

1: Water resource management - Wikipedia

resource distribution makes for some contorted logic and nonsensical formula-tions. For example, Huang characterizes marriage as a "resource" (pp. 65,).

This article has been cited by other articles in PMC. Abstract Background Equitable distribution of health system resources has been a serious challenge for long ago among the health policy makers. Conducted studies have mostly ever had emphasis on equality rather than equity. In this paper we have attempted to examine both equality and equity in resources distribution. Method This is an applied and descriptive study in which we plotted Lorenz and concentration curves to describe graphically the distribution of hemodialysis beds and nephrologists as two complementary resources in health care in relation to hemodialysis patients. To end this, inequality and inequity were measured by calculating Gini- coefficient, concentration and Robin Hood indices. Results The results showed that inequality was not seen in hemodialysis beds in population level. However, distribution of nephrologists without considering population needs was accompanied with some sort of inequality. Gini- coefficient for beds and nephrologists distribution in population level was respectively 0. Hence, calculation of concentration index for distribution of hemodialysis beds and nephrologists with regard to population needs indicated that unlike beds distribution, equity gap between nephrologists distribution against patients distribution among the provinces was considerably significant again. Equity, Lorenz curve, Gini- coefficient, Concentration index Introduction Issues related to the equity in distribution of health resources are considered as the most important challenges for researchers, planners and policy-makers in the health sector 1 , 2. Equity, by definition, means equal distribution of resources among the people in consideration of their needs 3 â€” 6. Conducted studies in Iran have mostly assessed the geographical distribution of resources in population level. That is, distribution without considering the population needs. One of the most applicable indicators used across the world to measure the size of inequity and equality in health care resources is Gini coefficient 10 , However, other indicators like concentration index and Robin Hood have also been applied to take out the scale of equity in distributed resources 11 , Hospital beds and specialists in health systems are considered as two of the most precious resources In most cases inappropriate distribution of this complementary resources can, on one hand, lead to the wasting health resources and, on the other hand, imposing extra cost on patients The issue is as much important that the world health organization WHO has also emphasized on the necessity of attention to the equity principle in distribution of health resources, because one of the leading indicators in health systems i. These problems are mostly seen among the developing countries due to weaknesses in information infrastructure of health system 17 , Chronic kidney diseases CKD and end-stage renal disease ESRD are of the most important conditions that not only threaten the physical health of patients but they also have an enormous potential to impose huge pressure on the budget restrictions of health systems Poor referrals and diagnosis, which may be resulted from inequity in distribution of kidney â€” related specialties, can provide the situation for high-risk patients to reach ESRD. In other words, management and control of these kinds of diseases, to a large extent, depend on the ways upon which the related resources have been distributed The more distribution is equitable, the easier management and their control would be Therefore, management and control of risk factors increasing chronic kidney failure and also improving quality of services delivered to the dialysis patients depend on the implementing of integrated medical practices as well as providing equitable access to complementary needed resources According to the recent statistics, there are hemodialysis patients, hemodialysis beds and nephrologists in Iran. Thus necessity of paying attention to equity as a rational and moral principal in distribution of resources whether physically or humane among the provinces can be a suitable strategy to slow the quantity of patients demanding kidney replacement treatments through earlier diagnosis and as well as help the improvement of quality of delivered services to the hemodialysis patients and finally can reduce the pressure on scarce resources 19 , Lorenz curve and Gini coefficient along with concentration index and Robin Hood are among the frequently used indicators very often applied to analyze equity and equality in distribution of health resources 22 , Lorenz curve compares the distribution of a specific variable with equal distribution of same

variable, while in calculation of concentration index; the distribution of two different variables is assessed. According to the best available information, in Iran such a study with this approach has not been conducted yet. Thus, this study aimed to evaluate equity in geographical distribution of nephrologists and hemo-dialysis beds at the same time in Iran based on the need indicator i . Methods Geographical units of analysis Iran consists of 30 provinces that generally all of health care services in every Province are supervised through medical science university. In this research, we considered every Province as an analysis unit. Therefore, all data for year including the number of hemodialysis patients, hemodialysis beds and the number of nephrologists per each Province were collected from health ministry of Iran. Then we calculated data parameters e . Measuring equality and equity We used Gini coefficient to assess equality in distribution of beds and nephrologists in population level. In present study we used suggested formula by Brown 26 as follows:

2: Social Media for Doctors - Underused or Overrated?

Get this from a library! Power, entitlement, and social practice: resource distribution in North China villages. [Xiyi Huang] -- "Rapid economic and social transformation in rural China has aroused enormous scholarly interest at home and abroad.

Professional Networking Two main types of social networks are available for you to connect with colleagues: Intended for medical professionals only. Intended for the public at large. Anyone can sign up and begin posting content for a specific or general audience. Examples include Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn and Instagram The former is especially great for connecting with colleagues. In a survey of SERMO users, 46 percent say they use the social network to share second opinions on patient cases. Forty-one percent are logging on for casual discussions, i. Nearly 50 percent of surveyed doctors use a social network to share second opinions with colleagues. Practice Marketing Marketing your practice via social media is best done through consumer social networks, e. Previous research reports have taught us patients really care about your web presence because they use online reviews as a key selection criteria when looking for a new doctor. In our physician survey, respondents were asked what is keeping them from maintaining a social media presence to attract or retain patients. A PwC Health Research Institute study found 41 percent of patients take social media content into consideration when selecting a doctor. Our findings indicate some physicians do want to market themselves on social, but are coming up against the challenges listed in our graph. We offer you the solutions to get rid of those challenges in this table: Twitter, for example, lets you schedule posts weeks in advance. Encourage staff to submit ideas for future posts. Not enough help from staff Help from staff is ideal, but unnecessary. The Doctors Company is also a great resource for physicians to learn best practices about posting on Facebook, Twitter and even YouTube. Still not sure what implementing social at your practice would look like? Check out this recent Facebook post from Texas-based solo physician Dr. Kadir is welcoming new patients, but also keeping her practice on the minds of existing patients and eliciting positive feedback in the process. This means doctors that do use social have a competitive advantage over their peers. Patient Education Millions of Americans are already looking up health information online, even though researchers note that it often comes from unreliable sources. You have the chance to disseminate accurate, thoughtful and helpful health information through social media. But would patients actually read your educational posts? Yes, according to our data! For our last survey, we asked U. To help you determine what kind of posts would drive the most patient engagement, we asked respondents to pick the most helpful types of content their doctor could post on social media to contribute to their health care: Top Social Media Content Types Patients Want From Doctors This is great news for physicians, especially as providers move to value-based care models , where patient health outcomes are prioritized over number of services performed. With this shift, it is increasingly important for practices to ensure patients are able to identify health problems early on, follow care instructions well and lead healthy lifestyles. Social media is a free way to educate patients on all these objectives. New York-based orthopedist Dr. Just be sure to explain difficult concepts in a way that is easy to understand. Use videos or images when possible to make your posts pop. Seeing as the majority of patients surveyed 74 percent are willing to check your social media feeds for educational content on a daily or weekly basis, it would be a missed opportunity to ignore their desire for preventive and follow-up care information. Consider automating parts of your clinical and operational processes by investing in medical office software. The time savings can help you find a few minutes each week you can devote to developing a social presence.

3: The Social Dimensions of Scientific Knowledge (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

Power, Entitlement and Social Practice: Resource Distribution in North China Villages (review) (p. 16), or with the conclusion that "[c]hange in the nature of marriage finance and in the.

Historical Background Philosophers who study the social character of scientific knowledge can trace their lineage at least as far as John Stuart Mill. Mill, Charles Sanders Peirce, and Karl Popper all took some type of critical interaction among persons as central to the validation of knowledge claims. Mill argues from the fallibility of human knowers to the necessity of unobstructed opportunity for and practice of the critical discussion of ideas. Only such critical discussion can assure us of the justifiability of the true beliefs we do have and can help us avoid falsity or the partiality of belief or opinion framed in the context of just one point of view. Critical interaction maintains the freshness of our reasons and is instrumental in the improvement of both the content and the reasons of our beliefs. The achievement of knowledge, then, is a social or collective, not an individual, matter. Whatever the correct reading of this particular statement, Peirce elsewhere makes it clear that, in his view, truth is both attainable and beyond the reach of any individual. Peirce puts great stock in instigating doubt and critical interaction as means to knowledge. Thus, whether his theory of truth is consensualist or realist, his view of the practices by which we attain it grants a central place to dialogue and social interaction. Popper is often treated as a precursor of social epistemology because of his emphasis on the importance of criticism in the development of scientific knowledge. Two concepts of criticism are found in his works Popper , and these can be described as logical and practical senses of falsification. The logical sense of falsification is just the structure of a modus tollens argument, in which a hypothesis is falsified by the demonstration that one of its logical consequences is false. This is one notion of criticism, but it is a matter of formal relations between statements. This is a social activity. For Popper the methodology of science is falsificationist in both its logical and practical senses, and science progresses through the demonstration by falsification of the untenability of theories and hypotheses. The work of Mill, Peirce, and Popper is a resource for philosophers presently exploring the social dimensions of scientific knowledge. However, the current debates are framed in the context of developments in both philosophy of science and in history and social studies of science following the collapse of the logical empiricist consensus. The philosophers of the Vienna Circle are conventionally associated with an uncritical form of positivism and with the logical empiricism that replaced American pragmatism in the s and s. According to some recent scholars, however, they saw natural science as a potent force for progressive social change. Cartwright, Cat, and Chang ; Giere and Richardson, eds. While one development of this point of view leads to scientism, the view that any meaningful question can be answered by the methods of science; another development leads to inquiry into what social conditions promote the growth of scientific knowledge. Logical empiricism, the version of Vienna Circle philosophy that developed in the United States, focused on logical, internal aspects of scientific knowledge and discouraged philosophical inquiry into the social dimensions of science. This family of positions provoked a counter-response among philosophers. These responses are marked by an effort to acknowledge some social dimensions to scientific knowledge while at the same time maintaining its epistemological legitimacy, which they take to be undermined by the new sociology. At the same time, features of the organization of scientific inquiry compel philosophers to consider their implications for the normative analysis of scientific practices. Big Science, Trust, and Authority The second half of the twentieth century saw the emergence of what has come to be known as Big Science: Theoretical and experimental physicists located at various sites across the country, though principally at Los Alamos, New Mexico, worked on sub-problems of the project under the overall direction of J. While academic and military research have since been to some degree separated, much experimental research in physics, especially high energy particle physics, continues to be pursued by large teams of researchers. Research in other areas of science as well, for example the work comprehended under the umbrella of the Human Genome Project, has taken on some of the properties of Big Science, requiring multiple forms of expertise. In addition to the emergence of Big Science, the transition from small scale university or even amateur science to institutionalized research with major economic impacts supported by

national funding bodies and connected across international borders has seemed to call for new ethical and epistemological thinking. Moreover, the consequent dependence of research on central funding bodies and increasingly, private foundations or commercial entities, prompts questions about the degree of independence of contemporary scientific knowledge from its social and economic context. John Hardwig articulated one philosophical dilemma posed by large teams of researchers. Each member or subgroup participating in such a project is required because each has a crucial bit of expertise not possessed by any other member or subgroup. This may be knowledge of a part of the instrumentation, the ability to perform a certain kind of calculation, the ability to make a certain kind of measurement or observation. The consequence is an experimental result, for example, the measurement of a property such as the decay rate or spin of a given particle the evidence for which is not fully understood by any single participant in the experiment. This leads Hardwig to ask two questions, one about the evidential status of testimony, and one about the nature of the knowing subject in these cases. With respect to the latter, Hardwig says that either the group as a whole, but no single member, knows or it is possible to know vicariously. Neither of these is palatable to him. Talking about the group or the community knowing smacks of superorganisms and transcendent entities and Hardwig shrinks from that solution. Vicarious knowledge, knowing without oneself possessing the evidence for the truth of what one knows, requires, according to Hardwig, too much of a departure from our ordinary concepts of knowledge. The first question is, as Hardwig notes, part of a more general discussion about the epistemic value of testimony. Much of what passes for common knowledge is acquired from others. We depend on experts to tell us what is wrong or right with our appliances, our cars, our bodies. Indeed, much of what we later come to know depends on what we previously learned as children from our parents and teachers. We acquire knowledge of the world through the institutions of education, journalism, and scientific inquiry. Philosophers disagree about the status of beliefs acquired in this way. Here is the question: Some philosophers, as Locke and Hume seem to have, argue that only what one has observed oneself could count as a good reason for belief, and that the testimony of another is, therefore, never sufficient warrant for belief. A number of philosophers have recently offered alternative analyses focusing on one or another element in the problem. In practice, however, only some results are so checked and many are simply accepted on trust. Not only must positive results be accepted on trust, but claims of failure to replicate as well as other critiques must be also. Thus, just as in the non-scientific world information is accepted on trust, so in science, knowledge grows by depending on the testimony of others. What are the implications of accepting this fact for our conceptions of the reliability of scientific knowledge? David Hull, in his argues that because the overall structure of reward and punishment in the sciences is a powerful incentive not to cheat, further epistemological analysis of the sciences is unnecessary. The structure itself guarantees the veridicality of research reports. And, while the advocates of cold fusion were convinced that their experiments had produced the phenomenon, there have also been cases of outright fraud. Thus, even if the structure of reward and punishment is an incentive not to cheat, it does not guarantee the veridicality of every research report. The reward individual scientists seek is credit. That is, they seek recognition, to have their work cited as important and as necessary to further scientific progress. The scientific community seeks true theories or adequate models. Credit, or recognition, accrues to individuals to the extent they are perceived as having contributed to that community goal. There is a strong incentive to cheat, to try to obtain credit without necessarily having done the work. Both Alvin Goldman Goldman, , and Philip Kitcher have treated the potential for premature, or otherwise improperly interested reporting of results to corrupt the sciences as a question to be answered by means of decision theoretic models. The decision theoretic approach to problems of trust and authority treats both credit and truth as utilities. The challenge then is to devise formulas that show that actions designed to maximize credit also maximize truth. Kitcher, in particular, develops formulas intended to show that even in situations peopled by non-epistemically motivated individuals that is, individuals motivated more by a desire for credit than by a desire for truth , the reward structure of the community can be organized in such a way as to maximize truth and foster scientific progress. One consequence of this approach is to treat scientific fraud and value or interest infused science as the same problem. One advantage is that it incorporates the motivation to cheat into the solution to the problem of cheating. But one may wonder how effective this solution really is. Increasingly, we learn of

problematic behavior in science based industries, such as the pharmaceutical industry. Results are withheld or distorted, authorship is manipulated. Hot areas, such as stem cell research or cloning have been subjected to fraudulent research. Thus, even if the structure of reward and punishment is in principle an incentive not to cheat, it does not guarantee the reliability of every research report. Community issues have been addressed under the banners of research ethics and of peer review. One might think that the only ethical requirements on scientists are to protect their research subjects from harm and, as professional scientists, to seek truth above any other goals. This presupposes that seeking truth is a sufficient guide to scientific decision-making. Heather Douglas, in her critical study of the ideal of value-freedom Douglas, rejects this notion. Douglas draws on her earlier study of inductive risk Douglas to press the point that countless methodological decisions required in the course of carrying out a single piece of research are underdetermined by the factual elements of the situation and must be guided by an assessment of the consequences of being wrong. Science is not value-free, but can be protected from the deleterious effects of values if scientists take steps to mitigate the influence of inappropriate values. One step is to distinguish between direct and indirect roles of values; another is the articulation of guidelines for individual scientists. Values play a direct role when they provide direct motivation to accept or reject a theory; they play an indirect role when they play a role in evaluating the consequences of accepting or rejecting a claim, thus influencing what will count as sufficient evidence to accept or reject. The responsibility of scientists is to make sure that values do not play a direct role in their work and to be transparent about the indirect roles of values. Steel and Whyte examine testing guidelines developed by pharmaceutical companies to point out that the very same decision may be motivated by values playing a direct role or playing an indirect role. Elliott questions whether only harmful consequences should be considered. If science is to be useful to policy makers, then questions of relative social benefit should also be permitted to play a role. This point will be pursued below. Torsten Wilholt argues that the research situation is more complicated than the epistemic vs. He argues that the reliance called for in science extends beyond the veridicality of reported results to the values guiding the investigators relied upon. Most research involves both results expressed statistically which requires choice of significance threshold and balancing chances of Type I vs. Type II error and multiple steps each requiring methodological decisions. These decisions, Wilholt argues, represent trade-offs among the reliability of positive results, the reliability of negative results, and the power of the investigation. In making these tradeoffs, the investigator is per force guided by an evaluation of the consequences of the various possible outcomes of the study. Wilholt references arguments about inductive risk offered originally by Richard Rudner and elaborated by Heather Douglas and discussed below. This attitude is more than epistemic reliance, but a deeper attitude: For Wilholt, then, scientific inquiry engages ethical norms as well as epistemic norms. Formal or mechanical solutions such as those suggested by the application of decision theoretic models are not sufficient, if the community must be held together by shared ethical values. Peer review and replication are methods the scientific community, indeed the research world in general, employs to assure consumers of scientific research that the work is credible. Peer review both of research proposals and of research reports submitted for publication screens for quality, which includes methodological competence and appropriateness as well as for originality and significance, while replication is intended to probe the robustness of results when reported experiments are carried out in different laboratories and with slight changes to experimental conditions. Scholars of peer review have noted various forms of bias entering into the peer review process.

4: Conclusions // Purdue Writing Lab

Uneven Distribution Of Natural Resources. Resources are defined as a means of meeting a need, particularly an economic or social need, of the people. The term usually refers to natural resources like land, water, air.

Health Equity and Social Justice Share: The Roots of Health Inequity: A Web-Based Course for the Public Health Workforce, offers health department staff a place to investigate the relationship between social injustice—the fundamental cause of health inequities—and everyday public health practice. The Building Networks Project: Kellogg Foundation and the Kresge Foundation links public health with the discipline and strategies of community organizing in five states in the Midwest: Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, and Wisconsin. The goal is to create strong, flexible, and durable statewide teams by devising strategies for realizing structural reforms. These reforms refer to transforming the decision-making processes that produce unhealthful living and working conditions by making them more democratic and accountable. As a result, communities can become more effective and powerful in supporting the social change necessary to eliminate health inequities. Richard Hofrichter discussing how structural racism and class oppression are implicated as root causes of health inequities as well as strategies for acting upon root causes. Part II Intersectionality discusses intersectionality, a framework for understanding how multiple social identities i. Part III Stories from the Field features local public health practitioners discussing how to embed health equity and social justice into public health practice. Roots of Health Inequity Roots of Health Inequity is an online learning collaborative and web-based course designed for the public health workforce. The site offers a starting place for those who want to address systemic differences in health and wellness that are actionable, unfair, and unjust. Based on a social justice framework, the course is an introduction to ground public health practitioners in concepts and strategies for taking action in everyday practice. Funded by the National Center for Minority Health and Health Disparities at the National Institutes of Health, the course is open free of charge to any professional interested in addressing the root causes of health inequity. The course material is written primarily for local public health department staff at all levels. The interactive site includes five units and features a rich source of case studies, readings, presentations, video, audio, and group-directed discussions. Participants can also expect to: Build a community of peers dedicated to addressing health equity. Strategize more effective ways to act on the root causes of health inequity. Lay the foundation for an organizational culture committed to tackling social injustice. For more information, including guidance documents about how your organization can use the course, please contact rootsofhealthinequity@naccho.org. The Roots of Health Inequity is an online learning collaborative designed for the public health workforce. Based on a social justice framework, the course introduces public health practitioners to concepts and strategies for taking action in everyday practice. This guide offers six lesson plans focused on specific aspects of public health practice. These plans include activities and readings that describe components of a conceptual framework informing the values, strategic plans, and assessment activities at a LHD that is committed to confronting health inequities. The guide also describes tips and tools for using RHI including guidelines for forming successful learning groups and facilitation and meeting organizing tips for the Roots of Health Inequity curriculum. Roots of Health Inequity Instructional Video: This video offers a tour of the website and course units. You can link to the video from YouTube or use the YouTube embed code to add the video to a website. Main Features of this Course: Index of Course Units: Each unit provides an in-depth look at a specific topic using various types of learning modalities — interactive maps and timelines, slideshows, geographic story-telling, resource libraries, video presentations, and interviews with practitioners. Find and use the parts of the course that most interest you. The course material is designed around group participation — primarily through group discussions on specific topics and the results of activities in the units. Learn how to plan, select, and create a Learning Group on the website. Share this presentation about the Roots of Health Inequity with your partners and colleagues. Roots of Health Inequity informational booklet: Learn about our purpose, why it matters, and why now. Roots of Health Inequity Promotional Statements: Use these promotional statements and the social media content to share RHI with partners. How are you using the Roots of Health Inequity? In this video, Dr.

5: Caseworker (social work) - Wikipedia

Download Citation on ResearchGate | On Jan 1, , Helen F. Siu and others published Power, Entitlement and Social Practice: Resource Distribution in North China Villages by Xiyi Huang }.

Distributive Justice and Redistribution The concept of distributive justice is sometimes understood as the moral assessment of distributions, or as the moral assessment of individual or collective decisions in light of how they affect distributions. These distributions affecting institutions include laws and other social rules governing what kinds of things can be owned and by whom , how they can be acquired, transferred, relinquished, and forfeited, how markets and the production systems are structured, the manner in which decisions concerning trade policy and the monetary system are made, and so on. The concept of redistribution has been invoked extensively in discussions of distributive justice in both the domestic and global context. Indeed, the differences between popular recent approaches to distributive justice, such as libertarianism, prioritarianism, and so-called luck egalitarianism, are sometimes characterized in terms of their attitudes towards redistribution Scheffler Given its robust role in discussions of distributive justice, it is unsurprising that disagreements concerning the permissibility of redistribution have often been quite heated. In this vein, critics of so-called redistributive policies often claim that while individuals may have positive ethical duties to aid poor or unwell persons, it is morally impermissible to compel them to do so through state-administered tax and transfer or other means, unless universal consent for these policies can be secured Narveson , ch. Egalitarians, on the other hand, have often argued that redistribution through compulsory taxation and other coercively imposed measures is required to meet basic material needs or to promote other valuable social goals, and provide a legitimate, though perhaps not morally costless means of doing so. This essay aims to clarify and evaluate some of these disagreements by exploring the many different senses in which the concept of redistribution has been used. It also indicates some of the confusions to which equivocation among different senses of this concept has led. It concludes that the use of the concept of redistribution has tended to obscure rather than clarify the true nature of substantive disagreements about distributive justice. Two kinds of questions concerning redistribution can be identified: Does it have a unified and coherent meaning? Is it purely descriptive, so that we can classify practices as redistributive without evaluating them? Or does the correct application of the term, like democracy, liberty, and perhaps also coercion depend on evaluative judgments? Does the concept of redistribution provide a helpful framework for understanding and evaluating institutional arrangements, or does it invite confusion? Can social practices that are commonly said to involve redistribution be justified? In what contexts and for what purposes is it permissible to adopt these practices? Does the fact that a social practice involves redistribution count for or against it, or does it lack basic moral significance? We might begin to address these questions by looking more closely at the structure of the concept of redistribution. The concept of redistribution can be characterized in terms of four parameters. In assessing whether and how redistribution has occurred, then, the following four questions must be answered: Among which if any subjects did the redistribution take place? Which if any baseline can be defined, of which the present distribution can be seen as a modification? Through which if any social mechanism was the redistribution brought about? Which if any goods have been redistributed? Redistribution refers to modifications of the holdings of particular persons, collective agents, or groups as defined in terms of non-resource holding characteristics , or changes in holdings by groups as defined by resource holdings. Sometimes those from and to whom resources are redistributed are defined as individuals, other times as groups to which individuals are rigidly assigned for example, Whites and Hispanics , and other times to groups that are defined by their holdings for example, the top and bottom quintile. Whether redistribution has occurred, then, can only be determined relative to the set of subjects that is identified. Discussions of redistribution are not always very specific about which kinds of subjects they are concerned with, or about the possible significance of the fact that policies will be more or less redistributive depending on how these subjects are defined. Take, for example, the following claim by Harvard economist Richard Freeman , p. If substantial numbers of people have moved up or down, then redistribution in this sense has taken place. My

focus in this entry will be on the issue of the baseline, since this seems most fundamental. The Baseline Distribution Talk of redistribution implies a baseline, some distribution to which another distribution can be compared. We can explore this concept by examining the different baselines that are implicitly or explicitly adopted when people claim that redistribution has taken place. Once these baseline distributions are clarified, questions regarding the meaning and moral significance of redistribution can be more easily addressed. Economists, for example, often refer to policies as having redistributive effects when they engender a different pattern of holdings than obtained previously. Redistribution of wealth, in this sense, occurs whenever there is a shift in patterns of holdings over time among some set of subjects in response to some policy or other social mechanism. On this understanding, we can determine whether redistribution has taken place by identifying 1 a pattern of holdings at time t_1 that characterizes the initial distribution; 2 a pattern of holdings at time t_2 that characterizes the later distribution; and 3 some policy or other social mechanism that, intentionally or not, caused the change in patterns of holdings between t_1 and t_2 . Changes in the structure of markets, the production system, monetary policy, the allocation of public funds for primary and secondary education, or the level of the minimum wage have all been adopted at least partly for the purpose of bringing about changes in the pattern of holdings. In a recent study, for instance, Alberto Alesina et al. Purposive diachronic redistribution involves the successful implementation of institutions and policies whose purpose is to bring about changes in the holdings of different subjects. On this interpretation, determining whether redistribution has taken place involves identifying 1 the holdings of a set of subjects at time t_1 ; 2 the holdings of these subjects after the policy or institutional changes at t_2 ; 3 an agent or set of agents who have enacted the policy or institutional changes that have engendered changes in holdings; and 4 the purposes of these agents in bringing these changes about. It will not always be easy to identify whether redistribution in this sense has occurred, since the purposes of those who choose and implement policies are often opaque, and also because changes in policies and institutions result from collective decisions involving many agents with diverse and often conflicting purposes. Whether this was an instance of purposive diachronic redistribution is less clear. It may have been part of an overall plan to improve the position of the least advantaged. Or, instead of reflecting a systematic attempt to intervene on behalf of those at the low end of the labor market, the purpose of the legislation may have been to appease organized labor and a generally dissatisfied public. Still other policies may be adopted for the purpose of bringing about changes in the patterns of holdings, but fail to do so, either because of internal flaws in the policies themselves, or because of countervailing pressure from other factors. Expropriation is a clear and familiar case of redistribution as taking. Some local government agency, for example, may expropriate a condominium from the Jones family without compensation and subsequently transfer the condominium to the Matua family. In this example, a good that was initially in the possession of some person or persons is taken out of their possession by some agent perhaps by force or with the threat of force and given to someone else. All of these understandings of redistribution are purely descriptive. These understandings identify distinct but partially overlapping sets of practices and actions as redistributive. Some policies and institutional changes, for example, may involve redistribution in all of these senses. Take, for instance, Taiwan, which, in the course of a decade, radically reduced levels of income inequality $\hat{\epsilon}$ thereby involving a case of diachronic redistribution. And among the most important agricultural reforms were changes in land distribution $\hat{\epsilon}$ thereby involving redistribution as taking. In other cases it may be unclear whether redistribution occurred in any of these three senses. Take, for example, the question of whether income redistribution occurred in the United States between and , accepting as true the findings of a U. With respect to purposive diachronic redistribution, matters are still less clear, since in the case at hand it is hard to determine whether or not officials in the Reagan Administration intended that their policies should have these effects. And the congressional study provides no information about whether purposive taking occurred, since it refers only to income quintiles, which are non-rigidly defined. It is hard to see how redistribution in any of the diachronic senses could have any basic moral significance. That is, that some social reform involves redistribution in this sense would not as such count for or against it. Different institutional arrangements, policies, conventions, and individual behaviors will tend to produce different patterns of holdings. Each set of patterns of holdings engendered by changes in these factors can be viewed as redistributive relative to others,

and whether a policy is redistributive will depend only on when it is adopted and which policies prevailed beforehand. Surely, some will do better after a policy or institutional change than they fared before it – but this is not in itself an objection to it. Similarly, though we may of course have grounds for criticizing the particular kinds of patterns that public officials intend to bring about, or for finding these policies objectionable on other grounds for example, if they are intended to discriminate arbitrarily against minorities or other groups that are socially disfavored, the mere fact that a policy is adopted for the purpose of bringing about changes in patterns of holdings does not count for or against it. Purposive taking may appear to have basic moral significance, such that the fact that a policy involves purposive taking always counts against it. The thought here would be that we tend to develop plans and projects based on things in our physical possession – and it therefore seems wrong to us if these goods are expropriated from us and given to others. But our assessments of takings seem to depend wholly on background facts. Did the Jones family acquire the condominium that the government has redistributed through legitimate means? Regardless of their deep attachment to the condominium, or the unpleasantness of having physical possessions forcefully expropriated, their interests are not unfairly harmed since they lack valid moral claims to its exclusive and enduring use. This example shows that whether takings are morally problematic depends not on facts about the initial physical distribution of goods, but on whether these actions take from or give to people or groups things that are rightfully in their possession. The initial possession of goods raises questions about subsequent transfers only if the initial possession is rightful rather than merely physical. Indeed, where possessions have been acquired through unjust processes, purposive takings may be required to restore rightful possession. That purposive takings have no basic moral significance can be shown in another way. In either case, people have enduring legal entitlements to their net rather than their gross incomes. Yet it seems that these contingent facts about different income tax systems could not possibly make any significant difference to our normative assessment of them. Whether a tax can be morally justified depends, therefore, not on whether it involves a redistributive taking, but whether it is compatible with a plausible account of the processes by which people can acquire valid moral claims to things. There are, of course, reasons for considering certain economic systems just, and others unjust, but the fact that these systems involve redistribution in the diachronic sense does not in itself seem to be relevant to these assessments. Since circumstance could have differed in many ways, judging whether redistribution in this sense has occurred will require identifying a more specific subjunctive baseline situation that can serve as the basis for these assessments. With respect to the question of whether the redistribution of income occurred in the U. Determining whether redistribution occurred relative to each of these baselines can be extremely difficult in practice, since the counterfactuals upon which they depend are quite complex. This is not always adequately recognized. It is sometimes assumed, for example, that baseline 2 is identical to the pattern of gross pre-tax incomes, so that difference between gross and net income will count as redistributed income according to it. But this is mistaken. The presence or absence of income tax will itself substantially influence many market outcomes, including the availability of economic opportunities to persons with different sets of skills and personal characteristics, and the gross incomes that can be earned in different jobs. Had no income tax been in place, altogether different jobs and economic opportunities would most likely have existed, and gross incomes would most likely have been very different. This is because there is no obvious way of determining how much some individual has contributed to production. In cases of interdependent production, things become even more difficult, since there is usually no non-arbitrary way of determining the contributions of different factors of production for example, labor, capital, raw materials, so-called public goods, and so on that jointly lead to total output. But this, too, is mistaken. First, in conditions where there are increasing or decreasing returns to scale, not everyone will be able to receive what they contribute. Where there are increasing returns to scale, for example, it will be impossible for people to receive what they contribute at the margins since the marginal return is greater than the average. Second, while assessments of the marginal productivity of different inputs can be useful for deciding how to use additional resources so as to maximize profit, they do not show how much each resource has produced as a proportion of the total output. Putting aside the manifest difficulties involved in characterizing the pattern of holdings that would obtain in these subjunctive baselines, would the fact that

redistribution has occurred relative to any of them count for or against them as such? Similarly, that a pattern of holdings differs from the pattern that would have obtained in the absence of any taxation would not in itself seem to give us reason to look upon the pattern of holdings that obtain with the tax positively or negatively. For although few would insist that all should receive exactly what they contributed to production, or that valuable social goals ought never to be pursued when they require that some receive more or less than what they contributed, many might feel that an economic system in which people regularly receive much less than what they contribute to production would be unjust. But granting basic moral significance to the set of holdings that would have obtained had all received what they contributed to production is less plausible than it may initially appear. If, for example, a society allowed educational opportunities for technical training only to members of certain ethnic groups, or if poorly designed education system puts these opportunities out of reach for the vast majority of people, then the fact that those who received such training might then be able to contribute more to production would not seem to entitle them to proportionally higher incomes. Second, the contribution of some person to total output will depend not only on the value of their labor, but also on the value of the resources that they own. And the claim that owners of resources should receive the marginal contribution of their resources to production is especially problematic:

6: Drawing Conclusions

Whichever reasoning processes and research methods were used, the final conclusion is critical, determining success or failure. If an otherwise excellent experiment is summarized by a weak conclusion, the results will not be taken seriously.

Overview[edit] Visualisation of the distribution by volume of water on Earth. The entire block comprises 1 million tiny cubes. Of the water resources on Earth only three percent of it is fresh and two-thirds of the freshwater is locked up in ice caps and glaciers. Of the remaining one percent, a fifth is in remote, inaccessible areas and much seasonal rainfall in monsoonal deluges and floods cannot easily be used. As time advances, water is becoming scarcer and having access to clean, safe, drinking water is limited among countries. At present only about 0. Due to the small percentage of water remaining, optimizing the fresh water we have left from natural resources has been a continuous difficulty in several locations worldwide. Much effort in water resource management is directed at optimizing the use of water and in minimizing the environmental impact of water use on the natural environment. The observation of water as an integral part of the ecosystem is based on integrated water resource management, where the quantity and quality of the ecosystem help to determine the nature of the natural resources. As a limited resource, water supply sometimes supposes a challenge. This project faced a difficult task for developing areas: The DESAFIO engineers worked on a water treatment system run with solar power and filters which provides safe water to a very poor community in the state of Minas Gerais. For water as a resource, this is particularly difficult since sources of water can cross many national boundaries and the uses of water include many that are difficult to assign financial value to and may also be difficult to manage in conventional terms. Examples include rare species or ecosystems or the very long term value of ancient groundwater reserves. An assessment of water resource management in agriculture was conducted in by the International Water Management Institute in Sri Lanka to see if the world had sufficient water to provide food for its growing population or not. Regarding food production, the World Bank targets agricultural food production and water resource management as an increasingly global issue that is fostering an important and growing debate. To avoid a global water crisis, farmers will have to strive to increase productivity to meet growing demands for food, while industry and cities find ways to use water more efficiently. This rapid urbanization happens worldwide but mostly in new rising economies and developing countries. Cities in Africa and Asia are growing fastest with 28 out of 39 megacities a city or urban area with more than 10 million inhabitants worldwide in these developing nations. With developing economies water scarcity is a very common and very prevalent issue. As cities offer the best opportunities for selling produce, farmers often have no alternative to using polluted water to irrigate their crops. Wastewater from cities can contain a mixture of pollutants. There is usually wastewater from kitchens and toilets along with rainwater runoff. This means that the water usually contains excessive levels of nutrients and salts, as well as a wide range of pathogens. Heavy metals may also be present, along with traces of antibiotics and endocrine disruptors , such as oestrogens. Developing world countries tend to have the lowest levels of wastewater treatment. Often, the water that farmers use for irrigating crops is contaminated with pathogens from sewage. Common illnesses include diarrhoea , which kills 1. Many cholera outbreaks are also related to the reuse of poorly treated wastewater. Actions that reduce or remove contamination, therefore, have the potential to save a large number of lives and improve livelihoods. This involves analysing the food production process from growing crops to selling them in markets and eating them, then considering where it might be possible to create a barrier against contamination. The UDSS is then able to analyse and show homeowners which of their appliances are using the most water, and which behaviour or habits of the households are not encouraged in order to reduce the water usage, rather than simply giving a total usage figure for the whole property, which will allow people to manage their consumption more economically. The UDSS is based on university research in the field of Management Science , at Loughborough University School of Business and Economics, particularly Decision Support System in household water benchmarking, led by Dr Lili Yang , Reader [15] Future of water resources[edit] One of the biggest concerns for our water-based resources in the future is the

sustainability of the current and even future water resource allocation. Finding a balance between what is needed by humans and what is needed in the environment is an important step in the sustainability of water resources. Attempts to create sustainable freshwater systems have been seen on a national level in countries such as Australia , and such commitment to the environment could set a model for the rest of the world. The field of water resources management will have to continue to adapt to the current and future issues facing the allocation of water. With the growing uncertainties of global climate change and the long term impacts of management actions,the decision-making will be even more difficult. It is likely that ongoing climate change will lead to situations that have not been encountered. As a result, alternative management strategies are sought for in order to avoid setbacks in the allocation of water resources.

7: Health Equity and Social Justice - NACCHO

Read "Power, Entitlement and Social Practice: Resource Distribution in North China Villages (review), China Review International" on DeepDyve, the largest online rental service for scholarly research with thousands of academic publications available at your fingertips.

8: Redistribution (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

The chosen areas are human resources, distribution, marketing and customer services. Human Resources The function of human resources is to provide a focus and strategy for the efficient management of business employees.

9: PAD/D | Gregory Sholette Artist/Writer/Activist NYC

The Uneven Distribution of Fresh Water - The Uneven Distribution of Fresh Water Uneven distribution of fresh water causes an Impact on the lives of people; it causes the destruction of nature, and depletion of a valuable resource.

Berlitz Spanish Business Dictionary (Berlitz Dictionaries) The second house : I am my values and resources Child labor in the District of Columbia. How to get a college degree via the Internet Beer for beginners. I. FOUNDATIONS. Identifying the problem, and the solution Management aptitude test questions and answers Organizing for reproductive control 4. Mamas out of place Fort drum blue book Christietown: A Cece Caruso Mystery. Orozco frescoes at Dartmouth. Why do horses sleep standing up? Off the beaten track in Tel Aviv. Stream management Wet Feet Insider Guide to Booz Allen Hamilton The virtues of the Prophet Abraham Marty makes a date The value in the valley Set theory and hierarchy theory V Contemporary Urban Haiku Sbi money back plan The DWEEBZ (Book One : JaneLee and some DWEEBZ (Dweebz) NCLEX-RN exam cram Secondary Teachers Guide to Free Curriculum Materials Fashion product development process Chemistry a molecular science wertz Stop opening automatically after chrome Korean economy at a crossroad Cowboys Special Woman From silly to serious Smiths The/world Wont Listen A collection of hieroglyphs George W. Quintard. Rethinking vocational and professional education. Italian-English correspondences in the juridical discourse of sports arbitration : an electronic glossary The Captain America complex AutoCAD 2000 3D f/x and design Two-Hour Applique Miscellaneous forms of drama.