

**STATISTICAL
INDICATORS**

**FOR THE ECONOMIC
& SOCIAL SCIENCES**

ROBERT V HORN



**CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS**

Published by the Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1RP, UK
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, Melbourne, Victoria 3166, Australia

© Cambridge University Press 1993
First published 1993

Printed in Hong Kong by Colorcraft

National Library of Australia cataloguing in publication data

Horn, R. V. (Robert Victor).

Statistical indicators for the economic and social sciences.

Bibliography.

Includes index.

ISBN 0 521 41333 8.

ISBN 0 521 42399 6 (pbk).

1. Research—Statistical methods. 2. Social indicators. 3. Economic indicators. I. Title.

001.422

Library of Congress cataloguing in publication data

Horn, Robert Victor.

Statistical indicators for the economic and social sciences /

Robert V. Horn.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-521-41333-8.—ISBN 0-521-42399-6 (pbk.)

1. Economic indicators. 2. Social indicators. I. Title.

HB137.H627 1992

330'.01'5195—dc20

92-23005

CIP

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN 0 521 41333 8 hardback

ISBN 0 521 42399 6 paperback

CONTENTS

Figures	vii
Tables	viii
Preface	xi
CHAPTER 1 FROM STATISTICS TO INDICATORS	
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Classification of indicators	2
1.3 Operation and structure	7
1.4 Indicators and scientific enquiry	13
CHAPTER 2 INDICATOR TECHNIQUES	
2.1 Data handling	16
2.2 Format	18
2.3 Stocks and flows	25
2.4 Ratios	27
2.5 Aggregation and averages	29
2.6 Scaling	36
2.7 Weighting and equivalence scales	42
2.8 Index numbers	46
2.9 Correlation and regression	53
2.10 Time series analysis	58
2.11 Multivariate analysis	65
CHAPTER 3 DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS OF INDICATORS	
3.1 Development—general	67
3.2 Gross national product	70
3.3 Accounts systems	76
3.4 Ordinal evaluation	79
3.5 Basic needs	81

3.6	Income distribution	82
3.7	Poverty	86
3.8	Levels of living	89
3.9	Human development	92
3.10	Quality of life	95
CHAPTER 4 ECONOMIC APPLICATIONS OF INDICATORS		
4.1	Economic activity	102
4.2	Business cycles	107
4.3	Stock exchange indexes	111
4.4	Standardised indicators	113
4.5	International price comparisons	115
4.6	Labour market	118
4.7	Productivity	122
4.8	Performance	124
4.9	Economic diagrams and formulas	129
CHAPTER 5 SOCIAL APPLICATIONS OF INDICATORS		
5.1	'Social indicators'	146
5.2	Health	154
5.3	Education	160
5.4	Intelligence tests	166
5.5	Science	168
5.6	Environment	171
5.7	Culture	177
5.8	Human rights	180
5.9	War and peace	189
5.10	Politics	191
5.11	Performance merit	192
5.12	Status	197
5.13	Time use	199
5.14	Urban studies	203
CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSION		206
Bibliography		208
Index		221

FIGURES

1.1	GDP for two countries over two periods	5
2.1	Population by region and age	21
2.2	Change in scale	23
2.3	Change in amplitude	24
2.4	Broken and stretched scale	25
2.5	Linear and exponential series on linear and semilog scales	25
2.6	Aggregate of a series	30
2.7	Scatter diagrams and correlation	54
2.8	Trend lines—moving averages: number of births, Australia, 1970–79: annual and averages for 4, 7 and 9 years	63
4.1	Component charts: price index numbers	130
4.2	Export and import price index and terms of trade	131
4.3	Overseas trade indicators	133
4.4	Trade intensity	134
4.5	J curve: effect of currency depreciation in year 2	136
4.6	Economic activity chart, March 1990	137
4.7	Engel curves	138
4.8	Phillips curve (cost-push effect)	140
4.9	Laffer curve	141
4.10	Tobin's q	143

TABLES

1.1	Some direct objective-type indicators	10
2.1	Population by region and age	20
2.2	Fiscal and calendar years	23
2.3	Vehicle exports	26
2.4	Net flow statistics	27
2.5	Vehicle exports (ratios)	28
2.6	Employment/unemployment	29
2.7	Aggregate and average of a series	30
2.8	Calculation of standard deviation	34
2.9	Wage rate averages	34
2.10	Income averages	35
2.11	Averaging growth rate	35
2.12	Employment by region and industry	37
2.13	Monthly income: householders in one region	38
2.14	Monthly income per household	40
2.15	Celsius and Fahrenheit temperatures	41
2.16	Pre- and post-tax incomes	41
2.17	Existing educational systems	42
2.18	Disposable family income equivalence scales	44
2.19	Medals gained at Olympic Games in Seoul, September 1988	45
2.20	Base-weight price index: Laspeyre, aggregative	50
2.21	Price-quantity combinations for constructing/testing index numbers	51
2.22	Alternative changes of index base	51
2.23	Grafting new series onto old series	52
2.24	Revision of weights for items I and II	52
2.25	Substitution of new item III for item II	52
2.26	Base weight index updated with current weights	53

2.27	Regression: age of wine and its price	56
2.28	Rank order correlation: juice extractors merit-ranked by four features, weighted overall performance and retail price	57
2.29	Trend fitting: coal production in Australia, 1971-79	62
2.30	Elimination of trend in time series: number of births, Australia, 1970-79	63
2.31	Seasonal adjustment, additive model: weekly earnings	64
2.32	Multivariate analysis	66
3.1	Daly-Cobb index of sustainable economic welfare, United States	73
3.2	UNRISD development indicators	77
3.3	SPES indicator tableaux, West Germany	79
3.4	SPES indicator tableaux: summary scores	80
3.5	Basic needs dimensions (model)	81
3.6	Income distribution by quartiles	84
3.7	Distribution of net family income among quintiles of families	85
3.8	Income sources and taxes as % of average gross income	86
3.9	Components of levels of living	90
3.10	Basic material and non-material needs	90
3.11	Welfare/happiness and level of living/quality of life	91
3.12	Human development index: minimum and maximum values, 1985-87	93
3.13	Human development index: various countries from list of 130 countries, 1987	94
3.14	Scale equivalence ratios for the human deprivation and human development indexes	94
3.15	Quality of life: Sydney survey, 1990	99
4.1	Some business/economic series used as indicators	104
4.2	<i>The Economist</i> : economic series used in index of business activity, United Kingdom	105
4.3	Characteristics of major stock-exchange indexes	111
4.4	Weighted quantum index	113
4.5	Reference population for labour force: civilians aged 15-64	119
4.6	Participation rate and unemployment rate	120
4.7	Two-occupation unemployment model	121
4.8	Growth rates: business sector	123
4.9	Evaluation by the World Bank of 187 projects, 1987	125
4.10	Comparative job evaluation	129
4.11	Intensity of trade between two countries	135
4.12	Proportion of expenditure spent on food	139
5.1	Social process functions of social indicators	148
5.2	Major domains of social indicators	151
5.3	OECD list of social concerns and social indicators	153
5.4	Proposed actions that may cause environmental impact	174
5.5	Universal Declaration of Human Rights	181
5.6(a)	Human rights situation by numbers affected (model)	185

5.6(b) Organisational activities (model)	185
5.6(c) Change in human rights situation over the year (model)	186
5.6(d) Estimated contribution to improvement of human rights situation in year (model)	187
5.6(e) Supplementary impact indicators (model)	188
5.6(f) Action indicators (model)	188
5.7 Consumer tests	193

CHAPTER 1

FROM STATISTICS TO INDICATORS

1.1 Introduction

This book deals with applications of statistics to the social sciences, including economics and other areas usually styled as 'social', such as sociology, social policy and planning. Examples are drawn mainly from those disciplines, but some applications extend to the natural sciences. The discussion does not stretch to the higher reaches of epistemology, semantics and general philosophy; rather it looks more practically at the purpose of indicators and, from there, to their nature and construction.

Sections 1.2 to 1.4 that follow discuss the statistical derivation of indicators, their structure and typology, and their use in scientific analysis. Then Chapter 2 'Indicator techniques' outlines some of the major statistical techniques and characteristics used for indicators. This material is based on the general statistical textbook literature, to which reference should be made for further detail. In Chapters 3 to 5 particular indicator applications in various fields of economics and social analysis are discussed. There are brief descriptions of some of the major subject matter, and references to sources in the bibliography, but the main emphasis is on identification of the processes involved and on appropriate socioeconomic measurement. Finally, Chapter 6 presents a summary of the main features of indicator analysis.

The bibliography covers some classic texts but concentrates otherwise on a selection of fairly recent titles, which themselves list further references, chosen from the very large literature in the various branches of the social sciences.

1.2 Classification of indicators

The term '*statistics*' is used in the dual sense of numerical facts, which are the basic material for indicators, and of a methodology, which serves as a tool for the construction of indicators. To put it in another way, statistics are the building blocks, which can be assembled in various ways for different indicative purposes. Statisticians distinguish between data, methods and purpose:

Statistics are numerical statements of facts in any department of inquiry, placed in relation to each other . . . [they are] used for describing and analysing groups or aggregates, too large or complex to be intelligible for simple observation. (Bowley, 1923: 1-2)

Or to quote a more recent textbook:

By Statistics we mean quantitative data affected to a marked extent by a multiplicity of causes. By Statistical Methods we mean methods specially adapted to the elucidation of [such] data. (Yule and Kendall, 1950: xvi)

We will be concerned with the process of *social quantification*, which goes back to the work of nineteenth-century statisticians like Galton in England and Quetelet in Belgium, or even the poverty studies by Gregory King in 1688. However, it has achieved wider currency only since the 1950s through the social indicator movement. In practice it is not easy to separate the data from their content and purpose.

The word '*statistics*' itself was first used in the eighteenth century in Germany, in reference to the workings of the state, and the first volume of the *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* in 1838-39 refers to facts 'which are calculated to illustrate the conditions and prospects of society'. However, the further development of statistical methods weakened the link between statistical data and their indicative purpose, leading to a division between the work of theoretical statisticians and that of applied statistical analysts. At the Statistical Congress held in Brussels in 1853 the leading statisticians of the day seemed more interested in the description of living levels than in tidy rules for the analysis of consumer expenditure. However, subsequent generations of 'Year Book' statisticians and textbook writers became more concerned with the manipulation and presentation of data than with concepts. Only in more recent times have social scientists, including socially aware economists, become concerned about policy targets expressed in statistical form with reference to welfare, environment and similar issues.

Statistical methods are described in many learned papers and textbooks pitched at various levels of comprehension. For the present purpose it will be sufficient to summarise some basic methods and to refer readers to the textbooks for elaboration. The nature of indicators is less discussed in the literature and then mainly in the context of methods. Here we will try to reverse the sequence by concentrating more on the purpose and use of

indicators and only then look at methods of constructing them for set objectives. Progression *from why? to how?* seems such a simple logical procedure in the pursuit of knowledge that it hardly requires further justification. However, with so many protagonists of the reverse procedure of expounding methods with only casual comment on the rationale of their application, indicators have sometimes become forced into unsuitable formats that obscure their meaning.

Some prevailing perceptions about statistics that are relevant to indicators can be briefly summarised as follows:

- Numbers hold a fascination of their own for many people. They become metaphors of phenomena, and they order our thinking into a fixed frame that is seemingly objective in the rigor of its spacing. The symbolic expression of so many kilometres, years or dollars reflects to us the reality of space, time or wealth.
- We must measure to cope with our environment, with the rhythm of nature and with scarce resources.
- Many scientists are so preoccupied with the exactness of methodology that they disregard the uncertainties of underlying concepts and policies.
- Comparisons, expressed numerically, set standards of what has been and can be achieved. Our values are formed not so much by what we have as by what others have in comparison to ourselves. Socioeconomic notions such as production, poverty and work are comprehensible only in relative terms. Economics, described by Alfred Marshall in 1890 as the study of 'mankind in the ordinary business of life', is dominated by assumptions about comparative rules of behaviour such as:

More is better than Less.

I am more important than Thou.

Sooner is better than Later.

What You have got I need too.

Rationality sanctifies the greed of Economic Man.

However, such narrow views are now being expanded into more comprehensive, more compassionate attitudes, and a wide range of indicators can help us to understand better the ordinary business of life.

- Numerical symbols set the pace for mathematical manipulation, and they can be retranslated into verbal language without much regard to the logic of the result. That is reflected in statements such as 'We are now three times better off than we were last year', or in regarding output as the equiproportional function of inputs, or in positing that $a + b - b = a$ or that $ab/b = a$. Such shortcut assumptions bypass the complexities of changing context and of synergic effects.

Socioeconomic concepts are usually described in relative or even negative terms (e.g. unemployment, work, living standards, poverty). They are identified with a state or activity within a subjective frame of reference. In economics the debate about economic thought and language, to quote

the title of L.M. Fraser's analytical critique of 1937, has abated with the rise of econometric analysis, which rests on narrow, rigorously defined certainties. Statisticians' choices of what to include or exclude in their counts and how to combine subseries depend largely on practical considerations inherent in the collecting process. Economists look for unambiguous statistics, rather than unambiguous concepts, for their models and will at worst accept series that do not fit well their titles (e.g. underemployment, disposable income). In direct measurement the gap between concept and statistics is sometimes narrowed by means of explanatory footnotes, but it is not so easily bridged in the indirect measurement of welfare, utility and qualitative notions in general.

In the nineteenth century inspired statisticians in Europe (e.g. Quetelet, Engel) and Australia (e.g. Coghlan, Hayter) sometimes interpreted their collections as welfare indicators, but subsequent generations of official statisticians opted for safety when, for the sake of objectivity, they left the interpretation of their collections to other analysts. For instance, the empirical observation that the income elasticity of the demand for food is less than 1 in most countries, expressed in the Engel curve (1857), led to further mathematical analysis of consumer behaviour and contributed to the subsequent development of econometrics (see section 4.9 and Zimmermann, 1932).

Indicators are expressed mainly as:

- statistics in a time series (diachronic) or at a point of time (synchronic);
- comparisons of structural components; or
- comparisons of different entities (e.g. regions, enterprises).


A single statistical datum is not indicative by itself. When we quote a figure for income per head of \$*a* last year, or a population totalling *b* million at the end of last year or a literacy rate *c*% at that time, the figure means nothing until we compare it with corresponding figures for other periods or elsewhere. Figure 1.1, for instance, shows the change in gross domestic product (GDP) for country A between years 1 and 2 and the size of GDP in country A compared with country B. It also shows the structure of GDP, assumed to be made up of wages and surplus, in either country or period:

$$\begin{array}{rcccc} \text{Wages} & + & \text{Surplus} & = & \text{Expenditure} \\ W & + & S & = & GDP \end{array}$$

The comparison need not be formal; it can rest on our knowledge of the general statistical situation; so we can at once describe an income per head of \$50 000 as relatively high or a literacy rate of 10% as relatively low. Yet while it is reasonable to argue that an isolated statistical datum has no indicative meaning without being related to some reference series, it can be claimed that no event is independent of other historic or circumstantial events. A single statistic, say a population count of 1 million people, has a history of earlier population sizes and changes and is itself

Figure 1.1 GDP for two countries over two periods

Country	Year 1			Year 2		
	W	S	GDP	W	S	GDP
A	20	30	50	30	40	70
B	10	30	40	20	60	80



a link indicator for future counts. Yet the number by itself, 1 million, is silent; its history is impenetrable without the key furnished by other data. We need statistical series and systems to unlock its indicative content.

Indicators are intermediaries that link statistical observations with social or other phenomena. In semantic terms they are *metadata*—that is, data describing other data. This fits into a so-called *syntactic model*, as proposed by Olenski (1986) and other semiologists, from which it may be concluded that indicators acquire meaning, indeed variable meanings, in their application; they bring amorphous statistics to life.

Concepts in the social sciences are called *soft* if they cannot be defined with the precision of terms used in the physical sciences. The description varies according to the point of view of the user and the purpose to which the concepts are applied. Broad agreement about generalised meaning leaves gaps and overlaps between areas. This applies to major notions such as

health, education and welfare and also to broad economic terms such as 'production', 'trade' and 'income', where precise statistical descriptions cannot hide some indeterminacy in underlying concepts (e.g. in the treatment of non-cash benefits or transfers as part of income, or of household services as production). Indicators, as neutral tools, help to clarify the specifics of concepts in a particular context. We can, for instance, extend the meaning of health statistics beyond morbidity by including the operations of pharmacies as an aspect of health service delivery.


According to Kaplan (1964: 77), specification is part of the process of enquiry itself. We begin with terms that are not specified by the context and build up a conceptual structure from empirical findings, discarding on the way some earlier information and discovering additional sources as we go along. This *instrumentalist approach* is similar to the *method of successive definition* used in physics, or to what has been called a process of *reciprocal illumination* or *successive approximation* (Ridley, 1983: 651). It involves an *iterative learning process* (De Neufville, 1975: 127) in which indicators lead to the specification of concepts. Therefore we can speak of two main functions of statistics:

- 1 description by summarising information;
- 2 induction, which involves either generalisation from samples or the formulation of laws based on repeated observation.

We can mention here the hypothesis of *sonic resonance* (Sheldrake, 1988), which suggests that, at least in the natural sciences, all systems are shaped by 'morphic fields' that represent a collective memory around them beyond the genetic encoding of individuals, in contrast to traditional assumptions about mind and matter. This can possibly be extended to the learning process as not being confined to processing statistical indicative information but subject also to the sonic resonance of universal experience. More generally, it can be claimed that no indicator can be abstracted from its historical context.

We shall return later to the conversion of statistics into indicators, but note here a caution about the process of the specification of concepts, known as *conceptualisation*, or, in related terms, of the *reification* or *concretisation* of abstract notions. The search for meaning should not be attempted by a haphazard choice of possibly related statistics fed into the computer for factorising or other complex multivariate analysis, to produce a uniform series or vector that represents the abstract notion on a single even scale. The perils of such methods have been well illustrated by Gould (1983) in chronicling attempts to create concepts of intelligence during and since the last century. They have reflected personal, political and social bias as well as the ambiguity of the statistical methods employed, in their efforts to grade persons by hereditary or environmental factors. In other words, concepts cannot be mechanically-mathematically constructed without evidence that supports the objective logic of every successive step.

The merging relation between statistics and indicators can be demonstrated with the following sequence:



This relation can be summarised by describing indicators as *purposeful statistics*.

1.3 Operation and structure

As previously suggested, much of our thinking is anchored in comparisons. These may reflect aspirations to some ideal of virtue or harmony, but more often they are related to other people and situations in the past, present or expected future. Indicators provide a guide for expressing such comparisons in systematic scale marks. A single datum, in time or space, comes to life when related to others that indicate direction or relative magnitude. What usually matter most are simple relations, or changes in such relations, of the more-or-less type, even if expressed with mathematical precision. This relative nature of indicators calls for attention when choosing the indicator base (e.g. population of certain ages or status, production by provenience). Indicators with fixed scales are familiar in daily life (e.g. hands of a clock, markings on a thermometer, lines of a weather map). Economists use indicators to delineate the working of the economy, and other social scientists apply them to societal analysis. These examples supplement the dictionary definitions that describe an indicator as something (or somebody) that *points out*. Indicators describe what has happened, is happening or may happen; they categorise and superimpose a calculus on events. Different systems of indicators can be applied to a given set of data (e.g. metric or non-metric) or mixed bundles of indicators to abstract notions such as welfare or safety.

Pointing out can refer simply to directions (e.g. by a car trafficator, weather vane or a litmus test), or symbolically to the threat of global catastrophe (e.g. the clock on the cover of the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*, which stood at 10 minutes to midnight at the end of 1990), or to on-off choices of the yes-no type. More frequently, however, we are presented with a spectrum or with degrees of change where a scaled mode is appropriate for indicators. The classification of indicators can be based on various criteria of contents and objectives, and the catalogue below is directed particularly towards socioeconomic processes:

- (A) Direct-objective type
 - (A.1) Single variable concept
 - (A.2) Combined-fixed concept
 - (A.3) Combined-dynamic concept

- (B) Indirect-derived
 - (B.1) Binary signals
 - (B.2) Complex subjective

Direct-objective indicators may be based on single series (e.g. school enrolments) or more-or-less homogeneous aggregates (e.g. value of mineral production). Sometimes they require standardisation by differential weights (e.g. calorific value of fuels). Alternatively, a fixed concept can be built up from heterogeneous components that are summed up by number or value (e.g. tonnage and value of exports). That means prior agreement on aggregation and excludes controversy (i.e. dialectical argument) about the inclusion or exclusion of any item.

For open or dynamic concepts (e.g. health, quality of life) the indicators themselves help to define the notion and acquire the dual role of specification and signal. Starting off with a vague concern, the process of selecting and testing data will show their relevance to the target notion; or to express the procedure in indicative jargon, indicators through an iterative learning process exercise a heuristic function in determining the epistemology of social-economic concerns.

Indirect-derived indicative conclusions can emerge from signals of movement or from *proxy series* that are related to the main series (e.g. economic cycles and suicides).

The distinction between subjective and objective indicators cuts across the above classification. It can be applied both to what is being measured and to how it is done. The term '*objective*' is usually applied to the mode of assessment that is based on external evidence that is independent of the reporter, such as the series published by official statistical agencies where objectivity becomes identified with factual evidence. *Subjective* indicators are judgemental, often in mode and in concept, and reflect perceptions or opinions. They can be expressed in simple yes-no terms or divided into intermediary steps of the none-little-enough-a lot type.

The indicators mentioned so far are objective in the sense of being based on circumstantial evidence that is external to and independent of the reporting person or institution. Typical here are the official statisticians' series where objectivity is identified with factual evidence. Against that we have subjective indicators based on judgemental evidence from the persons concerned. They reflect perceptions or opinions by those close to the issue in question, which yield a broader band of answers than a factual enquiry. Examples are surveys and opinion polls about perceived life values and other issues.

Subjective indicators can be formulated in simple binary terms of the more-less or better-worse signal type, and these can be further subdivided by intermediary steps (e.g. none-a little-enough-a lot), or by Maslow's hierarchical classification of five levels of human needs, or by Cantril's *self-anchoring scale* in which people express their degree of satisfaction in ten grades. From there it is only a small step to *cardinalise* such *ordinal*

grading by way of assumed (not necessarily equal) step intervals, which convert them to indicators of the (A.1) type. Subjective indicators are occasionally used in economics (e.g. for housing or work satisfaction) and more widely applied in other social sciences.

The relation of subjectivity to *social facts* has been discussed in the sociological literature (e.g. Turner and Martin, 1984: part 2), as has been the link between cardinal and ordinal scaling (e.g. McKennell in Strumpel, 1973). As far as indicative measurement is concerned, the claim to objectivity for any social statistics is dubious due to the essential subjectivity of the selection and presentation process. We must also avoid confusion between *what* is being measured and *how* it is being measured:

	Mode of measurement:	
	Subjective	Objective
Concept: Subjective	(a)	(b)
Objective	(c)	(d)

For instance, we can look at the incidence of disability reflected in an outside indicator by taking the number of invalid pensioners and the cash paid to them, as per (d); or we can take the number from a census that asks people to self-enumerate their specific disabilities, as per (b); or the census can ask whether people feel themselves to be disabled in a general way, as per (a); or it can ask people in receipt of invalid pensions to grade themselves by severity of disablement, as per (c).

In a general way the objective-subjective distinction is often more a matter of form than of substance. All objective-type indicators carry a subjective value load inherent in the process of the collection, selection and presentation of statistics, and subjective-type indicators borrow objective modes of grouping, ranking and partitioning the data. For practical purposes a classification of indicators as shown in Table 1.1, on the lines of the division into objective types, will be sufficient, but it will help in understanding the nature of indicators to consider some other classifications.

We can look at interrelations within the statistical base and between components. This is important for establishing correlations within and between indicator elements (e.g. the connection between production and trade via high technology; auto-correlation between infant mortality and life expectancy; the role of elasticities of substitution in a cost-of-living index). However, such interrelations are too variable and uncertain to serve as *a priori* for classification.

Georgescu-Roegan (1971: 43) draws a distinction between *numerical* (anthropomorphic) and *dialectical* (not uniquely defined) concepts, which in many ways corresponds to our division into (A) and (B) types. In a different approach a division is drawn between *instrumental* indicators, which serve as a means to an end, and *definitive* indicators, which refer directly to their purpose. Mukherjee (1975: 89), for instance, distinguishes between statistics as the *constituent variables* of an indicator and statistics

Table 1.1 Some direct objective-type indicators

Factor	Single variable	Combined variables	
		Fixed concept	Dynamic concept
Production	Single product, houses	Factory, mine buildings	National output
Transport	Car registrations, train mileage	Motor vehicle registrations	Transport index
Trade	Product sales, export item	Group sales, total exports	Total demand, balance of payments
Transfers	Tax by type, government expenditure by type	Tax revenue, public expenditure	Tax burden, welfare spending
Finance	Bank deposits	Money supply	Flow of funds
Income	Wages, pensions	Earnings	Personal income
Labour	Employment, hours worked	Labour force participation	Labour market, time use
Population	Births, deaths	Natural increase	Market growth
Environment	Urban areas	Open space	Pollution index
Health	Hospital beds	Death rates	Healthiness index
Education	Teacher numbers	Teacher ratios	Educational status
Quality of life	Holiday length, suicides	Achievement of set goals	Multiple scale index
Culture	Attendances at concerts	Music appreciation index	Multiple scale index
Human rights	Imprisonment of protesters	Number of gaolings	Multiple scale index

as the *contingent variables* that it seeks to indicate. The contingent variables become *societal* indicators when they refer to a societal condition (e.g. state of the education system), as distinct from *social* indicators, which apply this state to differential human relationships (e.g. access to higher education). The number of persons employed/unemployed can be regarded as an instrumental or constituent indicator for the description of the labour market or the burden of unemployment, but it can also be regarded as a definite or contingent indicator.

On somewhat similar lines Johnstone (1981) distinguishes between *variables*, which particularise different facets of society, and *indicators*, which combine conceptually related variables for an overview. He describes them as basic units in theory development.

Looking beyond their internal classification, indicators can be considered as part of an information system that links observers with the dynamics of the world around them and helps them to understand it. Like language, indicators have in the first place an intermediary (instrumental) task, and again like language they rise beyond their function as a medium to that of shaping the message. With language the selection and presentation of

words can carry overtones beyond their original meaning. So also the impact of indicative signposts can be varied by their size and accompanying *noise* (e.g. a government claims to have 'tightened the budget' by a spending cut of some millions when the total budget is reckoned in billions; a supermarket cuts a price 'below \$5' to \$4.99). The nominally equal interval spacing of numbers need not coincide with suggestive indicator breaks at decennial age points, price integers or mile-a-minute records. Also, just as language adapts itself over time to a changing environment, so must indicators evolve in response to changes in social settings and societal objectives.

The structural sequence for indicators can be depicted as follows:

observations

organised systematically provide

data

that contain basic information and can be ordered into

statistics

either quantified at cardinal/fixed interval scales or non-quantified in ordinal ranking, further processed into

indicators

designed to express

structure or change

of phenomena related to

social and scientific concerns.

Systematic observations from records or surveys yield data for series that can be scaled numerically with even or variable intervals or by rank ordering without fixed intervals. The statistical database can be manipulated by means of aggregating, averaging, multivariate analysis or extrapolation to fit a framework of social concerns. The choice of data, periods and format will vary between analysts. This means that the computation of indicators, like good statistics, requires judgemental skill.

We can mention here a distinction between *social statistics* and the *social indicator movement*. Statistical interest in social conditions goes back to biblical times (Numbers 1:1-3; Luke 2:1-3), and social statistics have been used ever since as indicators of health and welfare. The social indicator movement dates only back to the 1960s, when social scientists tried a systematic translation of the language of economic indicators and models for the purposes of social planning and the study of human needs. That development was welcomed by those economists who tried to lift their eyes above the money income/wealth horizon to encompass human and environmental values. Hopes for an *holistic* approach through social indicator matrices have not been fulfilled, nor has the extension of economic measures such as gross national product (GNP) into non-monetary spheres been successful. However, much can be learnt from the debate about concepts and methods, as we shall see later.

The operational purpose of indicators is circumscribed by their reference

to time or structure. Philosophers have long argued about the notions of points and flows of time, and economists have entered the debate in connection with equilibrium theory since the days of Menger, Böhm-Bawerk and Wicksell, and more recently Keynes (1930, 1936), Georgescu-Roegan (1971) and Hicks (1942: ch. 6). We may accept that time (and an indicator at a point of time) is unidirectional and irreversible. History, rather than looking back from the present to the past, when the present was unknown, looks forward from the past to the present and to the unknown future. We can regard both points and flows of time as devices superimposed on reality. As such we use them for indications of where we stand and where we are going in *cross-section (synchronic)* or *time series (diachronic)* analysis, respectively. Structurally indicators can be further divided into those that show up the forces within a system (e.g. demographic series for a labour market) and those that compare components of a larger universe (e.g. markets in different regions). Both can be extended to indicate change over time.

Some indicators have no meaningful zero level, in particular those that list attitudes on a multipoint scale from 'unhappy' to 'happy'. In this case change or difference can be expressed in points; so a change from, say, 'very dissatisfied' to 'rather dissatisfied' on a five-point scale (from 1 to 2) would be equivalent to a change from 'rather satisfied' to 'very satisfied' (from 4 to 5). However, it would be wrong to express these changes in percent as +100% and +25% respectively; on a scale from -2 to +2 similar changes would come to +50% and +100% respectively. This does not apply to objective-type indicators and others on a ratio scale, as they have a theoretical minimum level of nil, signifying the total absence of its material or satisfaction contents. It can be argued that they all have also an upper limit of total use or fulfilment. However, with many indicators this upper limit is more distant than the horizon to which we refer for production, services, income or longevity and their respective growth rates.

In some situations, however, we have definite upward bounds for indicators. One is ratios relating two or more variables to a given total, which can be a stated population for rates of employment/unemployment, literacy/illiteracy or exports by countries. Others lie between 0 and 100%, where the components relate to a stated population of people or things. As we shall see, ratios provide a convenient form for some indicators, but there are operational limits in describing their movement. There is also a subjective-type bounding of indicators in ordinal satisfaction grades at a point where the marginal utility of a further increment becomes nil. This will be discussed later in connection with poverty and living levels.

We have emphasised the interconnection between indicators and related concerns. A closer look at the latter will clarify the scope of the former. The term '*concern*' has been used by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) with reference to its scheme of social indicators under the following headings (OECD, 1982: 5):

- Health
- Education and learning
- Employment and quality of working life