



Western Michigan University
ScholarWorks at WMU

Masters Theses

Graduate College

4-1979

A Behavioral Analysis of Ethical Systems

Glen R. Peterson
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses



Part of the Social Psychology Commons

Recommended Citation

Peterson, Glen R., "A Behavioral Analysis of Ethical Systems" (1979). *Masters Theses*. 2034.
https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses/2034

This Masters Thesis-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



A BEHAVIORAL ANALYSIS
OF
ETHICAL SYSTEMS

by
Glen R. Peterson

A Thesis
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment
of the
Degree of Master of Arts

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan

April, 1979

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The idea for this thesis evolved out of some course work in Systems Analysis for Dr. Dale Brethower, to whom I am indebted for his encouragement and support. I also wish to thank my advisor, Dr. Neil Kent, and my other committee members, Dr. Paul Mountjoy, and Dr. Malcolm Robertson.

Glen R. Peterson

INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

1312978

PETERSON, GLEN R.
A BEHAVIORAL ANALYSIS OF ETHICAL SYSTEMS.

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY, M.A., 1979

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	INTRODUCTION1
	Morality and Technology	2
	A Holistic Approach	3
	Macrodeterminancy	4
	Language5
II	SYSTEMS THEORY7
	The Total Performance System7
	Ethical Processes and Products8
	Voluntariness and Choice12
	An Ethical System of Social Control	13
III	VALUE THEORY AND THE MORALITY OF SYSTEMS	15
	Value Judgement	15
	Social Values17
	Value Sets20
IV	GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION	24
	The Rationale for Intervention	24
	Coercion	26
	Control and Counter-Control30
V	MENTAL HEALTH ADVOCACY33
	The Role of the Therapist	33
	An Ethical System in Practice	34
VI	CONCLUSION38
VII	REFERENCE NOTES	40
VIII	REFERENCES43
IX	TABLES	45
X	FIGURE49

Persons operate on the environment individually and collectively. They establish systems. In turn, the environment controls the behavior of individuals and groups (Skinner, 1957, p. 1). Societies control themselves through the establishment of systems.

The interests of individuals are often at odds with the interests of the larger group. Consequently, systems of social control have built in sub-systems of counter-control which serve to balance those interests.

The criminal justice system, for example, uses severe penalties as its sanction. Fines or imprisonment are extremely serious consequences for actions in this society. As a result, many counter-controls have been built into that system, so that incarcerations of the individual is made very different. The counter-controls are so effective that very few crimes are punished by imprisonment. Some analysts (Kamisar, LaFave, & Israel, 1974) estimate that less than five per cent of the persons committing crimes actually enter the penal system.

It is in the interest of society to decrease criminal behavior by punishing it; however, it is in the interest of individuals to stay out of the criminal justice system entirely. These interests are balanced within the system. The counter-controls available to individuals are articulated in the Bill of Rights, and by implementing those procedures, society tries to assure that no innocent persons will be punished. Where society has powerful controls, individuals have powerful counter-controls.

The welfare system is an interesting contrast. In that system, the end product is a reward, and not a punisher. It is in the interest of individuals to receive that reward, in the form of subsidies, but is in the interest of society to limit the number of subsidized persons. Society wants its less fortunate members to be helped, but it cannot afford to have that system abused. Consequently, the counter-controls are designed to keep persons out of the system. The counter-controls used by the system itself to prevent abuse are in the form of long waiting lines, complicated forms, incomplete information for applicants, and a general dehumanization designed to benefit the system rather than the recipient.

Both of the previously mentioned systems are systems of social control. The balancing of interests is defined in this paper as the component of those systems which make them ethical or non-ethical. The existence of effective counter-controls, in proportion to the inherent coerciveness of a system, is the characteristic that makes a system an ethical system.

The main thesis of this paper is that systems may be analyzed in terms of structural components and processes that make them ethical. Whereas individuals use an evaluative process to make ethical decisions, ethical systems must be defined in terms of a model with essential, ethical, components. To develop this thesis, I have started with some assumptions.

Morality and Technology

In some scientific endeavors, it seems fairly simple to pursue a research question without concern for the ethical dimension. This

is especially true in basic research, where researchers have only a vague idea of what might happen if they were to modify the molecular structure of the double helix, or combine a newly discovered antibody with an infectious germ culture. The assumption is that scientific inquiry is good for everybody. And, on that level of research, that assumption appears to be functional.

This paper is concerned with the synthesis of material from two fields of inquiry, and it assumes an ethical dimension for both of them. Those two disciplines are Applied Behavior Analysis and Systems Analysis. The inability to separate moral and technical issues is stated well by R. Wayne Kraft (1975) in a passage in which he affirms interrelatedness:

"It would be easier if one could separate the moral from the technical, but this is not possible, either in theory or in practice. It is a lesson the morally self-righteous and the technically ignorant must learn just as much as the technically self-righteous and morally ignorant.

Science is not morally neutral." (p. 138)

A Holistic Approach

The second assumption of this study is a holistic position. For the purposes of this study, holism is defined as a philosophical theory which claims that the determining forces in nature are wholes which are not reducible to the sum of their parts. This position is in direct contrast to a reductionist position, which asserts that the truth about an entity can be derived from knowledge of its parts. As Sutherland (1973) stated:

"The holistic modality... does not deny either the value

of empiricial analysis or the occasional reduction of entities for scientific manageability. It simply demands that some awareness of the whole precede the attempt to appreciate the parts." (p.39)

In this paper systems of social control will be analyzed in the broadest context possible without losing economy.

Macrodeterminancy

The third assumption of this study is that of macrodeterminancy. This concept has been defined by Sutherland (1973). "A system may be treated as deterministic at the higher levels, but the lower-order components of the system may not admit to determinancy." (p. 42). This is a significant distinction, and an important assumption to clarify.

Generally, the pure sciences begin with an idiographic approach-- that is, they begin with a study of individual cases and build theories from them. This is because sufficient causes, the criteria of determinancy, are most easily seen in individual cases. For example, a different schedule of reinforcement may be deterministic in a given experimental situation.

The present analysis of systems of social control assumes macrodeterminancy. The larger system determines outcomes. The behavior of individuals in large social systems is rule-governed, rather than contingency-shaped (Note 1). Those rules are designed to preserve the system. This is not to say that the basic principles of behavior do not apply in individual cases. It simply emphasises the determinancy of larger systems of behavioral control. The contingencies which

control individual behavior are themselves lawfully established.

The criminal justice system, for example, is deterministic. Its sub-systems are not. A manufacturing complex is deterministic, but the employees union is not. If the striking employees result in the dissolution of the corporation--sale of all assets and tearing down of all buildings--one would not say that the union was deterministic. The management still has its capital, which is deterministic.

Language

The fact that this study is attempting to synthesize material from disciplines that use different languages creates some problems. For example, in sociology and ethics, researchers write about "choice" with very little explanation of the meaning of that word. In the experimental analysis of behavior and in applied behavior analysis, however, choice is defined more scientifically. Where the intersection of these two languages seems to cause confusion, I will translate terms. But, generally, in the interest of brevity, I will not translate concepts that are more economically defined in less scientific terms.

Goldiamond (1974) made this point when he used the term "needs", and footnoted the item somewhat waggishly with:

Gentle reader, who may be shocked by my use of a term such as "needs," despair not for me. I could have written that we establish discriminative control of the husband's attentive behaviors by those of his wife's behaviors which are the behavioral components in a behavior-attention contingency.

These behaviors are ... Many words later, he concluded with the hope that such terms will make ready contact with the reader's current repertoire. (p 15)

Systems Theory

The Total Performance System

The systems referred to in this study are "Total Performance Systems" (Brethower, 1972). Most systems theorists represent a system with inputs, processes and outputs. But, the Brethower conceptualization is preferable, because it attends to the impact of outputs on recipients. The receiving system is an integral part of a total performance system. Other theorists account for the phenomenon in terms of collateral effects or "spill-over" effects (Van Gigch, 1974, p. 9).

Following are the five elements of a system according to Brethower, and a brief description of each element:

Inputs: All raw materials and energy that go into the production of a product or the implementation of a process. Generally, inputs are nouns.

Processing System: All activities that transform raw materials into products. Generally, processes are active verbs, or nouns that represent action.

Outputs: All products of a processing system. Outputs are generally nouns. They range from products that are intended and valuable to products that are accidental and harmful.

Receiving System: This is actually more than a system. It is the list of all other systems on which products impact. The receiving system of a behavior change program would include such diverse systems as the family of the person involved, the Department of Mental Health, the client's church or school, and even society at large.

Feedback Loops: Brethower depicts information going back into the processing system from 2 different points in the total performance system. Feedback comes from the processing system itself and is, in effect, addi-

tional input for the processing system. This feedback is part of the essential value set (Note 2). The other point of feedback is from the receiving system. Again, this information functions as more input for the processing system, and is part of the informational value set.

A graphic representation of a total performance system appears in Figure 1.

Insert Figure 1 about here

These feedback loops represent the balancing of interests in social systems. The effectiveness of the processes they represent is a measure of the "goodness" of a system. Their role is the defining characteristic of an ethical system.

Ethical Processes and Products

What is ethical is what "ought to be". The key word is "ought". But the determination of what ought to be turns out to be a very complex process. What ought to be for one person is not what ought to be for another. What ought to be on Monday is not good for Tuesday; what is good for one place is not good for another.

Fortunately, each time the question of what ought to be needs answering, it is not necessary to investigate all the possible consequences. Historians, theologians, philosophers, and law makers have summarized and codified the activities of the past. Some past activities have had survival value for individuals, groups, or cultures. Some activities have been reinforcing for one member of a group at the expense of another.

Successful behavior patterns are articulated in constitutions, statutes, administrative procedures, and by-laws. They provide a good starting point for the determination of what ought to be, because they are based on past

knowledge. These codifications, however, can only provide the simplest, most general guidelines. As cultures evolve, more complex questions of what ought to be arise, and there are no answers in past laws. Should a surgeon perform an experimental operation? Should a government agency employ a behavior therapist to change a person's behavior?

These are more difficult questions involving ethics, and their answers are obscured by conflicting guidelines. The final decision of what ought to be is made through an evaluative process only.

Traditionally, the study of ethics has asked two questions. The first is a question of what ought to be. That is, what ought to exist for its own sake? What things are intrinsically good? What is the ultimate good? The second question is a question of what ought to be done. This discussion is primarily concerned with the latter issue because it is a question involving a process and one that involves activities and products, and the causal relationship between them. Those characteristics fit well into a systems model. Therefore even though I will use the expression "ought to be", the reader should assume that I am referring to processes. The larger question of what is the ultimate good can be left to the philosophers and theologians. We are concerned with behavior.

Because ethical decision-making is an evaluative process, it is important to consider the source and context of the evaluator. Inmates behind bars could probably write as much as Moses about what ought to be. That document, however, could very well be limited by the severe conditions of deprivation in their environment. The consideration of the source would require an investigation into the interests of those persons. What contingencies are operative, or, as is often said, what do those persons have at stake? What system are they a part of?

These elements of consideration are easily demonstrated by viewing the politicians' statements about what ought to be. Every other October, Americans hear long lists of not only what ought to be, but what indeed will be, if only the people respond appropriately to the advice of politicians. Their list of good things is all for the good of the people. A crude examination of the contingencies of such statements, however, reveals that politicians have another interest. In spite of the fact that they are only concerned for our welfare, it is obvious that they will not be able to implement all those good programs unless they are elected. This, then, is their primary goal -- election. One of the prices to pay for living in a system of elected representatives is that by definition the citizens become objects of secondary interest.

Sources closest to a situation may not be the best sources of information about what ought to be. That includes administrators of social systems. For example, when customers want to purchase a used car, they have several sources of information. The salesperson managing the used car lot is one source. That person may have more information about a given car than any other person. The salesperson, however, is part of a system that survives on the immediate reinforcers of quick sales. The long term contingencies of survival -- the build-up of a satisfied clientele -- do not control much behavior. So, prospective buyers might want to get information about what they ought to do from some sources more distant from the immediate situation.

The same principles operative in these examples apply to ethical decision making in systems of behavioral control. Consider, for example, a psychiatric facility, a powerful system of behavioral control. In this system, who will decide what ought to be done with a patient? The

staff is caught up in a complex system requiring compliance with the larger system of which it is a part, and compliance from its various sub-systems. The facility will not function unless it is in compliance with state standards, federal standards, standards of the Joint Committee on Hospital Accreditation, standards of the Departments of Mental Health and Public Health, standards of Medicaid and Medicare, and of insurers such as Blue Cross. With all that at stake, can the staff be expected to make a decision about a client's treatment that considers only the best interest of the client? The staff will not make a decision in the best interest of the client, because the survival of the system is the determining factor. Our mandate, then, is to assure that systems of behavioral control dedicated first of all to survival also deliver optimum services to clients.

Governments are established, presumably, with one goal in mind. There is a basic assumption that people can live in greater comfort and security if they cooperate. So, they agree on a set of principles, and establish systems to manage the contingencies of survival. As soon as the systems are established, however, there is no longer a single-minded government. It is no longer an ideal, but now consists of real people who love, hate, want, and fight. The executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government engage in a very real power struggle to survive. Within the executive branch, for example, one agency is competing for limited funds with another agency, so that Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) is competing with the Veterans Administration for funds to fulfill their legitimate goals. Within HEW, the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration competes with Social Security. Within Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health, Mental Health competes with Drug Abuse. Within Mental Health, Data Processing competes with Program Services. And so on. Mean-

while, an alcoholic, neurotic, strung-out ex-GI may be in need of services. Where does he go? Which system of social service is concerned about him more than in its own survival?

An easy answer to this question is that clients themselves, the recipients of services, are the only persons in a position to make decisions in their own interest. And, if that person is knowledgeable about the contingencies, competent to make decisions, and goes through a behavior change program voluntarily, that person ought to make those decisions. In reality, however, knowledge, competence, and voluntariness are all relative concepts. And, because of the powerful rewards and punishers, all social systems are coercive in some degree.

Voluntariness and Choice

Our society values freedom above all. The most grievous penalty imposed on citizens is the abridgement of freedom (Stone, 1976, p. 2). But freedom is an elusive concept. Persons readily sacrifice certain kinds of freedom so that they may have more of a different kind of freedom. They do this by submitting voluntarily to various systems of control.

For example, they buy the counterments of freedom, and submit willingly to the inflexible schedule of bank payments. Families and friends make agreements, enabling them to live in greater peace and harmony, but they are then subject to the contingencies of the agreement. Some persons voluntarily sign into mental hospitals, and are then subject to the regimen.

It is interesting to note the conditions under which people talk about choice. They talk about choice when the decision to act in a certain way is not the obvious result of obvious contingencies. When someone jumps

from a burning building, people don't ask them why they chose to jump. They do, however, talk about a graduate of Harvard Law School choosing to become a coal miner, or Albert Schweitzer choosing to serve as a missionary.

When at Baskin-Robbins, customers talk about how difficult it is to choose from all the flavors of ice-cream. Nobody will ever know all the variables that go into someone choosing a dip of Rocky Road on the bottom and a dip of Chocolate Mint on the top. When the stimulus for that response cannot be labelled, nor the reinforcement specified, the situation is explained by calling it choice.

Voluntary choice means that the contingencies are not so coercive that the individual has only one reasonable alternative. In other words, the rewards and punishers for one option are not significantly out of balance with the rewards and punishers of at least one other option.

When persons choose to become part of a system, they relinquish some freedom to the contingencies of the system. To relinquish freedom means to willingly be placed under a set of contingencies over which one has little or no control. Non-compliance with the contingencies of the system will lead to punishing consequences. To retain freedom in a contractual relationship means to enter into an agreement in which the contingencies are minimal, and flexible. Non-compliance with the contingencies will not result in very severe punishment. Some systems of social control are much more coercive than others, a topic discussed in Chapter Four following.

An Ethical System of Social Control

The foregoing discussion suggests that systems of social control may not be ethical if the contingencies are such that the recipient of services

has very little choice -- that is, if the penalties for one option are significantly greater than the penalties for another option.

Because this society values freedom above all, citizens cherish their right of voluntary participation in any system. Voluntary participation in a system means that the contingencies are not coercive. An initial definition of an ethical system of social control might therefore be: An ethical system is a process of controlling behavior in which the system has some corresponding system of counter-control, so that the recipients of the process activities may effectively alter the system of which they are a part, or withdraw from it.

That is an ideal definition; one which accounts for the interests of the individual member of society. Society, however, also has its own interests, and if the interests of society conflict with the interests of the individual, a decision must be made about which interest will take precedence. The assumption of macrodeterminancy suggests that the larger system--society--takes precedence. The process by which those decisions are made is discussed further in the following section.

Value Theory and the Morality of Systems

Value Judgement

Eugene Meehan (1969) is a systems theorist who has addressed the problem of value judgements. He defines value judgement as choosing—expressing a preference—a choice among real options. Choice is a behavior which leads to consequences, and consequences are measured solely in terms of direct or indirect impact on society. That impact is the basis for future judgements. A value judgement, then, requires calculations that project into the future.

The approach to value judgement must be empirical, experimental, and rational...if we are to control it and improve its quality.

In these terms, society becomes a normative enterprise. (p. 52)

He is suggesting that the measurement of the impact of value judgements on society will lead to the establishment of standards, whereby precedents are set for future decisions. He continues, "Government, whatever its form or structure, becomes a potential normative instrument." (p. 52)

From this position, it is fairly simple to develop a theory of value judgement. "An ethic, then, must contain two kinds of standards: first, those that order the values of a single normative variable; second, those needed to establish priorities among clusters of variables when there are incompatibilities or conflicts" (Meehan, p. 111). The first standard is for personal or individual ethics and the second is for the development of a social ethic. As was mentioned earlier, however, the interests of the individual and the interests of society may very well be in conflict. Ethical standards must accommodate that potential conflict.

Value theories are not absolute. Most ethical systems require the balancing of interests, costs over benefits, the individual and the collective. Extreme religious groups and radical cultists are the exceptions. In those systems, there is only one standard of truth and obedience.

Some value theories are based on cost and utility. It is the role of the systems designer to appraise those variables. (van Gigch, 1974). The systems designer must:

1. Understand the objectives of those he serves. Appraise the goals of his clients and evaluate them in terms of their "good" and "harm".
2. Anticipate the consequences of his design upon all those who will be affected by them. He must judge the consequences of each of his proposed alternatives and evaluate their worth. (p. 113)

Van Gigch further analyzes the Utilitarian theory of values, which suggests that the greatest all-around welfare will be obtained if a combination of the principles of utility and of justice is struck. This will provide the greatest possible balance of good over evil or of benefits over costs.

Van Gigch summarizes with a list of standards for making value judgments:

1. Use available resources to foster the well-being of society.
2. Ask whether the goals specified by the clients are the correct ones in terms of clients' interests.
3. Judge systems by their consequences.
4. Understand the optimal design of the whole system as well as that of the sub-systems.
5. Realize that values, positive and negative, are not all economic

values. Human values should be given as much weight in decisions as technical or economic criteria. (p. 115)

Eventually, the experimental analysis of behavior may be developed to such a degree that the survival value of any given choice may be predicted. At this point, however, and in the near future, that degree of exactitude is highly unlikely. While continuing to develop an empirical approach to decision making, society survives by making its best guesses.

Social Values

Society has interests apart from and in addition to the collective interests of its members. The values of any given society are other than the sum of the values of the individuals in that society.

In the process of evolution, people have learned that cooperation on certain enterprises is better than individually struggling to achieve common goals. This is especially true in the development of systems of communication and transportation. It is also true in the development of systems of social control. Collectively, society has determined to monitor the behavior of individual members, and to invest in the correction of deviants. Standards of behavior have evolved, with elaborate systems of rewards and punishers for unusual behaviors.

These systems of social control lie on a continuum of coerciveness. At one end is the criminal justice system with its punitive sanctions, which society enforces for its own protection. On the other end is the welfare system. The rationale for the existence of that system is in question. Whatever the rationale, the existence of the system represents some sort of commitment to the less fortunate members of society. This type commitment has often been referred to as the measure of a civilization.

One suggested rationale is altruism. In other words, society helps its less capable members out of love. This rationale is used by Christian societies.

It has also been argued that the well-being of all persons will be enhanced if all of society's personal resources are utilized. Therefore, society must invest in the education, training, or even just the maintenance of all its members. This rationale requires a more scientific approach to systematizing values. As long ago as 1758, the development of social values was seen as a scientific endeavor. Helvetius (Note 3) proposed to treat ethics like all other sciences and to make ethics, as well as physics, experimental. These ideas were developed in the British Utilitarian school of thought, best represented by Jeremy Bentham (Bentham, 1969). However, at this point, social welfare programs do not result in an increased cost-benefit ratio to society. (Sutherland, 1977).

Another possible rationale is that some persons might fear being incapacitated in the future, and would support a social welfare system in anticipation of the day when they themselves might need those services.

Krasner (1969) articulates a behavioral definition of social values:

"The good society is one in which all people are positive social reinforcers. The important value is to behave so as to please others and to contribute (as assessed by others) to the general welfare of all men--society." (p. 543)

Skinner (1971) defines social values in terms of social contingencies.

"The social contingencies, or the behaviors they generate, are the 'ideas' of a culture; the reinforcers that appear in the contingencies are its 'values' " (p. 121).

Skinner further defines the criteria against which the values of a culture can be measured:

The simple fact is that a culture which for any reason induces its members to work for its survival, or for the survival of some of its practices, is more likely to survive. Survival is the only value according to which a culture is eventually to be judged, and any practice that furthers survival has survival value by definition.

(p. 130)

This position is quite difficult to translate into a working model of social order. Labelling survival as the one value, the summum bonum, presents problems in application. We simply do not know what variables will be responsible for the survival of our culture. Those variables cannot begin to be quantified until that point in time at which the culture no longer survives. Variables contributing to the survival of cultures may be radically different from the variables contributing to the survival of some individuals within that culture. Some cultures require the sacrifice of individual members. In some sense, plagues and wars have probably strengthened some cultures. It would be specious, however, to argue that such tragedies should be cultural values. Finally, survival itself cannot be defined for a culture. Cultures do not just come and go. They merge, and parts of them survive. Written records and artifacts survive and sometimes cultures are revived. At what point does a culture no longer survive?

Ashby (1960) defines survival as a process, rather than as a final goal. That approach leads to a useful definition: "We can define survival objectively, and in terms of a field: it occurs when a line of behavior takes no essential variable outside a given limit" (p. 42). That definition

of survival is identical to a systems definition of an essential value set, which is discussed in greater detail in the following chapter.

In summary, the rationale for deriving a definition of social values is as follows:

Society has recorded the events of the past by means of laws, rules, and regulations. These codifications of past events are based on what has worked or has not worked in the history of this culture. These rules vary in degrees of formality, from Supreme Court decisions to informal guidelines within a family unit. Rules specify the contingencies on behaviors—the manner in which certain activities are rewarded or punished.

Social values are the rewards that appear in the contingencies of all the formal and informal rules of society.

Because we live in a pluralistic society, these social values may vary greatly from one part of the country to the other. In fact, we are all members of several social orders, each of which has its own set of values. The values of any given society are the values that appear as common denominators in all the overlapping social systems that make up the definition of that society.

Value Sets

In the language of systems theory, value sets are the essential variables of a system. A value set is all the variables that must be kept within a narrow range for a system to survive. (Miller, 1978)

The Brethower conceptualization of a total system includes two definitions of value sets. The essential value set is the set of essential variables that must be kept within a narrow range in order for the processing system to survive. This may be graphically represented as a feedback

loop for the processing system. If one of the essential variables approaches its limit, the feedback to the processing system would make adjustments to bring the variable back within a safe range.

The informational value set may be graphically represented as feedback from the receiving system back to the processing system. The receiving system is sensitive to external environmental variables. The informational value set, then, processes information from the receiving system as those variables approach their limits. Again, the processing system would make adjustments to bring its outputs within the limits necessary to modify effects on the receiving system.

An oil refinery, for example, has many internal feedback mechanisms. If pressure and temperature tolerances become critical, red lights flash and adjustments are made immediately--perhaps automatically. Those limits on the processing system are part of the essential value set. Those regulators, however, are not the only regulators of that processing system. A glut of oil on the world market (an unfortunate example) would result in prices dropping dramatically. Cost of refined petroleum products might drop so low that the refinery would no longer have the resources to purchase the crude. These regulators are not in the processing system, but in the receiving system. They are part of the informational value set.

Figure 1 demonstrates graphically how these value sets are represented in a total performance system.

A human system must be construed as open or organic rather than linear or closed. A value set for a linear system is fairly easy to quantify. A linear system takes in a certain amount of energy, processes it, and the outputs are easily measured. A human system, however, must take into consideration the development of behavior patterns and learning experiences.

Humans are not controlled and monitored in closed settings. Unknown variables operate on humans as they interact with a broad environment. For this reason also, it is best to construe human systems as total performance systems. In a total performance system, the receiving system can account for all the unknown effects of any given output from a processing system. This information from the receiving system--the informational value set--is an important element in the development of a blueprint for an ethical system.

Information from the environment may not always be in accord with the essential value set of the processing system. The two value sets may be in conflict. The processing component, for example, may need to make changes if it receives information that the survival of some subsystem of the receiving system is endangered. Perhaps a decision will have to be made about the relative value of the two systems in conflict.

The informational value set is sensitive to many environmental variables. This is especially true in human service delivery systems. One of the variables affecting the informational value set is the advancement of communication technology itself. In the past ten years, advanced communication techniques have enabled researchers to recover information previously inaccessible to the administrators of mental health systems. The effects of institutional confinement have always been fairly constant. Recently, however, those effects have been quantified, summarized, and returned to the processing system. The receipt of this information has resulted in strong reactions from several other systems also. The judicial system, the legislative system, and systems within the private sector have all responded to produce major changes. Some of the information suggested that

too many persons were being confined in mental institutions involuntarily. Consequently, institutions nation-wide have reduced their inmate populations dramatically.

The increase of information from receiving systems has led to broad attacks on institutionalization and has renewed heated arguments about the rationale for government intervention.

Government Intervention

The Rationale for Intervention

When this society was founded, the framers of the constitution took a strong position that freedom and liberty were to be safeguarded above all else. To the greatest extent possible, individuals would manage their own environment. Immediately, however, serious difficulties became apparent. One problem is that most individuals will attempt to collect the most reinforcers for themselves even if the rest of society will have to pay the consequences. Therefore, systems of social control were seen as important regulators in situations where the interests of society seemed to take precedence over the interests of the individual.

Two concepts provide the theoretical base for justifying state intrusion into the lives of individuals. In these two situations, society, through its duly appointed systems of social control, may take over the responsibility of managing persons environments for them.

1. **Police Power.** One way individuals attempt to collect reinforcers is simply to take them. Such a response might be in the form of taking an apple from a neighbor's tree or taking \$20,000 from a bank. Generally, these behaviors are punishing for other members of society and are prohibited by a set of rules that has been previously legislated, adjudicated, and fixed as law. Violation of those rules will lead to state intervention into the life of the violator. The rationale for this intervention is that the interests of society are greater than the interests of the individual, in this given situation. The power used by the state in this instance is called police power. This power is not used lightly. A complex system of counter-controls is operating to prohibit the abuse of that power. That system of control and counter-control is called

the criminal justice system.

2. *Parens patriae*. Another way persons attempt to collect reinforcers or avoid punishment is by exhibiting behaviors that society has determined are unusual or bizarre, but not criminal. Other persons in the immediate environment will often respond to that kind of behavior in such a way as to decrease the probability that it will happen again. If those informal attempts to assure social conformity are not successful, however, the bizarre, unacceptable behavior may persist or increase in frequency. When that behavior is considered dangerous to that person or to others in the environment, the state may intervene by using the rationale of *parens patriae*. The assumption is that the state knows better than the persons what is good for them and that the state is able to help those persons for their own good. The legal origins for this rationale go back to English common law, where the king was seen in the parental role, especially for those subjects who were unable to care for themselves. This is the power of the state that is used to commit persons involuntarily to mental institutions.

This power is used by the state in other situations also. For example, if a citizen is born with some genetic defect, and is unable to care for basic needs, the state may intervene by placing that person involuntarily into an institution for the developmentally disabled. Some persons may be adjudicated incompetent to handle certain of their affairs, and the state will take over the responsibility, in spite of what these persons may think. Children may be removed from the homes of their parents if the state has evidence of abuse or neglect. The state assumes the parental role.

In each of these instances, it is the parens patriae power of the state that is employed in rationalizing its intervention into the lives of individual citizens. The state has exercised its power to manage the contingencies of the life of one of its citizens.

This intervention is employed systematically in the juvenile justice system, the mental health system, the public health system, the welfare system, and the education system. These are the systems developed by this society to help the persons who themselves believe they need help or whom the state believes need help.

Coercion

Coerciveness means that one person or agency is more in control of the contingencies than another person or agency. The setting in question does not meet the definition of complete voluntariness as defined earlier in this paper. In other words, the consequences for one option are significantly more severe than the consequences for the other option. The client does not have much of a choice. Goldiamond (1974, p. 54) defines coercion as negative reinforcement.

To control against the dangers of coercion by the government, society relies on the concepts of informed consent and voluntariness.

Consent must be given by clients for every element of their treatment program. Consent is needed before information can be received from previous service providers and before information may be released to other service providers. Informed consent is needed before treatment can begin. If the treatment is in any way experimental, special procedures safeguard the interests of the client. Clients who are adjudicated incompetent may not be subjected to behavior change programs unless consent is obtained from their guardians and, very often, an informed

consent board.

In practice, however, systems of social control are inherently coercive in varying degrees. They have been established to serve the needs of society and only secondarily serve the needs of individuals. Administrators and clinicians are in powerful positions. Sometimes harsh penalties accrue to those persons not cooperating with an agency.

Even with rigorous standards of informed consent, clients yield to the wishes of the authority figures to whom they look for guidance. Goldamond (1974) reports on the testimony of a pediatrician who claims:

"I beleive ... that I can persuade 99% of patients to my way of thinking... even if I am 100% wrong. If I tell them in such a way that I appear concerned and that I am knowledgable and that I have their interest at heart and the interest of their fetus or their newborn baby, there is no question in my mind but what they will let me 'cut off that infant's head.' I think informed consent is an absolute farce legalistically, morally, ethically--any point of view you want to talk about. The information is what I want it to be." (p. 13)

Treatment plans in mental hospitals and clinics are drawn up by conscientious clinicians. The client will not likely disagree with the goals or the techniques.

An inmate of a Michigan prison signed a very thorough and carefully worded consent form which would allow doctors to sugically experiment with his brain. The entire consent form is reproduced in Note 4 at the end of this paper. In essence, this consent form is a good example of

a procedure that is designed to meet the interests of society at the expense of the interests of the individual. A court case¹ resulted in the termination of the experiment, and the court concluded that the concept of voluntariness is not valid when a person is in a coercive setting. (Miller, 1976, p. 575)

Because of the substantial counter-controls available to citizens to protect themselves from state intervention, government systems of social control prefer working with individuals on a voluntary status. In the mental health system, for example, persons in the process of being committed involuntarily are encouraged regularly to change to voluntary status. The state has an interest in reducing paperwork. Voluntary clients are administratively less troublesome. It could even be demonstrated that clients are very often coerced into becoming voluntary clients, even after involuntary commitment. (Note 5)

Perhaps that situation is not always all bad. Agencies of social control are designed to meet the needs of society. There is some support in the literature for the notion that this is the inevitable result of social cooperation. Neibuhr (1932) states, "All social cooperation on a larger scale...requires a measure of coercion... The state cannot preserve itself without coercion" (p.3)

This is not a new idea. Rousseau (1976) attempted to demonstrate an inverse correlation between the number of people in a system and the amount of individual freedom.

¹Kaimowitz V. Department of Mental Health, 42 U.S.L.W. 2063 (Circuit Court, Wayne County, Michigan., July 10, 1973)

Skinner (1971) maintained that loss of reinforcers is an element of social cooperation:

"Organized control for the good of others will continue to compete with personal reinforcers, and different kinds of organized control, with each other. The balance of goods received by controller and controllee will remain unfair or unjust." (p.114)

This position, which admits to the state having more power than an individual in some systems of social control, is a position that is frightening to civil libertarians. We can take comfort in the fact, however, that the edge of power in the hands of social agencies is only a slight edge of power and does not represent the kind of absolute control of totalitarian governments. As Goldiamond (1974) notes, the contract between the federal government and its citizens is a limited contract. Powers assigned to one of the contracting parties (the federal government) are limited to those explicitly stated in the contract. The other party (the citizen) retains all other powers.(p.7). The legal basis for this limitation is the 10th Amendment.

Therefore, citizens have at their disposal substantial counter-controls that are designed to temper or prevent government intervention.

A non-coercive relationship between a system and a person within that system can now be defined. The mental health system will serve as an example. The essential value set of the mental health system is that set of variables outside which that system cannot survive. The clients are also individual systems. Their essential value sets are the sets of variables beyond the limits of which they cannot survive.

A non-coercive relationship would be the condition in which those two essential value sets are approximately the same or not in conflict.

Government Control and Counter-Control

Agencies of social control are not allowed to proceed unchecked. The government itself is a system of checks and balances. What the legislative branch of the government passes into law is always subject to scrutiny by the judicial branch of the government.

Using this system of governing what ought to be, society arrives at a definition of social policy whose criteria is moderation. Anything too progressive or regressive will be checked. A right decision, or a good decision, is one that will not be disputed or over-ruled by a different government agency.

There are many advantages to this government of control and counter-control. In such a system, nothing can change too quickly. All legal disputes end up in the judicial branch--if necessary, before the Supreme Court. Thousands of hours of deliberation are invested in a decision. An adversary process is used to promote the best arguments for and the best arguments against the plaintiff. Judicial precedents are set from which new laws are written to guide future disputes. When a decision is finally made, it is a powerful decision which must be obeyed under penalty of the law.

There are also disadvantages to a government of control and counter-control. For example, in any given dispute, it is a very difficult and cumbersome process to introduce the judicial system as a counter-control. Only the most pressing cases ever get beyond the prosecutor's

office. In civil law, only cases that appeal to an attorney for the rewards of money or publicity will ever be heard. Small complaints are never heard. Complaints that are processed may take years to litigate.

There is at least one other major problem with using the judicial system as a system of counter-control. It is a problem of over-kill. One of the basic laws of physics states that for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction. This is not true in government. For every conflict, there is an opposite and overwhelming over-reaction. If the judicial system responds to a conflict, precedents are set. The intent of the judgement is to prevent the possibility of that problem ever rising again. Laws are written to uphold judicial decisions. New bureaucracies are instituted to enforce new regulations. Billions of dollars are spent to ensure a few dollars worth of direct services.

Consider, for example, the new standards set for mental health facilities by judicial decree. As a direct result, one Michigan institution for the developmentally disabled is responding to new regulations by spending \$20,000,000 on the remodeling of facilities designed to house 500 persons. It may be questioned whether that expenditure is in the best interest of the clients, or if it is designed to serve the system itself.

Systems of social control are checked by other systems designed as counter-controls.

A recent example demonstrates that Michigan's mental health system had not been checked in some of its sub-systems. Abuses were common in facilities for the developmentally disabled, and the facility at Plymouth was finally brought under attack by the media. But the processing system at Plymouth was operating within the range of its essential value set. It was the informational value set of that particular system that provided the necessary stimuli for change. This change is now in progress with a

flurry of expensive legislative activity and litigation.

This is an important process in the social order. Systems must have checks and balances. The judicial system, however, should be only the last resort. For most disputes within a given system, there is a better way to handle it.

Mental Health Advocacy

The Role of the Therapist

The therapist, or change agent, had a dual role; he has even been referred to as a "double agent". (Note 6) Krasner (1969) has stated very directly, "I will take a stand that the therapist is always society's agent." (p.541)

The therapist must take into consideration the interests of society and the interests of the individual. Ideally, they will not vary greatly. The degree of variance may be a function of the inherent coerciveness of the setting.

The accompanying tables demonstrate the conflict in goals when a change agent is acting in the interest of the individual or in the interest of society.

Table 1 shows some general distinctions in the conflicting roles of the change agent. The agent's goals vary with the setting.

Table 2 shows the role conflict in a specific problem area-- confidentiality.

Table 3 shows a similar role conflict with the issue of commitment or initial entry into the systems.

Table 4 shows the standard of proof for entry into the systems of varying coerciveness.

Insert tables 1, 2, 3, & 4 about here

These tables indicate how the aversive consequences for clients increase proportionately with the coerciveness of the system. Where the

change agent would emphasize the interests of society, the potential aversiveness for the client increases.

Therefore, an ethical system would institute safeguards against those aversive consequences, proportionate with the potential harm to the client.

In settings that are not very coercive, the role of the change agent operates within a value set change that is similar to that of the client.

In settings that are more coercive, the value sets of client and change agent are quite different. In those settings the change agent is not a good advocate for the client. The interests of the client would be best protected by the presence of some other advocate.

An Ethical System in Practice

The Michigan Department of Mental Health (DMH) provides services through two divisions: the Facilities Division and the Community Mental Health Division. The Office of Recipient Rights (RR) is a client advocacy office over both divisions, and the director of that office answers only to the executive director of the DMH.

The Officers of RR for the various counties that have client advocacy systems in effect are responsible for monitoring the agencies' compliance with the Mental Health Code. In addition, they receive complaints about the system from any recipient of services, investigate those complaints, and recommend solutions.

This advocacy system is a sub-system of the DMH. As a sub-system, it is distinguished from external sources of counter-control, such as the

judicial system or private client advocacy groups. Also, as a sub-system, the Office of RR has direct access to client records, and is an active part of administrative procedures. It may be considered an internal advocacy system.

In Community Mental Health settings, the Office of RR answers directly to the executive director of the county program. In problem solving, the Officer has access to two sources of legal advice: the county prosecutor's office and the central Office of RR in Detroit.

In terms of systems theory, this internal advocacy system is represented by the essential value set and the informational value set. The system not only monitors responses from the receiving system, but it has direct input into the processing system as a shaper of policies and procedures.

This system of counter-control is much more effective than an external system such as the judicial system. The Office of RR is capable of handling all complaints. Most complaints received in the office would not gain a hearing at the prosecutor's office. The officer can respond immediately and feed the information back into the processing system.

The following example, taken from case records and modified to disguise the origin and the identity of the client, may illustrate the system .

Mrs. Smith had been a client of a community mental health clinic for several months. The therapist, Mr. Wright, had come to know the family quite well, except for one son-in-law whom he had never met.

One afternoon, six months after the last time that Mr. Wright had seen Mrs. Smith, a young man came into the office on an emergency basis and asked to see Mr. Wright. He was given an immediate appointment. He introduced himself to Mr. Wright as the son-in-law and proceeded to talk about the Smith family as if he had a lot of information. Actually, the young man was fishing for information about the Smith family. Via nods of Mr. Wright's head and various other gestures of affirmation, he was actually getting information. He was, in fact, an estranged son-in-law and was fishing for information to use against the family. He received the information he was fishing for, and he did use it against the family.

One week later, an enraged Mrs. Smith came into the office, seeking redress for the slanderous things being spread about--items that had been gained from Mr. Wright.

There are two sources of redress for Mrs. Smith. The Federal Privacy Act prohibits disclosure of confidential information. She could bring a lawsuit against the clinician and the clinic, and may, in time, win the suit. Some compensatory relief may be awarded but it is doubtful that any punitive damages could be gained from such a suit. Mrs. Smith has mostly time, and money to lose, and not much to gain via this route.

The alternative solution is made possible by the existence of a client advocacy office, the Office of RR. The problem was resolved as follows.

Mrs. Smith filed a complaint with the Office of RR. The officer investigated the complaint by interviewing all parties involved. The officer called a meeting with Mrs. Smith and Mr. Wright, and in this

he acted as the advocate for Mrs. Smith. In this meeting, Mrs. Smith discovered the facts about how Mr. Wright had been tricked and her anger was softened. The officer determined that Mr. Wright was in error, even though he had been tricked into revealing the information.

The officer recommended the following action be taken:

1. A memo would be circulated to all therapists, to remind them of the need for confidentiality, especially in situations involving family. Therapists are trained to avoid such traps and must always remain alert to them. This part of the solution focused on the informational value of finding a flaw in the system and sought to turn the flaw into an educational experience.

2. A letter be sent from the executive director to Mrs. Smith, thanking her for her time and concern, and informing her of the resolution to the problem.

3. A one-month follow-up call by the officer to Mrs. Smith to assure her satisfaction with the resolution.

These recommendations were implemented. Mrs. Smith felt that her voice was heard, and it was. She was pleased that she was instrumental in modifying policies and procedures that would contribute to the more effective delivery of services in the future.

If Mrs. Smith had gone to an attorney and filed a law suit, she would have received no such satisfaction. Money and time would have been wasted. Services would not have improved.

Access to the legal system is necessary and should be used by those persons who want to press litigation to that degree. However, this example of the effectiveness of an internal advocacy system illustrates a greater degree of satisfaction for all parties involved.

Conclusion

An ethical system is a system that has effective counter-controls.

The counter-controls must increase proportionately with the inherent coerciveness of a system of social control.

Counter-controls that are a sub-system, rather than external to the system, are more effective in many cases and have significant advantages in terms of cost-effectiveness.

No matter how unpleasant it might sound, or how some persons might want to change the language, coerciveness is a fact of life, and is the direct result of social cooperation.

Reinhold Niebuhr was one of the most outstanding philosophers and theologians of the 20th century. In 1932, he stated:

The future peace and justice of society depend upon not one, but many social strategies, in all of which moral and coercive factors are compounded in varying degrees. So difficult is it to avoid the Scylla of despotism and the Charybdis of anarchy, that it is safe to hazard the prophecy that the dream of perpetual peace and brotherhood for all society is one which will never be fully realized ... But meanwhile, collective man, operating on the historic and mundane scene, must content himself with a more modest goal. His concern for some centuries to come is not the creation of an ideal society in which there will be uncoerced and perfect peace and justice, but a society in which there will be enough justice, and in which coercion will be sufficiently non-violent to prevent his common enterprise from issuing into complete disaster.

That goal will seem too modest for the romanticists; but, the romanticists have so little understanding of the perils in which modern society lives, and overestimate the moral resources at the disposal of the collective human enterprise so easily, that any goal regarded as worthy of achievement by them must necessarily be beyond attainment. (p. 22)

Reference Notes

1. Skinner, B. F. Contingencies of Reinforcement. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969. The comment referenced is my interpretation of his argument in the chapters on rule-governed and contingency-shaped behavior.
2. Brethower, D. Healthy Systems. Unpublished manuscript, 1978. Available from Psychology Department, Western Michigan University.
3. Helvetius, C. A. Del l'Esprit. In Ouvres Completttes d'Helvitius, Tome Premier. Paris: Chez Serviere, 1795.
4. The following form was prepared by the experimenters, and was signed by the patient, Louis Smith, and his parents: "Since conventional treatment efforts over a period of several years have not enabled me to control my outbursts of rage and anti-social behavior, I submit an application to be a subject in a research project which may offer me a form of effective therapy. This therapy is based upon the idea that episodes of anti-social rage and sexuality might be triggered by a disturbance in certain portions of my brain. I understand that in order to be certain that a significant brain disturbance exists, which might relate to my anti-social behavior, an initial operation will have to be performed. This procedure consists of placing fine wires into my brain, which will record the electrical activity from those structures which play a part in anger and sexuality. These electrical waves can then be studied to determine the presence of an abnormality.

In addition, electrical stimulation with weak currents passed through

the wires will be done in order to find out if one or several points in the brain can trigger my episodes of violence or unlawful sexuality. In other words, this stimulation may cause me to want to commit an aggressive or sexual act, but every effort will be made to have a sufficient number of people present to control me. If the brain disturbance is limited to a small area, I understand that the investigators will destroy this part of my brain with an electrical current. If the abnormality comes from a larger part of my brain, I agree that it should be surgically removed, if the doctors determine that it can be done so, without risk of side effects. Should the electrical activity from the parts of my brain into which the wires have been placed reveal that there is no significant abnormality, the wires will simply be withdrawn.

I realize that any operation on the brain carries a number of risks which may be slight but could potentially be serious. These risks include infection, bleeding, temporary or permanent weakness or paralysis of one or more of my legs or arms, difficulties with speech and thinking, as well as the ability to feel, touch, pain, and temperature. (sic.) Under extraordinary circumstances, it is also possible that I might not survive the operation. Fully aware of the risks detailed in the paragraph above, I authorize the physicians of Lafayette Clinic and Providence Hospital to perform the procedures outlined above."

5. Personal communication with Phil Teitelbaum, Administrative Assistant,

Kalamazoo Regional Psychiatric Facility, and with Kay Dickinson, Hospital Liaison, Calhoun County Community Health Board, Battle Creek, Michigan, January 1979.

6. Hastings Center Report, Special Supplement, In The Service of the State: The Psychiatrist as Double Agent. Proceedings of a conference of conflicting loyalties, co-sponsored by the American Psychiatric Association and the Hastings Center, March 1977.

References

- Ashby, W. R. Design for a Brain: The Origin of Adaptive Behavior.
New York: Wiley, 1960.
- Bentham, J. Principles of morals and legislation. In M. Mack (Ed.)
A Bentham Reader New York: Pegasus, 1969.
- Brethower, D. Behavior Analysis in Business and Industry. Kalamazoo:
Behaviordelia, 1972.
- Goldiamond, I. Toward a constructional approach to social problems.
Behaviorism, 1974, 2(1), 1-85.
- Kamisar, Y., LaFave, W. R., & Israel, J. H. Basic Criminal Procedure
St. Paul: West Publishing Co., 1974, pp. 1-18.
- Kraft, R. W. Symbols, Systems, Science and Survival. New York:
Vantage Press, 1975.
- Krasner, L. Behavior modification -- values and training: the
perspective of a psychologist. In C. M. Franks (Ed.), Behavior
Therapy: Appraisal and Status. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.
- Meehan, E. J. Value Judgement and Social Science. Homewood, Illinois:
Dorsey Press, 1969.
- Miller, F. W., Dawson, R. O., Dix, G. E., & Parnas, R. I. The Mental
Health Process. Mineola: Foundation Press, 1976.
- Miller, J. G. Living Systems. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978.
- Niebuhr, R. Moral Man and Immoral Society. New York: Scribner, 1932.
- Rousseau, J. The social contract. In L. Crocker (Ed.), The Social
Contract and Discourse on the Origin of Inequality. New York:
Pocket Books, 1976.

Skinner, B. F. Verbal Behavior. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957.

Skinner, B.F. Beyond Freedom and Dignity. New York: Bantam/Vintage, 1971.

Stone, A. Mental Health and Law: A System in Transition. Rockville, MD: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1976.

Sutherland, J. W. A General Systems Philosophy for the Social and Behavioral Sciences. New York: George Braziller, 1973.

Sutherland, J. W. Managing Social Service Systems. New York: PBI, 1977.

Van Gigch, J. P. Applied General Systems Theory. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.

Wallas, G. Social Judgement. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1935.

Table I

Conflict of Interest of the

Change Agent:

Main Goals

The role of the
change agent
acting in the interest
of the
INDIVIDUAL

The role of the
change agent
acting in the interest
of
SOCIETY

Welfare System	Encourage the client to enter the system, in order to receive maximum services	Provide minimal services, and move the client out of the system
Mental Health System	Voluntary: Provide services Involuntary: Help the client get out of the system	Voluntary: Provide minimal services Involuntary: Change the behavior of the client, and process out of the system
Criminal Justice System	Help the person get out of the system	Move the person into the penal system and keep him there

Table II

Conflict of Interest of the

change agent:

Dealing with confidentiality

	The role of the change agent acting in the interest of the INDIVIDUAL	The role of the change agent acting in the interest of SOCIETY
Welfare System	Release information only to help the client receive services	Release information only to help the client
Mental Health System	Release information only to help the client	Use information to commit the client
Criminal Justice System	Release information only to help the client	Use information to convict the client

Table III
Conflict of Interest of the
change agent:
Entering the System

	The role of the change agent acting in the interest of the INDIVIDUAL	The role of the change agent acting in the interest of SOCIETY
Welfare System	Help the client receive maximum services	Provide minimum services required by law. Save the resources of the system
Mental Health System	Help voluntary clients enter the system, and help involuntary clients get out of the system	Commit persons to teach socially acceptable behaviors. Remove bizarre persons from society
Criminal Justice System	Help the person stay out of the system	Remove the person from society. Keep in jail

Table IV
Standard of Proof Necessary
for Entry into Various Systems

Welfare System	Entry is voluntary. The client must demonstrate to the administrators that services are necessary. The preponderance of evidence is adequate.
Mental Health	For involuntary commitments, the state must prove by clear and convincing evidence that the client is in need of treatment.
Criminal Justice	The state must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that confinement is necessary.

Figure 1
A Total Performance System

