



## **THE PLACE OF PROGRAMMING IN THE STATE'S SOCIAL POLICY**

**Venelin Terziev, National Military University, Bulgaria; University of Rouse, Bulgaria  
Marin Georgiev, University Hospital Kaneff - Rouse, Bulgaria; National Military  
University, Bulgaria**

### **ABSTRACT**

In its multiple-meaning, the word “program “ is widely penetrating in the field of social life and is also understood as a list, index, notes (of theatre, concert performances, performed roles, and their performers, in radio and television broadcasts, of authors of reports, scientific conferences, and symposia), etc. Namely, the potential range of application of that term is the grounds for transferring its general meaning upon wider and wider fields of applicability, within which frames to define its aspect meaning and content. For the aims of our study, we determine the term “program” in the aspect of a particular public activity, what social activity is. We use the concept “social program” in this sense, which definition finds manifestation in several aspects: The social program is a perspective concept for the growth of wealth and development of social relations. Social programs appear to be special sections of the economic and social development plans (yearly or for a longer period) of the corresponding planning regions, districts, and municipalities.

Keywords: social program, social programming, control, management

## Introduction

Social programs contain the specification of the goals and tasks, reflect their hierarchy, serve for forming new forms of satisfying population's social needs, and for creating of corresponding new organization connections. The combination of outlined and feasible actions (measures) in one or another social field can be quite reasonably be reviewed in the capacity of a social program, in this case, if they haven't got unified programming document, plan, etc., but grounded on a common concept, interconnected and directed towards achieving one complex goal. The pointed qualities of social programs such as conceptuality, targeting for the satisfaction of social needs, including new forms, defining the reference points in the social development, the social criteria in economy's progress, their expression in quality and quantity indicators, type diversity and social flexibility, allow to be found as a universal method for political and management activity. Using this method might vary depending on the general and specific social-economic, political, and other circumstances (Terziev, 2013, Terziev, 2014 ).

Although recognizing the time in our society – the end of the 70s, social programs are reviewed within the frame of the then existing system of party management and total state directive-based planning (Semenets, 1999). The term “target complex program” has established itself in the political and management vocabulary since the 70s, which is usually understood as “directive-based and addressing document, which is bound to resources, executors and time terms for conducting a complex of interrelated tasks and actions, united by a common goal” (Semenets, 1999).

Recognizing the significance of such programs in the practice of managing, it is necessary to note that their general name is far not the most proper. The adjectives “target” and “complex” characterize the attributive, immanent features of each program, not of the ones of the particular class only. Non-target and non-complex programs simply do not exist. Each program, openly or not, contains a goal and a certain number of or a complex of means for execution. This case confirms once more the necessity of terminological analysis and of finding and adequate definition. The term “program” started being used by the American politicians and in the scientific circles for signifying part of the budgetary process, as a direction for financial funds for solving particular social and economic tasks. It is to be noted that in most of the aspect definitions there is identifying of the term for program, with the term “plan”, where there is merging of one of the terms into the other. A circle of definitions appears of the type “a program, this is a type of program”, etc. The terms project, model, etc. are put within this circle, which interpretation is also changeable.

The identifying of the term “program” with the term “plan” distorts the essence of the program-targeted approach of management and the integrity of the management phases - planning, programming, budgeting. Each one of them has certain functions in the management process and has as result certain products. And if the phase planning gives answer to the question “what” (has to be done), the phase programming looks for answer to the question “when” (to be done), and the budgeting phase gives answer to the question “how much and what resources are necessary” (for what is to be done). The substantial is that these are the questions of each management process, united by the question “Why”. This is the reason for the particularism of programming to be looked for as intermediate phase between planning (defining the long-term goals) and budgeting (specifying the interrelation of the goals and the resources insuring). And this, more or less, expresses the subordination “resources-capabilities-effects”, which lays in the grounds of results-based management.

### **The place of programming in the state's social policy**

The programming, as grounds of management in the public sector, and in particular of the management of the state resources, is an intermediate stage between planning and budgeting at implementing the state's social policy. The reason for social programming is set in the very nature of planning as type of prognosis. It, the planning, includes in itself the activities of "distribution of resources, adaptation to the external environment, the internal coordination and the organization strategic cooperation" (Angelov, 1995). Namely on the grounds of the continuous planning horizon approach, the future actions connected with the state social policy are prognosticated, and balance between the long-term priorities and the short-term requirements and expectations of society from state social policy is ensured. In other words, planning is directly connected with drawing programs. More, the programs appear to be the connecting section between the mission, the goals and the plans. Through them, the goals are bound to the resources, "reflecting the whole potential for achieving the set goals" (material, financial, human, information resources) (Andreeva, 2001). The result of the planning process is the program directions of the separate ministries and administrations that annually give "the criteria, goals, priorities and the medium-long financial frame that are base for the programs effective management" (Sistema za upravlenie na razvitiето na vaorazhenite sili, s. 13). All elaborated plans, financially bound by programs and guaranteeing the program goals implementation in the social field are synthesized in the ministries' and administrations' program directions. This means the program directions are grounds for realizing the budgeting as manifestation of one of the most distributed methods of coordinating the social plan implementation and the resources.

Programs are "combination of actions, specification by time-terms and executors and are directed towards achieving one or several goals" (Andreeva, 2001). Thus, from program-targeting management's point of view programming is to define the expedience with the choice of one or another approach for maintaining the directions. It ensures the mechanism that allows finding the combination of circumstances for the complete satisfaction of social needs within the frame of the limited budget resources. In this sense, programming makes possible the elaboration of alternative options for taking optimal decision managing the social processes and resources for building and maintaining of expedient social policies and their carrying to the social environment factors dynamic changes. And this is in the base of the so called "designed management" (Kamenov, 1999a), which plays the connecting role between the resource potential and the goals and tasks of social policy. On one hand, design management is connected with the concrete factors and conditions for achieving the final goals, giving answer to the questions "what-is". On the other – it is a model synthesizing in itself the various sides of social processes management, while this way it makes it possible to get a summarized view for the social policy. Thus elaborating programs through design, various connections and subordinations of social processes management are embraced, which wouldn't be defined at other circumstances. Thus each part of the projects is bound to the budget limitations, where on the grounds of the various combinations of conditions and possibilities they synthesize in the programs. From here, the programs are reviewed as an integrated plan of using the resources for social activities, conformed to the occurred changes in the social environment. This, and the circumstance that alternative programs elaboration is based on the variable costs, without their precision being necessary, makes programming a necessary phase of the social processes program-targeted management. System analysis of the missions, goals and tasks of social policy is accepted as advantage at this intermediate stage between planning and budgeting. The alternative approach at choosing methods for implementing the social policies is in the base of the effective distribution of the resources for the execution of various assignments and the related time and expenses.

The terminological polysemy with the defining of the programs makes impression, which leads to difficulties in the political and management activity. The attempts to get out of that situation at the legislative level, to give a precise meaning definition of the term “program” legally speaking are well known. In one of the first attempts like that undertaken by the USA congress in 1975, in the law “For the State Economy and the Reform of Expenses for 1976”, the program is defined as grounds for the budgetary direction of the state authorities activity. In other words, the established in practice type (aspect) interpretation of the term is legally shaped. While scientists debate, the law-makers, using their works, give interpretation of the terms for particular circumstances. Despite that, the issue with the term “program” requires further review and general solution. Said in other words, the answer is to be looked for not in the sequence of terms placed in a row, but in the summary of aspect interpretations, in the logic of common essence qualities.

Taking into consideration the expressed interpretations, without pretending for final editing, the program could be defined as dynamic, structured image and way of acting (fixed in certain symbolic systems), created for coordinated interaction by the subjects of activity for purposeful impact upon a subject of that activity with the help of bound resources, executors and time terms for realization, the complex of tasks and actions.

From social processes’ point of view, social programs might be defined as dynamic structured image and way of acting (fixed in the program’s text), created for coordinated interaction by the subjects of power, directed towards solving of socially significant problems with the help of bound with resources, executors and time terms for the realization of a complex of tasks and actions. The way of action and the connected defined approach appear to be of key significance in the given definition. Before undertaking one or another practice action, the subject mentally constructs their image “Modus Vivendi.” This complicated mental process is based on the necessity and the possibility for satisfying a necessity that has significant importance for the subject, for solving problems, and for the result of the undertaken actions that could be suggested.

In its shape regarding the current activities, the program answers the question “What to be done?”, but the answer of the question is inevitably connected with the other one “How to do it?”. Defining the way of the forthcoming activity “modus operandi”, the choice and the order of use is kind of complex of means for getting the demanded result. These means might already actually exist or their creating to be forthcoming. In any case, they are preliminary selected and arranged in a certain structure and sequence (logical and temporal). Here, also the structure and sequence of operations of use of these means is to be made, and respectively the program’s authors’ and executors’ efforts. In the process of implementation of single elements as well as the whole structure of the program, an action within the given property might be reviewed, corrected, modified, and terminated. More integral programs that realize goals, which are not within the intentions of the initial participants, might be drawn from the program for behavior and interaction among the single subjects.

And not least, the term “program” expresses one of the essential characteristics of human activity, namely being ahead of any actions by their mental form. The program appears to be a special product of individual and/or collective mental activity directed towards practice and manifests as the family category for very special or private constructions, where a particular model for purposeful actions is created or a concept for social development of the region, district or municipality, target programs for population’s social protection, complex employment program, etc. (Parashkevova, 2009; Parashkevova, 2015-a; Parashkevova, 2017).

Depending on the priorities decomposition's phase, the following stages of elaborating programs could be defined:

1. At the first level, basic programs that reflect the goals and tasks in social policies in compliance with the long-term development goals are elaborated. Each basic program contains: the program goals, the organizational structures that participate in the program, the responsibility for the program's implementation, the external factors that could influence the program's goals' achievement, the necessary information sources and the three-year budget prognosis by departmental and administering paragraphs of the program;
2. At the second level, the programs, where the corresponding components are identified by types of social policies, are elaborated;
3. At the third level, the definition of the sub-programs as the specification of the programs by structures is;
4. At the fourth level, the program elements that possess relative autonomy, allow giving value, assessing and separate distribution of resources, reflecting on the social potential, are defined;
5. At the fifth level, the program sub-elements are differentiated, as detailing the program elements by priority operations.

## **Conclusion**

The programs practical realization at each of the pointed levels is not deprived of some disadvantages. Quite often, programs elaboration is accompanied by the conflict of interests between the bodies of programming and budgeting. The lack of coordination between them, the lack of clear rules and procedures for defining the financial quotas by programs, could bring in question the objectiveness and transparency of programs financial bonds within the financial limitations. More, this might deprive them of reality and threaten their feasibility because of resource insecurity. This is the reason for looking and giving meaning to the approaches for defining criteria and indicators for effective program activity and management impact on society through programming.

## **References**

- Andreeva, M. (2001). *Strategicheski menidzhmant*, Varna, 2001 (Андреева, М. Стратегически мениджмънт, Варна, 2001).
- Angelov, A. (1995). *Osnovi na menidzhmanta*. Sofiya, 1995 (Ангелов, А. Основи на мениджмънта. София, 1995).
- Kamenov, K. (1999a). *Menidzhmant*, Veliko Tarnovo, 1999 (Каменов, К. Мениджмънт, Велико Търново, 1999).
- Parashkevova, E. (2009). *Vazmozhnosti za protsesno upravlenie na riska v publichniya sektor*. Publichnata administratsiya - predizvikatelstva i perspektivi: Jubilee International Scientific Conference organized for the 10th anniversary of Public Administration Major, Sofia: IC UNWE, pp. 265-260, ISBN: 978-954-644-070-9 (Парашкевова, Е. (2009). Възможности за процесно управление на риска в публичния сектор. Публичната администрация - предизвикателства и перспективи: Юбилейна международна научна конференция по повод 10 години специалност публична администрация, София: ИК УНСС, стр. 265-260, ISBN: 978-954-644-070-9).
- Parashkevova, E. (2015). *Risk i projektno upravlenie*. *Razvitiето na balgarskata ikonomika - 25 godini mezhdur ochakvaniyata i realnostite*: Proceedings of a Jubilee International Scientific Conference, Svishtov: Tsenov, pp. 525-529, ISBN: 978-954-23-1105-8 (Парашкевова, Е. (2015). Риск и проектно управление. Развитието на българската

- икономика - 25 години между очакванията и реалностите: Сборник доклади от юбилейна международна научна конференция, Свищов: АИ Ценов, стр. 525-529, ISBN: 978-954-23-1105-8).
- Parashkevova, E. (2015a). Tselepolagane v publichniya sektor v R Bulgariya - problemi i resheniya. Evropeyski praktiki i natsionalni refleksii v planiraneto: International Jubilee Scientific and Practical Conference: Proceedings, Svishtov: Tsenov, pp. 63-65, ISBN: 978-954-23-1075-4 (Парашкевова, Е. (2015). Целеполагане в публичния сектор в Р България - проблеми и решения. Европейски практики и национални рефлексии в планирането: Международна юбилейна научно-практическа конференция: Сборник доклади, Свищов: АИ Ценов, стр. 63-65, ISBN: 978-954-23-1075-4).
- Parashkevova, E. (2017). Problemi pri управлението на риска v publichните organizatsii. Novite realnosti v управлението: Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference organized for the 50th anniversary of the Department of Management and Administration (pp. 326 - 333). Varna: Science and Economics - EU Varna, стр. 326 – 333, ISBN: 978-954-21-0947-1 (Парашкевова, Е. (2017). Проблеми при управлението на риска в публичните организации. Новите реалности в управлението: Сборник с доклади от юбилейна международна научна конференция по случай 50 години катедра "Управление и администрация", Варна: Наука и икономика - ИУ Варна, стр. 326 – 333, ISBN: 978-954-21-0947-1).
- Semenets, N. Ya. (1999). Institut sotsialnoy zashtity voennosluzhashtih v usloviyah sotsialnogo reformirovaniya. Dis. kand. sots. nauk. – Saratov, 1999 (Семенец, Н. Я. Институт социальной защиты военнослужащих в условиях социального реформирования. Дис. канд. соц. наук. – Саратов, 1999).
- Sistema za upravlenie na razvitiето na voorazhenite sili, s. 13 (Система за управление на развитието на въоръжените сили, с. 13).
- Terziev, V. (2013). Vazdeystvie na politikite na pazara na truda za osiguryavane na zаетost. Izdatelstvo „Dema Pres – Ruse“, 2013 (Терзиев, В. Въздействие на политиките на пазара на труда за осигуряване на заетост. Издателство „Дема Прес – Русе“, 2013).
- Terziev, V. (2014). Vazmozhnosti za povishavane na effektivnostta na sotsialnata adaptatsiya na voennosluzheshti, osvobodeni ot voenna sluzhba. Izdatelstvo „Primaks“ – Ruse, 2014 (Терзиев, В. Възможности за повишаване на ефективността на социалната адаптация на военнослужещи, освободени от военна служба. Издателство „Примакс“ – Русе, 2014).