Institute of Social Studies

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

Mainstreaming Child Development: Lessons from the World Bank

A RESEARCH PAPER PRESENTED BY

Dan Onyango-Maina

(Kenya)

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for obtaining the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN DEVELOPMENT STUDIES
SPECIALIZATION: POPULATION AND DEVELOPMENT

MEMBERS OF THE EXAMINING COMMITTEE

Prof. Dr. Ben White
Drs. Loes Keysers

THE HAGUE, NOVEMBER 2001

Enquires:

Postal Address:

Institute of Social Studies
P.O. Box 29776
2502 LT, The Hague
The Netherlands

Telephone : -31-70-4260460
Telefax: -31-70-4260799
e-mail: postmaster@iss.nl

Location:

Kortenaerkade 12
2518 AX, The Hague
The Netherlands

DEDICATION.

To Selpha and Leslie with lots of love.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to express my sincere thanks to all those who helped me in the preparation of this Research Paper. For the successful completion of this work, I am greatly indebted to the faculty members of the Population and Development (PND) and Children and Development (CAD) Programmes at the Institute of Social Studies for the ideas that shaped my thinking. Very special thanks go to my supervisor, Prof. Ben White, for his advice and guidance during this undertaking. I also owe a debt of gratitude to my second reader Loes Keysers for her comments and suggestions. I also thank my colleagues in the Population and Development Programme for discussing this paper during my seminars. Here I wish to single out Smart Sydney Ryson Namagonya (from Malawi), my discussant during both my Design and First Draft seminars, for his comments. Many other people helped in the realisation of this work, through their comments, criticisms and suggestions, and through other types of support provided to me during its preparation. It is impossible to mention them all by name, but I would like to offer them this general expression of my thanks. As much as others have contributed to this research paper however, I alone am responsible for any shortcomings.

Dan Onyango-Maina
The Hague, The Netherlands
November, 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

List of Figures and Tables.

List of Acronyms

UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
SAPs	Structural Adjustment Policies
IMR	Infant Mortality Rate
GAD	Gender and Development
GIDP/UNDP	Gender and Development/United Nations Development Programme
TOR	Terms of Reference
IBRD	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
IDA	International Development Association
IFC	International Finance Corporation
MIGA	Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency
ICSID	International Center for the Settlement of Investment Disputes
BOG	Board of Governors
BED	Board of Executive Directors
OP	Operational Policy
BP	Bank Procedure
GP	Good Practice
OD	Operational Directive
CDF	Comprehensive Development Framework
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
CAS	Country Assistance Strategy
UNU	United Nations University
GNP	Gross National Product
RWG	Redistribution With Growth
PHC	Primary Health Care
FY	Financial Year
EFA	Education For All
PTI	Programmes of Targeted Intervention
WHO	World Health Organisation
PHN	Population, Health, and Nutrition
SPSP	Social Protection Strategy Paper
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

MAINSTREAMING CHILD DEVELOPMENT: LESSONS FROM THE WORLD BANK

A Research Paper Presented by
Dan Onyango-Maina
(Kenya)

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for Obtaining the
Degree of Master of Arts in Development Studies
Specialisation: Population and Development.

Members of the Examining Committee:
Prof. Dr Ben White
Drs. Loes Keysers

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background.

This study sought to find out whether child development has been mainstreamed in the World Bank's development operations between the years 1970 and 2000. This study is premised on the argument that adequate child development makes both social and economic sense. Child development is fundamental to the social wellbeing, economic prosperity, political stability, and even environmental integrity of a society (Young 1996; Selowsky 1981; UNICEF 1966; Myers 1992; Evans et al. 2000).

Human development[1] is a process of enlarging people's choices and their level of achieved wellbeing by expanding their capabilities (long and healthy life, knowledge, access to resources, and full range of political, economic, and social rights and self-respect) and functioning (UNDP 1990). Formation of human capabilities is an accumulative lifelong process beginning at birth and the level and efficiency of capabilities applied in productive socio-economic work in adulthood depends upon the formation of these capabilities in childhood. Child development, therefore, is very crucial to the formation of human capabilities and, hence, to human development.

Child development is both a human capital and a human rights issue, depending on how one looks at it. The human capital approach "views childhood [and child development] as preparation for adulthood, and children in terms of their potential to become economically productive adults, which potential must be protected and nurtured" (Myers 2001: 35). According to this perspective, the children of today are not only the producers, but also the entrepreneurs, consumers, and planners of tomorrow and investment in their development – by families, communities, governments, or by international development partners – can lead to increased productivity, income generation possibilities, and social cost savings. Estimates presented by the last almost thirty years of research indeed suggest a high rate of return on investment in child development (Myers 1992).

[1] Human development is used in this study to refer to social and economic development.

But children, like adults, have a right to their welfare and development as children, and not just as adults in the making. The human rights approach to child development takes a child-centred, child rights approach to child development, and views development (social or economic) as children's right. Based on the 1989 *United Nations Convention on the Right of the Child* (UNICEF 1990), this perspective has at its heart, "the best interest of the child" (Article 3). All "[development] actions [should be] planned and evaluated according to that criterion", and "all parties in the international [development] debate must address [it] in order to maintain their credibility" (Myers 2001: 40, 41).

Both these approaches have been variously used by development institutions and governments to underpin their child related activities. The human capital approach mostly appeals to economic development institutions like the World Bank, and governments. The human rights approach has mostly been fronted for by UNICEF and international Child Rights organisations like Save the Children Alliance (Myers 2001).

Either way, Child development is human development – the two are not mutually exclusive. Its process and outcomes contribute not only to the wellbeing of children but to overall socio-economic development as well. It should therefore form part of the mainstream strategies for realising productive, equitable, sustainable and empowering human development (UNDP 1990), and not regarded as something to follow in the wake of economic development, as has been the case. Child development should never be considered as a problem *for* development and something that it has to dispense of for development to accelerate. Instead, in the making of human development policies, development institutions must consider how child development can be more effectively taken account of within the mainstream frameworks.

1.2 Statement of the problem and purpose.

Despite the arguments and evidence to support the role of child development in socio-economic development, child development has not been given its rightful place within development policies. Child development has not been treated as an integral and strategic part of the mainstream development processes. Instead, children have been treated as victims or a problem for development, needing humanitarian support.

Today, most policies and programmes directed at children in many developing countries are not targeting children because they are the future productive workforce and future citizens, who will determine the socio-economic development trends of tomorrow. Instead, they target children as victims of diseases, wars, various forms of disabilities, debilitating child labour, homelessness – basically as people at the fringes, and not as part of the mainstream development. Mostly, when issues of children are raised, it is usually children who are on the margins of society, swept aside by the tide of socio-economic development. Children appear on the development agenda, and even in academic discourse, as "children in need of special protection", or as "children in especially difficult circumstances" - as victims of food deprivation, inadequate medical care, housing and welfare, violence and abuse of all sorts, and as recipients of aid – and child development as a humanitarian activity. Seldom do children appear as agents of or stakeholders in development. It never occurs to development policy makers that the existence of children in such circumstances, is itself a signal of development failure.

Development institutions and governments should plan to meet child development needs within the frameworks of their mainstream development strategies and policies. Instead, the attention of development planners in developing countries and among development institutions like the World Bank has been focussed on capital investment with insufficient attention being given to child development within the core development policies.

The World Bank is today the world's largest single multilateral donor to the developing world. This study therefore, sought to look into the World Bank's development thinking, strategies and policies between the years 1970 and 2000, to find out whether, and to what extent the Bank has mainstreamed child development in the making and financing of its development strategies and policies, and whether what it does for child development has been part of its overall development policies or actually falls besides the mainstream.

1.3 Research Questions

"The World Bank is the foremost international development agency" (Payer 1982: 15), giving the most financial, and technical support, and wielding the most economic development policy influence in the developing world. The Bank has also been an active player in shaping development thinking since 1970 – it led the Redistribution With Growth and Basic Needs movement predominant in the 1970s, and steered neoliberalism in the 1980s. It is therefore a highly appropriate focus for the question: *Has the World Bank mainstreamed child development in the evolution of its development thinking and policies between the years 1970 and 2000? To what extent, and in what ways?*

This study sought to address the above question through exploring the following specific questions:

1. Which major economic and social development policies has the World Bank pursued between 1970 and the year 2000, and what are the major trends and shifts in the thrust of these policies? What are the specific implications of these policies for child welfare and development?
2. What has been the Bank's policy on basic education and primary health care over this period? And what has been its policy on the financing of these sub-sectors?
3. What approaches and rationale for child development has the World Bank used, over the period under review, in its financing of child development, and (how) are these reflected in its core development policies?
4. Which institutional and operational structures has the Bank put in place to address child development over time?
5. What lessons can be learnt from the Bank's operations, on mainstreaming child development?

1.4 Significance of the study.

While many studies have been carried out on mainstreaming gender or environmental concerns in development, and mainstreaming policies drawn, little however, has been done on mainstreaming child development, either in development thinking or practice, notwithstanding its significance for human development. It is this gap in development thinking and policy that this study seeks to fill. It provides a new perspective for analysing socio-economic development and for institutionalising child development.

The World Bank has been chosen for this study, first, because of its influence in shaping development strategies and policies of the developing countries. The Bank, together with IMF, through their conditionalities, often dictates policy reforms to aid-recipient and dependent governments. What the Bank advocates and what it omits or marginalises, has a strong influence and impact on the development policy and investment decisions of the aid-recipient countries. Secondly, the Bank, being a large repository of intellectual expertise, has combined its financial hegemony with intellectual and ideological influence on development thinking. Therefore, a study and possible influence on the Bank's policy and practice on mainstreaming child development is worth undertaking for this will definitely influence the child development, and more so, the overall socio-economic development policies and investment decisions of its partner countries.

1.5 Methodology

This study is both descriptive and evaluative. It describes what mainstreaming child development is and what it entails, and how mainstreaming of child development can be done. The core of the study is a case study of the World Bank. The study evaluates whether the Bank's development ideology, policies, and strategies, have mainstreamed child development in their evolution since 1970. This evaluation of the World Bank development performance is based on the descriptive analysis of mainstreaming of child development, and on an analytical framework for mainstreaming child development that the study has developed.

The data for the study has been collected through a review of secondary data and literature, both published and unpublished. The study reviewed the existing literature on child development, and on "mainstreaming" in development as used in other contexts and with other concerns, especially gender. A systematic review has been done of the Bank's publications and reports, and policy and strategy documents since 1970. This has been combined with a review of independent studies, commentaries and critiques of the

Bank's operations. This has enabled the researcher to draw parallels, links and contrasts between what the Bank says it does (rhetoric and propaganda), and what it actually does. In its assessment of mainstreaming of child development, the study has been aided by the analytical tools, drawn from the 'mainstreaming approach', to look into the Bank's policies and their strategies. Specifically, the study looked into:

I. The objectives of the Bank to find out how, during the period under review, the development objectives of the Bank changed and to what extent they were supportive of child development.

II. The Bank's approaches to child development – the thinking that shapes the Bank's involvement with child development.

III. The study also used the Bank's financing of primary health care and Basic education, and its policy on the financing of these as an indicator of the Bank's mainstreaming of child development.

IV. The study also looked into the institutional and operational structures of the Bank to find out whether they effectively address child development.

1.6 Scope and Limitations.

Due to limitations of time and resources, this study was limited in scope. First, the study only focused on the World Bank's development policies and strategies without going down to programmes and projects level. The study also only made an in-depth look at the Bank's policies on Basic Education, Primary Health Care, and child labour. The study also does not attempt any systematic comparison with what other multilateral development organisations are doing, unless it is necessary to support specific arguments.

The case study did not include interviews and discussions with the Bank's staff. It would have been more appropriate to conduct a field-based case study to carry out interviews and follow the policy making process first hand at the Bank.

1.7 Structure of the Paper.

This chapter has given an introduction to the study. Chapter 2 introduces the main concepts, and develops the analytical framework used in the study. Chapter 3 analyses the World Bank's institutional and operational organisation, the evolution of its development ideologies and policies between 1970 and 2000, and the implications these have had for child development over time. Chapter 4 analyses the Banks policies on Basic Education and Primary Health Care, and on Child Labour. Chapter 5 draws policy lessons on mainstreaming child development.

CHAPTER 2

MAINSTREAMING CHILD DEVELOPMENT: AN ANALYTICAL EXPOSITION.

2.1 Introduction.

Mainstreaming child development cannot be an *ad hoc* process. It must be done within a framework upon which the conceptualisation, institutionalisation and operationalisation of the child development concerns can be based. This chapter develops a conceptual and analytical framework for mainstreaming child development. It adapts the *mainstreaming approach*, which has been used in development work to bring marginalised concerns, particularly gender, to the centre-stage of development. It first defines and operationalises the main concepts used in the study. The chapter then adapts the mainstreaming approach as an analytical tool to discuss the meaning, process and implications of mainstreaming child development.

2.2 Evolution and Operationalisation of Main Concepts

2.2.1 Child and Childhood

There is no universal concept of "child" or "childhood". While there may be recognisable biological features in children, the definition and meaning of the 'sociological child', with whom this study is engaging, is highly contested. This study makes a distinction between two concepts of 'child' – the *'socially constructed'* child and the *'social structural'* child (James et al. 1998). For social constructivists, there is no universal 'child', and 'childhood' does not exist in a finite and identifiable form. Social constructivism sees "the child as a product of time and material conditions...[and one] determined by its relation to the means of production; the means of parenting; or even the means of educational provision" (James et al. 1998: 212-13). A 'child' is hence a local, rather than a global, phenomenon whose meaning depends on the socio-cultural context in which the child is growing up, and different societies have different understanding and attach different meanings and social roles to childhood.

The threshold separating childhood from adulthood is as well largely seen as a socio-cultural construction. Age is widely used in many societies, and even in national and international legislation, to define a "child" and to demarcate "childhood". But across societies and countries, there is no standard age for taking up adult roles. Besides, accurate quantitative age is not given much importance in many societies, where childhood or adulthood is characterised by what one can or cannot do (Blanchet 1996; Fyfe 1993). Such societies have cultural rights of passage that mark transition from childhood to adulthood and have little age bearing.

This study however, adopts a *social structuralist* concept of 'a child' and 'childhood', which views children as a typical and tangible component of all societies. Though their manifestations may vary from society to society, and though they emerge differently from the constraints their particular social structures proffer, children (and childhood) are a universal category, an enduring feature, and a formative component of all social structures (James et al. 1998: 32-33).

But although children exist as a distinct social category of all societies, they are not a unitary undifferentiated social entity. Children's experience of childhood varies across all societies depending on their gender, age, and social class (James et al. 1998). For example, "gender roles during childhood can be highly prescriptive, determining ... education opportunities, work roles and practically all aspects of life" (Boyden et al 1998: 40). Besides, developmental needs of children aged 0-8, for example, are not entirely similar to those of adolescents. These gender, age, and class differences should at all times inform development policies, directly or indirectly affecting children's lives.

This study adopts the social structural concept of 'a child' and of 'childhood' for it enables us "to compare children and 'childhoods' internationally and interculturally, because we are availing ourselves to the same types of parameters – economic, political, social, and environmental" (Qvortrup 1994, cited in James et al. 1998: 33). As the details of intercountry and societal differences become less clearly marked day by day, a focus on one 'childhood' rather than many 'childhoods' enables us to understand processes of comparative childhood structural changes. The study in addition, adopts the age of 18 years, as defined by the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, as the end of childhood. Indeed setting of standards and limits, is itself an effort to eliminate discrepancies in child development.

2.2.2 Child Development

The concept of "child development" crosses several disciplinary lines, and means different things to different people. Besides, there seems to be confusion about the terms child survival, child growth, child development, and child care, as they mean different things to different people, and are often used interchangeably (Landers 1990; Myers 1992; UNICEF 1990).

In distinguishing these four concepts, Myers (1992), views child survival 'positively' along a death-sickness-health spectrum, as a process of actively seeking a healthy state by moving further towards the healthy end of the spectrum, rather than a negative understanding of simply arresting death or 'not to die'- for example infant survival as not to die before age one (measured as Infant Mortality Rate (IMR)). His examination therefore goes beyond analysis of causes and reduction of child mortality, to include analysis of the state of mental, social, and physical wellbeing of children. *Child growth* means to increase in size, as measured, mostly, by weight and height, relative to age. Stunting (severed height), and wasting (weight loss) are therefore indicators of severed child growth. He views *Child development* as "a process of change in which a child learns to handle ever more complex levels of moving, thinking, feeling, and relating to others" (Myers 1992: 39). This includes physical or motor development, cognitive/mental development, emotional development, and social development. Finally, *Child Care* means actions necessary to promote the survival, growth and development of the child (Myers 1992).

While some people use these concepts distinctively, to refer to child development, others prefer to view them as interrelated aspects of "total child development". Child development, in this study however, is an integrated process that addresses 'the whole child' and not a piecemeal sectoral activity. It includes a child's physical, cognitive, emotional, social and moral development, and the processes and actions necessary to realise these. A child's physical development includes overall health, nutrition, co-ordination, vision, and hearing needed to survive and contribute into adulthood. Cognitive development includes literacy, numeracy, vocational skills, and other knowledge required to live a reasonable life. Emotional development includes self-esteem, family attachment, and love necessary to maintain family ties as an adult. Social and moral development includes sense of belonging, co-operation, distinction of right from wrong, needed for social living (Myers 1992). On the other hand, the processes and actions necessary for optimal child development include *provision* (supplying the means necessary for harmonious child development), *protection* (combating all forms of discrimination; physical or mental abuse; and economic or sexual exploitation), and *participation* (children intervening in matters affecting their lives and that of their community). Provisionary actions include (primary) health services, adequate nutrition, safe drinking water and environmental sanitation, universal basic education, adequate housing and clothing, security, and legal protection. Protection includes combating child sexual abuse and trafficking, exploitative child work, violence and all forms of maltreatment of the child, drug abuse, and protection for children in difficult circumstances (for example children in the streets, war displaced refugees, and orphans) (UNICEF 1990).

This study also adopts UNICEF's (1990) definition of 'total child development', based on the *Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989),* which defined child development as comprising child survival, development, protection, and participation.

Lastly, this study understands 'child development' within the 'social structuralist' approach. Thus child development needs, wherever they are, and though they may be subjected to, and affected or mediated by, different socio-economic and cultural contexts, are the same universally.

2.2.3 Mainstreaming.

'Mainstreaming', in development language, is a recent concept, brought to the fore by debates on institutionalisation of gender concerns in the development process (Razavi & Miller 1995). In the gender and development (GAD) discourse, "Mainstreaming" means moving a marginalised concern (gender) to the centre-stage of development.

By adapting the concept, as used in the Gender and Development discourse, 'Mainstreaming' of child development here means shifting from looking at children as victims and recipients of residual or rehabilitative welfare programmes. It involves moving child development to the centre-stage of development, making it an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the policies and programmes in all political, economic, and social spheres. Mainstreaming child development therefore ensures recognition of the implications for child development of all development processes affecting children's lives directly or indirectly. It also involves the establishment of systematic procedures and mechanisms within institutions for explicitly taking account of child development at all stages of policy making and execution. The process of mainstreaming child development therefore ensures that social and economic development processes do not merely support child development activities, but that they reflect child development concerns in their core strategies and policy objectives.

2.3 Mainstreaming in Development: An Analytical Framework

This study draws its analytical underpinnings and tools from the *Mainstreaming approach.*

In this approach, the *mainstream* is "the place where choices are considered and decisions made that affect the economic, social and political options of large numbers of people. It is where the action is. It is where things happen" (Anderson 1993: 5). It also refers to the "interrelated set of dominant ideas and directions, and the decisions or actions taken in accordance with it" (GIDP/UNDP 2000:6). Two aspects of the mainstream are the ideas (theories and assumptions) and practices (decisions and actions) which together determine resource allocation determining who or what gets what. There is therefore an interrelationship between the ideological component (the key theories and assumptions about development) and an institutional component (the organisation and the people making key decisions) (Anderson 1993).

The process of *mainstreaming* therefore, takes account of a given development concern in all policy, programme, administrative and financial activities, and in organisational procedures. It involves assessment of the implications, for the identified concern, of any planned action, policy, or programmes, at all levels, hence making the concern an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the policies and programmes (Anderson 1993).

Rounaq Jahan (in Jahan 1995), in a pioneering way, gave the approach a clear conceptual clarity and developed an analytical framework for assessing mainstreaming in development. This analytical framework has, basically, four components or levels: Objectives, Approaches, Strategies, and measures of progress (Figure 2.1).

To assess policy *objectives*, the framework differentiates between substantive objectives (like poverty reduction), and process-focussed instrumental objectives (like economic growth), and looks at the extent to which they address the new concern (like child development).

The core of the analytical framework is however its distinction between *'Integrationist'* and *'Agenda-setting' approaches* to mainstreaming. Integrationist approach builds the identified concern within the existing development paradigms. The overall development agenda, priorities, or objectives are not transformed, but each policy, strategy, or programme is adapted to take into account the new concern. The second approach, the 'agenda-setting', is transformative and changes the development agenda in the perspective of the identified development concern. Such a mainstreaming brings about a fundamental change in the existing development agenda or policy, in the structures of the institutions that are involved in development planning, strategies, and processes, hence reorienting the nature of the mainstream.

Figure 2.1 Analytical Framework for the Assessment of Mainstreaming in Development.

1. Development Objective
   A. Substantive
   - Poverty Reduction

   B. Instrumental
   - Provision of Basic Needs
   - Economic Growth
2. Mainstreaming Approach
   - Integrationist
   - Agenda-setting
3. Structures and Strategies
   A. Institutional
   - Responsibility
   - Accountability
   - Co-ordination
   - Monitoring
   - Evaluation

   B. Operational
   - Guidelines
   - Training
   - Research
   - Special projects
   - Analytical tools
   - Country programming
   - Macro-policies
   - Policy dialogue
4. Measure of (Mainstreaming) Progress
   - Discourse
   - Resources

(Adapted from Jahan, 1995)

Thirdly, the framework looks into the *institutional and operational strategies* for mainstreaming. Institutional strategies are the structural changes within the development agencies and governments, which facilitate the implementation of the new concern. Operational strategies bring a change in the work programmes, and include guidelines, training, research, special projects and analytical tools.

Lastly, the framework uses two sets of indicators to gauge *progress* in mainstreaming. The first indicator, 'mainstreaming resources', uses quantitative data, for example financing of the new concern. The second indicator, mainly based on qualitative information, analyses key institutional documents over time to asses achievements in mainstreaming the identified concern in development discourse (Jahan 1995).

This study adopts this framework and uses it to analyse the World Bank's institutional and operational structures, its development policies, and its approach and performance on child development. The mainstreaming framework has been chosen for it provides a framework for looking into a development institution, its objectives, its structure, and its approach to a marginalised concern, and how progress in this regard can be measured. It is thus suitable for this study. In the following half of this chapter this framework has been adapted and made suitable for this study, and in the subsequent chapters the study employs the adapted framework in its analysis of the World Bank.

2.4 Mainstreaming Child Development.

Based on the analytical framework presented in figure 2.1, we can basically ask four sets of questions in assessing mainstreaming of child development. First, what are the articulated objectives of the development policies? Are they responsive to or supportive of child development? Second, what is the approach used in addressing child development? Third, based on the approach used, are there any identifiable sets of strategies used to address child development? Are they effective? Finally, what are the results? Are there any indicators to assess progress?

2.4.1 Development Policy Objectives and Child Development

In assessing mainstreaming of child development, an examination of the articulated development objectives can be done at two levels. First, an analysis of the overall policy objectives, which express the substantive development goals, will reveal whether these objectives are conducive to optimum child development. For example, a development objective like *poverty reduction*, will most likely result in instrumental objectives like provision of basic needs – universal primary healthcare, basic education, or food security – which are directly supportive of child development (Corrie 1987).

An examination of the process-focussed instrumental development policy objectives will reveal whether in the pursuit of the substantive development goals, child development is articulated as one of the means. This could take the form of child-focused operations, or development objectives directly supportive of particular child development needs, like universal basic education and primary healthcare.

2.4.2 Integration or Transformation? Approaches to Mainstreaming Child Development.

Of the two approaches to mainstreaming discussed in section 2.2, the integrationist approach builds child development within the existing development paradigms while the overall development agenda remains unchanged. By this approach, special child development projects, for example, would be designed and fitted mechanically into major sectoral programmes, while the programme priorities remain unchanged. The transformative approach on the other hand, transforms the existing development agenda with a child development perspective. Here child development not only becomes a part of the mainstream; it also comes to reorient the nature of the mainstream. Hence, it is not simply the individual isolated child development projects, but the child development agenda, which gets recognition from the mainstream. A good example of agenda-setting approach is a purposive policy of public financing of basic education and primary healthcare, in education, and health sector policies (UNICEF 1966).

Mainstreaming based on integration is an 'add-on' exercise which eventually leads to isolated child development projects with little consistency, either among the individual projects, or between the projects and the policy objectives of the macro-level development concerns. This approach tends to be on a situation-by-situation basis, is problem-driven, and hence reactionary. Being project based, it is tends to be short term in its goals, which have to be delivered within the limits of the resources and time, with no lasting impact on the development outlook or ideology (Jahan 1995). Child development activities initiated based on this approach will mostly run parallel or counter to the core development objectives of the development institutions. It also puts child development concerns and objectives below the mainstream macro-objectives.

A shift to an agenda-setting approach involves changes on many fronts, including in articulation of objectives, in prioritisation of strategies, and in the positioning of child development amidst competing emerging concerns like gender and environment. Transformative mainstreaming of child development therefore highlights the need for fundamental changes in the development paradigm, in the institutional and operational structures and development strategies.

2.4.3 Institutional and Operational Structures and Strategies for Mainstreaming Child Development.

Mainstreaming of child development cannot take place in an institution that does not value children. Not until child development concerns are institutionalised and operationalised within development institutions will the process of mainstreaming child development take off. This requires organisational transformation and setting up of clearly defined institutional and operational structures and strategies.

2.4.3.1 Institutionalising Child Development.

Various strategies can be designed to institutionalise child development within development institutions. Five strategies however - relating to child development responsibility, accountability, co-ordination, monitoring, and evaluation - as shown in figure 2.2, are important.

In order to successfully institutionalise child development there must be established specific responsibility and functional structures mandated and resourced to facilitate the mainstreaming process within the institutions and their policies and operations. Either separate administrative units with their own staff and budgets or advisory positions may be created in this regard. These must however be at senior management levels to give these structures the status and authority in the institutional hierarchy to participate and influence decision making from the top (UNICEF 1966). Such structures require optimum resourcing, at par with other structures, for effective functioning (UNICEF 1964).

To ensure institutional commitment and compliance however, elaboration and enforcement of accountability for child development concerns, through establishment of accountability systems and support mechanisms for institutional compliance, should go alongside the establishment of responsibility structures.

Internal accountability within institutions may include taking into account child development in staff performance appraisals, and in programme/project screening, approval and evaluation (Jahan 1995). Performance accountability is important, since officers may only allocate time and resources to child development "if they ... are required by performance appraisals and job descriptions to meet certain specific performance criteria" (McAllister 1989: 3). Child development compliance may also be used as a criteria for development programmes and projects approval and evaluation, and reflected in the programmes and projects 'Memoranda of Understanding' and evaluation 'Terms of Reference'.

Internal accountability needs to be reinforced by public accountability. Development institutions work for the people and must remain accountable to them. For example, governments can be accountable to their parliaments by giving periodical reports and holding public debates on the state of the mainstreaming process. Development agencies can ensure public accountability by remaining open to public scrutiny of their operations by public interest groups like the media, and citizen's groups in their own and partner countries (Jahan 1995).

Institutionalisation of child development requires concerted action through establishment of co-ordination mechanisms, for example a co-ordination committee (UNICEF 1966). This provides an institution-wide forum for exchange of information, and ideas, and for identification of obstacles to a smooth institutionalisation process.

Figure 2.2 Institutional Strategies.

1. Responsibility
   A. Structure
      - Advisory position
      - Administrative unit
   B. Function
      - Policy and Strategy Development
      - Advocacy, Co-ordination and Monitoring.
      - Technical Support for operations
      - Implementation.
2. Accountability
   A. Internal
      - Staff Performance Appraisal
      - Programme/Poject screening
      - Corporate/programme screening
   B. Public
      - Board/Parliament
      - Citizen's groups
      - Media
3. Co-ordination
      - Separate
      - Integrated
4. Monitoring
      - Reporting-requirements on child development
      - Child Development action on Project-reporting Format
      - Statistical reporting on Child Development budget
5. Evaluations
      - Guidelines
      - Checklists
      - Child Development concerns in Terms of Reference (TOR)
      - CHILD Development Specialists in Missions.

(Adapted from: Jahan 1995)

Monitoring and evaluation frameworks need to be put in place to assess and measure the progress towards the realisation of the mainstreaming objectives. These may include periodical reporting requirements, and reflection of child development on project reporting formats. A monitoring process should not only assess the adoption of instruments and procedures, but also be able to measure, based on selected key child development indicators, how the mainstreaming process has influenced institutional operations (Jahan 1995). An evaluation process should include child development considerations in all policy and programme evaluations, and develop child development guidelines, or checklists to include in the evaluation manuals. It should also include child development-impact assessment in the Terms of Reference (TOR) of evaluations; especially those concerned with assessment of socio-economic impact. All these require adequate collection of field-based baseline data on the situation of children, over time, in the programme implementation areas (UNICEF 1966; Simpson 2000).

2.4.3.2 Operational Strategies for Mainstreaming Child Development.

For child development to be effectively institutionalised by development institutions, child development considerations should at all times influence development operations – from policy making to programme implementation.

Strategies that can be adapted to operationalise child development include development of mainstreaming guidelines, training, research, country programming, macro-policies, and policy dialogue (Figure 2.3).

Detailed guidelines for mainstreaming child development may come in the form of long-term guidelines and programming directions, or short-term action plans with established targets and timetables, logical frameworks, checklists, 'how-to' guidelines, 'best practices' manuals, or operational toolkits with 'what-to-do' or 'what-works' guidelines. Developing operational guidelines is important in providing broad directions and setting standards (Jahan 1995).

In operationalising child development concerns, training can be an effective instrument for raising awareness and improving skills and expertise of institution and programme staff on child development issues. It provides analytical tools and practical knowledge for policy and project design. Training methodologies can be developed by mainstream training departments of development agencies and training institutes mandated to train public officials in development issues, like civil service training academies.

Research is a strong strategy for making concerns visible in a development process. Properly conducted research should generate age-disaggregated data that will highlight the plight and raise awareness about child development issues (UNICEF 1964). Operational research can also be used to develop operational tools on how to mainstream child development.

Figure 2.3: Operational Strategies

1. Guidelines
   - Policy Guidelines
   - Sector Strategies
   - Country programme
2. Training
   - Awareness and sensitivity
   - Skill and expertise
3. Research
   - Age-disaggregated statistics and data
   - Operational research
   - Policy analysis
   - Theoretical research
4. Country Programming
   - Child development Country Profile and Strategy
   - Child Development issues in country assistance strategy
   - Child development components in key ministries and major sectors/programmes
   - Medium-long term development plans
5. Macro-policies
   - Child development Impact analysis
6. Policy Dialogue
   - Participation
   - Child development Agenda

(Adapted from: Jahan 1995).

Country programming, especially by multilateral or bilateral development agencies, can be a very good strategy for ensuring that a marginalised concern, to wit child development, is operationalised. Development agencies can prepare child development situation analyses and country profiles of all their partner countries. This eventually facilitates development of country strategies and action plans on child development. Development institutions can also push for establishment of child development components in all key ministries and major sectors to ensure that they at all times take account of child development concerns in their programming and budgeting (UNICEF 1966). A dialogue between the multilateral/bilateral agencies and partner governments and preparation of long-term joint programme initiatives in priority sectors (of most relevance to child development) like basic education and primary healthcare should immediately follow.

Macro-policies (economic or social) will normally have a felt impact on the lives of everyone, including children. Child Impact Analysis of all macro-policies can be conducted as part of social and economic impact analysis to determine their impact on child development before their approval (Cornia et al. 1987).

Finally, active policy dialogue can be a strong strategy for setting straight, policy reforms intended to mainstream marginalised concerns (Jahan 1995). However, child development has tended to be largely ignored in such policy dialogues mainly due to: first, the structure of representation in such dialogue, in which children or their advocates are rarely represented, and secondly, due to the structure of the mainstream policy agenda, in which macro-policy dialogue has tended to focus mostly on economic issues (Cornia et al. 1987). If child development considerations are to be brought to the centre-stage of mainstream development, then active debate on the place of child development in all macro-policies should thrive.

2.3.3 Measuring Progress in Mainstreaming Child Development.

Visibility, if used properly, can be a good measure of progress in mainstreaming (Jahan 1995). The visibility of child development concerns and issues in institutional documents – reports and publications -, sectoral policy debates, annual and progress reports, and macro-policy discourses can give an indication of mainstreaming efforts.

However, an assessment of progress in mainstreaming child development within institutional discourses is largely impressionistic and could be merely rhetorical[1]. Evidence from field-level assessment is necessary to judge whether the changes in institutional/agency language reflects only rhetorical shifts or imply real changes in policies, programmes and investment.

---

[1] http://www.brettonwoodsproject.org/topic/reform/r2238_childpov.html

Another indicator of policy change is resource reallocation. It is actually the budget that defines priorities and commitments, and an increased share of financial expenditure in the sectors that support child development – like education and health - indicates greater institutional commitment to mainstreaming child development. This increase in budget share should however be an outcome of a qualitative change in sectoral priorities and development paradigms.

2.5 Conclusion

This chapter has developed an analytical framework for assessing mainstreaming of child development in socio-economic development. What is clear by now is that mainstreaming implies re-evaluation of current development policy. The policy has to be scrutinised and inquiries made as to what kinds of development objectives are to be pursued, what strategies and programmes are to be promoted to achieve them, and whether these are child development-friendly. The approach and strategies for mainstreaming child development must aim to make development policies more effective through emphasis on reshaping the mainstream rather than adding activities to the margin. These cannot be done in a vacuum but instead need a re-evaluation and possibly a reorganisation of the institutional and operational structures of the development institutions, and development of frameworks for monitoring progress and evaluating mainstreaming performance.

CHAPTER 3

THE WOLD BANK: ITS STRUCTURE, OVERALL POLICIES AND OPERATIONS SINCE 1970 - IMPLICATIONS FOR CHILD DEVELOPMENT.

3.1 Introduction.

This chapter aims to find out to what extent, between the years 1970 and 2000, the World Bank, in its institutional and operational organisation, and in its overall development policies, has addressed or been conscious of child development as a development concern. It answers the questions: *"Which major economic and social development policies has the World Bank pursued between 1970 and the year 2000, and what are the specific implications of these policies for child welfare and development?* And *"Which institutional and operational structures has the Bank put in place to address child development over time?"* By looking at the Bank's organisational and development ideology, this chapter also answers the question *"What approaches and rationale for child development has the World Bank used in its financing of child development operations, and (how) are these reflected in its core development policies?"*

The World Bank group consists of five closely associated institutions: International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD); International Development Association (IDA); International Finance Corporation (IFC); Multilateral Investment Guarantee (MIGA); and International Centre for the Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID). Reference however to the World Bank, normally refers to two of these institutions: IBRD and IDA. The IBRD provides market-based loans (repaid over 15-20 years with a 5-year grace period) and development assistance to middle-income and credit-worthy countries (per capita income between $ 1,056 and $ 5,445). The IDA supports the Bank's poverty reduction mission, focusing on the poorest countries – those that cannot afford to borrow from IBRD – with per capita income below $ 885. Its loans are repaid in 35-40 years with a 10-year grace period (Williams 1994).

Since its establishment in 1944, the World Bank has grown to become the world's largest single source of multilateral development assistance to the developing world (Culpeper

1997; Kraske et al. 1996). The Bank (whose mission is to fight poverty) provides loans (and credits) and technical assistance (nearly US$ 16 billion annually), policy advice, and knowledge-sharing services to the developing countries and exerts most influence over the development policies of these countries (George and Sabelli 1994).

3.2 Child Development in the Institutional and Operational Organisation of the Bank.

Effective policy execution or reform depends, to a large extent, on the institutional structures and operational strategies and procedures employed in the pursuit of the policy objectives. The determination of priority concerns of management; the signals that are transmitted down to middle and junior managers regarding the priorities in their work programmes; the form of documentation and of procedures; and other issues of internal management structure and style, influence the realisation of development goals (Kapur et al. 1997).

In its institutional and operational organisation, the Bank has not mainstreamed child development, as manifested by the absence of structures that could institutionalise and operationalise child development in the Bank.

The Bank is owned and governed by its 183 member countries, each represented in the Board of Governors (BOG). A resident Board of Executive Directors (BED) oversees the Bank's overall policies and operations, including approval of all lending operations. The Directors have weighted voting power depending on the level of their country's/countries' capital subscriptions. Voting power is thus heavily skewed towards those non-borrowing developed countries that provide the greatest capital backing for the Bank (Kapur et al. 1997; Miller-Adams 1999; Culpeper 1997; Williams 1994).

The institutionalisation of policy reforms, new operational procedures, or marginalised development concerns like child development, should start at this policy-making organ. But this is a very political process and depends largely on the voting power, and the preference of private investors in the Bank's bonds, who are largely interested in private sector development (Brown 1992; Miller-Adams 1999). In practice, "this has meant that management seeks approval only for policies... on which [the support of the largest shareholders]... is known to be forthcoming" (Culpeper 1997: 29). For example, the Bank's enthusiastic adoption of the private sector development initiatives in the 1980s was essentially forced on it by its largest member, the USA. On the contrary, while a lot of support for social policy concerns like gender or child development always comes from NGOs and the Bank's smaller members with less voting power, these agendas meet with a less enthusiastic approach from the Bank, as they lack the support of the larger members (Miller-Adams 1999). Child development, like other social objectives, has never emerged as a priority concern at the BED, and its mainstreaming is likely to meet a reluctant response.

The Bank undertakes its activities through its Vice Presidencies, which focus on various sectors, departments, operations and regional offices.(Miller-Adams 1999). However, unlike other marginalised concerns like environment, child development has no vice-presidency. Sectors and operations relevant to child development however, fall under the Human Development Network vice-presidency[1]. Mainstreaming of child development however, requires its outright recognition at the vice-presidency level, either through its own vice-presidency, or outright representation at the relevant vice-presidencies, to give it a high level representation in the policy-making organs.

The Bank's operations are governed and guided by the institution's range of Operational Policies, Bank Procedures, Operational Directives, Good Practices, and Operational Strategies (Kapur et al. 1997; Miller-Adams 1999). How do these structures and procedures recognise child development?

The Bank has issued Operational Policies (OPs) and Bank Procedure (BPs) on concerns, themes, and strategies that it considers pertinent to its core objectives. They guide policy formulation and review and cover matters of Importance to the Bank's core objectives and establish the parameters for the Bank's operations. They have been issued on topics

[1] *http://www.worldbank.org/about/organization/organization-units.htm*

ranging from Preparation of project documents, Environmental Assessment, Gender, to Financial Management, and provide the Bank staff with direction and guidance in pursuit of the policies. The OPs are binding (Miller-Adams 1999). There is however no Operational Policy on child development, neither is compliance with child development concerns outrightly outlined in the existing OPs[1]. Bank involvement with child development, so far, is neither operationally defined nor binding to the Bank. The Bank has not considered child development worth an OP or BP.

The Bank Procedures (BPs) explain to the Bank staff the process and documentation needed to ensure Bank-wide consistency and quality of the Bank's OPs (Miller-Adams 1999). The Bank has BPs on almost all its policy operations and management processes[2]. Though less binding than the OPs, any development concern or theme that is not touched directly by the Bank's BPs can as well be said to be a non-issue to the World Bank. The Bank once again has no Bank Procedures on child development and therefore no policy guidelines and management procedures on child development.

The Good Practices (GPs) package contains advice and guidance on policy implementation (Miller-Adams 1999) The GPs are maintained and made available by various Bank units responsible for specific policies. The Bank currently has GPs on involuntary Resettlement, Indigenous Peoples, and Environmental Assessment and not child development[1]. Actions best for children or in their support and defence are not regarded as important enough to merit development of a best practices module by the Bank.

For policy concerns and operations to be effectively implemented in a manner that directly contributes to the identified development objectives, there must be put in place institutional and operational structures and procedures that monitor compliance. The Bank's compliance monitoring is guided by its Operational Directive (OD) on 'Project

[1] *http://www.worldbank.org/whatwedo/policies.htm*
[2] *Ibid*

Monitoring and Evaluation'. Besides having no monitoring system for its child development activities, child development compliance is not covered by the Project Monitoring and Evaluation OD[2].

But compliance with the policies of the Bank is also a public concern for private citizens. The Bank created an Inspection Panel whose "function is to ensure that the Bank adheres to its operational policies and procedures regarding design, preparation, or implementation of Bank projects"[3] and provides an independent forum to those directly affected by a project financed by the Bank. But the panel only accepts and acts on requests of claims "arising directly out of an action or omission of the Bank to follow *its own* operational policies and procedures in the design, appraisal, and implementation of a Bank-financed project"[4]. This limits the panel only to the concerns covered under the Bank's OPs and BPs. Of all the 11 inspection reports issued by the panel between 1998 and 2000, the compliance monitoring is underpinned only by the Bank's safeguard operational policies[5], all of which do not cover child development. This makes it difficult to lodge complaints over the projects' omission or neglect of other concerns, like child development, which is not covered by the operational policies and procedures.

Besides the operational policies and procedures, the Bank's operations are also guided by various operational strategies, of which there are four sets: The Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF), Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRSs), Country Assistance Strategies (CASs), and the various Thematic and Sector-specific Strategies[6].

The *Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF)*, is an integrated and holistic approach to development that seeks a better balance in policy making by highlighting the interdependence of all elements of development – social, structural, human, governance,

---

[1] *http://wbln0018.worldbank.org/inst...pmanual.nsf*
[2] *http//wbnl0018.worldbank.org/ins...8C9A8525672C007D08F2?openDocument*
[3] *http://www.worldbank.org/inspectionpanel*
[4] *http://www.worldbank.org/inspectionpanel/operatingprocedures.*
[5] Safeguard policies ensure that Bank operations do not harm people and environment.
[6] *http://www.worldbank.org/about/whatwedo/strategies.htm*

environmental, economic, and financial[1]. This operational tool could provide one of the best operational structures to mainstream child development yet the CDF does not outrightly mention child development concerns as one of its key principles.

The development principles set out in the CDF are translated into practical plans for action by the *Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs)*. In 1999, the World Bank passed a resolution that determined that nationally owned poverty reduction strategies should provide the basis for all World Bank's (ODA) concessional lending and debt relief. Among the core principles of the PRSPs is comprehensive recognition of the multidimensional nature of poverty, and a long-term perspective for poverty reduction[2], both of which embody child development concerns in development.

The PRSPs, so far, provide the Bank's most comprehensive mainstream framework for development in the developing countries. Recognition of child development in the PRSPs can therefore bring child development concerns to the centre-stage of development planning. So far, the PRSPs recognise low capabilities (particularly health and education) as indicators of poverty and investment in human development (Social Protection, Health, and Education) as important in poverty reduction. However, no forthright attention is given to child development. Among the cross-cutting development issues pertinent to poverty reduction, for example; Participation, Governance, Community-Driven Development, Gender, and Environment are elaborately considered (Klugman 2001) yet child development is not considered in this important Bank policy and operational strategy tool as a crosscutting development concern. Its absence here, once again, demonstrates the Bank neglect of child development or its peripheral consideration.

Therefore, the World Bank, between 1970-2000, only put in place institutional and operational structures that only address child development peripherally. No institutional or operational structure directly addresses child development concerns in the Bank.

[1] *http://www.worldbank.org/cdf*

[2] *http://www.world bank.org/poverty/strategies*

3.3 The Bank's Organisational and Development Ideology, and Child Development.

The dominant ideology which conditions the World Bank's development thinking and which informs its lending operations, is that of economic neo-liberalism. It is inscribed in the Bank's Articles of Agreement, and is widely shared throughout the institution and disseminated through its main economic and research outputs (Williams 1994; Ayres 1985). The principle objective of this neoliberalism is economic growth through market mechanisms, the promotion of private entrepreneurship, downsizing of the public sector, and "cost/benefit analysis applied to every conceivable object including human life" (George and Sabelli 1994: 104). Though a development Bank, the dominant thinking, shared by many people within the institution, views it as a purely financial and economic development institution and strive to adhere to rigorous financial standards in conducting the Bank's lending operations (Williams 1994). According to a study conducted by the United Nations University (UNU), the Bank should cease to be a moneylender and transform itself into an institution more concerned with development. The study recommends a reorientation in the Bank's mainstream (neo-classical) thinking about development (You 2001).

How then, has the Bank's mainstream organisational and development ideology influenced and shaped the institution's rationale for its child development operations?

First, the Bank's mainstream ideology has greatly disfavoured child development. By this development thinking, social objectives, like child development, are seen as non-economic issues not deserving of great Bank attention. Its Articles of Agreement explicitly prohibit the Bank from taking non-economic considerations into account in making decisions over its operations (Shihata 1996).

Secondly, the Bank, following from its development ideology, takes a Human Capital approach in its child development operations. It sees child development as an investment in human capital for better returns in worker productivity, reduction in public expenditures, increased income levels, higher GNP, and overall economic growth

(Shihata 1996, Young 1996). According to George and Sabelli (1994), the bottom line of the Bank's development doctrine is that everything (and everyone, including children) can be assigned a price determined by the market. The Bank has largely ignored a rights-based approach to child development which views social factors like education and health as child rights (Fyfe 2001). The Bank's neo-classical, free-market based development policies greatly disfavour, and indeed undermine, the principles of universal basic education and primary health care. This neoliberalism, together with the Human Capital approach, have led the Bank, for example, to "...[favour] privatisation and decentralisation of education [and health care] in ways which transfer costs to the poor and worsen exclusion and quality of education [and health care]" (Fyfe 2001: 76).

3.4 The Bank's Development Policies and Child Development Since 1970.

The World Bank's stated mission is to fight poverty and improve living standards for people in the developing world[1]. However, how the Bank has interpreted its mission, and the mainstream development policies and strategies it has adopted in living up to its mission since 1970 have all along been shaped by the neoliberal thinking elaborated in section 3.3 above. What has been the implication of the development policies pursued by the Bank over this period, for child development?

3.4.1 "The McNamara Years".

In the 1970s, Robert McNamara (President of the Bank – 1968-81) set the Bank on an ambitious path of poverty oriented social engineering. This was consistent with the intellectual shift in development thinking and policy in the early 1970s away from pure economic growth to an emphasis on distributional equity (Kapur et al. 1997: 16). This shift found a particularly ready echo in the World Bank, which soon became a lead agency in advocating redistribution strategies (Singer 1992).

[1] World Bank, *Annual Report 2000,* pp. 2.

The new "poverty agenda" consisted, basically, of two approaches: *Redistribution With Growth*[1] with an emphasis on rural development and urban poverty; and a *Basic Needs Approach*, with a focus on investment in human capital (education, health, and nutrition).

For the early parts of the decade, the publication of "*Redistribution With Growth*" (Chenery et al 1974), a research report on policies to improve income distribution and employment provided "an intellectual rationale for the Bank's poverty alleviation operations (Kapur et al. 1997: 233). A series of sector policy papers were also drawn, outlining the Bank's thinking about sectoral poverty concerns, notably rural development, basic education, basic health, and low cost urban housing (Ayres 1985).

In the latter half of the decade, policy emphasis was put on meeting fundamental human needs[1]; education, nutrition, and basic health, clothing and shelter, human rights and cultural values.

These were policy objectives favourable to child development. But despite the conceptual and intellectual clarity of the social, to wit poverty, agenda, administrative reorganisation, and rapidly rising lending, the Bank was slow to translate these into operational specifics. Social objectives did not actually achieve the degree of priority suggested by the Bank's official (presidential) position and were more apparent in rhetoric than in operations. Having stated the goal, rhetoric quickly outran implementation. The mainstream development policies throughout the 1970s remained committed to the traditional "productive" sectors considered to be contributing directly to economic growth. Most of the loans were for power, transportation, telecommunications, and industrial projects, which absorbed two-thirds of the total loan commitments (Williams 1994). The mainstream Bank policies saw the social objectives as implying a trade-off with growth (Kapur et al. 1997).

[1] The Bank was however not the sole exponent, or indeed the pioneer, of the RWG approach. Other international institutions, notably the International Labour Organisation (ILO) World Employment Programme; World Food Programme (WFP); and Institute for Development Studies (IDS), Sussex, contributed significantly to the articulation of the new development paradigm.

The greatest obstacle was scepticism and even utter resistance of Bank senior staff (Executive Directors and vice-presidents), and most of the Bank staff, who saw the social objectives as running counter to economic growth. They only supported large-scale 'bankable' projects that would be acceptable and attractive to the Bank's principle shareholders and creditors, and saw Basic Needs strategies as mere ethical propositions, with a moral and not productive persuasion (Kapur et al. 1997).

Therefore, though there was an intellectual rationale for engage in child-development-related social objectives lending (through wealth redistribution and provision of basic needs) the mainstream Bank ideology and policy-making organs disfavoured such operations. Throughout the 1970s, child development – and the supporting sectors and sub-sectors of Basic Education and Primary Health Care - remained marginal (Kapur et al. 1997).

3.4.2 Structural Adjustment Policies (SAPs) and Child Development.

The turn of the 1980s saw a total commitment of the Bank to neoliberalism in its development thinking and policies with very far reaching negative implications for child development (Cornia et al. 1987).

The Bank, together with the International Monetary Fund (IMF), initiated Structural Adjustment Policies (SAPs) which focused on the medium-term need to achieve balance-of-payments viability without any development considerations. A key feature of the SAPs was that they conditioned the governments to drastically cut back on social provisioning and recurrent expenditure. More policy emphasis was placed on the private sector in the financing of economic development. Longer-term development issues like development of human resources (education, training, health); technological change (agricultural research, appropriate technology); rural and urban development; provision of basic needs

[1] When Basic Needs appeared on the Bank's agenda, the proximate cause seemed to be, once again, an ILO initiative. ILO, in June 1976, organised a conference, "Employment, Growth, and Basic Needs" with the central proposition that war on poverty be recast as a "basic needs strategy" (Kapur et al. 1997).

(nutrition, water, housing, sewage) were put on hold. Effectively, poverty reduction took a backseat under SAPs, with a reasserted emphasis on economic growth (Please 1984).

The detrimental impact of SAPs on human and social conditions have been documented by studies which have underscored the lack of attention to the social consequences of adjustment.

The most prominent criticism of the negative social consequences of SAPs was UNICEF's call for 'adjustment with a human face' (Cornia et al.1987), which highlighted, especially, the severe consequences of SAPs on children, women and the poor in general.

In a study of a sample of 10 developing countries[1], Cornia et al. (1987) explored the links between Structural Adjustment Policies (SAPs) and stabilisation policies on one hand, and child welfare in the first half of the 1980s on the other. The evidence provided by the study shows that child welfare sharply deteriorated in many "adjusting" countries over this period. The study explored the links between: the variables influencing the availability of resources for children, such as household income, government social expenditure, and parents' time, health and skills *(input factors)*; availability and/or use of food and key social services needed for the production of child welfare *(process indicators)*; and changes in child welfare, i.e health, nutritional and educational status *(outcome indicators)*.

The SAPs led to declining household incomes, contraction in government real expenditure per capita on social services, decline in expenditure on food subsidies and supplementary feeding, and a decline in time of mothers allocated to child care "as women increase their participation in the labour force in order to compensate for the declining incomes of the male members of the family" (Cornia et al. 1987: 28). There was thus a general decline in the *input indicators* for child development. These led to a

[1] These were Botswana, Zimbabwe, Ghana, South Korea, Sri Lanka, Philippines, Peru, Brazil, Chile, and Jamaica.

decline in the process indicators with widespread contraction in service availability, rapidly escalating user costs, and a general deterioration in the quality of services delivered to children. For example, there were general declines in food availability and coverage in the education and health sectors.

The severity of the deterioration observed for the input and process indicators was reflected in severe losses of child welfare *outcome indicators.* Evidence provided by the 10 countries shows that under SAPs, infant mortality and child death rates increased, primary school enrolment and completion rates dropped, and overall quality of education declined in the 1980s.

Contributing directly and indirectly to the deterioration in child welfare and development therefore, SAPs, as the Bank's mainstream development policy package in the 1980s, did not embody child development concerns.

3.4.3 Private Sector Development, Public Sector Reforms, and Child Development in the 1990s.

Through the first half of the 1990s, the Bank continued to pursue Structural Adjustment Policies (SAPs). However, faced with a public outcry over the debilitating and impoverishing consequences of the policies, particularly from the developing countries and humanitarian agencies, and a general shift in development thinking (towards greater attention to human development[1]), the Bank renewed its rhetorical campaign on poverty, this time as an "overarching objective" (UNDP 1990;World Bank 1990; ul Haq 1995; Kapur et al. 1997).

Private sector development and public sector reform policies dominated the Bank's mainstream operations throughout the 1990s, permeating all Bank sector work in this period (Miller-Adams 1999). Even though the Bank did not lend directly to the private

[1] Led by UNDP, human development paradigm was based on the premise that the real objective of development is to enlarge peoples' choices (just one of which is income) through expansion of their capabilities and functioning. Health, nutrition, education, physical environment, and freedom, among other human choices are just as important as, if not prerequisite to, income.

sector (this is reserved for the International Finance Corporation), it made its adjustment loans with pro-private-sector policy advice. Following from the *World Development Report 1990* however, the Bank recommitted itself to poverty reduction through human resource development/investment in human capital – primary health care, nutrition, family planning and primary education[1].

How then did this renewed commitment to social agenda (through human resource development) interact with the mainstream development practice (private sector development and public sector reforms), and what were their implications for child development in the 1990s?

There were several direct and indirect implications for child of the mainstream Bank policies in the 1990s. The reduced role of the state in social service delivery directly targeted key social sectors of utmost support to child development – Education and Health care – under the public sector reforms, to open them up for private capital (Bayliss and Hall 2001). The payment of service user-fees and privatisation of service delivery in these sectors (Akin et al. 1987) adversely affected primary health care and basic education, perfect embodiments of child development concerns. Household incomes suffered due to staff redundancies and lay-offs from public enterprises resulting in increased child poverty.

In addition, even though there was a numerical increase in lending volumes to the social sector in the 1990s, the total lending for this sector stood only at 25% of total Bank lending throughout the 1990s (World Bank 2000; ul Haq 1995). Besides, much of the lending in this sector went to Programmes of Targeted Intervention (PTI), targeting specific sectors of the population or particularly focused projects. Little did this increase change the mainstream development policies either. The social sector policies were intended, at best, to lessen the social costs and provide safety nets against the unintended and undesired impacts of mainstream privatisation and public sector reform policies (Fyfe 2001). The Bank, by increasing its volume of lending to the social sectors, was

[1] World Bank, *Annual Report*, (1990-2000).

merely resorting to welfare and charity, and not using human resource development as a development strategy as it so loudly proclaimed in its publications. By failing to effectively give greater attention to public sector and social services, which support child development, the Bank failed to mainstream child development concerns.

In the latter half of the 1990s, the Bank developed operational strategies to not only tackle absolute poverty, but to link human resource development more directly with development as well (Kapur et al. 1997). These operational strategies included the Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF) and the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), which together became the dominant frameworks for Bank-country operations. Still being developed, this study is incapable of judging these policy and operational tools on their performance on child development.

The private sector is motivated only by profit maximisation. Child welfare and development only thrives under public provision and consumption of social services, among them, Basic Education and Primary Health Care. As a policy measure, public sector reforms aimed at putting the provision of social services and public consumption goods in the private sector signifies less concern for child development. The World Bank, in this regard, has failed to take on board child development concerns in its development policies in the 1990s.

3.5 Conclusion.

As this chapter has demonstrated, the World Bank is a constantly evolving organisation. It has undergone widespread organisational change since its creation at Bretton Woods. But while its stated mission remains the same – to fight poverty – the mainstream development thinking and the attendant mainstream policies and strategies, are still largely underpinned by conservative monetarist neo-classical economic thinking.

The Bank, in pursuing its mainstream development policies, has absolutely marginalised child development and instead engaged in policies, like Structural Adjustment, which instead impact negatively on child development. When it has engaged in policies supportive of child development, the rationale has been development of human capital, and not development of children's capabilities and protection of their rights. Mainstreaming child development in the Bank therefore requires first, a change in development ideology. Secondly, child development must be incorporated in the mainstream operational policies, strategies and frameworks that the Bank has developed over time to inform and guide its mainstream policies and operations. Above all, mainstreaming must be done from the Bank's top-ranking policy making organs like the Board of Executive Directors and the relevant vice presidencies, for it to be effectively operationalised throughout the Bank's rank and file, and regional and country level operations. It must move from rhetoric to effective action.

CHAPTER 4

THE WORLD BANK'S SECTORAL POLICIES AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT.

4.1 Introduction.

This chapter looks at the World Bank's policies on Basic Education and Primary Health Care (PHC), and its policy on their financing. The chapter also looks at the Bank's child-focused development operations, taking child labour as an example. Here, the chapter explores the Bank's approach and arguments for its financing of its child-focused operations. By looking at these sub-sectors, and the institutional and operational structures that support them, this chapter aims to find out whether, in its sectoral and overall mainstream development operations, the Bank has made any conscious attempts to bring child development concerns to bear on its mainstream development policies, or mainstream child development.

4.2 World Bank on Basic Education, and Primary Health Care.

Basic Education and Primary Health Care are perfect embodiments of concerns for child development. The significance they are given in development policies and operations indicates the level and extent to which a development institution or government has mainstreamed child development in its development policies and strategies. By reviewing the evolution of the Bank's lending policies and strategies on basic education and primary health care, this section seeks to answer the questions; *"What has been the Bank's policy on basic education, and primary health care? And what has been its policy on the financing of these sub-sectors?"* It also begins to answers the question; *"Which Institutional and Operational Structures has the Bank put in place to address child development over time?"*

4.2.1 The World Bank and Basic Education[1].

The Bank has supported education by providing financial resources, technical assistance, and policy advice, and is today the World's largest single external financier of education in developing countries, accounting for almost 30 percent of all aid to education (World Bank 1999). Coupled with this financial support is technical advise, designed to help governments develop education policies suitable for the circumstances of their countries. So what has been the Bank's policy and strategies on basic education and its financing?

Up to 1970, the Bank made no lending for primary education. Lending policies were only progressively widened to include primary education from 1970. In 1971, the Bank issued a "Sector Working Paper" on education which highlighted the need to find new sources of educational financing, improve efficiency in delivery, and search for less costly alternatives to formal primary education, including non-formal education. The Working Paper was thus not a mandate for more lending in primary education but instead a search for its alternatives. This mandate came in the "1974 Sector Working Paper", which confronted the low enrolment rates in the developing countries among children of school-going age, especially those of the lowest 40 percent of the income group. As a result, Bank lending for primary education went up from 5 percent of total education lending between Fiscal Year 1970-74 to 14 percent between FY1975-79 (Table 4.1).

However, even though lending grew, marginally, there were still misgivings throughout the 1970s, within the Bank, about the suitability of education as an object of lending. Primary education in particular, was considered to be consumption rather than investment, unlimited in its demands and not directly productive. Lending for education thus concentrated on 'productive' sub-sectors – general secondary, vocational and technical, and tertiary education, and teacher training. Besides, lending for primary education concentrated on pilot and experimental projects, detached from the overall educational policy framework (Romain 1985; Verspoor 1991).

[1] In this study, basic education encompasses elementary (early childhood), and primary levels of education, and does not include general secondary and formal or non-formal vocational training. It imparts general skills - language, science, mathematics, and communication that imparts basic numeracy, literacy, and articulation. It thus lays foundation and attitude for further education and training.

Clear policy framework for primary education operations came in the 1980 "Sector Policy Paper" which emphasised and committed the Bank to supporting basic education for all children, with an emphasis on access for girl-children, the poor and rural children to basic education (World Bank 1980a).

Table 4.1 World Bank Lending for Primary Education, 1970-90.

(US$ millions)

FY	Total ($)	Primary Education ($)	Primary Education as % of Total Bank Lending for Education
1970-74*	814.9	36.4	5
1975-79*	1,681.9	236.7	14
1980-84	2,964.2	423.7	14
1985-90	5,530.7	1,278.2	23
Total 1970-90	10, 991.7	1,975.0	18

* Data for Primary Education also includes non-formal basic education.

Source: Verspor 1991.

Since the issuing of the policy paper, several significant developments in lending for education sector in general, and for basic education in particular, have taken place. Lending volume for education sector doubled as a percentage of total Bank lending from 4.5 percent in the 1980s to 8.5 percent in 1998 (Table 4.2).

Table 4.2 Education Sector Lending Fiscal 1970-1998

Year	New Commitments (Annual Averages) US$	New Education Commitments as % of Total Bank New Commitments
1970-79	660	4.6
1980-1989	1029	4.5
190-1998	1982	8.5

Source: World Bank 1999.

Education sector has therefore constituted a very insignificant proportion of Bank lending, however loud the Bank has been on being the largest funder of this sector, and on the significance of education to human capital development and to economic development. Remaining below one-tenth of Bank lending, education sector has by no means been a priority sector to the Bank for the realisation of its mission – poverty alleviation.

Within the education sector though, primary education has increasingly gained priority since 1980. Lending to this sub-sector climbed from 23 percent in the 1980s to 30 percent in the 1990s. This has led to a reduced share to secondary and higher education in overall (World Bank 1995, 1999). Emphasis on primary education has continually grown in the 1990s largely due to the impetus from the Bank's 1990 policy paper on Primary Education, and from its commitment to the objectives of the Education for All (EFA) conference in 1990 of which it was a co-sponsor. Priority within the primary education sub-sector has been given to access, especially of girl-children and the rural poor. Girls' education has increasingly received attention in the Bank projects. While less than 15 percent of projects in the 1980s contained components to educate girls, the percentage of education projects that contain explicit intervention aimed at benefiting girls rose from 39 to 58 percent between 1993-1995 (World Bank 1996b).

The newest area of Bank lending in the 1990s is early childhood education in which projects have largely been experimental and done on pilot basis.

The Bank's strategy for support to Basic Education has been based on project approach. It is only from mid-1990s that approach shifted to sector-wide strategies that were aimed at influencing across-the-board borrower policies on education (World Bank 1999). This has also influenced an integrated approach for example integrated early childhood development programmes that combine education and school health and nutrition programmes. But still, many of the operations were free standing projects (World Bank 1996b).

Besides, many education sector operations in the 1990s were executed as Programmes of Targeted Intervention (PTI), and as Safety Nets programmes aimed at particular target groups, and protecting those "who were unable to take advantage of opportunities presented by growth, or those who suffer 'temporary' setbacks owing to seasonal fluctuation in income...or macroeconomic shocks" (World Bank 1996b: 23). Most (65%) education sector lending between 1992- 1995 went not to implementation of sector-wide programmes but to targeted interventions (Table 4.3). Most education sector operations were thus a reaction to undesired social effects of mainstream Structural Adjustment Policies, and were meant to provide safety nets and to mitigate the effects on the poor of the macroeconomic shocks rather than reorienting them.

What then has been the Bank's policy on the financing of basic education?

Generally, the Bank has always seen education as a semi-public good deserving of a mix of public and private finance. In the Bank's mainstream thinking, education is not a pure economic good, and it is a drain on public finances. In the 1970s, the Bank questioned the economic role of education, and its decisions on the financing of education were based only on the value of its externalities (like development of a well-informed electorate), and equity in meeting basic needs. Education, to the Bank, was not a factor in economic development (Jallade 1973).

While the Bank has actively advocated for private ownership and financing of education, it has only done so at post-basic levels. It largely agrees with public financing of basic education (World Bank 1999). However, the public finance to primary education has been advocated for only on the grounds of social equity, while private finace has largely been promoted on grounds of efficiency and innovation. Besides, large externalities of education, especially at primary level, are seen as a stumbling block in measuring allocative efficiency and calculating rates of return. The Bank therefore sees primary education as posing too many financial and implementation problems, in the sense that it is difficult to draw a direct price to be charged to the recipients and the financial returns from it (Romain 1985). On the other hand, it promotes private financing in post-basic education due to ease of pricing.

Table 4.3 Programmes of Targeted Intervention (PTI) by Sector, 1992-95, as percentage of Total Investment Lending[1] in each sector.

Sector	Fiscal 1992	Fiscal 1993	Fiscal 1994	Fiscal 1995	Total
Agricultural	38	27	26	56	36
Education	59	73	75	55	65
PHN	75	84	79	87	82
Social	-	-	100	100	100
Urban	19	54	48	29	35
Water & Sanitation	35	55	40	19	38

Source: World Bank 1996a.

The 1980s and 1990s were very turbulent decades for the financing of education. The Bank's Structural Adjustment Policies conditioned governments to cut back on social expenditures. Among the immediate targets was education. The Bank proposed *adjustment, revitalisation of education infrastructure, and selective expansion* as policy measures to restore quality and improve enrolment (World Bank 1988). Adjustment measures have two elements – diversifying sources of finance and containment of unit costs. While diversification of sources of finances targets post-basic education, containment of unit cost has largely been advocated at all levels of education for both capital and recurrent costs. This has led to most primary education costs like expansion and maintenance of physical facilities falling back on the families. Still, revitalisation measures focussed on restoring quality through a focus on fundamentals like instructional materials while financing of physical expansion and all other capital costs remained with the families and communities. These have left families with unbearable educational costs at primary level leading to low enrolment and high dropout rates. For example in the 1980s, gross primary enrolment ratios dropped from 75 percent in 1983 to 68 percent in 1986 for the median African country. However, selective expansion measures favoured

[1] Investment lending is defined by the Bank as all lending except for adjustment, debt and debt-service reduction operations, and emergency-reconstruction operations.

renewed progress towards the long-term goal of universal access to primary education (Wyss 1990).

Therefore, if analysis is narrowed down only to Education, then the World Bank has been favourable to Basic education. However, within the overall Bank policy and lending framework, Education has remained largely at the margins and not directly seen as a strategy in the realisation of Bank objective of poverty alleviation. Consideration for its financing has remained largely subordinate to mainstream macro-economic considerations.

4.2.2 The Bank and Primary Health Care

In this sub-section, the framework for the analysis of the Bank's health sector policies and its approach to Primary Health Care is based on the 1978 *Alma-Ata Declaration on Primary Health Care* (WHO 1978) (Figure 4.1). The declaration, coming out of a joint WHO/UNICEF initiative towards the goal of "Health for All Through Primary Health Care", provided an elaborate framework for providing universal Child health and nutritional services.

Even though the World Bank is today the World's largest external funder of health in the developing world[1], its health sector operations have not always taken adequate account of child health and nutrition.

It is not until 1975 that the Bank adopted a "Health Sector Working Paper" which however, restricted its operations within the sector to financing of health components of projects in other sectors, notably agriculture and rural development, education, and urban projects. Throughout the 1970s however, the Bank remained reluctant to consider direct financing of health care unless it was very strictly related population control, on the argument that "health facilities contributed to the decline of death rates and thereby to population explosion" (Kapur et al. 1997: 250). For the entire decade, health lending

[1] *http://www.worldbank.org/html/extdr/pb/10things.html*

constituted just 1 percent of total Bank commitments (World Bank 1980b). Health sector therefore remained entirely shunned in the 1970s.

Figure 4.1 The Alma-Ata Declaration on Primary Health Care

- The Declaration committed all governments, international Organisations and the whole World community to the attainment by all peoples of the world of a level of health that will permit them to lead a socially and economically productive life.
- It identified Primary Health Care (PHC) as the key to this goal.
- The Declaration defined PHC as the essential health care based on practical, scientifically sound and socially acceptable methods and technology made universally accessible to individuals and families in the community at a cost that the community and country can afford.
- It is the first level of contact of individuals, the family and community within the national health system, bringing health care as close as possible to where people live and work, and constitutes the first element of a continuing health care process.
- PHC:
- Addresses the main health problems in the community, providing promotive, preventive, curative, and rehabilitative services accordingly.
- It includes at least:
    - Education on prevailing health problems and their prevention and control
    - Promotion of food supply and proper nutrition.
    - An adequate supply of safe water and basic sanitation.
    - Maternal and Child health care, including family planning.
    - Immunisation against the major infectious diseases.
    - Prevention and control of locally endemic diseases.
    - Appropriate treatment of common diseases and injuries.
    - Provision of essential drugs.
- Involves, in addition to the health sector, all related sectors and aspects of national and community development, including agriculture, animal husbandry, food, industry, and education; and demands co-ordinated efforts of all those sectors.
- Is sustained by integrated, functional, and mutually supportive referral systems.
- Relies, at local and referral levels, on health workers, including physicians, nurses, midwives, auxiliaries and community workers, as well as traditional practitioners.
- All governments should formulate national policies, strategies and plans of action to launch and sustain primary health care as part of a comprehensive national health system and in co-ordination with other sectors.

Source: WHO (1978).

It is with the creation of a Population, Health, and Nutrition (PHN) department in 1979, followed in 1980 by the issuance of the *Health Sector Policy Paper* (World Bank 1980b), that the Bank began direct health lending.

Obviously prompted by the "Health for All Initiative", the central problem identified by the policy paper was that despite large expenditures, efforts to improve medical care for the majority of the population in the developing countries had only a modest impact. The reason identified by the paper was the typical overemphasis on sophisticated, hospital-based services to the neglect of preventive public health programmes and simple primary care provided at readily accessible facilities (Ayres 1985).

The policy paper committed the Bank to an emphasis on: development of basic health infrastructure; the training of paraprofessional staff, and community health workers; the promotion of proper nutrition; the provision of maternal and child health care and family planning; and endemic and epidemic disease prevention and control (World Bank 1980b). The policy paper may be said to have laid a good policy environment for engaging in Primary Health operations in the years to come.

However, the policy paper came at about the time when the Bank initiated mainstream macro-economic Structural Adjustment Policies which favoured cut-backs on health sector financing, and which affected major determinants of health (food supply, basic income). The conservative fiscal policies of SAPs viewed investment in the social sectors, especially health, as being 'unproductive' and hence favoured severe cuts in national budgets for health, and limited resource allocation for capital and recurrent costs. These resulted in deteriorating health facilities, shortage of equipment, drugs and transportation, and reduction in health personnel. Universal primary health care became unfeasible in such macro-economic environment resulting in severe loses in child survival outcomes (rising morbidity, infant mortality and child deaths, and malnutrition) (Cornia et al. 1987).

The Bank's policy on the financing of health care in the 1980s and 1990s was shaped and guided by the Bank's 1987 policy study on health financing (Akin et al. 1987). Among the policy strategies put forward were the charging of user fees for public health facilities, and encouraging private sector (non-profit groups, private physicians, and pharmacists) to provide health services. Primary Health services were not spared. Instead, targeted interventions like lesser charges for poor rural areas, vouchers to the poor, and encouragement of community support and non governmental provision of primary health services like vector control and immunisations were proposed (Akin et al. 1987: 39).

Other than the 1987 policy study and the ensuing health sector reforms, the *World Development Report 1993: Investing in Health* (World Bank 1993) is the most comprehensive document of the Bank regarding the health sector as a whole. It embodied and shaped the Bank's understanding and approach to PHC in the 1990s (Gupta 1999).

In the report, the Bank advocates government financing of PHC and "essential" clinical services. It advises public provisioning for population-based health services including immunisation against vaccine preventable childhood diseases (Tuberculosis, measles, diphtheria, pertusis, tetanus, and polio); mass treatment for parasitic worm infections; mass screening; and referral (World Bank 1993). The Bank's 'essential' clinical package includes prenatal and delivery care; family planning services; management of the sick child; treatment of tuberculosis; and case management of STDs. To the Bank, "public financing of a basic package of services is an effective mechanism for reaching the poor" (World Bank 1993: 118).

But while the Bank's approach to PHC may seem reasonable and favourable to child survival, this is not quite the case. First, it must be remembered that the Bank's mainstream macro-economic development policies in the 1980s and 1990s (SAPs) sought to reduce funds (revenue) available to governments in general (through import liberalisation – reducing excise duties -, retrenchments, etc.), and a direct reduction in health sector spending. The governments were thus starved of funds to carry out comprehensive PHC. Secondly, the Bank adopted "selective" rather than comprehensive approach to PHC and clinical services focusing on particular diseases and interventions, and emphasised cost-efficiency. Even maternal and child health are treated as purely technical problems isolated from the socio-economic situation (Qadeer 1999). The stress on cost-effectiveness also beats the possibility of expanding scope of basic services. The rest of the comprehensive PHC is relegated to the private sector. Thirdly, promotive, preventive, and rehabilitative services are mutilated from PHC, yet these are crucial for ensuring not just treatment of childhood diseases but, more importantly, ensuring a state of sound child health.

Still, the Bank is opposed to universal government financing of PHC and its 'essential' package as this, it claims, would lead to public subsidies to the wealthy. It thus advocates targeting of resources on the poor. More so, it advocates targeting by type of services where those PHC and essential clinical services considered to be disproportionately needed by the poor should be universally available, but with a minimal charges for poor rural areas, and vouchers to the poor (Akin et al. 1987). This leads to great targeting errors especially failure to reach all genuinely deserving cases (Sen 1995). Because of this targeting policy, most of the Bank lending to the health sector in the first part of the 1990s (82%) were executed as Programmes of Targeted Interventions (PTI), not aimed at sector-wide policy changes (Table 4.3).

In 1997 the Bank drew up its Health, Nutrition and Population Sector Strategy which only legitimised the contents of the 1993 *World Development Report.*

Therefore, while the Bank has rhetorically supported PHC, at least since 1980, thereby signalling concern for child survival, it has largely pursued health sector policies, especially on financing health care, and macro-economic policies that counter its stated stand on PHC. The Banks health sector policies, and the macro-economic policies that shape them, are not at all influenced by or even take account of child health and survival concerns, embodied in Primary Health Care.

4.3 Child-focused Operations: The World Bank and Child Labour.

This sub-section, by looking at World Bank's child labour operations, explores the approach(es) and rationale for child development that the Bank has used in its financing of child-focused operations, and how these operations are reflected in its core development policies, and the institutional and operational structures and strategies that support them.

As elaborated in section 3.3, the World Bank's operations relevant to child development are underpinned by Human capital arguments – that "investing in human capital ensures that people participate fully in the growth of the economy and that they can be productive members of society" (World Bank 1996b: 18).

The Bank has been involved, mainly from the beginning of the 1990s, in child-focused operations targeting "vulnerable" children, particularly children affected by HIV/AIDS; children and violence; children with disabilities; and child labour.

Like in its work with other vulnerable children, the Bank's child labour operations are based on its Social Protection policies, outlined in the Bank's 'Social Protection Strategy Paper' (SPSP). It is the SPSP therefore, that defines the operational framework for child labour operations, which fall under the Bank's Human Development Network's Social Protection Unit. The Bank's macro-economic Structural Adjustment Policies and the resultant fiscal, and socio-economic crisis brought social and human dimensions of these policies on children to the fore (Cornia et al. 1987) prompting the Bank to engage in social protection operations. Its approach entailed targeting transfers to cushion children from the negative effects of the macro-economic policies.

The Bank has been involved in child labour only since 1998 when it started a "Global Child Labour Programme". Still in its infancy, the programme is basically involved in supporting pilot projects and researches. The Bank sees child labour as "one of the most devastating consequences of persistent poverty" (World Bank 2001: 16).

The Bank's Human Capital approach informs its child labour operations (Myers 2001). This approach "views the work of children through the lens of national economic development" and "judges children's work according to whether it contributes to or detracts from this objective". It actually "regards child labour as a product of economic underdevelopment". The Bank "does not much engage in the language of children's rights" in its child labour operations (Myers 2001: 32, 33; Shihata 1996).

Among its major approaches for eradicating child labour are broad goals like reducing poverty, educating children, and raising public awareness; and providing support services for working children, legislating and regulating child labour, and promoting elimination of abusive child labour through international measures (Fallon and Tzannatos 1998).

Most of the strategies that the Bank puts forward for combating child labour are targeted interventions, far removed from the sectoral or overall development policies. For example, while the Bank has identified compulsory schooling as a perfect way of keeping children out of work, it prefers provision of educational subsidies like scholarships and school feeding schemes, and income subsidies and nutritional supplements as ways of keeping children in school (Shihata 1996; Fallon and Tzannatos 1998).

The child labour operations thus do not address broader sectoral and overall policy issues that make child labour necessary, but instead focus on targeted interventions whose reach is limited and which do little to reorient development policies. The Bank's child labour operations are only charitable humanitarian, and not development, operations.

Besides, making education compulsory may not do much to reduce child labour if the pressures keeping children out of school are not addressed. As this study has demonstrated, the Bank's Structural Adjustment Policies which have dominated the macro-economic policy environment of many developing countries throughout the 1980s and 1990s have themselves increased poverty and undermined access to education. This is a clear case of policy dissonance in the Bank regarding its child labour operations and its mainstream policies (Fyfe 2001).

Therefore, the Bank's child labour operations, like its entire child-focused operations, are not based on proactive development policies that seek strategies to develop children's potentials, and provide their basic needs. Instead, they are premised on policies and operational structures that seek to protect children from the shocks of the mainstream macro-economic development policies, which do not take on board their concerns and to which they are vulnerable.

There is a clear policy dissonance regarding the Bank's child-focused operations and its mainstream policies. While the Bank purports to support child development, its mainstream policies clearly counter this. Greater mainstreaming of child development requires sectoral policy harmonisation between the child-focused operations and the mainstream development policies.

4.4 At the Centre or in the Periphery?

The aim of this chapter, by looking at the Bank's policies on basic education, primary health care, and child labour, has been to establish whether in its mainstream development policies (sectoral and overall) the Bank has been conscious of the role of child development in realising its development goals and of the impact of its mainstream development policies on child development.

In reviewing the Bank's policies on these sub-sectors, it has become apparent how the Bank has a remarkable ability to adapt to changes in international development dialogue.

However, there is an apparent discontinuity between the Bank rhetoric and practice. This chapter has established that the Bank has a favourable stand on these sub-sectors only in rhetoric, and at the margins. As Clarke (1991) warns, the Bank's publications on poverty must be read in context. Its sectoral and sub-sectoral policies must also be viewed within the broader policy framework. The Education and Health sectors, and more so, the above sub-sectors, have borne the biggest brunt of the Bank's mainstream development policies in the 1980s and 1990s. While the Bank talks favourably of these sub-sectors, its core development policies have impacted negatively on Basic Education and Primary Health Care (PHC), and with them, had devastating effects on child development (Cornia et al. 1987).

When the Bank has focused on children, like on child labour, its operations have largely been underpinned by the need to protect children from, and to mitigate the effects of, the mainstream development policies on them. In addition, its operations have mainly been through narrowly targeted charitable gestures that do little to reorient mainstream development policies. The Bank's work with children have thus been side-activities that have neither relevance nor bearing on mainstream development policies.

Child development concerns have therefore remained largely peripheral, in the making of World Bank's development policies.

CHAPTER 5

MOVING CHILD DEVELOPMENT TO THE CENTRE-STAGE OF DEVELOPMENT OPERATIONS.

5.1 Introduction.

As this study has demonstrated, the World Bank has not mainstreamed Child development in the evolution of its structures, development thinking and development policies since 1970. In this chapter therefore, this study first, sets out policy and operational recommendations that are necessary if the World Bank is to mainstream child development. Secondly, this chapter draws lessons and recommendations from the study, on mainstreaming child development in overall development policies and institutions thereby answering the last question of the study: *What lessons can be learnt from the Bank's operations, on mainstreaming child development?* Finally, this chapter gives the overall conclusion of this study.

5.2 Child Development in the 'Mainstream' World Bank.

The mainstream World Bank has been identified by this study in terms of a set of dominant development objectives (both substantive and instrumental), policies, institutional and operational structures, and organisational ideology. In this mainstream, child development has remained marginalised. But is the Bank likely to mainstream child development soon?

It is certainly unlikely that the Bank in the near future will move child development concerns to the centre-stage of its development operations. The Bank is continually placing ever more emphasis on privatisation and public sector reforms. The Bank's *Annual Report 1995* announced that "The private sector is now a recognised area of emphasis for the Bank" (p. 17). The current President, Mr. James Wolfenson has continually reiterated that commitment to the private sector is one of the Bank's immediate priorities (Miller-Adams 1999). Continued privatisation and decentralisation of the social services especially education and health care however, will only drive more children in the developing world into deeper poverty (Bayliss and Hall 2001, Fyfe 2001). Secondly, the debt crisis in the developing countries is growing deeper everyday. Most countries indebted to the Bank (and other donors) spend much more on debt servicing than they do on basic needs[1]. For example, "Tanzania spend(s) six times more on debt repayment than on education" (Fyfe 2001: 78). Besides, the voting system in the Bank greatly disfavours child development and other social objectives, as the largest shareholders, and creditors, are solidly behind private sector development (Brown 1997, Williams 1994, Miller-Adams 1999). Further, the Bank's Articles of Agreement prohibit it from taking "non-economic decisions". Prospects for changing all these are currently remote.

However, steady progress, however slow, can be made towards moving child development concerns to the mainstream World Bank by taking the following steps:

Firstly, there is a need for greater Bank-civil society collaboration, especially with those NGOs working on child development and other social objectives. With enhanced policy dialogue, these organisations can offer technical advice and expertise on child development and other areas like health and education to the Bank, and bring pressure to bear on the institution to adopt more child-friendly macro-policies.

Secondly, the stated development objective of the World Bank (poverty reduction and improvement of living standards for people in the developing world) should include children. The mainstream instrumental objective has however been predominantly economic growth, mainly through Structural Adjustment. Child development has not been a mainstream instrumental objective or strategy for the Bank's mainstream operations.

The economic rationale for investment in child development having been proven, the Bank should take up child development as an argument and strategy for socio-economic development. This should come to be reflected in the mainstream development policies.

[1] *http://www.brettonwoodsproject.org/*

This could take the form of development objectives directly supportive of child development like the Bank's financing of universal basic education and Primary Health Care within its macroeconomic development policies like Structural Adjustment Policies. This "human capital" based economic rationale to child development may better appeal to the Bank, which has identified itself as an "economic development" and not a "human rights" institution.

Thirdly, mainstreaming child development in the Bank requires a transformative engagement with child development by the institution. So far, child development concerns have not come to bear on the Bank's mainstream development objectives, strategies, and ideologies, unlike gender and environmental concerns, for example, which until recently were considered marginalised.

Where the Bank has engaged in child-focused operations – child labour, children with disabilities, 'children and violence', children affected by HIV/AIDS, or Early Childhood Development – in most cases, these have been 'add-on' isolated projects. They are short-term, problem-driven, reactionary, and carried out on situation-by-situation basis. There is little link between the projects and their objectives and the macro-policies. Instead, they serve as remedial gestures that mitigate the harmful effects of the macro-policies on children.

Similarly, the sub-sectoral operations supportive of child development, notably, basic education and primary health care have not influenced the sectoral policies, especially on financing of education and health.

But instead of charitable add-on, isolated child-focused projects like child labour, child development concerns themselves should come to reorient the nature, strategies and programmes of the Bank's mainstream development policies. In Structural Adjustment Policies, for example, greater Bank lending and favourable financing policies towards basic education, Primary Health Care, and food security, and their respective sectors are sector-wide operations that reach all children and help reorient the Bank's mainstream economic policies.

However, mainstreaming of child development does not entirely isolate or replace the need for targeted, child-specific policies and programmes. Instead, in the making of such targeted interventions, they should be outcomes of a clear mainstreaming strategy and not mere appendages with no functional relationship. This ensures consistency between the objectives of these targeted interventions and the overall mainstream policy objectives, which they should fit into and help to achieve. But many targeted interventions, for example school-feeding schemes, in most cases, respond either to shortfalls or problems created by the sectoral policies of privatisation and cost-sharing, which respond to macro-policies of economic growth.

Fourthly, mainstreaming child development requires establishment of specific Bank-wide structures to facilitate the process. Currently, the Bank has no clear institutional structures to entrench child development concerns within the institution.

Being very bureaucratic, establishment of *responsibility and functional* structures needs to start right from the top levels of the Bank's management. Particularly, establishing a permanent child development office at the vice-presidency level will give the child development concerns the presence and authority at the policy-making levels of Bank hierarchy. Running right to the country-representation level, such responsibility structures should be adequately resourced to carry out their functional responsibilities, including child development policy advice, technical support, strategy development, and co-ordination for the mainstream policies. This ensures that at all times, the mainstream development policies remain accountable to child development.

To ensure commitment to child development concerns, the Bank may put in place accountability strategies like including child development compliance in Staff Performance Appraisals, and in project appraisal, and monitoring and evaluation frameworks.

The mandate of the Bank's inspection panel can be extended to include Child Impact Analysis in the inspection of the impact of the Bank's projects.

Fifthly, there is a need for an operational tool on child development in the Bank. While the Institution has issued Operational Policies, Bank Procedures, and Operational Directives on various sectors and themes that it considers pertinent to its work, including gender and environmental concerns, there is no operational tool on child development. Even within the existing tools, child development does not appear.

To mainstream child development in its development operations, the Bank should issue an Operational Policy or a Bank Procedure on child development. This will ensure that the Bank staff remains vigilant to child development concerns in all policy and operational matters.

Similarly, child development should be incorporated in the Operational Strategies like Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF), and more forthrightly in the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers.

In its country programming, the Bank can compile specific Child Development Country Profiles, and incorporate child development in its Country Assistance Strategies. This should eventually be reflected in the macro-policies through Child Development Impact Analysis of every policy, and drawing up of a Child Development Agenda for the Bank and its client countries.

Finally, at every stage, a clear monitoring of progress in mainstreaming child development should go on at all levels of Bank operations. This should not just be through rhetoric in its discourse, like through its publications, reports and working papers. Instead, there should be indicators-based progress monitoring and more so, reallocation of more resources to sectors and sub-sectors directly supportive of child development like Basic Education and Primary Health Care. This resource reallocation should be both absolute and in relative terms as well; these sub-sectors and their relative sectors (Education and Health) should come to get higher proportions of overall Bank lending proportional to other sectors.

5.3 Mainstreaming Child Development: Policy Lessons.

This study has established that the World Bank, the largest multilateral donor to the developing countries, and a key player in shaping and influencing the development ideologies and objectives of these countries, has not mainstreamed child development in its development operations, and may not do so in the near future. This section therefore proceeds to draw some policy lessons from this study.

Given that child development has a role – both instrumental and intrinsic – in socio-economic development, child development should at all times be an integral component of the mainstream strategies for, and objectives of socio-economic development. But mainstreaming child development requires a policy shift from the traditional humanitarian approach to child development that sees children as victims of development, pushed to the fringes of society by strong currents of economic growth, and who are thus in need of charity. Instead, mainstreaming should be a strategic process, based on protection and preparation of children, and focusing on child development as an objective rather than children as a target group.

Mainstreaming of child development also raises the question of how development objectives should be set. There should always be a consistency between the objectives of the macro-economic and social development policies, and child development objectives. The macro-policies should at all times be supportive of and facilitate optimal child development, both as a means to long-term development goals, and as a development objective in itself. In the making of macro economic and social development policies, like SAPs, Poverty Reduction Strategies, or policies of taxation, subsidies, and public services, an assessment should be made beforehand, of their likely age-differentiated impact. For example, though the burden of taxation may fall directly on income-earning adults, indirect burden falls more heavily on children, who depend wholly on the adults' income. Similarly, price subsidies on items like food, and basic drugs, have an indirect positive income on child development. Macro-policies should therefore be conscious of, or take into account and if possible facilitate child development. Mainstreaming child development should not just be an add-on process through mechanically fitted and isolated child-focused projects having no relevance or any functional relationship with the mainstream policies. Instead child development concerns should come to reorient the objectives of the macro-policies to reflect child development concerns. Therefore, macro-policies that support public provisioning and financing of basic needs and other services and programmes of most relevance to child development like basic education, primary healthcare and rural extension services, are important strategies in mainstreaming child development. In this way, child development considerations come to challenge and reorient the basic macro-policy directions.

Mainstreaming child development cannot take place in a vacuum. It is necessary for governments and development institutions to put in place Institutional and Operational structures that support and guide the process. In governments for example, administrative structures specifically responsible for child development can be established in all key ministries. These should have the mandate and resources to advice on child development dimensions to all sectoral policies, and give technical support to sectoral operations bearing on child development, and to monitor compliance.

Finally, it is easier to support and front for child development concerns in discourse. In policy making however, mainstreaming child development should go beyond mere rhetoric. Progress should be seen to be made, particularly through increased budgetary allocation to sectors that directly support child development – like health and education – not just in absolute terms but also relative to other sectors of little or indirect bearing on child development, like infrastructure.

5.4 Conclusion.

The purpose of this study was to find out whether the World Bank has mainstreamed child development in the evolution of its development thinking and policies between the years 1970 and 2000, and to evaluate the extent and ways in which this has been done.

An examination of the Bank's development policies and ideologies, institutional and operational structures, its sectoral policies, and its child-focused operations has revealed that the Bank has not mainstreamed child development. While in rhetoric it supports child development, in its structure and development policies, child development concerns have not come to influence the Bank's mainstream operations. Its mainstream policies over the last 30 years have not only marginalised child development concerns, but have had very negative implications and impact on child development in the developing countries.

The Bank's current development ideology is so heavily shaped by neo-liberal thinking that it is unlikely to move social objectives supportive of child development close to its mainstream policy decisions. To mainstream child development therefore, it is necessary that the Bank first change its organisational ideology that has remained unfavourable to child development. It needs to reshape the objectives of its mainstream development policies to make them supportive of child development. All these need institutional and operational structures that support the mainstreaming process and reallocation of finances to the sectors and sub-sectors that embody child development concerns.

In all, Child Development will only come to be mainstreamed within socio-economic development when child development concerns come to transform and reorient the mainstream development institutions, objectives and strategies.

REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Akin, John S., Nancy Birdsall, and David de Ferranti (1987) *Financing Health Services in Developing Countries: An Agenda for Reform.* A World Bank Policy Study. Washington DC.: World Bank.
2. Anderson, Mary B. (1993) *Focusing on Women: UNIFEM'S Experience in Mainstreaming.* New York: UNIFEM.
3. Annis, Sheldon (1986) "The Shifting Grounds of Poverty Lending at the World Bank", in Richard E. Feinberg *Between Two Worlds: The World Bank's Next Decade.* Washington DC: Overseas Development Council.
4. Ayres, Robert L. (1985) *Banking on the Poor: world Bank and World Poverty.* Cambridge: Massachusetts.
5. Bayliss, Kate and David Hall (2001) *A PSIRU Response to the World Bank's 'Private Sector Development Strategy: Issues and Options'.* London: Public Services International Research Unit (PSIRU).
6. Blanchet, Therese (1996) *Lost Innocence, Stolen Childhoods.* Dhaka: The University Press.
7. Boyden, Jo. Birgitta Ling, and William Myers (1998) *What Works for Working Children.* Stockholm: Radda Barnen and UNICEF.
8. Brown, Bartman S. (1992) *The United States and the Politisization of the World Bank: Issues of International Law and Policy.* London and New York: Kegan Paul International.
9. Chenery, Holis, M. Ahluwalia, C. Bell, J. Duloy, and R. Jolly (1974) *Redistribution With a Human Face: Policies to Improve Income Distribution in Developing Countries in the Context of Economic Growth.* New York: Oxford University Press.
10. Clarke, John (1991) *Democratising Development: The Role of Voluntary Organisations.* West Hartford: Kumarian Press.
11. Cornia, G. A., R. Jolly, and F. Stewart (1987) *Adjustment With a Human Face – Protecting the Vulnerable and Promoting Growth.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
12. Corrie, Bruce Peter (1987) *children in the Economic Development Process: A Vulnerable Group.* Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International (UMI).
13. Corsaro, W. (1997) *The Sociology of Childhood.* Thousand Oaks: Pine.Forge Press.
14. Culpeper, Roy (1997) *Titans or Behemoths? The Multilateral Development Banks.* London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
15. de Vries, Barend A. (1996) "The World Bank's Focus on Poverty", in Jo Marie Griesgraber and Bernhard G. Gunter (eds.) *The World Bank: Lending on a Global Scale.* London: Pluto Press. pp. 65-80.
16. Evans, Judith L., Robert G. Myers, and Ellen M. Ilfeld (2000) *Early Chilhood Counts: A Programming Guide on Early Childhood Care for Development.* Washington D. C: The World Bank
17. Fallon, Peter and Zafiris Tzannatos (1998) *Child Labour: Issues and Directions for the World Bank.* Washington DC.: World Bank.
18. Fyfe, Alec (1993) *Child Labour: A Guide to Project Design.* ILO Child Labour Collection. Geneva: International Labour Office.

19. Fyfe, Alec (2001) "Child Labour and Education: Revisiting the Policy Debate", in Kristoffel Leiten and Ben White (eds.) *Children at Work: Policy Perspectives.* Amsterdam: Aksant. pp. 65-82.
20. Gender and Development Programme, UNDP (GIDP/UNDP) (2000) *UNDP Learning and Information Pack – Gender Mainstreaming.* New York: UNDP.
21. George, Susan and Fabrizio Sabelli (1994) *Faith and Credit: The World Bank's Secular Empire.* London: Penguin Books.
22. Griesgraber, J. M and B. G Gunter (1996) *The World Bank: Lending on a Global Scale.* London: Pluto Press.
23. Griffin, Keith and T. McKinley (1994) *Implementing a Human Development Strategy.* London: Macmillan Press.
24. Gupta, Amit Sen (1999) "The Structure and Utilisation of Health Services: An Inter-state Analysis", in Mohan Rao, *Disinvesting in Health: The World Bank's Prescriptions for Health.* New Delhi: Sage Publications.
25. Haq, Khadija and Uner Kirdar (1986) *Human Development: The Neglected Dimension.* Islamabad: North South Roundtable.
26. Jahan, Rounaq (1995) *The Elusive Agenda: Mainstreaming Women in Development.* London: Zed Books.
27. Jallade, Jean-Pierre (1973) *the Financing of education: An examination of Basic Issues.* Washington DC.: World Bank.
28. James, A and A. Prout (eds.) (1990) *Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood: Contemporary Issues in the Sociology Of Childhood.* London: Falmer Press.
29. James, Alison, C. Jenks, and A. Prout. (1998) *Theorising Childhood.* NewYork: Teachers' College Press.
30. Kapur, Davesh, John P. Lewis and Richard Webb (1997) *The World Bank: Its First Half Century.* 2 Vols. Washington D. C.: Brookings Institution Press.
31. Klugman, Jeni (2001) *A Sourcebook for Poverty Reduction Strategies.* Washington DC.: World Bank.
32. Kraske, Jochen, W. H. Becker, W. Diamond, and L. Galambos (1996) *Bankers With a Mission: The Presidents of the World Bank, 1946-91.* New York: Oxford University Press.
33. Landers, Cassie (1990) "Enhancing Early Child Development: Alternative Programme Strategies". A Briefing note presented to the Workshop on Early Childhood Development on October 9, 1990 in Cairo.
34. Levinger, Beryl (1996) *Critical Transitions: Human Development Capacity Development Across the Lifespan.* Newton & NewYork: Early development Centre and UNDP.
35. Mason, Edward S., and Robert E. Asher (1973) *The World Bank Since Bretton Woods.* Washington DC.: The Brookings Institution.
36. McAllister, Elizabeth (1989) *Managing the Process of Change.* Hull: CIDA
37. Miller-Adams, Michelle (1999) *The World Bank: New Agendas in a Changing World.* London & New York: Routledge.
38. Mosley, Paul, Jane Harrigan, and John Toye (1991) *Aid and Power: The World Bank and Policy-Based Lending,* 2 Vols. London: Routledge.
39. Murphy, Josette (1997) *Mainstreaming Gender in World Bank Lending: An Update.* Washington D. C.: The World Bank.

40. Myers, Robert (1992) *The Twelve Who Survive: Strengthening Programmes of Early Child Development in the Third World.* London & NewYork: Routledge.
41. Myers, William E. (2001) "Valuing Diverse Approaches to Child Labour", in Kristoffel Lieten and Ben White (eds.) *Children at Work: Policy Perspectives.* Amsterdam: Aksant. pp. 25-46.
42. Payer, C. (1982) *World Bank: A Critical Analysis.* New York & London: Monthly Review Press.
43. Please, Stanley (1984) *The Hobbled Giant: Essays on the World Bank.* Boulder & London: Westview Press.
44. Psacharopoulus, G. (1986) "The Economics of Early Childhood Services: A Conceptual Framework and Some Empirical Dimensions", in OECD *Caring For Young Children: An Analysis of Educational and Social Services.* Paris: OECD, Centre for Educational Research and Innovation.
45. Qadeer, Imran (1999) "The World Development Report 1993: The Brave New World of Primary Health Care", in Mohan Rao, *Disinvesting in Health: The World Bank's Prescriptions for Health.* New Delhi: Sage Publications.
46. Rao, Mohan (1999) *Disinvesting in Health: The World Bank's Prescriptions for Health.* New Delhi: Sage Publications.
47. Razavi, Shahra and Carol Miller (1995) *Gender Mainstreaming: A Study of Efforts by UNDP, The World Bank, and ILO to Institutionalise Gender Issues.* United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) Occasional Paper No. 4. Geneva: UNRISD.
48. Romain, Ralph (1985) *Lending in Primary Education: Bank Performance Review, 1962-1983.* Washington DC.: World Bank.
49. Selowsky, M. (1981) "Nutrition, Health, and Education: The Economic Significance of Complementarities at Early Age" in *The Journal Of Development Economics* vol. 9 pp 331-46.
50. Sen, Amartya (1995) "The Political Economy of Targetting", in Dominique van de Walle and K. Nead *Public Spending and the Poor: Theory and Evidence.* Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press, for the World Bank.
51. Shihata, Ibrahim F. I. (1996) "The World Bank's Protection and Promotion of Children's Rights", in *The International Journal of Children's Rights.* Vol. 4 No. 4 pp. 383-405.
52. Simpson, Gary (2000) "Social Impact Assessment Tools for Mitigation and Project Development", in Laurence R. Goldman (ed.) *Social Impact Analysis: An Applied Anthropology Manual.* Oxford and New York: Berg.
53. Singer, H. W. (1992) "Lessons of Post-war Development Experience: 1945-1988." In Soumatra Sharma (ed.) *Development Policy.* London: Macmillan.
54. ul Haq, Mahbub (1995) *Reflections on Human Development.* NewYork: Oxford University Press.
55. UNDP (1990) *Human Development Report.* NewYork: UNDP.
56. UNICEF (1964) *Planning for the Needs of Children in Developing Countries.* Report of a Round-Table Conference 1 – 7 April, Bellagio, Italy.
57. UNICEF (1966) *Children and Youth in National Planning and Development in Asia.* Report of a Conference 8 – 15 March, Bangkok.
58. UNICEF (1990) *First Call for Children.* New York: UNICEF.

59. UNICEF (various years) *State of the World's Children.* NewYork: UNICEF.
60. Verspoor, Adrian (1991) *Lending for Learning: Twenty years of World Bank Support for Basic Education.* Wasington DC.: World Bank.
61. WHO (1978) *Primary Health Care: A Joint Report by the Director-General of WHO and the Executive Director of UNICEF".* Geneva: WHO.
62. Williams, Marc (1994) *International Economic Development and the Third World.* London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
63. World Bank (1980a) *Education Sector Policy Paper.* Washington DC.: World Bank.
64. __________ (1980b) *Health Sector Policy Paper.* Washington DC.: World Bank.
65. __________ (1988) *World Development Report.* New York: Oxford University Press.
66. __________ (1990 *World Development Report 1990: Poverty.* New York: Oxford University Press.
67. __________ (1993) *World Development Report 1993: Investing in Health.* Washington DC.: World Bank.
68. __________Group (1994) *learning From the Past: Embracing the Future.* Washington D. C.: The World Bank Group.
69. __________(1995) *Priorities and Strategies in Education: A World Bank Review.* Washington DC.: The World Bank.
70. __________ (1996a) *Poverty Reduction and the World Bank: Progress and Challenges in the 1990s.* Washington DC.: The World Bank.
71. __________ (1996b) *World Development Report.* New York: Oxford University Press.
72. __________ (1998) *Assessing Aid: What Works, What Doesn't, and Why.* A World Bank Policy Research Report. New York: Oxford University Press.
73. __________ (1999) *Education Sector Strategy.* Washington DC.: World Bank.
74. __________ (2001) *The Global Fight Against Child Labour.* A Social Protection discussion Paper. Washington DC: World Bank.
75. World Bank Homepage (http://www.worldbank.org).
76. Wyss, Hans (1990) *Update on the Implementation of the World Bank Policy Study: Education in Sub-Saharan Africa.* Washington DC.: World Bank.
77. You, Jong-Il (2001) "The Bretton Woods Institutions: Evolution, Reform, and Change" In Deepak Nayyar (ed.) *New Roles and for the UN and the Bretton Woods Institutions.* Internet site: *http://www.wider.unu.edu.*
78. Young, Mary Eming (1996) *Early Childhood Development: Investing in The Future.* Washington DC: The World Bank.