fundamental reference point for analyzing the processes by which a system either comes to terms with the exigencies imposed by a changing environment, without essential change in its own structure, or fails to come to terms and undergoes other processes, such as structural change, dissolution as a boundary - maintaining system, or consolidation of some impairment leading to the establishment of secondary structures of a "pathological" character.¹²

In this theoretical framework, great attention has to be given to the systematic fit of the terms, "equilibrium" and "equilibrating processes." because of their pure analytical and empirical significance. The problem of equilibrium here is a problem of values and allocation. For this reason the study of social welfare as a social system should concern itself on one hand, with understanding how social welfare needs are socially preceived, politically recognized,

and legally supported in a given society; and on the other hand how social welfare resources could be developed and allocated to meet social welfare needs. This part of the study should be established within the context of the basic assumption that the ultimate origin of both needs and resources is found in the individual human being.

Once we begin to think of social welfare as a related system of social institutions, certain consequences follow for the way in which we can undertake to analyse the working of the system. The very idea of a social system, as suggested by Mitchell, could be identified by the following characteristics :

- 1 - It has a set of interrelated units engaged in some types of action.
- 2 - It is definable in terms of certain boundaries that distinguish it from other systems or from its environment.
- 3 - It has certain specific interactions with that environment and tends to maintain itself, through some kind of equilibrating processes.
- 4 - It has an internal structure and a set of processes which enable it to meet stresses and perform whatever tasks are required by the members and its external environment.¹³

According to these four general criteria, we can conceptually isolate the social welfare system from the rest of the social systems in a given society, at least for analytical purposes, and examine it as though for the moment it is a self contained entity surrounded by, but clearly distinguishable from, the other systems which may share with it some of its own activities and/or characteristics. This approach, as I see it, should be guided by a conviction of the enormous significance of the element of "system" for purposes of defining the subject matter of social welfare.¹⁴

BOUNDARIES OF THE SOCIAL WELFARE SYSTEM :

Some of the most significant questions with regard to the operation of the social welfare system can be answered only if we bear in mind the obvious fact that a system does not exist in a vacuum. It is always immersed in a specific setting or environment. The way

in which a system works will be in part a function of its response to the total environment, included in that the social, physical and biological aspects of that environment.

It would seem to me that the special problem with which we are confronted is how to distinguish systematically between a social welfare system and other social systems in a given society. And what do we actually mean by attaching the term "social" to welfare ? What makes it social ? Is there any significant difference between "welfare" and "social welfare" ? In my opinion, the inclusion of the word "social" in welfare should be seen as far from accidental.

Does it even make sense to say that a social welfare system has a boundary dividing it from its environment ? If so, how are we going to draw these lines of demarcation ? According to Parsons a boundary is defined as :

A theoretical and empirically significant difference between structures and processes internal to the system and those external to it exists and tends to be maintained. In so far as boundaries in this sense do not exist, it is not possible to identify a set of interdependent phenomena as a system.¹⁵

In our study of the conceptual approach to the social welfare system, a "boundary" will be referred to as the specific roles played by the social welfare institutions within its environment. These boundaries could be defined as all the behavior more or less directly related to the social welfare activities; namely, meeting people's needs and solving their problems that cannot be met and/or solved through the money price - market-system. In this regard, David Easton states :

Conceptually, a boundary is something quite different from its possible physical representation. A boundary line stands rather as a symbol or spatial embodiment of the criteria of exclusion with respect to a system. It is a summary way of referring phenomenally to what we have included in or left out of a system. If, for systems in which space is a significant dimen-

sion, we can point to a line or a container, we know immediately that what is inside is part of the system and what is outside may belong to other systems.¹⁶

Along these lines, and according to the definition of social welfare, we find that it implies that the selected institutions of social welfare must constitute a system and must share at least some common values, goals and operational principles not shared by other institutional systems such as the politico-legal, religious and economic systems. Also this definition implies that the selected social welfare institutions must express the concern of social wholes for their members as individuals and in family and community groups - not concern for an unspecified membership, but for specific individuals, alone or in specific groups.

INPUTS AND OUTPUTS OF THE SOCIAL WELFARE SYSTEM:

Presumably, if we select the social welfare system for special study, we do so because we believe that it has characteristically important consequences for society; namely, the reduction of the number of dependents in society and the conversion of the state of dissatisfaction into a state of satisfaction. These consequences we shall call outputs.

In our conceptual approach to the social welfare system, the outputs are supposed to be identical with the objectives of the system such as : improved economic status, improved health, improved social functioning and strengthened family life. In many instances, the output could be used as an input for another system or subsystem. For example, some of the employable poor (assuming that they become employable after a period of training invested in them by the social welfare system) may become a new input in the labour force system. Here, we can visualize the relationship of interdependence among the social welfare system and other social systems or subsystems in society.

Unless a system is approaching a state of entropy, and here, we can assume that this is not true of the social welfare system, it must have continuing inputs to keep it going. Without inputs, the system cannot claim any functional role, and without outputs we cannot identify the kind of work done by the system. The speci-

fic research tasks, in this connection, would be not only to identify the inputs, but also to discover the forces that may shape and change them, to trace the processes through which they are transformed into outputs, to describe the general conditions under which such processes can be maintained, and to establish the relationship between outputs and succeeding inputs.

The inputs in our analysis will be representing both social welfare needs, and social welfare resources. The first is defined "as those differences between the ill-being and the well-being of the members of a society as individuals and in family and community groups for which some surplus, some social welfare resources, exists or can be brought into being".¹⁷ A social welfare resource is defined as "something deriving from the collective : it is the means for the expression of the collective concern".¹⁸

According to Smith, social welfare needs are conceptualized in two different ways, primary needs and secondary needs. A primary need is a direct need for a good, a service or a human relationship, such as the need for food or educational council or approval. It is primary, not in any sense of being primitive or simple but rather in its priority and in the consideration due to it as compared with the needs of the helping person who helps in the meeting of the primary need. It is primary in degree of necessity. The primary need is seen as a difference in social potential which exists between the person in need and others in position to help. Persons who fall within the category of the primary need are those who are in a state of acknowledged dependency. In other words, those who take wholly or give less than they take.

A secondary need is defined as an indirect or non-egocentric need to help another person obtain or attain a good, a service or a relationship to meet a primary need; to match the examples of the primary need given above, we might have the need to provide food, to teach or to council, or to encourage with approval. The person with the secondary need is a giving person. For this reason we find that the person exercising a secondary need is in a state of acknowledged superior inequality and authority, of relative independence.

Smith holds also that there is no necessary implication of superiority of the whole person, of being wholly independent, or of not being himself a taking person. In respect of some area of help-

ing competence, the person with the secondary need is capable of the linear social welfare exchange, giving here and now to this primary - need person, and taking elsewhere at another time from "secondary-need" persons who can meet his own primary needs.¹⁹

In my study of social welfare I have been interested in developing the notion of primary and secondary needs in terms of the state of interdependence that ties them together - to another direction related to the idea of social welfare movements, and their leaders whose ideas have brought these movements into being. In this regard, when we talk about the needs that are supposed to be met through the social welfare institutions, we will discover that societies are rich with their social welfare innovators who perceive the primary needs of people, devise programs and match appropriate secondary needs with the perceived primary needs. These leaders try to stimulate people to associate in order to meet specific needs, either on a voluntary basis or in support of a government program.

As an example of the so called social welfare innovators we have the following four types :

- 1 - Persons who actively worked on problems of individual need and personal adjustment, e.g. Mary Richmond and Florence Hollis.
- 2 - Persons who worked on problems of group adaptation and of the use of group process as means to individual development, e.g. Kurt Lewis and Gisela Konopka.
- 3 - Persons who worked on problems of society and structural adaptation affecting the individual, e.g. Grace Abbott and Jane Addams.
- 4 - Scientific, political and social theorists whose ideas have notably effected the direction of social welfare programs, e.g. Karl Marx and Adam Smith.

In my judgement, there is no doubt that the discovery of not only the state of interdependence between primary and secondary needs, but also the state of interaction between these two vital elements in our study would virtually lead us to the origins of social welfare movements.

SOCIAL WELFARE PROCESSES :

Now we will be taking the first and most general steps in exploring the idea of social welfare processes which seem to have an important part to play in the function of the social welfare system. At this stage of our presentation, it appears that the processes of transforming the input into output should be analyzed in terms of the conceptual elements which compose the social structure within which social welfare cases are processed.

All or some of these conceptual elements of the social structure are assumed to be present as basic ingredients in the social structure of any type of social welfare organization. Concepts, such as community power structure, values, leaderships, professionalism, knowledge, bureaucracy and institutionalization, all should be considered in the study of the social welfare system as important variables in terms of their direct or indirect impact on the overall outcome of the social welfare process.

The assumption here is that this part of the social welfare system - where processes take place - consists of interdependent variables, and the hypothesis is that these variables are so inter-related in this manner that if the values of one or more of the previously mentioned constituent variables are altered, the values of the remaining variables will thereby be predictably affected.

Here it might be useful for our purposes to shed some light on the idea of social welfare process. In social welfare and social work literature, it is customary today to speak of social work or social welfare activities as a social process. By "activity" in the modern usage of the word, is usually meant an action which brings about a change in an existing situation by means of an expenditure of energy.²⁰

In its essence, the term "process" refers to a method or methods used in transforming dependence into independence, or needs into satisfactions. This interpretation of the concept of social process suggests that it is an integral part of the total pattern of interaction among social groups and individuals, and that one aspect of this interaction relates specifically to social welfare activities. Its orientation is towards the activity taking place in a social welfare situation, this is its substantive implication. It may also suggest that

the various social units which act within the social welfare situation would ultimately shape the social welfare policy that emerges for all those who are expressing demands through political processes in order to meet their social welfare primary and secondary needs.

From the preceding, it appears that the social welfare process is a special term that could be used to denote the importance of the interaction that will take place between groups of primary and secondary social welfare needs. This form of conceptualization may leave us with the impression that the social welfare process is, above all, a group process. However, one of the important aspects which needs to be developed in this study is the idea of the importance of groups as a foundation for any social process in general, and for the social welfare process in particular.

In my opinion, the traditional classification of social work levels of interaction namely; individual, group, and community should be substituted by using the level of small group, as an identified unit for our focus. In other words, in this study I will not be perceiving of the individual human being as the fundamental reality in society.

From an analytical point of view, this is a deceptive approach, because we have been confronted by scientific evidence derived from the fields of psychology, sociology, social psychology and anthropology, that the individual human being in his reality as a social being represents a bundle of interests, desires, and needs conditioned by geographic culture and other social considerations. Because of the nature of social life, the individual who seeks to satisfy his needs, is compelled to unite himself with groups which represent these interests. According to these assumptions which may be entertained to the level of a scientific fact, the true datum of our focus in this study will be the group life and the forms of its interactions rather than the individual person *per se*.²¹

It is highly important to what follows to indicate that any group process does not exist in a vacuum. This notion leads us to the idea that social welfare processes are usually achieved from the stand point of a social welfare situation. Any situation, according to Carr, is referred to :

as a focalized pattern of human relationships and circumstances which an observer or one involved reacts to as an adjustment challenge, something to be met or dealt with ... At the same time, any of these situations is made up of : a setting, i.e. objects and forces of an external nature in a particular location, two or more persons and, specific culture traits and complexes, material traits, cultural objects, adjustment patterns, ideas, values and beliefs, and social interdependencies, interaction, communication, adjustment and readjustment.²²

Within this frame of reference, and as an empirical system of action, the social welfare agent is assumed to intervene in a related situation for the purpose of providing it with stability and help the actors maintain their state of equilibrium, or the state of satisfaction or the state of independence.

In the study of social welfare as a social system, I will not be concerned with the social welfare process per se, but rather I will be interested in the factors which have a great influence on the process itself or the provision of social welfare services. These factors were referred to previously as the basic elements which constitute the social structure of the social welfare system.

As we may notice, these concepts represent variables of several types, and each type could be identified by a set of elements. For example, what are the elements of "community power structure"? And what are the elements of "bureaucracy"? As students of social welfare our primary emphasis should be directed towards improving our ability to examine, assess and understand the nature of each of these factors in terms of their functional and/or dysfunctional role within the system.

To illustrate, in order to understand the concept of "community power structure" and its role within social welfare, we, as students of this discipline, when we treat this concept, should understand its internal structure : "What is it like"? And its external connections"? For example, one might ask : How does "power" affect a concept such as "professionalism" which has been established - in social work terms - on the premises of the two value assumptions of "acceptance" and "self-determination"? In answering this ques-

tion, we may be able to discover the impact of "power" on the practitioner's helping process. In this case, we may be able to identify the role played by the concept of power in terms of how it may positively or negatively shape the actual process of help or the outcome of the the services rendered to the clients.

FEEDBACK :

We have indicated previously that our primary concern is with conceptualizing social welfare as a social system. In order to persist, the system has to use measures and means through which it can cope with stress flowing from environmental as well as internal sources. To achieve this functional role, the system must seek to acquire the kind of information which may reveal the state of affairs inside and outside its structure. Once the information is obtained, the system, then, should be in a position to adjust its future activities in the light of its past experience.

The flow back of information to the system is referred to here as the feedback process. However, the objectives of this process should not be viewed as limited to the system under investigation; in many instances, the feedback information is transmitted to the authorities in society through the quality and quantity of system output. More precisely, when the inflow of needs is so heavy as to require more resources or excessive time for processing as for example in the case of programs for dependent children and juvenile delinquency, this situation would undoubtedly affect the relationship between inputs and outputs. In other words, this relationship may be so far out of balance as to stimulate either criticism and opposition or active support to the system. In the latter case, other system smay be quite responsive to the extent that a new subsystem may emerge to cope with the stressfull situation.

In the meantime, it is important to view feedback in terms of its relationship to the total level of performance on which the system operates. On the basis of feedback, the social welfare system can reorganize its structure, or modify its function. Roles may be altered, new knowledge may be added, resources may be discovered and emerging needs may be admitted. However, these changes within the system are supposed to be determined not only by the validity and reliability of the received information, but also, by the

degree of objectivity with which this information is perceived and analyzed by the decision makers in the system.

CONCLUSION :

As stated at the outset of this paper, facts for themselves do not enable us to explain and/or understand events. Facts about social welfare must be ordered in some way so that we can see their connections. The higher the level of generality in ordering such facts and, clarifying their relations, the broader will be the range of explanation and understanding. It is for this reason that the search for reliable knowledge about empirical social welfare phenomena requires ultimately the construction of a systematic framework.

In following this direction, I hope to construct a conceptual model that can mirror with minimum distortion certain aspects of relationships that prevail in different societies and are known as social welfare. This kind of strategy will allow for a selection and organization of a useful set of interrelated concepts and principles with which we can work to provide a theoretical significance to social welfare as a social discipline.

FOOTNOTES

- 1 - By a constructed image I mean abstracted or synthesized formulations which have no counterpart in observable reality such as force, status, power, etc ...
- 2 - David Easton, A Framework for Political Analysis. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc. 1965) p. 134.
- 3 - In spite of the fact that Parsons continually distinguishes between "concrete system" and "analytical systems", I will follow in this paper the idea that system analysis is simply an analytical device to explain things.
- 4 - D. Easton, op. cit., p. 67
- 5 - Social work activities which are based on the money price-market system e.g. private practice - are excluded from our conception of social welfare.
- 6 - Edward C. Tolman, "A Psychological Model" in Talcott Parsons and Edward Shils (ed.) Toward a General Theory of Action (New York and Evanston, Harper and Row, 1962) p. 283.

- 7 - Parsons and Shils, op. cit., p. 190.
- 8 - Edmund Arthur Smith, Social Welfare : Principles and Concepts (New York : Association Press, 1965) p. 30.
- 9 - Parsons and Shils, op. cit. p. 53.
- 10 - Melvin Warren Redes, Studies in the Theory of Welfare Economics : (New York : Columbia University Press, 1963). p. 15.
- 11 - Ibid., p. 14.
- 12 - Talcott Parsons, "An Outline of the Social System", In Parsons, Shils, Naegela and Pitts (ed.) Theories of Society, (New York : The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961). p. 37.
- 13 - William Mitchell, Sociological Analysis and Politics: The Theories of Talcott Parsons. (Englewood cliffs, N. J. Prentice Hall Inc., 1967), p. 51.
- 14 - The writer has been confronted with a sizable amount of confusion when he made a tentative content analysis of the papers presented at the UN International Conference of Ministers Responsible for Social Welfare (New York 3-12 September 1968). More than seventy countries participated in this conference. In no one of these papers was an attempt to define social welfare made. As a matter of fact the conception of "social welfare" was confused with "welfare", with "Community development", and with "social work".
- 15 - Talcott Parsons, "An Outline of the Social System", op. cit. p. 36.
- 16 - David Eason, op. cit., p. 66.
- 17 - Smith, op. cit., p. 75.
- 18 - Ibid., p. 66.
- 19 - For a complete analysis of the concepts of primary and secondary needs, see Smith, op. cit., chapter 5.
- 20 - Erik from, The Art of Loving, (New York : Harper Colophon Books, Harper and Row Publishers, 1962) p. 12.
- 21 - For a sound discussion of this view point see, Albion Small, General Sociology (1905), p. 209.
- 22 - Lowell Guilliard Carr, Analytical Sociology : Social Situations and Social Problems, (New York : Harper and Brothers, 1955) pp. 33, 244.