11 Toward Realizing Human Dignity: Evaluating Institutional Impacts on Basic Human Values*

Charles F. Hermann
Margaret G. Hermann

In the past decade, social scientists have expressed a growing sense of urgency concerning the need for transnational appraisal of the impacts of institutions on basic human values. The proposal by one of this chapter's authors for a global monitoring system appraising the effects of governments on human dignity (see Snyder, C. Hermann, and Lasswell 1976) and the focus on the 1977 International Studies Association Convention on "Worldwide Appraisal of Institutions: Toward Realizing Human Dignity" are illustrative of these calls to action. The present chapter continues in this vein by describing and evaluating some illustrative transnational appraisal projects that are now underway with a variety of sponsors. Generally, these projects focus on the effects of one type of institution - governments - on basic human values. In hopes of increasing social scientists' capabilities to engage in the transnational appraisal of a variety of institutions, we propose in the present chapter some next steps in the development of a worldwide appraisal effort.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

Appraisal

Appraisal appears to have characterized mankind from the dawn of Homo sapiens. Beginning with the attempts of

primitive man to keep tabs on his game supply or to chart river cycles, we find efforts at purposeful record keeping. The records were designed to more fully realize certain agreed-upon value outcomes - to avoid hunger, to escape the dangers of flood time. When a tribe migrated in a certain season to improve its hunting or to avoid the anticipated flood or drought, it was taking action based on appraisal. The significance of appraisal activity is that it provides the necessary basis for informed action. When someone engages in such evaluative activities as a basis for action that affects a collectivity - be it the community, the nation, or the global society - the role of appraisal in public policy becomes clear.

To say that we have always engaged in some form of appraisal activity is not to say that the task has always been done well or effectively. We have, too often, misgauged the impact of everything from damming a river to a leader's appeals for a better life. Given the centrality of the appraisal function for our individual and collective well-being, it is remarkable that the activity is so frequently done with such little care. Perhaps it is not too much to say that our future depends upon the quality of our appraisal efforts and the actions we base upon them.

A rigorous appraisal process has the following key elements. First, there is an organizing scheme, or theory, that provides a set of standards or criteria of measurement. This organizing scheme indicates what aspects of phenomena to monitor, how these phenomena are produced, and what their probable effects are. Second, we need systematic and continuous recording of trends. Such trends should be recorded over a long enough period of time to correct for the biasing effects of situations and events. Third, we must assess the impact on the affected people and things of the observed trends and the processes that produced them - how are the people affected by their environment, what are the emotional and intellectual states engendered by the environment? Fourth, the appraisal system should be designed so that it is open to feedback with a built-in capacity for correcting errors. Fifth, the results of the appraisal need to be communicated in a comprehensible form to the publics affected. The results also need to be communicated to those who are responsible for or can influence the observed pattern.

Human Dignity As The Purpose Of Appraisal

As we have defined it, appraisal is more than systematic, continuous record keeping. Appraisal, in effect, becomes an important part of any recurrent process of informed decision making. The appraisal of our prior decisions and actions serves as a necessary input for the next ones. But exactly

how powerful a tool might appraisal be? Could a substantial increase in the appraisal effort, as defined, make a marked difference in dealing with the shared concerns of people throughout the globe, both now and in the years ahead?

Entertain for a moment the possibility that an underlying shared concern of us all is a greater measure of human dignity. Human dignity can capture the common yearning in all humankind if we view it as providing every individual with a meaningful degree of participation in the shaping and sharing of certian basic human values. Let us examine each of the key terms in the defining phrase, "participation in the shaping and sharing of certain basic values." Participation refers to personal involvement, directly or indirectly through accountable delegates. Shaping introduces the idea of production or formation; thus, human dignity contains personal involvement with the decisions about which values to foster, in what form, for whom, and in what amounts. Sharing involves the experiencing of the value outcomes produced; people can consume or enjoy a certain value as an end in itself, or they can use it to produce other values. From one perspective, much of what is referred to as "human rights" concerns the claim of every person to be the recipient of certain basic values. Human dignity, then, like human rights, is concerned with the opportunity to consume certain values; but it goes beyond the issue of sharing to include participation in decisions regarding the production of values.

Lorenz curves are a familiar graphic device for displaying inequalities. A 45-degree diagonal line indicates perfect equality, that is, each additional member of the population adds the same amount of a commodity as every other member. The more a curve dips away from the line of perfect equality, the greater the inequality. In conveying the idea of human dignity, one might think of a pair of Lorenz curves. One curve represents the idea of the degree of equality or inequality in the decision processes concerned with the shaping or producing of certain values. In thinking about the concept of human dignity, we must be mindful of possible inequalities in participation in both curves.

Eight Summative Values in Human Dignity

If human dignity is a meaningful degree of participation in the shaping and sharing of certain basic human values, a fundamental question remains. What are the basic human values? Indeed, is there a common set of values that would be applicable across the variety of cultures, political systems, and belief patterns that characterize our world?

Let us consider a set of value categories: wealth, well-being, skill, enlightenment, power, affection, rectitude,

and respect. We can use this short list as a comprehensive network that can be interchanged with any other inclusive list of values. The following is an elaboration of the eight value categories we have presented. (A fuller discussion of this classification of values is found in Lasswell [1963, 1971], Lasswell and Kaplan [1950], and Brewer and Brunner [1975].)

> power - participation in decision making
> respect - honor, status, prestige, recognition
> rectitude - virtue, goodness, righteousness
> affection - love, friendship, loyalty
> wealth - income, goods, services
> well-being - health, safety, comfort
> skills - proficiency in any practice
> enlightenment - knowledge, insight, information

In other words, all other single value terms are assumed to be essential equivalents or to be subsumed under one of these eight basic values. Thus, for further example, we expect that the more than 700 separate value concepts listed in the Yearbook of World Problems and Human Potential, 1976 are essential equivalents of part or all of one of these eight value categories.

The proposed set of eight value categories develops the idea of "basic values" so essential to the concept of human dignity. With respect to its value component, human dignity can be viewed as a summative symbol or umbrella term that encompasses power, respect, rectitude, affection, wealth, well-being, skill, and enlightenment - or their essential equivalents.

Not all peoples or cultures ascribe equal importance to all these values. The mix of values that they do profess, however, can be located in this framework. Human dignity does not require everyone to given priority to the same values. The emphasis in the concept of participation in the shaping of values allows individuals to express those values they wish to see given prominence in their society.

The Role of Institutions

Of course, the simple expression of a preference for certain value outcomes - more education, better health, or whatever - is not enough to lead to their realization. A favorable vote by a population for economic development does not by itself produce any more of that value. In human societies, basic values are shaped and distributed by institutions.

By institutions we mean more than formal, complex organizations. We mean the well-established and structured patterns of behavior and relationships that are accepted as the

INSTIT(

way of
society'
determi
indulge
Thus,
political
Enlighte
researcl
Whether
informa
institut
all.
    Fu
apprais
must t
For ex.
of hum
the "c
families
laws.
experie
practice

At   th
institut
maybe.
There
feasibil
now u
invento
human
efforts
compre
method
staff.
contrit
variety
apprai:
possibl
    T
activit
occurr
charac
the pr
the ty
numbe

way of doing things in any culture. Institutions are a society's "patterns of practices." They are the vehicles for determining what values will be emphasized and who shall be indulged and deprived in the distribution of value outcomes. Thus, a society's institutions are not only such entities as political parties and governments, but also laws. Enlightenment institutions include schools, libraries, and research laboratories, as well as languages and data banks. Whether embodied in a formal set of organizations or in an informal but widely-accepted set of practices, we find institutions determining the value outcomes experienced by us all.

Fundamentally, therefore, if we wish to use the tool of appraisal to improve human dignity, the objects of appraisal must be institutions and the value outcomes they produce. For example, to appraise the value of affection as a component of human dignity, we must appraise the institutions that are the "channels" for acceptable expressions of affection – families, tribes, clubs, associations, marriage and divorce laws. For affection, as for other values, the amount and kind experienced by groups of individuals depends on institutional practices.

ILLUSTRATIVE APPRAISAL ACTIVITIES

At this point the skeptic may mumble, "Appraisal of institutions for a fuller measure of human dignity? Desirable – maybe. But realizable - that's doubtful - a utopian dream." There should be a little bit of skeptic in each of us, but the feasibility of such activity is revealed by a variety of efforts now underway. We are convinced that a careful, worldwide inventory of appraisal efforts applicable to the basic values in human dignity would produce a surprisingly large number of efforts. Many are incomplete from the perspective of comprehensive appraisal. All suffer from various financial and methodological limitations and from shortages of sufficient staff. We cannot review all such efforts or critique the contributions of each. We can, however, provide a sufficient variety of illustrations to suggest, in the strongest terms, that appraisal of the values associated with human dignity is possible.

Table 11.1 presents information of 11 illustrative appraisal activities, many of which are ongoing, all of which have occurred during the 1970s. The table suggests some characteristics of each of these projects - the values on which the project focuses, the purpose or aim of the appraisal effort, the type of methodology used in collecting trend data, the number of countries on which the project gathers information,

Table 11.1   Characteristics of Illustrative Appraisal Projects

PROJECT	VALUE FOCUS	PURPOSE	METHODOLOGY	NUMBER OF COUNTRIES MONITORING	LENGTH OF TREND RECORD	SOURCE OF DATA
Amnesty International (Source: Greenfield 1977; Weissbrodt 1977)	Power	To examine governments' adherence to Universal Declaration of Human Rights items indicating rights of individuals not to be tortured or arbitrarily arrested.	Case Study Informants Content Analysis	90	Continuous monitoring	Informants
Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Social Indicator Development Programme (Source: OECD, 1976, 1977)	Well-being Skills Wealth Enlightenment Power	To identify social concerns of member countries, to develop social indicators of level of well-being for each social concern, and to monitor changes in these levels over time.	Social Indicators Some Survey	24 Member Nations	In beginning stages at present	Data collected by member governments; general cross-national household surveys
Gallup/Kettering Global Survey on Human Needs and Satisfactions (Source: Gallup 1976, 1976/77; Collins 1976, 1977)	Well-being Skills Wealth Affection Rectitude Power	To identify people's hopes and fears, their satisfaction with their life in general and with key aspects of their life, and to determine people's attitudes on a number of increasingly critical global issues.	Survey	60	Only one survey complete to date, done 1975-1976; capability to do more in shorter time (estimate 3 months now)	Citizens of 60 countries (from national master samples of participating survey organisations)
Overseas Development Council (ODC) Physical Quality of Life Index (Source: Overseas Development Council 1977; New York Times 1977)	Well-being Skills Power	To develop a composite measure that estimates the degree to which the basic human needs of all people in a country have been met.	Social Indicators	Countries of World	All countries for 1973 (for a number of countries also have index for 1950, 1960)	Country Statistical Reports
Goals for Mankind Report to The Club of Rome (Source: Laszlo et al. 1977)	Power	To detail present national goals, to assess a variety of global goals now being advocated, and to delineate the current goals gap.	Informants Surveys Content Analysis Social Indicators	Countries of World	Goals for 1970s	National reports, surveys, media (goals of various regions were assessed by natives of that region)
Bureau of Social Science Research (BSSR), Crossnational Indicators Project (Source: BSSR Newsletter 1977; Biderman 1977)	Well-being Affection Skills Power Wealth	To select, organise, and disseminate a limited number of internationally comparable social indicators for major social issues and problems facing the U.S. that would be useful in providing cross-national comparisons with the U.S.	Social Indicators	5 to 45 countries depending on indicator	Up to 25 years depending on indicator	National governments, international organisations, research groups

(continued)

Table 11.1 (continued)

PROJECT	VALUE FOCUS	PURPOSE	METHODOLOGY	NUMBER OF COUNTRIES MONITORING	LENGTH OF TREND RECORD	SOURCE OF DATA

Table 11.1 (continued)

PROJECT	VALUE FOCUS	PURPOSE	METHODOLOGY	NUMBER OF COUNTRIES MONITORING	LENGTH OF TREND RECORD	SOURCE OF DATA
International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) Civic Education Survey (Source: Buergenthal and Torney 1976; Torney, Oppenheim, and Farnen 1975)	Enlightenment Power	To ascertain how education systems influence attitudes, perceptions, and interests of young people in their government.	Survey	9 Democratic Countries	To date done only at one point in time; data collected between 1968 and 1972	Samples of 14-year-olds from countries surveyed
World Military and Social Expenditures (Source: Sivard 1977)	Well-being Wealth Skills Power	To provide an annual accounting of the use of world resources for social and military purposes, and an objective basis for assessing relative priorities.	Social Indicators	138	1960-1975	U.S. government agencies, international organizations, research and other monitoring groups
Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) World Armaments and Disarmaments Yearbooks (Source: SIPRI 1977)	Well-being Power	To assess and disseminate information on world arms races and attempts to disarm with a commitment to urging on governments positive actions in disarmament.	Social Indicators Event Analysis Content Analysis	Countries of World	1948 to present	Official national documents, journals, newspapers, reference works, documents from international intergovernment organizations
International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) Military Balance (Source: IISS 1977)	Well-being Power	To collect, organize and disseminate information on military forces and security developments on premise that "rationality makes a major contribution to security."	Social Indicators Event Analysis Content Analysis	Countries of World	1956 to present	Country documents
Worldwatch Institute (Source: Worldwatch Institute 1977; Brown, Newland 1975; McGrath, and Stokes 1976; McGrath 1976)	All Values	To focus attention on emerging global issues by anticipating global problems and social trends (some of the issues addressed have been population, energy, women's equality, malnutrition, nuclear power.)	Informants Social Indicators Experts	Depends on problem, though generally interested in global rather than country needs	Depends on problem	National government documents; international organization documents; writings of experts

215

the length of time appraisal data have been accumulated, and
the sources of the trend data.

The two values receiving the most attention across these
illustrative projects are power and well-being. Of interest are
citizens' health, safety, comfort, and participation in
policymaking. Not unexpectedly, the institutional focus of the
majority of these projects is the government. This fact should
not surprise us, given the regulatory and resource impact that
governments often have on other societal institutions. In table
11.1, the IEA Civic Education Survey and the Gallup/Kettering
Global Survey are exceptions, the first focusing on how the
education institution teaches young people about participation
in government, the second asking people about their
perceptions of various institutions in the society. At present,
appraisal projects of institutions other than government tend to
be within a nation rather than across nations (e.g., see
Coleman 1966; Ferriss 1969, 1972; Milbrath 1977; Segal 1977).

An examination of the purposes of the illustrative projects
shows several ways in which they examine the institution's
impact on basic values. Projects like the OCED Social
Indicator Development Program and the ODC Physical Quality
of Life Index examine the institution's effects on the people of
the country. The projects ask how well people are sharing in
the values under consideration. On the other hand, projects
such as the Gallup/Kettering Global Survey and the IEA Civic
Education Survey inquire what the peoples' reactions are to
their institutions and what their value priorities are. These
projects are interested in individuals' feelings about the
shaping of values as well as how they share in values. A
third type of project - e.g., Anmesty International and Goals
for Mankind Project - sets a standard to which institutional
results should measure up, and assesses how well the standard
is met. In the case of Amnesty International, the standard is
certain statutes in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;
for the Goals for Mankind Project, the standards are certain
global goals that are seen as necessary for a "just and
sustainable society" (Lazlo 1977).

Combining these three types of information - institutional
or value outcomes, people's perceptions, and comparisons to
a standard - it becomes possible to think of appraising
individuals' participation in the shaping and sharing of values
as manifest in a specific institution. Using the national goals
from the Goals for Mankind Project as a starting point, we
could compare OECD or ODC indicators to the goals to appraise
movement toward those goals. We could see from the
Gallup/Kettering Survey peoples' perceptions of their input to
the goals and their evaluation of the goals' impact on their
lives. Assuming some of the questions from the survey ask
for priorities from those interviewed, we could use these
priorities as a standard against which, once more, to compare

the OECD and ODC indicators. For some countries, the data are probably available now to start such a comprehensive appraisal effort.

To a certain extent, the purposes of our illustrative appraisal activities determine the methodologies employed. If one is interested in the general public's perceptions, the tool used is the survey. If one is interested in an institutional output, the tool used is the social indicator. Although informants, event analysis, and content analysis have been used by several of the projects, they are relied on generally less than the survey or social indicator. Since the researcher is getting different types of information from these various methods, it would seem highly appropriate, where feasible, to use all of them. The richer information base would provide a more accurate picture of what is being monitored.

For some of the projects in table 11.1, there is a wealth of appraisal data available. The SIPRI World Armaments and Disarmament Yearbooks as well as the IISS Military Balance reports include information across the past 20 years. It is possible, by looking at their data, to plot trends over time, taking into account minor fluctuations due to certain events or situations. Large increases and decreases will stand out from the more normal pattern. But what about the Gallup/Kettering Survey, which to date has been done only once? Would the perceptions and views of the citizenry be similar several years hence or several years ago? How much impact did certain situations have on these perceptions? The Gallup/Kettering Survey included several questions from a transnational survey instrument used by Cantril (1965) over a decade earlier. Comparisons among the responses provide new information about peoples' perceptions in these two time periods. Gallup (1976/77, p. 466) comments: "It is apparent, however, that life has not improved as rapidly as had been hoped." Without some sense of the trend in an indicator or a perception, it is hard to evaluate one's data and easy to draw an erroneous conclusion.

The last column in table 11.1, regarding source of data, suggests that although many of these appraisal efforts are examining government institutions, the appraisals are dependent on the governments for their data. There are some risks in using such data since governments are notorious for justifying past actions or demonstrating the need for new programs. For example, the figure the Soviets list as their military budget is the equivalent of only one-quarter of the U.S. military budget as listed by the United States. Yet the Soviets' large numbers of forces and sophisticated weapons would suggest they at least rival the United States. (For more discussion of this issue see Sivard, 1977.) To the credit of the scholars engaging in the appraisal projects listed in table 11.1, most have tried to use multiple sources of data (international

documents, informants, experts) as a check on their national documentation.

A close examination of table 11.1 shows that most of these projects are based in the West – in the United States or Western Europe. What effect does this Western bias have on what is appraised? In responding to this question, one scholar (Morehouse 1977) suggests: "We are afflicted with what I regard as the telescopic phenomenon. We have a tendency to look at ourselves through the customary end of the telescope, thereby magnifying our importance in the world when we should be looking at ourselves through the other end." At least one of the projects listed in table 11.1 – the Goals for Mankind Project – has deliberately worked to include a diverse group of scholars from around the world in its team of researchers. The various national goal statements resulting from this project were prepared by native scholars from the area addressed. Encouraging diversity of predispositions and orientations in appraisal teams is highly likely, in the long run, to improve the content of the appraisal effort. Such diversity should definitely be sought in any worldwide appraisal activity.

In this discussion of the illustrative appraisal projects described in table 11.1, we have raised some issues that we feel are important to a systematic, worldwide appraisal effort. We have not meant to be critical of these projects, which have been or are being true to the purposes for which they were designed. What we are suggesting is that these appraisal activities can be considered as providing us with building blocks or stepping stones on the way to a systematic, worldwide appraisal network.

SOME POSSIBLE NEXT STEPS

Given what is now being done in many areas to establish the foundation for basic value assessments, and given the potential offered by a commitment to systematic appraisal, where do we go from here? Specifically, has the time come to undertake one or a series of initiatives designed to consolidate and expand our commitment to the worldwide appraisal of institutions in order to more fully realize human dignity?

In this section, we would like to propose six possible next steps in developing our capabilities to work toward transnational appraisal of institutions. These six steps are: (1) prepare and disseminate an inventory of past and present institutional appraisal efforts; (2) convene an international conference for the purpose of having scholars from a variety of nations advance proposals for the design of global appraisal activities; (3) circulate for international consideration a set of

values and their possible equivalent concepts that might form
the basis on which institutions are appraised; (4) undertake a
series of pilot projects that would attempt to appraise one or
two common institutions in several different societies; (5)
explore the transnational validity of a set of indicators of in-
stitutional performance derivable from public sources; and
(6) create a clearinghouse to (a) exchange information about
ongoing appraisal activities, (b) highlight common problems
and attempted solutions, and (c) provide suggestions on how
existing or planned projects could be reinterpreted or ex-
panded to enhance their contribution to cross-societal in-
stitutional appraisal. In addition to describing each of these
possible next steps, we will examine the priorities assigned to
them by a group of scholars who have been exposed to
discussion and debate on the creation of a worldwide effort at
appraising institutions.

The appraisal projects listed in table 11.1 are illustrative
projects. In doing the literature search necessary to con-
struct this table, we realized that we had just begun to
scratch the surface of what is available. The projects listed
are probably the more visible appraisal efforts and those that
are definitely transnational by design. Buried in scholarly
publications around the world, we are likely to find descrip-
tions of dozens of other appraisal activities. The fact that
there is an annotated bibliography of some 600 entries, en-
titled Social Indicators and Societal Monitoring (Wilcox, Brooks,
Beal, and Klongan 1972), suggests the extent of interest in
using social indicators in appraising various aspects of society.
Even though most of the studies described by Wilcox and his
colleagues (1972) focus on one type of institution in one
nation, the research provides us with clues on the validity and
relevance of certain indicators. But they include only
research on social indicators. What about surveys and other
techniques? Though, again, generally limited to one society,
the number of surveys of quality of life is growing. If we
could prepare, disseminate, and update an inventory of
institutional appraisal efforts, we might find that the basic
tools are already present for use in a worldwide institutional
appraisal project and, in effect, that for some nations much of
the data for establishing trends has already been or is being
collected. Preparation of a rather exhaustive inventory of
institutional appraisal studies provides us with the basic
ingredients for designing a transnational institutional appraisal
system and keeps us from continually having to "reinvent the
wheel."

If we are interested in a worldwide appraisal effort, it is
important from the very beginning to involve persons from
various parts of the world. Morehouse (1977), in commenting
on the idea of worldwide appraisal of institutions, noted: "We
need to broaden participation individually, organizationally,

ideologically, and, especially, geographically in this enterprise.... We need procedures that will draw into the kind of dialogue we started here a great variety of points of view. Perhaps highest priority should go to broadening the act of development in central leadership roles of our colleagues in Europe, both East and West, and in the Third World." One way to begin broadening participation is to hold an international conference in which people from various cultures and ideologies would be invited to think about their preferences for the design of a global institutional appraisal effort. Are there different goals and perspectives that any worldwide appraisal project needs to consider? Should there be not one but competing global appraisal efforts that reflect these varying perspectives? How do we make it feasible for scholars in various countries with differing political systems to participate in such an appraisal activity without repercussions? What biases do all of us bring to this experience? This set of questions could appropriately be the focus of an international conference. Such a conference might set a precedent for continuing dialogue and, thus, for a series of international gatherings at which one (or more) worldwide institutional appraisal project(s) would be shaped.

When we present our idea of a global institutional appraisal effort, debate arises most quickly about the values to be appraised. When we propose, as we did earlier in this chapter, that appraisal focus on eight values – power, respect, rectitude, affection, wealth, well-being, skills, and enlightenment – people raise questions. Why these values; aren't there others? At issue is whether there are universal values that one could appraise transnationally. If we could prepare and circulate for international discussion a description of a broad set of values and their possible equivalent concepts, could we gain some consensus on what it is we are trying to appraise? With a set of equivalencies, scholars could use those names most congenial to their societies with some expectation that their data would be comparable to others' work. It would be important in this exercise to prevent the discussion from turning to the priorities among the values since different societies will have different priorities. The focus here, however, should be on deriving a set of values and equivalencies that are found across societies, regardless of degree. Comparisons between nations will become possible only if we are using equivalent value concepts.

Instead of launching immediately into a worldwide appraisal effort, would we not be better off trying some pilot projects, looking at one or two common institutions in several different societies? Such pilot projects might focus on countries in a specific geographical region, on one developing and one developed nation, or on nations involved in a specific issue (e.g., oceans policy, disarmament). By limiting the

scope of our original appraisal attempts, we can gain some experience in dealing with the problems that will inevitably arise, and we can also experiment with various ways of gathering and assessing information. Moreover, in these pilot projects we might bring together a team of scholars from around the world. Can these scholars, from their differing perspectives and ideologies, arrive at a similar set of trend lines and projections for the society and institution under study? If not, can we ascertain where differences in perspective and ideology influenced the recording and analysis of available information, and work out some ways of dealing with these effects. In a sense, the pilot projects would provide a "trial run" before the "main event." We could gain some practice in coping with problems and discover areas of concern that we had not anticipated. The pilot projects may also suggest that some problems we expected to face will not emerge.

One of the important tasks undertaken by the OECD Social Indicator Development Program, for the OECD nations, is the transnational validity of a set of social indicators for assessing well-being. These researchers are asking if their indicators measure the same thing in each country, if the indicators reflect what the OECD Program is interested in assessing. This issue is particularly critical for cross-societal surveys, given the nuances in languages and customs. In considering indicators of institutional performance to be used on a worldwide basis, it is very important to include on any design team representatives of various cultures and languages, so that some careful thought can be given to the meaning of the indicators transnationally. Such a cross-societal team should also be used to construct tests to check if the indicators are adequately appraising the underlying concepts. The exploration of indicator validity is a step often neglected in appraisal projects - researchers accept face validity ("it appears to measure what we are after"). If we continue this trend, we risk highly-inappropriate appraisal, particularly with our desire to evaluate institutional performance worldwide.

The last of our proposed next steps involves creating a clearinghouse to serve as a source of information about ongoing appraisal activities, as a forum for the exchange of ideas on common problems and attempted solutions, and as a place for evaluating how existing or planned projects contribute to transnational institutional appraisal. The clearinghouse, so conceived, would provide a means for keeping persons engaged in appraisal endeavors aware of what each other is doing. Hopefully, this would result in less redundancy and in the development over time of an appraisal network. Moreover, a clearinghouse could help in the formation of a set of standards for appraisal efforts. In some

sense, the clearinghouse could become a micro-appraisal project in itself - appraising how existing endeavors aid us in assessing worldwide institutional performance. Through a clearinghouse, data could be more easily shared, since researchers would have some knowledge of who was doing what. Given the enormous costs of transnational research, such data sharing could be very cost-effective, enabling more scholars to consider doing appraisal projects than now can. A clearinghouse would also allow scholars to avoid some pitfalls through noting others' experiences, so all learning would not have to be trial and error. In effect, the clearinghouse would play a feedback function, providing an arena for persons in the "appraisal game" to suggest biases inherent in each others' indicators, to propose new ways of tackling old problems, and to introduce new perspectives. If carried out properly, the clearinghouse could help form the foundation for a worldwide appraisal of institutions.

We have proposed six next steps. To gain some sense of what priorities scholars might give to these possible projects, we asked persons who attended the 1977 International Studies Association Convention, where worldwide appraisal of institutions was the theme, to indicate which of these next steps should receive highest priority. Table 11.2 shows that over one-tenth of those responding thought each project should have the highest priority - no one project stood out. A further examination of the questionnaire responses revealed that one-fourth of those who were inherently interested in the worldwide appraisal of institutions favored putting more initial effort into pilot projects. One-fourth of those who were more skeptical of a global appraisal effort favored focusing first on indicator validity.

Table 11.2. Percent of Respondents Assigning
Highest Priority to Proposed Next Steps
(N = 201)

Proposed Project	Percent
Inventory	18
International Conference	13
Establishing Value Equivalencies	14
Pilot Projects	19
Establishing Indicator Validity	16
Clearinghouse	13
Other	7

In hopes of satisfying the skeptic but also maintaining the interest of the more committed, the authors believe it is important to see some headway in all these areas in the near future. Each of the next steps brings us closer to our goal of monitoring institutional performance on the global basis. When combined, the outcomes of these various next steps make more feasible our ability to appraise progress toward the realization of human dignity.

REFERENCES

Biderman, Albert D. "Development of Comparable Cross-National Indicators for the U.S. Social Report, 1976." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, St. Louis, March 16-20, 1977.

Brewer, Gary D., and Brunner, Ronald D., eds. Political Development and Change. New York: Free Press, 1975.

Brown, Lester R.; McGrath, Patricia L.; and Stokes, Bruce. Twenty-Two Dimensions of the Population Problem, Worldwatch Paper 5. Washington, DC: Worldwatch Institute, March 1976.

Buergenthal, Thomas and Torney, Judith V. International Human Rights and International Education. Washington, DC: U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, 1976.

Bureau of Social Science Research. Newsletter XI, nos. 1-3 (Winter-Summer 1977).

Cantril, Hadley. The Pattern of Human Concerns. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1965.

Coleman, James S. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Collins, Kent H. Statement to Senate Foreign Relations Committee Hearing, September 20, 1976.

Collins, Kent H. "Kettering/Gallup Human Needs and Satisfactions Survey in 60 Nations." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, St. Louis, March 16-20, 1977.

Ferriss, Abbott L. Indicators of Trends in American Education. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.

Ferriss, Abbott L. Indicators of Trends in Health Status. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1972.

Gallup, George H. Statement to Senate Foreign Relations Committee Hearing, September 20, 1976.

Gallup, George H. "Human Needs and Satisfactions: A Global Survey." Public Opinion Quarterly 41 (1976-77): 459-67.

Greenfield, Meg. "The Risky Rhetoric of Human Rights." Newsweek, July 18, 1977.

International Institute for Strategic Studies. The Military Balance 1977-1978. London, 1977.

Lasswell, Harold D. The Future of Political Science. New York: Atherton, 1963.

Lasswell, Harold D. The Future of Political Science. New York: Atherton, 1963.

Lasswell, Harold D., and Kaplan, Abraham. Power and Society. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1950.

Lazlo, Ervin. Goals for Mankind: A Report to The Club of Rome on the New Horizons of Global Community. New York: New American Library, 1977.

McGrath, Patricia L. The Unfinished Assignment: Equal Education for Women, Worldwatch Paper 7. Washington, DC: Worldwatch Institute, July 1976.

Milbrath, Lester. "Environmental Quality and the Quality of Life." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, St. Louis, March 16-20, 1977.

Morehouse, Ward. "Statement on Global Appraisal - Where Have We Been and Where Should We Be Going." Transcript of oral comments and paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, St. Louis, March 16-20, 1977.

Newland, Kathleen. Women in Politics: A Global Review, Worldwatch Paper 3. Washington, DC: Worldwatch Institute, December 1975.

New York Times. "A New Index on the Quality of Life." March 13, 1977.

OECD Social Indicator Development Programme. Measuring Social Well-Being. Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 1976.

OECD Social Indicator Development Programme. 1976 Progress Report on Phase II: Plan for Future Activities. Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 1977.

Overseas Development Council. The United States and World Development: Agenda 1977. New York: Praeger, 1977.

Segal, David R. "Worker Democracy in the Military." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, St. Louis, March 16-20, 1977.

INSTI1

Sivard
1977.

Snydei
Harold
Goverr
terly :

Stockh
mamen
& Lon

Torne
Civic
York:

Weissl
prepa:
nation

Wilcox
Klong
A Bib

World
stitut

Yearb
Bruss

Sivard, Ruth Leger.   World Military and Social Expenditures 1977. Leesburg, VA: WMSE Publications, 1977.

Snyder, Richard C.; Hermann, Charles F.; and Lasswell, Harold D. "Global Monitoring System: Appraising the Effects of Government on Human Dignity." International Studies Quarterly 20 (1976): 221-60.

Stockholm International Peace Research Institute.   World Armaments and Disarmament: SIPRI Yearbook of 1977.   Stockholm & London: Almqvist & Wiksell, MIT Press, 1977.

Torney, Judith V.; Oppenheim, A.N.; and Farnen, R.F. Civic Education in Ten Countries: An Empirical Study.   New York: Halsted Press, 1975.

Weissbrodt, David.   "Amnesty International."   Statement prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, St. Louis, March 16-20, 1977.

Wilcox, Leslie D.; Brooks, Ralph M.; Beal, George M.; and Klongan, Gerald E. Social Indicators and Societal Monitoring: A Bibliography.   San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Elsevier, 1972.

Worldwatch Institute.   Pamphlet put out by Worldwatch Institute, Washington, DC, 1977.

Yearbook of World Problems and Human Potential, 1976. Brussels: Union of International Associations, 1976.