INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARTS AND LIBERAL STUDIES (IJALS)
(Open Access, Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Journal)
ISSN Online: 3108-1673

Social Security: A Theoretical Perspective A Critical Synthesis of Four Theories And Their Implications For Social Work

Umesh K

Assistant Professor, Government College, Madappally, Kozhikode, Kerala, India.

Article information

Received: 14th July 2025
Received in revised form: 4th August 2025
Accepted: 24th September 2025
Available online: 23rd October 2025

Volume:1
Issue: 1
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21272158

Abstract

Social security is a cornerstone of the welfare state and an internationally recognised human right, yet the theories most often invoked to justify and design it are drawn from economics and demography and remain largely productivist in orientation. This paper does not merely describe those theories; it critically appraises them and asks what they offer, and what they obscure, when read through the normative lens of social work. Using a conceptual synthesis of secondary literature, the study examines four influential perspectives (the Life Cycle, Dependency Ratio, Human Capital, and Efficiency theories) and evaluates each against social work's commitments to human dignity, social justice, and the person-in-environment. The analysis finds that, taken alone, each theory is partial: the Life Cycle Theory presumes formal, forward-looking savers and marginalises informal workers and unpaid carers; the Dependency Ratio Theory frames the old and disabled as burdens; the Human Capital Theory values people for their productivity; and the Efficiency Theory can license retrenchment in the name of cost containment. The paper argues that these theories are best treated not as rival explanations but as complementary lenses that must be integrated within a rights-based and capability-oriented framework. It proposes such a framework, sets out its implications for social work policy, practice, and research, and illustrates its relevance to the Global South and India.

Keywords: Capability Approach; Dependency Ratio; Human Capital; Life Cycle; Rights-Based Social Protection; Social Justice; Welfare State.

Introduction

Social security is among the defining achievements of the modern welfare state and, since the mid-twentieth century, an internationally recognised human right. The idea grew out of modern liberalism, which called for the active involvement of the state in economic life and for legislation to improve the condition of workers by regulating hours, wages, and working conditions and by providing security against old age, sickness, disability, and the death of a breadwinner (George, 1973; Burns & Goldie, 1991). T. H. Marshall (1950) later theorised such provision as an element of social citizenship (the social rights that, alongside civil and political rights, constitute full membership of a community), while Esping-Andersen (1990) showed that welfare states cluster into distinct regimes that decommodify labour to differing degrees. In this tradition, social security is at once an economic instrument and an expression of the rights and status a society accords its members.

Empirical liberal thinkers such as Robert Dahl and Joseph Schumpeter regarded democracy as the surest route to socio-economic and political justice and encouraged governments to legislate for a more equal society (Thomas & Rousseau, 2016). In practice, social security came to encompass far more than cash transfers: homemaker and day-care services, family allowances and recreational provision, foster care, family counselling, and physical rehabilitation and accident-prevention services all extended protection to vulnerable households and to those disabled by accident, illness, or war (Merriam, 1962).

The origin and protection of social security begin with the state, whose mission is to secure the general well-being of its people; in maintaining social order, protecting rights, and guaranteeing security, the state makes social security a vital element of social welfare. This responsibility is now codified internationally. Articles 22 and 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights affirm everyone's right to social security and to an adequate standard of living; the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966) obliges states to realise that right progressively to the maximum of available resources; and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development reaffirms social protection as a development priority (Shahra, 2022).

The intellectual and institutional history of social security reflects this dual economic and rights-based character. Edwin Witte, often called the father of social security, and the insurance theorist Isaac Max Rubinow shaped its early philosophy; Abraham Epstein founded the American Association for Old Age Security in 1927; the Louisiana politician Dudley J. LeBlanc proposed an old-age stipend in 1932; and Francis Townsend popularised the cause through the “Townsend Plan” in 1933. Franklin Delano Roosevelt gave the phrase “social security” its currency in a 1934 message to Congress, and after the Second World War it became a defining term of welfare-state development worldwide.

Despite this rich history, the theories most often used to justify and design social security are drawn overwhelmingly from economics and demography and are largely productivist in orientation, valuing protection for its effects on saving, growth, and fiscal balance. Such theories are indispensable, but they under-theorise the dignity, justice, informality, and gendered care work that are central to social work and to the realities of the Global South. This paper therefore does more than survey four influential theories: the Life Cycle, Dependency Ratio, Human Capital, and Efficiency theories. It critically appraises each, compares them along their view of the person, the state, and social justice, and argues that they are best integrated within a rights-based and capability-oriented framework. The remainder of the paper reviews the relevant literature, states the problem and method, appraises the four theories in turn, offers a comparative synthesis, develops the integrative framework, and draws implications for social work policy, practice, and research.

Review of literature

Scholarship bearing on social security falls into two broad streams that rarely meet. The first, rooted in political theory and social policy, establishes social security as both a state responsibility and a human right and analyses the welfare state's forms and functions (George, 1973; Burns & Goldie, 1991; Marshall, 1950; Esping-Andersen, 1990; Townsend, 2009; Shahra, 2022). The second, largely economic and demographic, theorises how social security interacts with individual and aggregate behaviour: the life-cycle tradition of Modigliani, Jappelli (2005), and Kotlikoff (1979) on saving, consumption, and intergenerational transfers; the demographic tradition on dependency ratios and pension sustainability (Tanzi & Sadka, 1998; Bloom, Canning, & Moore, 2007); the human-capital tradition of Becker, Schultz, and Mincer on investment in people; and the efficiency tradition on programme design and administration. Social work has its own normative resources for adjudicating between these streams: Sen's (1999) and Nussbaum's (2011) capability approach, Midgley's (1995) social development perspective, Fraser's (1995) account of redistribution and recognition, and the rights-based social protection floor codified by the ILO (2012). Yet these are seldom brought to bear on the economic theories of social security. The gap this study addresses is thus the absence of a critical, integrative synthesis that reads the dominant theories through social work's commitments to dignity and justice.

Objectives

The objectives of the study are:

- To critically examine the theoretical foundations of social security relevant to social work;
- To appraise the assumptions and limitations of the Life Cycle, Dependency Ratio, Human Capital, and Efficiency theories;
- To compare the four theories in terms of their view of the person, the state, and social justice;
- To develop an integrative, rights- and capability-based reading of social security for social work; and
- To draw implications for social work policy, practice, and research, with reference to the Global South.

Statement Of The Problem

Research is theory-oriented and theory-directed, and the quality of social security policy depends on the adequacy of the theories that inform it. The dominant theories, however, are productivist and economistic, and each frames social security narrowly: the Life Cycle Theory as consumption-smoothing, the Dependency Ratio Theory as an actuarial balance, the Human Capital Theory as investment in productivity, and the Efficiency Theory as cost-minimising design. Examined in isolation, and without a normative anchor, these perspectives can license policies (thin coverage for informal workers, austerity justified as demographic necessity, conditionalities that discipline the poor) that conflict with social work's ethical commitments. The problem this paper addresses is therefore twofold: the fragmentation of social security theory across disciplines, and the absence of an integrative account capable of guiding coherent, rights-respecting policy and practice.

Methodology

The study adopts a qualitative, conceptual research design in the tradition of critical literature synthesis. It draws on secondary sources (books, peer-reviewed journals, working papers, and reports of international organisations) purposively selected for their relevance to the four theories. The analysis proceeded in three steps: thematic extraction of each theory's core propositions and proponents; critical appraisal of its assumptions, silences, and limitations; and evaluation against an explicit social work value framework comprising human dignity, social justice, human rights, and the person-in-environment. Rigour was pursued through transparent selection criteria and by triangulating each theory's claims against critiques in the wider literature. As a conceptual synthesis, the study generates interpretation rather than primary empirical data, and its integrative framework is offered as a set of testable propositions rather than as an established finding.

The Four Theories: Exposition And Critical Appraisal

Life Cycle Theory

Core propositions and proponents

The Life Cycle Theory, associated with Franco Modigliani and elaborated by scholars such as Jappelli (2005) and Kotlikoff (1979), holds that individuals seek to smooth consumption over their lifetime, saving in their prime earning years and dissaving in retirement so that consumption remains relatively stable despite fluctuating income. On this view, social security policies should be calibrated to the changing economic needs and risks of youth, working life, retirement, and old age. As government-provided retirement income, social security reduces the need for private saving, and because pay-as-you-go schemes finance current retirees from current workers' contributions, it operates as an intergenerational transfer. The theory has generated a substantial literature on saving behaviour and on the intergenerational, intragenerational, and intertemporal transfers embedded in social security (Samuel & Jones, 1983; Kotlikoff, 1979; Hyeon & Feigenbaum, 2018).

Critical appraisal

The theory's analytical power rests on strong assumptions that limit its reach. It presupposes a rational, forward-looking individual with a formal-sector career, a clear boundary between “working age” and “retirement,” and the disposable income needed to save. In much of the Global South, and India in particular, the majority of workers are in the informal economy with irregular and low incomes that make life-cycle accumulation impossible; for the chronically poor, the logic of voluntary saving simply does not apply. The framework is also largely gender-blind, overlooking the unpaid care work and interrupted labour-force participation that leave many women with thin contributory entitlements. Its methodological individualism, finally, tends to obscure the structural determinants of insecurity (class, caste, and the organisation of labour markets) and to reduce social security to a device for consumption-smoothing rather than a mechanism of redistribution and rights.

Relevance to social work.

Read critically, the theory remains useful: its life-course perspective resonates with social work's attention to developmental stages and helps map when risks concentrate and support is needed. But for social work it must be supplemented by structural and rights-based analysis so that protection reaches those whom the model's assumptions exclude.

Dependency Ratio Theory

Core propositions and proponents

The Dependency Ratio Theory analyses the balance between beneficiaries (the old, disabled, sick, and unemployed) and the working-age population that finances the system. The ratio, obtained by dividing dependants (aged 0–14 and 65 and over) by the working-age population (15–64) and multiplying by 100, is treated as a decisive measure of sustainability: a high ratio raises the burden on workers and strains financing, prompting higher taxes or reduced benefits. Proponents including Bloom and Williamson have linked falling fertility, rising life expectancy, and migration to the fiscal viability of pension systems (Tanzi & Sadka, 1998; Bloom, Canning, & Moore, 2007), with case evidence from China (Xiulin & Shi, 2020), India (Rani, Gopi, & Reddy, 2024), and high-income economies (Burkhard, Polito, & Wickens, 2020; Claire & Ostermeier, 2020).

Critical appraisal

The theory is indispensable for macro-level planning, yet its framing sits uneasily with social work values. By labelling older and disabled people “dependants” and a “burden,” it adopts a deficit and actuarial view of populations that a strengths-based, anti-ageist, and anti-ableist profession must resist. It conflates chronological age with economic dependency, ignoring the continued contributions of older people through care and informal work and treating “working age” as a natural rather than a socially constructed category. Its demographic determinism, moreover, presents fiscal strain as destiny, when in practice the pressure on social security reflects policy choices about labour-market inclusion, productivity, coverage, and financing. Precisely for this reason, the theory is easily mobilised to justify benefit cuts and higher retirement ages.

Relevance to social work

The theory rightly directs attention to the long-run financing of protection in ageing societies. For social work, its insights are best retained while its language is reframed: dependency becomes interdependence and life-course reciprocity, and sustainability is pursued through inclusive, solidaristic financing rather than the retrenchment the “burden” narrative invites.

Human Capital Theory

Core propositions and proponents

Following Becker, Schultz, and Mincer, the Human Capital Theory treats education, training, and health as investments that raise productivity, earnings, and economic security. Social security, on this account, is not only protective but productive: by cushioning the risks associated with education, training, and labour-market transitions, it enables investment in people and thereby supports growth (Yunhua & Huang, 2025). The perspective underpins the influential “social investment” turn in contemporary welfare thinking.

Critical appraisal

The theory's central weakness, from a social work standpoint, is that it values human beings instrumentally, for their productivity and the returns they yield. Those least able to convert investment into earnings, such as people with severe disabilities, the very old, or the chronically ill, are implicitly devalued, which is difficult to reconcile with the profession's commitment to inherent human dignity. Amartya Sen's capability approach offers a pointed corrective: the proper aim of development and protection is not human capital but human capability (the substantive freedoms people have reason to value), and Martha Nussbaum extends this to a threshold of central capabilities, including care and affiliation, owed to every person regardless of productivity (Sen, 1999; Nussbaum, 2011). A productivist reading can also rationalise conditional and tightly targeted schemes that discipline the poor rather than secure their rights.

Relevance to social work

Reframed through the capability approach, the theory's core insight is valuable: investing in education, health, and skills is a legitimate and powerful form of protection. But for social work that investment must be justified by the expansion of capabilities and the securing of dignity, not by productivity alone.

Efficiency Theory

Core propositions and proponents

The Efficiency Theory holds that social security should be designed to maximise benefits while minimising cost and administrative burden, through optimal resource allocation, performance measurement, and simplified, user-friendly delivery. Associated with scholars such as Diamond and Feldstein, it rests on the solidaristic premise that the burden of financing benefits is shared across generations through premiums and taxes, and it interrogates why the state insures longevity so heavily relative to other risks (Bloom, Canning, & Moore, 2007).

Critical appraisal

Efficiency is not a value-neutral criterion. “Minimising cost” can slide into retrenchment, tighter means-testing, and conditionalities that exclude the very people social security exists to protect, while raising non-take-up among eligible claimants. Administrative “efficiency” pursued through aggressive digitisation and biometric verification has, in several settings, produced exclusion errors that harm the most vulnerable, a dynamic visible in debates over technology-linked welfare delivery in India. By privileging allocative and technical efficiency, the theory tends to underweight adequacy, coverage, equity, and the relational quality of access, which are central to social work.

Relevance to social work

Stewardship of scarce public resources is a legitimate concern, and social work need not romanticise inefficiency. The task, rather, is to subordinate efficiency to adequacy, universality, and rights, the standards codified in the ILO's Social Protection Floors Recommendation (ILO, 2012), and to insist that “efficient” systems be judged by whether they reach and dignify those in greatest need.

Comparative synthesis

Placed side by side, the four theories reveal both their complementarity and a shared set of blind spots. Table 1 summarises each theory's central proposition, its principal limitation when judged by social work values, and the implication that follows for the profession.

Table 1. A social-work appraisal of four theories of social security

Theory	Central proposition	Principal limitation (social-work critique)	Implication for social work
Life Cycle	Social security smooths consumption and income across the life course; people save while working and dissave in retirement.	Assumes formal employment, stable careers, and the capacity to save; marginalises informal workers, unpaid carers, and the poor.	Map life-course risks, but pair with structural and rights analysis to reach those outside formal saving.
Dependency Ratio	System sustainability depends on the balance between working-age contributors and non-working dependants.	Frames the old and disabled as “burdens”; conflates age with dependency; treats fiscal strain as demographic destiny.	Reframe dependency as interdependence; contest ageist and ableist framings; advocate inclusive, solidaristic financing.
Human Capital	Social security is an investment that raises skills, productivity, and growth.	Values people instrumentally by productivity; devalues those with low expected “returns.”	Support education and health as protection, but anchor it in capability and dignity, not productivity alone.
Efficiency	Programmes should maximise benefits while minimising cost and administrative burden.	“Efficiency” can mask retrenchment, targeting, and exclusionary conditionalities.	Balance stewardship with adequacy, universality, and rights; guard against exclusion errors.

Three cross-cutting observations follow. First, all four theories are broadly productivist and economistic: they justify social security by its contribution to saving, growth, or fiscal balance rather than by its status as a right grounded in human dignity. Second, several rest on a contributory, formal-employment logic that structurally excludes the informal-sector majority in the Global South, along with women whose care responsibilities interrupt paid work, a limitation the welfare-regime literature exposes but does not resolve for developing contexts (Esping-Andersen, 1990). Third, questions of recognition and justice (who counts, whose contribution is seen, whose needs are met) remain largely invisible, precisely the terrain that Fraser's (1995) pairing of redistribution and recognition and Marshall's (1950) idea of social citizenship bring into view. No single theory, in short, is adequate on its own for a profession whose mandate is social justice.

Toward an integrative framework for social work

The argument of this paper is that the four theories are best understood not as competing explanations but as partial lenses to be integrated within a rights-based and capability-oriented meta-framework. Each answers a different question. The Life Cycle Theory clarifies when needs and risks arise across the life course; the Dependency Ratio Theory specifies the demographic and fiscal constraints within which protection must be financed; the Human Capital Theory shows that protection can be productive, provided its purpose is reframed from productivity to capability; and the Efficiency Theory reminds us that resources are finite and must be stewarded, provided efficiency is subordinated to adequacy and equity. Binding them together is a normative anchor absent from each: social security as a human right that expands capabilities and secures dignity across the life course, financed through solidarity and delivered inclusively. This integration is consistent with the social development perspective in social work (Midgley, 1995), which treats social protection as investment in people and communities, and with the person-in-environment orientation that situates individual security within social, economic, and demographic structures.

From this framework three propositions follow. First, the unit of concern is the person-in-environment across the life course, not the isolated rational saver or the actuarial "dependant." Second, adequacy, coverage, and dignity take priority over efficiency and productivity, which are means rather than ends. Third, financing should be solidaristic and largely tax-based where contributory capacity is limited, so that the informal-sector majority, women, and disabled and older people are included rather than excluded.

Implications follow at three levels. For policy, the framework supports universal or near-universal, rights-based social protection floors adapted to informal economies, and it equips social workers to contest austerity framings that present cuts as demographic necessity. For practice, it directs attention to access, take-up, and the relational dignity of service delivery, and to advocacy for those whom contributory and means-tested systems leave behind. For research, it invites empirical testing of these propositions in specific national contexts, including India, where a large informal workforce, rapid population ageing, and technology-mediated delivery make the tensions among the four theories especially acute.

Conclusion

This paper set out to move beyond description toward a critical, integrative theorisation of social security for social work. It has argued that the Life Cycle, Dependency Ratio, Human Capital, and Efficiency theories, though influential, are each partial and productivist, and that their assumptions sit in tension with social work's commitments to dignity, justice, and the person-in-environment. Read together within a rights-based and capability-oriented framework, however, they become complementary: they map the timing of need, the constraints of financing, the productive potential of protection, and the discipline of stewardship, all subordinated to the overriding purpose of securing human dignity and expanding capabilities.

As a conceptual synthesis of secondary literature, the study's claims are interpretive rather than empirical, and its integrative framework is a proposal to be tested rather than a finding; its focus on four theories also leaves others (among them feminist, ecological, and decolonial perspectives) for future work. Subjecting the framework to empirical scrutiny in the Global South, and especially in India, is the natural next step. Understood in this way, social security is not merely a matter of saving, demography, investment, or cost, but a means through which a just society secures the dignity and capabilities of all its members across the whole of life.

References

Bloom, D. E., Canning, D., & Moore, M. (2007). *A theory of retirement* (NBER Working Paper No. 13630). National Bureau of Economic Research.

Burns, J. H., & Goldie, M. (1991). *The Cambridge history of political thought*. Cambridge University Press.

Claire, H., & Ostermeier, M. (2020). *Population ageing: Alternative measures of dependency and implications for the future of work* (ILO Working Paper No. 5, pp. 1–8). International Labour Organization.

Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*. Polity Press; Princeton University Press.

Fraser, N. (1995). From redistribution to recognition? Dilemmas of justice in a 'post-socialist' age. *New Left Review, I*(212), 68–93.

George, S. H. (1973). *A history of political theory*. Oxford & IBH Publishing.

Hyeon, P., & Feigenbaum, J. (2018). Bounded rationality, life cycle consumption and social security. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization, 146*(C), 65–105.

International Labour Organization. (2012). *Social protection floors recommendation, 2012 (No. 202)*. International Labour Organization.

Jappelli, T. (2005). The life-cycle hypothesis, fiscal policy, and social security. *PSL Quarterly Review, 58*(233–234), 173–186.

Kotlikoff, L. J. (1979). Testing the theory of social security and life cycle accumulation. *American Economic Review, 69*(3), 396–410.

Marshall, T. H. (1950). *Citizenship and social class*. Cambridge University Press.

Merriam. (1962). The relations of social security and social welfare. *Social Security Bulletin, 25*(2), 1–14.

Midgley, J. (1995). *Social development: The developmental perspective in social welfare*. Sage.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). *Creating capabilities: The human development approach*. Harvard University Press.

Richardson, H. J. (1961). *Economic and financial aspects of social security*. George Allen & Unwin.

Samuel, W. H., & Jones, W. L. (1983). Computing the impact of social security using the life cycle consumption function. *American Economic Review, 73*(5), 1036–1052.

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.

Shahra, R. (2022). Making the right to social security a reality for all workers. *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics, 65*, 269–294. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41027-022-00378-6

Tanzi, V., & Sadka, E. (1998). *Increasing dependency ratios, pensions, and tax smoothing* (IMF Working Paper). International Monetary Fund.

Thomas, W. C., & Rousseau, D. L. (2016). *Liberalism: A theoretical and empirical assessment*. Routledge.

Townsend, P. (2009). *Building decent societies: Rethinking the role of social security in development*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Xiulin, J., & Shi, M. (2020). Population age structure, social security, and household consumption rate. *E3S Web of Conferences, 214*, 01021. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202021401021

Yunhua, X., & Huang, R. (2025). Social security contributions and firms' human capital structure: Evidence from China. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.strueco.2025.05.004