

Modern State and the Production of Social Indicators: History and Contemporary Challenges

Pietro Gibertini

University of Campinas (UNICAMP), Brazil

Abstract

This article performs a brief historical recapitulation of the birth and emancipation of social indicators, describing how they came to be consolidated as basic and irreducible tools of public management in modernity and how they helped shape the roles attributed to the States in contemporary politics. To achieve this goal, a bibliographic and documentary review is conducted to contextualize the main socioeconomic and political movements that marked the evolution of these tools in the international historical context. In this way, we go through their emergence in the 1960s, emancipation and democratization in the 1970s and posthumous perspectives in the 1980s. This structure allows, in the end, the realization of a critical reflection on the process of institutionalization and use of these tools in the national scenario of contemporary Brazilian politics and the understanding of how the misuse of them by public administrations can end up distancing the achievement of the objectives intrinsic to their creation, thus consolidating as a relevant subject the continuous scientific production in the development of studies that always seek to deepen the subject and the correct use and dissemination of these indicators.

Keywords: Social indicators, State, Public policies.

1. Introduction

Public policies are an intrinsic reality of our modern constitution, especially when we take into consideration nations that base their social structures on a democratic rule of law.

They adopt several facets and cross several areas of knowledge constituting importance in the same intensity; especially when we take into account agendas that prioritize action in facing issues related to quality of life, social development, economic growth, basic health networks, accessibility, equality and equity.

In the same way, they do not suffice in shallow analyses; taking into account its interdisciplinary locus, it observes in depth its mobilization in the face of problems that transgress belonging to disciplinary foundations and make up several of the wicked problems that constitute the attention and studies of several researchers and bureaucrats who work on the theme. For this very reason, its configuration today goes beyond the initial idealizations of the policy cycle (formulation, agenda setting, implementation and evaluation), constituting a diversity of models and arrangements that aim to innovate when facing adversities and in order to fit more pertinently in several possible realities: as an example, we have issues concerning the intersectionality of public policies, their configuration in networks, direct and indirect influence of stakeholders, political and social participation, deep core beliefs, among several others.

However, something that cuts across all these facets and consolidates in a constant manner and intensity is the use of indicators in the analysis of reality and in the composition of policy interventions. These tools, which according to Jannuzzi (2019) make it possible to move from the "complex and unattainable" to the "simple and modeled", have been consolidated as essential and sedimentary tools in the constitution of public policies by enabling the measurement and understanding of highly complex and even subjective realities, scenarios, and concepts, formalizing methodologies and emancipating scientifically backed interpretations for scenarios that were not tangible before.

These indicators, today, have several categories and permeate the various phases of the cycle of constitution of a public policy - some being created to achieve specific demands of each of these phases. We have from highly known indicators, such as the Gross Domestic Product (GDP), to more technical indicators directed to direct participants in the political process, such as those characteristic of measuring processes or isolated components of a larger database (raw indicators). Each one with its respective specificities, virtues and limitations.

As far as their initial use is concerned, much was limited to a purely economicist vision of the dominant sectors, based mainly on the theoretical formulations of what would come to be considered orthodox economics. It is modern, therefore, to understand the urgent need, previously implicit, to detach state decisions beyond the field of economics and the essentiality of developing what would come to be called social indicators: indicators that are more efficient in understanding the social complexities that were previously unscaled or unresolvable.

This transition, however, did not happen quickly and adopted different characteristics during its historical progression. Considering this scenario, the present article performs a recapitulation of the main socioeconomic contexts that enabled the creation of these indicators and presents the main political mobilizations that enacted their use in public administration, consolidating them today as an indispensable pillar of the referred modern public management. To this end, a survey of studies and documents was conducted to support both the analysis and the context that presented itself as pertinent to the emancipation of these tools.

At the end, a highlight was made of the Brazilian reality and how these tools have developed throughout its history, allowing a critical reflection on how they have been used and what can be politically expected from them in the coming years.

2. Socio-political context in the emancipation of social indicators:

The scenario where we see the initial mobilizations in the development of social indicators concerns the Cold War period and the Keynesian economic models characteristic of the so-called Welfare States.

The end of World War II constituted a bipolar scenario representative of the ideological conflict between the Capitalist and Communist blocks, whose main representatives were, respectively, the United States of America (USA) and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR). This conflict led to the mobilization of other countries in the choice of coalition with one of these blocks, dividing the political manifestations (with occasional caveats) between a capitalist West and a communist East.

Within the Western bloc, it is possible to observe different models of capitalist economy than those that had been developed until the mid-1960s, mainly by its hegemonic centers (USA, Canada, and Western Europe). Much of this has to do with the transition from measuring their degree of civilization using as a basis their level of industrial production, a pattern that was consolidated after the materialization of the second industrial revolution and only gained strength after the debate and emancipation of the so-called Welfare States, especially in the hegemonic capitalist countries of Western Europe, where they developed initially to be referenced and replicated in other regions.

They can be understood as institutionalities developed to intervene with the processes of production and distribution of wealth (Wolf & Oliveira, 2017) and in much aligned with the also rising Keynesian economic models, aiming to build a pattern of high productivity gains coupled with real wage growth (Santagada, 2007) and large social protection systems related to political interventions in the economy and in the distribution of opportunities and socioeconomic security for the population made precarious by the impacts of modernization (Fleury & Ouverney, 2012).

However, these same already industrialized countries had a large gap in understanding why the advance in capital accumulation derived from this model of capitalist production failed to reduce the differences in income and social security found intrinsically in their populations. As Jannuzzi (2019) mentions, prior to this period, population, mortality, and trade statistics were sufficient for countries, by the end of the 19th century, to feel comfortable performing their regulatory functions and monitoring the social trends and needs of their populations. The same author adds that a tax burden not much higher than 10% of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) was satisfactory to deal with the amount of social contingencies that presented themselves as needing attention.

However, this scenario was no longer enough, and the need grew for the development of new tools and indicators that would make it possible to understand this issue beyond an economic bias and the use of first generation indicators.

In this same movement and within the same period, realities not previously scaled and social complexities not previously addressed, however explicit or directly correlated to the income and social security differences proposed to be addressed, began to gain notoriety over the course of the twentieth century. This flourishing was guided mainly by the growing economic stratifications that were now better illuminated by the rise of Marxist theory, an appropriation of European discourses in the creation of critical theories that discoursed on race, class, ethnicity, international political conflicts such as World War II, and the growing social pressure on the State to mobilize against the demands of social movements that were gaining notoriety.

The combination of this turbulent international socio-political period, the dissatisfaction regarding the growing centralization of income, and the need to recognize the new social complexities of modernization made the State management model in developed countries need to be reformulated in order to be better able to solve these conflicts.

It is in this complex scenario that we will see, therefore, the reformulation of state design as an administrative response to the need to neutralize the destructive characteristics of modernization (Fleury & Ouverney, 2012) and the governmental pressure faced with the complex challenge of developing mechanisms for better understanding of these never before tangible scenarios that the initial mobilizations, a priori centralized in the United States of America (USA), for the development of social indicators.

2.1 United States of America and the early movement for the social indicators:

The genesis of social indicators dates back more categorically to the American socio-political situation; especially in the 1960s. The publication of the book *Social Indicators* (Bauer, 1966) marks not only the first use of the terminology, but also represents one of the most significant milestones of what would be called "Social Indicators Movement"; mobilization that had its cradle in the USA but soon spread rapidly to the rest of the world, especially in Europe (IBGE, 2020). In the public sphere, the first reference to what would be defined as social indicators occurs in the same year, with Daniel Bell, in the report of the National Commission on Technology and the American Economy (chapter IX). This report presents the proposal to develop a "social accounting" and a system of "social accounts" to better understand the governmental impacts (or lack thereof) on the American population (Santagada, 2007).

This rise, both of the political vision with a greater social content and of the indicators themselves, did not happen at random in the country. It can be said that there were three main factors that determined the fertile environment for the development of the concept: the first two being the already mentioned dispute over the hegemonic political model during the Cold War and the need for a greater understanding of reality beyond economic indicators, while the last one refers to the growing social tension in the face of American political mobilization against some of its main historical milestones and for the achievement of greater social rights.

Within the first point, we see the growing valorization of technocracy as a response movement to the political-organizational impacts of the Cold War, kicking off what would come to be recognized today as Public Policy as an area of knowledge and academic discipline (Souza, 2006). Souza explains that, bypassing the theoretical contextualizations about the role of the State and its evolution as an institution, as European studies trends were followed, the enthusiasts developed a greater focus on the administrative locus than on the socio-organizational institution itself, making it possible to develop work and theories more focused on governmental actions.

This change in focus brought about by the new strand of studies also made it possible to broaden the debate on the scope of action of the state apparatus in relation to issues outside the economic environment, thus creating space for the emancipation of the second point.

Finally, in the third point, it was understood that the US was going through what we now consider several relevant milestones in its history as a nation: the unpopular participation in the Vietnam War (1955), the assassination of President Kennedy (1963), and the Voting Rights Act (1965) within the Social Movements for Civil Rights. These events destabilized the period with tensions that could not make themselves understood by the government, analysts, and academics through the mere use of first-generation indicators as tools for monitoring the country's social dynamics (IBGE, 2020).

Once the scenario explained above was established, North American sociologists were driven to understand these diverse dynamics under a functionalist function of indicators (Santagada, 2007) and oriented to a resolute proposition of social problems through the organization of governmental actions (Souza, 2006).

This demand, along with the joint administrative efforts of the US government in the constitution of a technocratic apparatus, the formalization of the area of public policies as an academic discipline and the need for state mobilization in face of the complexity of the social dynamics faced by the country in the period resulted in the mobilizations necessary to define a historical basis for the development and initial dissemination of a new set of indicators, today called Social Indicators.

2.2 The 1970s and the international emancipation:

Continuing the history of social indicators, Santagada (2007) explains very well that the 1970s and 1980s were fundamental to materialize the movement in favor of their use in the development of global reports and in the promotion of public policies worldwide. However, it is worth noting that each decade has its own specific characteristics and contributed (or failed to contribute) in different ways.

The 1970s were known for internationally consolidating the use of these indicators, a factor that was promoted mainly by global organizations and institutions such as the United Nations (UN), the former Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (COMECON), the European Economic Community (EEC) and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). Encouraged by the cheapening of equipment and technological advances in the area of computing and statistical applications (Jannuzzi et al., 2020), the mobilization of these bodies in favor of the study and creation of supranational reports was fundamental to encourage regional and governmental organizations to mobilize in the creation and incorporation of mechanisms and methodologies that aimed at making data collection viable for subsequent conversion into social indicators.

This movement was efficient not only by involving developed countries in the creation and application of several social indicators; but also in the mobilization so that developing or underdeveloped countries could also apply the same activities without a further lag in their realization (Jannuzzi et al., 2020).

Much of the merit in face of this generalized mobilization derives from the interest in promoting the so-called synthetic indicators, which consolidated high relevance in this same period. Created in order to overcome the discrepancies identified in the so-called First Generation Indicators, such as the GDP itself (Guimarães & Jannuzzi, 2004), these indicators bring together two or more others in order to consolidate a parameterization for the study of a complex social reality that could not be measured by the use of a raw or simple social indicator.

The indicators did not take long to gain notoriety, mainly due to the proactive position of international organizations in their development and publication, which soon made them popular and efficiently accessible. The best known one nowadays is the Human Development Index (HDI), which was created by the Pakistani economist and former finance minister Mahbub ul Haq and is now consolidated as the main comparative measure when it comes to measuring social development worldwide.

The HDI is also representative of the growing effort by the UN and other organizations to promote ways of dealing with poverty and enabling human development around the world. The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) is a symbolic landmark of this struggle, presenting us with 8 other synthetic indices that would help mark the period of the 1990s as characteristic of the revival of social indicators in the face of global demands and a movement towards the democratization of social indicators (Santagada, 2007), as we will see later.

What Jannuzzi (et al., 2020) cites as a "resounding media success" of these indicators, especially in the aforementioned 1990s, represents an extremely relevant milestone in the history of this same democratization in access, dissemination and interpretation of them among the world population as a whole. Since they are agglutinations of indicators, in great majority, of easy access and compilation by the States around the world; since they have a high degree of intelligibility and media facility and for their high simplifying and synthetic potential (Guimarães & Jannuzzi, 2004), these indicators soon fell in the favor of journalistic vehicles and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) of the third sector for having an accessibility which was previously very restricted to specialists and academics of related areas. Thus, social indicators now serve not only as "methodological lanterns" used only by States and global agencies in order to better understand and act on problems not previously addressed, but also as a public mechanism of popular pressure for a greater accountability of policies and charging for their mobilizations.

It is in this growing emancipation promoted by international bodies that we will find a fertile ground, in 1970, for the publicizing of social indicators towards a governmental elucidation that "well-being" or "quality of life" are as important as measurement and economic focus (Santagada, 2007), further fortifying the movement not only in developed countries, but in developing or underdeveloped ones as well (Jannuzzi et al., 2020).

Faced with this international mobilization and following the example of the Social Indicators (BAUER, 1966), in the USA, European countries such as Germany and England, and Eastern countries such as Japan soon took steps to start similar movements with the intention of producing statistical compendiums that would make the aforementioned movement possible (Santagada, 2007); and Brazil was not left behind.

Around here, the initial movements in favor of incorporating the existing ones and developing new national social indicators date back to the 1970s. Although the so-called "Economic Miracle" characteristic of this period was portrayed as a period of fertility and national enrichment, it was impossible to deny that the growing economic accumulation supported the aggravation of social problems.

In 1973, the GPIS - Social Indicators Project Group - was created, placing as a consensus the fact that economic indicators are not enough for a complete understanding of socioeconomic development in the country (IBGE, 2019). In 1974, as Santagada (2007) explains, the Social Development Council (CDS) was created for the better conduct of social policy and according to the fulfillment of the guidelines of the II National Development Plan (PND). Finally, an extremely relevant milestone was reached in 1979 with the elaboration of the first Social Indicators Report, initial consolidation of the efforts proposed around the theme (IBGE, 2019).

However, it can be strongly said that the importance and relevance of social indicators and the joint development of public policies and statistical information derive from the constituent movements related to redemocratization and the new constitution of 1988 itself. The pressure for restructuring the State aiming at the institutionalization of a more inclusive, comprehensive and democratic Social Protection System in face of the affronts faced by the military dictatorship and the technical improvement in the formulation and implementation of public policies (Jannuzzi et al., 2020) reaffirmed the instrumental pertinence of social indicators in this period. It is also valid to state that the state movement for the decentralization of political decisions and the greater emancipation of states and municipalities towards the development of regionalized policies (Jannuzzi, 2014) added even more to the mobilization for the development of indicators - now aimed at supporting specific and territorialized realities difficult to measure by the mere use of indicators with general or federalized scopes.

This same constitution formalized the legal and conceptual basis for the future development of other guiding documents and emancipators of public policies, now focused on the analysis of scenarios and on the dispute for the representation of specific categories and administrative areas of political work: social assistance, inequality, health, sanitation, infrastructure and urbanism, childhood, among many others.

These documents, whether at the federal, state, or municipal level, have always opted to adopt the use of several types of indicators as a way to base their analysis and claim specific or intersectoral needs in their areas of activity, showing how these tools have consolidated themselves as an indispensable facet of the reflection and structuring of policies at the national level.

It is easy to identify, complementing the above, the direction to the creation of new indicators or platforms that integrate already existing indicators in the performance and evaluation of the demands identified; formalizing these documents not only as users, but also as promoters of the continuous production and consolidation of these tools in the institutional policy making.

In public administrative management, the concern of the Audit Courts in evaluating the performance of programs (Jannuzzi, 2014), the professionalization of the profession, consolidation of the technical apparatus (Jannuzzi et al., 2020), and the institution of social indicators as mechanisms for evaluating and guiding results within the Multi-Year Plans (PPA), Budget Guidelines Law (LDO), and the Annual Budget Law (LOA) represent movements of ascension of these indicators as fundamental pillars of political "language".

It can be said, therefore, that the emancipation of social indicators in Brazil occurred in a similar way as in the United States, with the difference that the original avant-garde movement had already achieved greater international consolidation through the direct encouragement of study and development by global multilateral agencies. Along with the emancipation of synthetic indicators and the need to understand the socioeconomic complexities of a re-democratized nation, Brazil was ready to remodel the functional structures of its State in order to decentralize management and decision-making power at the same time that it modernized its institutional apparatus so as to better meet the growing demands of social movements. Therefore, social indicators serve here as a mechanism of social accountability, a technical tool for public management, and an institutional response to the need for better understanding and action in face of the problems of a modern State; thus, an apparatus that not only meets the needs for change, but also creates and accentuates them through institutional mobilization.

3. Social indicators in the 1980s and contemporary perspectives at the Brazilian national level:

Jannuzzi (et al., 2020) is pertinent in his comment about the importance of statistical information and the development of indicators, social or otherwise, as the basic pillar of efficient public management in Brazil:

"Without IBGE and other institutions in the country, the production of empirical knowledge about the Brazilian reality would be much lower and much less profound, as well as the effectiveness of public action in the equation and mitigation of major national problems would also be immeasurably lower" (2020, p.57).

In light of what has been exposed so far and this comment, it is valid to point out that the production and use of indicators, just like policy making, is not impartial or less detached from the reality that creates it or the worldview that performs it. Following Dye's (1984) analysis of the conception of policy making, we see that public policy is all that the "what the government chooses to do or not to do." That is, the making of the politician is permeated with decisions about what is or is not a management priority for that moment or for that government itself. Thus, not doing, not analyzing or not diagnosing is also a political choice.

Santagada (2007) goes further and reinforces the non-neutrality of policy making within the use of statistics and indicators: technical-scientific objectivity is not an incontestable reality and must be taken into consideration when carrying out the proposed analysis of a period or policy in question.

Thus, just as there were social and political mobilizations during the 1960s and 1970s for the development of social indicators, revitalization of the Welfare State, and the constitution of blunt social welfare mechanisms for the Brazilian reality, the 1980s presented an opposite scenario and a great deal of wear and tear in relation to the advances obtained in the previous decades.

The crisis of the interventionist state, located in the late 1960s and early 1970s (Santagada, 2007), allowed the advance of neoliberal ideals such as fiscal austerity and reduction of the state apparatus to gain notoriety in the 1980s, directly impacting not only the investment and development of social indicators, but also the socio-political relevance they had consolidated up to that point.

The liberal critique of the welfare state raises questions about the relevance of developing public policies and the state's credibility in ensuring a sound economy. What can be said then about technical instruments and apparatuses such as indicators, which guide precisely the decision making process regarding the mentioned segments? In the neoliberal direction towards the consolidation of its three basic pillars: destatization of production, deregulation of economic activity and particularization of rights and benefits (Fernandes, 1995), the emptying of social protection standards and the weakening of the Welfare State mark the 1980s as the decade of relapse along with the advances achieved by the global mobilization towards the emancipation of social indicators. Once the effectiveness of the State in acting towards the social-economic needs of the period is questioned, the investment and mobilization of the State is reduced to the mechanisms that make this positioning possible.

It is a fact that the impacts witnessed in this decade, to a large extent, managed to be circumvented by the second upward movement in favor of social indicators in the 1990s, fortified mainly by the positive motion to ecological sustainability debate and in the "discussions raised by the introduction of the Human Development Report" (Jannuzzi, 2019). One should also highlight the various World Social Summits promoted by the thematic agencies of the United Nations, such as the World Conferences on Environment (1992) and Social Development (1995); or even the Declaration of the Millennium Development Goals promulgated in 2000. However, this mobilization front happened because of the urgency of resuming the topics in question when considering the growing irreversible impacts of human actions on the planet, and not as a form of affront to the neoliberal model of socioeconomic management; which has enabled the recent return of the same ideals and new impacts to the tools in question.

This makes contemporary Brazil share, in the guise of neoliberal policies, the same neglect observed in the 1980s for the development of new public policies of a social nature or attention to the support of social protection systems. In this same movement, the attrition or even discouragement in the production and use of social indicators is present.

Direct consequences of the Fiscal Ceiling and the cuts in resources and questionnaires, such as those of the Agricultural Census in 2016 or the 25% of the transfer to the Demographic Census 2020 (Jannuzzi et al., 2020); movements contrary to the transparency of spending as enacted by the Access to Information Law (LAI) of 2011, representative of the movement to restrict the information provided by indicators of infection and deaths regarding the SARS-COVID pandemic and the increasing restrictions or changes in methodological parameterization of institutions and surveys already established, such as the National Household Sample Survey - PNAD and, more recently, the PNAD Continuous, exemplify the current government's disregard for the mechanisms for measuring social reality in Brazil.

It is in these movements of delegitimization that politics has been losing space in the relation between the State and the market and has lost relevance in the sphere of social action, at the same time that it has been subordinated to the actions of the market and the ideology based solely on profit (ETULAIN et al., 2021). The movement of financialization and economic speculation enacted by the transformation of productive capital into financial assets, as explained by Dowbor in "The age of unproductive capital" (2017), transforms the state into a passive and arbitrary agent of planetary financialization, serving only to sustain a liberal viewpoint in the promotion of an apparatus that is no longer active in solving social stratification problems, but rather passive and promoting them in the face of the glorified ideal of growth and accumulation.

This deregulation allows new formalizations and organizations of state action to be permeated by state conceptions of a liberal nature that articulates it no longer as a policy provider, but rather as a normative agent and regulatory institution of a network of services to society; these are articulated by third sector organizations and companies of a private nature that act as stakeholders or influential agents in the policy making process.

This optic alone do not represent a problem or a threat of the politics or the utilization of the social indicators; on the contrary, network organizations not only present themselves as an innovative format that enables the sharing of knowledge and duties as a way of integrating and bringing political management closer to the citizens that are directed to it, but also provide a decentralization of political work that encourages intersectionality and the promotion of new responses to old demands identified by the State (Senna & Garcia, 2014)

The problem manifests itself when its formalization allows or justifies the State's unaccountability for meeting the refractions related to social issues and as a way to pave the way for an outsourcing of its responsibilities, formalizing the possibility of attacks to interventionist and redistributive policies and the return of a welfarist and privatizing vision of social policies (Pereira & Teixeira, 2013), which are seen as another product or service to be directly or indirectly emancipated by market and productivist ideals.

This process of removal of the State from the sphere of political implementation in favor of the reintegration of private ideals enables the paving of a process known as reification of social indicators (Guimarães & Jannuzzi, 2004), where the inversion of the concept in relation to the measure that was created to make it tangible is observed. This makes that, based on a productivist ideal, the indicators are deprived of their analytical depth in favor of an exacerbated scientific positivism that reduces the capacity of the measure to deeply analyze the scenario it was created to measure, replacing the concept by the formula and mitigating the comprehensiveness and complexity that its concepts were once able to promote.

This process can lead to the one-dimensionalization of reality, where complex analyses and multifaceted terminologies are reduced to its referent indicator; and to the over-dimensionalization of analyses, where that indicator can be used in positions that are not pertinent to it or that could be positively provided for by the use of others.

The resumption of private ideals with the idealization of profit can also lead to a regression in the use of indicators with a highly economic bias, such as the aforementioned GDP, for the parameterization of new social policies; thus disregarding all the advances made in more than 70 years of history of social indicators.

This one-dimensional economic standardization movement makes even the economic debate itself precarious, moving it to the field of mere financialization of capital and making it so that, as Dowbor (2017) rightly points out, it does not account for "what is produced, nor to whom the product goes, nor the reduction of the planet's natural capital, besides accounting as positive the pollution that requires large recovery programs."

We can also comment on the realization of the opposite effect and this one cited, where social or synthetic indicators continue to be used exacerbated now dissociated from its depth and intensifiers of reification by the process of "mediatization" of the same (Jannuzzi, 2014), where its use is projected only by the theoretical contribution and high media impact, but without its proper emancipation or substantiation.

We must, therefore, pay attention to contemporary political transformations and mobilizations regarding the use of social indicators in order to prevent or, whenever possible, mitigate their negative impacts on them. Beyond a discussion on political ideologies or management positions, the debate must be prompted by the preservation and evolution of social indicators in the development of new public policies worldwide - always prioritizing the fight against the several inequalities and stratifications resulting from or intensified by the several modern social conjunctures.

4. Conclusion

Social indicators were born as an administrative, organizational, and academic response of States and governments to the need for better understanding and acting towards the several (and harmful) complexities of modernization during the 20th and 21st centuries. However, these same indicators have not been slow to be democratized and to present several singular stages in their process of emancipation, and have started to serve not only as a response to the needs manifested by the growing social movements, but also as a fundamental artifice in favor of their mobilizations and in a greater accountability regarding their demands.

With this, it is impossible to deny that these indicators have been consolidated as a fundamental pillar to the cycle of public policies and as a tool that has not only been used, but has also helped to reshape the design that the modern State would adopt. Therefore, it is important to highlight the importance of the continuous study and deepening of the creation and use of these indicators, so that they are always up-to-date in face of the complexification of social dynamics and that they can always prove to be resolute in facing contemporary problems, always based on a broad theoretical foundation and, whenever possible, broad (and coherent) media dissemination for the democratic use of the information derived from it.

It is also demonstrated, in view of the "dance of the chairs" characteristic of the Brazilian political scenario, how much there is still to evolve and conquer in order to guarantee that the indicators will never cease to be a referential input, nationally or internationally, for the development of policies in the world. It is not enough, in this case, just to promote their use even where political trends occur that end up devaluing their institutional and scientific potential; the use and social support that these tools have must be strengthened so that they are not used mistakenly or as an electoral platform devoid of value or criticism.

We must, therefore, guarantee not only its stability as a tool, but also its validity as a measurer of complex and abstract themes. Only this way will we be able to validate all the

tangents that make, directly or indirectly, these tools so precious to the political and scientific work of our current reality.

References

- Bauer, R. A. (1966). Social Indicators and sample surveys. Retrieved 11 01, 2021, from <https://www.aapor.org/getattachment/About-Us/History/Presidential-Addresses/Public-Opin-Q-1966-BAUER-339-52.pdf.aspx>
- Dowbor, L. (2017). *A era do capital improdutivo* (2nd ed.). outras palavras & autonomia literária. Retrieved November 02, 2021, from https://dowbor.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/a_era_do_capital_improdutivo_2_impress%C3%A3oV2.pdf
- Dye, T. R. (2016). *Understanding Public Policy*. Pearson. 10.1017/S0008423900037094
- Etulain, C. R., Silva, A. L. G., & Sampaio, D. (2021). Estado, Economia e Desenvolvimento. *Política Pública no Brasil*, 1(1), 349-364. Retrieved November 03, 2021, from <https://www.nepp.unicamp.br/upload/documents/publicacoes/b3fa0d321c18de9b7e148bd0c5c9aa74.pdf>
- Fernandes, L. (1995). *Os fundamentos da ofensiva neoliberal*. Princípios.
- Fleury, S., & Ouverney, A. M. (2012). Política de Saúde: Uma política social. *Políticas e sistemas de saúde no Brasil*, 1(2), 1-42.
- Guimarães, J. S., & Jannuzzi, P. M. (2004). Indicadores sintéticos no processo de formulação e avaliação de políticas públicas: limites e legitimidades. *XIV Encontro Nacional de Estudos Populacionais*, 1-18. Retrieved October 29, 2021, from https://www.novo.justica.gov.br/sua-seguranca-2/seguranca-publica/analise-e-pesquisa/download/estudos/sjcvolume5/a_importancia_indicadores_elaboracao_diagnosticos_para_planejamento_setro_publico.pdf
- Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística - IBGE. (2019). *Síntese de Indicadores Sociais*. IBGE. Retrieved November 02, 2021, from <https://biblioteca.ibge.gov.br/visualizacao/livros/liv101678.pdf>
- Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística - IBGE (Ed.). (2020). *Síntese de Indicadores Sociais*. IBGE. Retrieved October 27, 2021, from <https://biblioteca.ibge.gov.br/visualizacao/livros/liv101760.pdf>
- Jannuzzi, P. M. (2014). *Indicadores Socioeconômicos na Gestão Pública* (2 edição ed.). Universidade de Santa Catarina. Retrieved November 02, 2021, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/336567787_Indicadores_Socioeconomicos_na_Gestao_Publica
- Jannuzzi, P. M. (2019). Estatísticas e Políticas Públicas orientadas por evidências no Brasil: o caso das Políticas de Desenvolvimento Social nos anos 2000. *Revista Brasileira de Geografia*, 64(1), 37-54. Retrieved November 02, 2021, from <https://rbg.ibge.gov.br/index.php/rbg/article/view/2096>
- Jannuzzi, P. M., Carvano, L. M., Rezende, L. M., & Souto, B. F. (2020). Economia política de informação estatística: por uma linha de pesquisa sobre as conexões entre estatística e

- políticas públicas. *População, território e estatísticas públicas : 20 anos do Programa de Pós-Graduação da ENCE*, 1(1), 47-61. Retrieved October 27, 2021, from <https://biblioteca.ibge.gov.br/index.php/biblioteca-catalogo?view=detalhes&id=2101768>
- Pereira, K. Y. d. L., & Teixeira, S. M. (n.d.). Redes e intersectorialidade nas políticas sociais: reflexões sobre sua concepção na política de assistência social. *Textos & Contextos*, 12(1), 114-127. Retrieved July, 01, 2022 from <https://revistaseletronicas.pucrs.br/ojs/index.php/fass/article/view/12990>
- Santagada, S. (2007). Indicadores sociais: Uma primeira abordagem social e histórica. *Pensamento Plural*, 1(1), 113 - 142. Retrieved October 26, 2021, from <https://periodicos.ufpel.edu.br/ojs2/index.php/pensamentoplural/issue/view/288>
- Senna, M. C., & Garcia, D. d. V. (2014). Políticas Sociais e Intersetorialidade: elementos para debate. *O Social em Questão*, XVII(32), 277-294. <http://osocialemquestao.ser.puc-rio.br/cgi/cgilua.exe/sys/start.htm?from%5Finfo%5Findex=1&infoid=282&sid=34>
- Souza, C. (2006). Políticas Públicas: uma revisão de literatura. *Sociologias*, vol. 8(no. 16), 20-45. Retrieved October 27, 2021, from <https://www.scielo.br/j/soc/a/6YsWyBWZSdFgfSqDVQhc4jm/?format=pdf&lang=pt>
- Wolf, P. J. W., & Oliveira, G. C. de. (2017). Os Estados de Bem-Estar Social da Europa Ocidental: tipologias, evidências e vulnerabilidades. *Economia E Sociedade*, 25(3), 661-694. Retrieved July 10, 2022, from <https://periodicos.sbu.unicamp.br/ojs/index.php/ecos/article/view/8648335>