

1 SOCIAL POLICY FOR DEVELOPMENT: LOCAL, NATIONAL AND GLOBAL DIMENSIONS

Summary

Conceptualization and application of social policy in a development context has evolved significantly in recent years. Notions of what constitutes social policy have moved from the statutory provision of social services, either under a minimalist, residual model or through a more systematic, institutional-incremental approach. Narrow, targeted interventions of a residual type have become popular since the 1980s as a short-term response to the poverty generated by structural adjustment, including safety net devices such as social funds. Yet in order to address long-term issues of poverty and social deprivation in the South, it is increasingly recognized that a more comprehensive, holistic and cross-sector livelihoods analysis is more appropriate. The goals of social policy have broadened to include poverty alleviation, social protection, social inclusion and the promotion of human rights. Implementing these goals requires not just a strong State, but also the actions of civil society, the private sector and international development institutions. The increasing 'globalization' of social policy through development banks, UN bodies, regional and supranational organizations raises important issues about where the locus of social policy-making now lies. In dealing with these fundamental questions, traditions of representative, analytical and normative theory should be borne in mind. Normative theory in particular enables a distinction to be made amongst three major schools of thought and value systems that determine social policy: the statist, institutional-welfarism model, the individualist, free market enterprise approach and populist or community development strategies. All have contributed elements to an emerging hybrid and holistic model of social policy for developing countries that will prove useful in identifying the most appropriate interventions to address the specific needs of diverse groups.

Rethinking social policy for development

The time is ripe for a re-examination of social policy and its role in the development process. Past development paradigms and related social policy approaches

2 *Social Policy for Development*

have proved to be of limited effectiveness in addressing mass poverty and promoting human welfare in the South. Arguably, this criticism is as valid for neo-liberal economic growth theories as it is for targeted and other more radical strategies. Intellectually, the unilinear, blueprint and universal solutions of the modernization and Marxist approaches have been challenged by post-modern and post-structuralist critiques. The latter, in their turn, have been criticized for adopting too incremental and piecemeal an approach that does not address structural barriers to promoting more equitable patterns of economic growth. Furthermore, it could be argued that one of the major reasons for the shortcomings of conventional development strategies has been their inability to recognize and take due account of social complexity and its interface with other key development dimensions such as the economic, the political and the environmental. These lacunae have undoubtedly helped to perpetuate serious problems of poverty, vulnerability, powerlessness and exclusion.

However, while policy itself tends to evolve slowly, the perceptions and practices that generate policy change have advanced markedly over the past decade. Interventions have become more targeted and tailored to meet the specific economic and social needs of diverse groups. At the same time, development planners have become increasingly aware of the need to systematically integrate social analysis and social policy into the mainstream of development policy design and implementation. There is a growing consensus that inclusion of the social dimension, while no panacea for the above problems, is one of the major prerequisites for more successful development. Reflecting this evolution, development institutions at both domestic and international levels have begun to incorporate and institutionalize social policy, social planning and social development into their mainstream activities.

The literature on social policy and development has also expanded considerably over this period and, together with related academic courses, has played a key role in sensitizing development policy-makers and practitioners to these issues. There have been many books published on specific social sectors including health, education, rural development and urban housing as well as related areas such as the environment and gender. There have also been landmark texts cutting across the social development and social welfare spectrum (Conyers, 1982; Hardiman and Midgley, 1982; MacPherson, 1982; MacPherson and Midgley, 1987; Booth, 1994; Midgley, 1995, 1997). Those early publications, among the first to address economic and social development within a more holistic vision, have been instrumental in advancing the frontiers of international social policy. They have extended its legitimate sphere of concern beyond narrow conceptions of social service provision by national governments towards inclusion of much broader livelihood issues. In particular, threats to human welfare arising from the internationalization and globalization of economic, social and political forces have generated new pressures that require a rethinking of how social policy reforms can most effectively respond to these changes.

It is important to stress, however, that re-examining the role and scope of social policy in development does not signify a rejection of all past practices,

nor is it an exercise in reinventing the wheel. In other words, we seek to identify the best of these practices and combine them with new experiences and analyses in appropriate applications suitable for diverse and changing circumstances. We wish in this volume to review how conceptions of social policy have evolved, how such ideas and linked strategies have been applied to promote human well-being, and how they may be improved to better address critical development problems in the South.

Redefining social policy: from welfare to livelihoods

The above opening remarks suggest that defining 'social policy' is not as straightforward a task as it once seemed. The term is nowadays fraught with potential ambiguity and confusion. It therefore needs to be carefully set out and employed appropriately. In the first instance, a basic distinction should be made between social policy as (a) an applied policy arena relating to governmental and other institutional interventions that affect people's welfare and (b) an academic field of enquiry. These two aspects are closely related since theory feeds directly into practice.

Historically, for example, the writings of early utopians and advocates of scientific social planning such as Auguste Comte, one of the founding fathers of sociology, were relevant for the emergence of social policy as an applied field. Early socialistic ideas were applied by pioneering industrialists such as Robert Owen, who in the early 1800s established the community of New Lanark in Scotland. Poverty surveys conducted by Charles Booth, Paul Kellogg and Seebohm Rowntree exposed the harsh and brutal conditions under which many ordinary people lived and fuelled pressures for social reform by pioneers such as Sidney and Beatrice Webb in the UK and Jane Addams in the US (Midgley et al., 2000). Anti-slavery movements in the US, Latin America and England during the nineteenth century can also be regarded as early intellectual expressions of progressive social policy. Social security and welfare policies introduced during the 1930s in the US under the New Deal, as well as publication of the Beveridge Report in the UK, were both underpinned by pioneering academic enquiry and the application of normative principles of social science for the improvement of society. Subsequently, social policy as an academic subject acquired its own identity in the UK with the appointment in 1950 of Richard Titmuss to the first such professorial position at the London School of Economics. In this discussion of emerging social policies, however, it should not be forgotten that societies have always evolved their own informal mechanisms for dealing with the needs of the elderly, sick and frail amongst their numbers. As will be seen in the following chapters, there is much to be learned from indigenous systems of social support and much to be gained from incorporating such lessons into modern practice.

4 *Social Policy for Development*

Conceptions of social policy have thus evolved to reflect historical priorities and changing attitudes towards the causes of social problems and solutions perceived as being most appropriate. These definitions overlap with, and should be considered alongside, the theoretical paradigms of normative social policy discussed in a later section of this chapter in which statist, enterprise and populist approaches are outlined.

Social policy as welfare services

Conventionally, applied social policy has been considered synonymous with government intervention to provide social services. Until the early twentieth century, this signified minimal State action to address the immediate needs of the poor and destitute. Comprehensive and systematic public social policy provision came to the fore in the European post-war conception of the 'welfare state', in which government was perceived as having a duty to ensure certain fundamental living standards for all its citizens, literally 'from the cradle to the grave'. Alongside economic planning based on Keynesian principles of employment-generating public investment, this involved government funding for key social sectors such as health, education and housing. In addition, complementary support would be provided to the socially disadvantaged and the needy through statutory regulation, including a range of unemployment and social security benefits. Taken together, such government measures are based on normative principles that are commonly understood to form the basis of a 'civilized' and 'modern' society. They include, for example, the economic, social and political rights and freedoms that comprise 'citizenship' (Marshall, 1950).

In the developing world also, social policy has tended to become equated with government intervention. During the 1950s, according to mainstream economic theories of the time, it was expected that central planning would stimulate modernization and growth through urban-based industrialization, generating employment while alleviating poverty. It was generally held that the benefits of growth would inevitably 'trickle down' to the wider population, automatically improving their welfare. At the same time, public spending on social sectors was considered a wasteful diversion from the business of economic growth. According to this 'residual model' of social welfare, introduced by many colonial authorities before independence, government intervention to meet social needs was to be minimized (Hardiman and Midgley, 1982). Government would restrict its actions to dealing with social pathologies such as crime and prostitution, as well as helping those who could literally not help themselves, such as the disabled, the old and infirm or orphans. Social needs would be met through individual effort in the market place, with support from the family and community, and via charitable or voluntary organizations such as the church. This minimalist approach, echoing nineteenth-century European and American Poor Laws, was commonly incorporated into the policy agendas of Ministries of Welfare in newly independent developing countries.

However, the residual welfare model proved unworkable for several reasons. Firstly, even where economic growth did take place, it by no means guaranteed

improved standards of living and welfare for the poorer classes. Residual social policy was evidently not equipped to cope with mass poverty. Secondly, social demand for basic services such as health, education and housing grew emphatically, especially from the 1960s onwards. The populations of newly independent nations were understandably anxious to gain access to social services and enhance their life chances, which they saw as their right after years of colonial domination. Responding to pressure from urban middle classes in particular, governing elites have expanded social service provision by building new schools, houses and hospitals in the competition to secure electoral support and political legitimacy. Thus, the 'incremental welfare' model was put in place, in which social sectors are expanded in a piecemeal, expedient fashion in response to political pressures rather than to social need as such (Hardiman and Midgley, 1982). This gave rise, for example, to accusations of 'urban bias' on the grounds that the pressing needs of the majority rural poor were simply ignored by most governments (Lipton, 1977). Arguably, this incremental approach is still characteristic of social sector planning in most of the developing and much of the industrialized world.

Deciding upon the means by which to achieve social policy goals has been a matter of growing political contention. During the 1980s, Keynesian economics together with the hitherto central role of the State in implementing public policy came under fire. The administrations of Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher, supported by the Friedmanite stance of the New Right, raised serious doubts about the viability of the comprehensive welfare state (Friedman and Friedman, 1980). Other analysts, notably Charles Murray (1984), questioned the effectiveness of public assistance and social welfare programmes in the industrialized nations, alleging that they merely exacerbated the problems they were meant to solve and lead to the creation of a permanent, poor 'underclass'. The post-war welfare ethos was thus undermined by several factors. Firstly, by ideological mistrust of the allegedly paternalist and repressive State machine, coupled with the proposal to strengthen individual freedom of choice. Secondly, by the need to contain public spending and shift a larger share of the cost burden to service consumers themselves. To meet these two goals, economic liberalization and deregulation have meant the growing privatization of public services along with reliance on the creation of markets and internal quasi-markets to boost efficiency in the allocation and spending of resources in Europe's 'welfare' states. Some countries such as France, Sweden and Germany retain a strong belief in the responsibility of central government to fund and manage basic welfare provision and public utilities, while others such as the UK have resorted increasingly to assistance from the private commercial and voluntary sectors as service providers.

Social policy as safety nets

This free market ideology was transferred to the developing world through programmes of economic stabilization and structural adjustment from the

6 *Social Policy for Development*

mid-1980s onwards. In order to strengthen indebted economies and their repayment capacity, their productive potential would be enhanced through a combination of economic and social measures. The so-called 'Washington Consensus' thus emerged to preach market deregulation and competition (Williamson, 1990). This ideology also embraced measures including withdrawal of the State machine from monopolistic positions such as agricultural marketing boards, the reduction of public expenditure, incentives for foreign investment, restrictions on imports and the provision of export incentives. The adverse social impacts of these policies have been documented at length (Cornia et al., 1987; Ghai, 1991; Stewart, 1995). Far from being self-rectifying under adjustment, as had originally been predicted, poverty and vulnerability were exacerbated in many countries and, for many groups, social indicators worsened. Welfare provision was heavily compromised, with basic sectors such as health and primary education often bearing the brunt of spending cutbacks, as detailed in Chapter 9 of this volume (Graham-Brown, 1991; Kanji and Manji, 1991).

There has for some time been discussion of medium- and long-term policies for dealing with the adverse social impacts of structural adjustment. Even in the initial stages, 'adjustment with a human face' was advocated in order to deal not just with short-term problems but also to address deep-seated cross-sector and structural obstacles to balanced development (Cornia et al., 1987). In practice, however, the emphasis has been on the creation of social safety nets using social funds to target scarce resources at poorer, more vulnerable groups (Narayan and Ebbe, 1997; Subbarao, 1997; Conway, 2000). However, the minimalist and selective nature of this approach as well as its reliance on the voluntary sector for implementation is somewhat reminiscent of the residual welfare model. Yet the havoc caused by adjustment has led to the realization amongst policy-makers that a longer-term perspective is also necessary to address deep-seated social problems within a more systematic analysis of poverty, its causes and appropriate policy solutions. These issues are taken up in Chapters 2 and 9.

Social policy and livelihoods

The above perspectives consider social policy as being concerned primarily with either, (a) social and welfare services of one kind or another, or (b) safety nets to alleviate immediate crises. However, a third definition views social policy in a much broader sense as encompassing any planned or concerted action that affects people's lives and livelihoods. In this conceptualization, social policy is concerned essentially with more fundamental questions of sources and stability of employment, support institutions, processes and structures that determine people's well-being as well as broader natural and political factors which encourage and constrain human development. Thus, in the words of one observer, social policy in this wider vision may be defined as, 'collective interventions directly affecting transformations in social welfare, social

institutions and social relations ... [and] ... access to adequate and secure livelihoods and income' (Mkandawire, 2001: 1).

The switch in emphasis towards a cross-sector, integrated and holistic livelihoods approach involving participatory planning to address people's specific needs is mirrored in other recent attempts to reformulate the social policy agenda (de Haan, 2000; Devereau and Cook, 2000). This evolution in thinking has been inspired by several factors. Firstly, there are evident shortcomings in Northern concepts of social policy when applied to the profound social problems and extreme poverty of developing countries. Secondly, a generally more comprehensive notion of interdependent economic and human development has emerged during the 1990s. Thirdly, the 'sustainable livelihoods framework' (SLF) has emerged as an analytical and operational tool. During the 1980s, the SLF was developed to facilitate a more integrated approach to dealing with poverty and deprivation. Moving away from single-sector strategies, this analytical framework allows livelihood strategies to be analysed within their wider environment, and context-specific solutions to be devised based on local capacities and needs. This framework is explored at greater length in Chapter 3 (Chambers and Conway, 1992; Scoones, 1998; Farrington et al., 1999). In this holistic view of social policy, welfare services and safety nets are likely to play a minor role in poverty alleviation strategies except under special circumstances such as targeted projects for the very poor and/or in emergency relief situations.

Although it will always be necessary to address crisis situations through social fund-type emergency solutions, longer-term development requires investment in people. Followers of the neo-liberal, residual approach take the view that there is necessarily a trade-off between social and economic development and that such social investments are a drain on national resources. However, traditions of political economy from the Enlightenment onwards caution against such simplistic conclusions (Myrdal, 1984). In the 1960s, Adelman and Morris (1965) underlined the importance of social and political variables in accounting for economic performance. Such views have regained their popularity more recently. Stewart et al. (2000) note that countries adopting a human development approach tend to enjoy higher rates of economic growth along with improved social indicators. It has for some time been recognized by major international development institutions that strengthening key social sectors such as basic education and health are instrumental, yielding not only direct productivity gains but also high social returns (UNDP, 1990; World Bank, 1991). Furthermore, the notion that the acquisition of basic human rights and fundamental freedoms forms an integral welfare need essential for balanced human development has gained wide if not universal acceptance (UNDP, 2000).

Most critically, the livelihood approach acknowledges the fact that 'the poor' are not a homogenous mass nor are they always merely weak, passive recipients of government handouts. It emphasizes the fact that they also have strengths, assets and capacities that may be mobilized for pro-active participation in the development process (Ellis, 2000; Helmore and Singh, 2001). Indeed,

8 *Social Policy for Development*

so-called 'empowerment' of the poor, once the exclusive prerogative of radical non-governmental organizations, has now been seized upon – some would say hijacked – by multilateral development banks as a fundamental prerequisite for tackling poverty (World Bank, 2001). Development thus increasingly becomes a multi-institutional challenge in which the State, international development agencies and donors, NGOs, the private sector and grassroots communities must combine forces to design and implement locale-specific solutions to particular problems. In this sense, social policy is necessarily concerned with taking due account of people's expressed needs and with making sure that project or programme design fits and is compatible with the social reality of affected groups (Cernea, 1991). The growing professionalization of social policy and planning as a discipline in its own right within international and domestic institutions, both academic and development-based, bears ample witness to this growing demand for specialist social planning skills.

Another important dimension of social policy embraced by this more holistic approach concerns what could be called its 'scope'. Social policy has conventionally been treated as a macro-level set of issues viewed in national and, more recently, in global terms. Yet analysis, policy prescription and implementation need to be disaggregated by levels of intervention and impact. The social policy expert must apply social science skills to appropriate units of analysis, whether socially or spatially determined. In gauging the impacts and policy implications of a development scheme, for example, it would be crucial to distinguish between its effects on key social units such as groups differentiated by social class, gender, age or ethnicity. In other circumstances, the household may be the most appropriate unit of analysis, while further disaggregation to the level of the individual may reveal additional nuances unperceived at higher levels.

The scope of social policy as it pertains to different institutional contributions is also relevant, as the respective roles of the State and civil society change and social regulation becomes a multi-organizational phenomenon. Cutting across social divisions, spatial or geographical characteristics may reveal key factors relating to local and regional dimensions as well as to national and international aspects. In a development climate that sets much store by decentralization of decision-making and on local participation, such distinctions become crucial. Yet another element of scope relates to the issue of time, since social consequences and policy prescriptions may vary considerably over the short, medium or long term. Thus, social policy analysis and prescription must necessarily take due account of differential scope on the basis of social, spatial and temporal dimensions.

The goals of social policy

The broadening of the social policy agenda described above, from charitable works and welfare service provision to a more encompassing concern for

strengthening livelihoods, necessarily implies a multiplication both of policy objectives and of the types of institutions required in order to achieve them. The goals of social policy have thus become multi-faceted, embracing an ambitious array of ideals towards which, some argue, development organizations seem to be converging at least in part. This package includes poverty reduction, social protection, fighting social exclusion, promoting human rights and even conserving the natural resources that form the basis of many people's livelihoods in the South.

Poverty alleviation

Poverty reduction sits on top of the social policy agenda for practically all development agencies and governments, at least rhetorically. However, important differences exist in terms of how poverty is defined and, consequently, how it may be most effectively tackled (see Chapter 2). Definitions of poverty range from reference to an absolute poverty line expressed in US dollars, to inequality in terms of relative poverty and deprivation and, more recently, to multi-dimensional concepts combining material and non-material needs. Poverty lines remain a popular tool with governments due to their simplicity and, arguably, the ease with which they can be manipulated for political purposes to show greater or lesser degrees of suffering by merely adjusting the poverty threshold. Relative poverty and inequality are concepts that have become increasingly unpopular with official development organizations due to their politically sensitive and operationally problematic nature. Associated in particular (although not always) with the radical left and centralized planning, policies that prescribe compulsory asset redistribution such as massive land reform in order to eradicate poverty have lost favour. If redistribution takes place at all, it is in response to locale- or identity-specific crises in which grassroots organizations and social movements take the initiative to secure livelihood assets, a case in point being Brazil's Movement of the Landless (see Chapter 3). Furthermore, such restructuring is increasingly likely to be facilitated by a market-based approach. In order to defuse potential conflicts, for example, land may be transferred not by expropriation but rather on the basis of willing buyer/willing seller through land banks or similar funding mechanisms.

Associated with the idea of alleviating the absolute poverty of particularly vulnerable groups, another social policy goal to have emerged during the 1990s is that of social protection. According to the World Bank (1990, 2001), the economic priority in development should remain that of maximizing the potential of the poor by increasing labour productivity. In addition, basic social services in health care, education, family planning, nutrition and primary education have to be provided. These two approaches are reputed to have brought about a significant reduction in poverty in Indonesia and Malaysia during the 1980s (World Bank, 1990). However, these measures may not be adequate to protect the very weak and vulnerable. In such cases, targeted transfers and safety nets such as social funds are seen as an essential complement in order to protect

10 Social Policy for Development

those who may not benefit directly from economic growth or social service provision. Emergency measures such as feeding programmes may be necessary, but social protection departs from the mere provision of charity since it is intended to support people's own livelihood strategies in the longer term during times of vulnerability or high risk. A variety of policy responses has thus arisen in the wake of structural adjustment such as employment generation, micro-credit and social insurance schemes (see above and Chapters 7–9).

It has been recognized during the 1990s, perhaps rather tardily, that in addition to poverty and inequality, social disadvantage can be perpetuated through mechanisms of social exclusion. Many factors may combine to exclude or marginalize large sectors of the population from participating fully in mainstream economic, social or political life. These factors may be associated with social class, caste, ethnicity, religion, culture, age or gender, for example. It remains a controversial issue whether concepts of social exclusion constructed in the industrialized nations in relation to minorities have the same applicability in the South where problems of mass poverty and structural marginalization are the norm (see Chapter 2). However, the goal of promoting greater social integration and inclusion into the mainstream of substantial groups which have been actively discriminated against, trapping them in situations of poverty and vulnerability, has become an increasingly important social policy objective. Improving the plight of many women, indigenous populations, the old and those at the bottom of the social ladder such as scheduled castes and street children are increasingly evident on the social policy agenda as specialized areas of investigation and intervention.

Social policy and human rights

Poverty reduction, social protection and livelihood strengthening as well as combating social exclusion have thus emerged as legitimate social policy goals in addition to the more conventional preoccupation with welfare service provision. Since the mid-1990s, the issue of human rights and the promotion of social justice have also entered the social policy agenda. In the post-war period, there have been a number of human rights instruments expounding fundamental freedoms. *The International Bill of Rights* comprises the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (1948), the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* (ICCPR) (1966) and the *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Political Rights* (ICESPR) (1966). There followed several other conventions on discrimination against women: CEDAW (1979); against torture: CAT (1984); and on the rights of the child: CRC (1989). The ICESPR entered into force in 1976 with 142 state parties to this covenant and it introduced a rights-based perspective on development issues.

The early focus on civil and political liberties has been complemented by a concern for economic, social and cultural rights, providing a link with development and social policy discourses. Human rights have in the past tended to be seen as the domain of international relations and legal expertise with social scientists

following a parallel but separate path in their concerns with promoting fundamental freedoms. Major international organizations such as the World Bank and UNDP have long emphasized the importance of providing education, adequate health care and other basic necessities. Yet these policy recommendations have often been couched in rather instrumentalist terms, justified because they contribute to improving economic and social development indicators rather than because they intrinsically constitute a fundamental human right. Such concerns were, however, formalized in the *UN Declaration on the Right to Development* (1986) that placed economic, social and cultural rights on a par with civil and political rights. More recently, the notion of 'environmental human rights' has gained ground, based on the right to a clean and safe environment as well as people's freedom to take part in environmental decision-making (IIED, 2001).

These legal and developmental discourses are now converging so that the strengthening of people's basic rights is increasingly seen as an integral and essential part of the development process. 'Human rights express the bold idea that all people have claims to social arrangements that protect them from the worst abuses and deprivations – and that secure the freedom for a life of dignity' (UNDP, 2000: 2). A human rights approach brings to development the notion that people are entitled to have their basic needs met, and that those in power have a duty and a moral obligation to facilitate this process. By attributing culpability to those who fail to duly deliver these benefits, a rights-based approach thus introduces an element of accountability that can be a powerful tool in the hands of civil society groups lobbying for change. In the final analysis, therefore, achieving comprehensive social policy goals in terms of reducing poverty and inequality, providing basic services, combating exclusion and strengthening people's livelihoods can only be achieved within a political environment that simultaneously seeks to address the issue of human rights for all citizens.

The institutions of social policy

Four major institutional sets of players may be identified in the social policy field: the State, civil society, the business sector and international development or financial agencies. Traditionally, the State has been seen as the major architect of social policy constructs and the main driving force behind social reform. This perception applies in particular to the narrower conception of social policy as providing either for residual needs associated with 'curing' pathologies such as crime and delinquency, or for government-funded incremental expansion of social services to meet the demands of growing urban populations. Yet this picture has become rather more complicated since the 1980s as social policy goals have broadened to encompass a wider range of human development concerns, including poverty alleviation and livelihood support.

Expansion of this social policy agenda has to a significant extent been driven by a diverse range of institutions previously confined to the margins of

12 *Social Policy for Development*

development policy-making and implementation, which was dominated overwhelmingly by central government. They include civil society entities such as non-governmental organizations, grassroots associations, social movements, trade unions, the church and in some cases even the private sector. They have pressured the larger international development and financial institutions such as the World Bank and the IMF, as well as bilateral aid agencies, to adopt a more sensitive and responsive attitude towards people's needs. These international bodies have, at the same time, articulated a more comprehensive social and economic policy agenda that requires the active involvement of many public and civil society collaborators in policy design and execution in the drive towards poverty alleviation, social justice and sustainable development. In addition to the State, civil society and international development institutions, the business sector is also becoming an increasingly important participant in social issues and policy dialogue.

The State

Arguably, however, the State remains the single most crucial social policy institution despite its failure in many contexts and despite the growing pressure upon internal affairs by international financial organizations. Central government expenditure in developing countries grew from 15 per cent of GDP in 1960 to some 25 per cent in 1990 (World Bank, 1997). Central government is still primarily responsible for basic social services such as education and health, for example, which together account for over 6 per cent of public expenditure in developing countries as a whole (UNDP, 2000). Aside from social-sector spending, and far more significantly, governments determine development policy priorities and, hence, the social impacts and social policy implications to which such interventions give rise. For example (as discussed in Chapter 3), the social consequences and resettlement policy implications of large-scale population displacements associated with hydropower development can have major repercussions not just upon the populations directly affected but also on national policies towards those evicted. Similarly, official plans to develop and 'modernize' frontier zones such as the Amazon rainforest in the pursuit of economic progress and national integration have massive social impacts which policy-makers must take due account of in designing more appropriate responses to meeting people's livelihood needs.

During the post-independence period until the 1970s in most developing countries, centralized government planning was seen as the key to promoting economic development. The national plan was seen as a model scientifically crafted by experts to guarantee progress, and seemed during the 1950s and 1960s at least to have '... joined the national anthem and the national flag as a symbol of sovereignty and modernity' (Waterston, 1965: 28). Centralized planning met with limited success and failed by a long way to live up to expectations. During the 1960s and 1970s, supported by agencies such as the World Bank, there was a move towards project planning as the major vehicle through

which governments implemented and shaped policies (Rondinelli, 1983). By the 1980s, other factors had further called into question the effectiveness of the State apparatus in promoting comprehensive economic and social development. The politics of the 'New Right' with its twin philosophy of liberalization and privatization as elements of the so-called 'Washington Consensus' was followed by the collapse of Communism in the USSR and Eastern Europe. During the 1980s, neo-liberal agencies such as the World Bank and the IMF called for the rolling back of the State and condemned virtually any form of central planning.

Yet during the 1990s, for all the rhetoric of the Right, the limitations of these market-based policies became all too evident, especially in the context of structural adjustment and worsening poverty in developing countries (see Chapter 9). Proponents of the Washington Consensus, especially the IMF, have come under heavy criticism for allegedly exacerbating the woes of indebted nations through the imposition of free market economic and social policies (Stiglitz, 2002). The World Bank soon called for a balance to be struck between State and market, each with its own distinctive and mutually supportive contribution to make to the development process, forming a social-democrat-style middle ground or, as it later became popularly known, a 'Third Way' (World Bank, 1991; Giddens, 1998). The key developmental role of the State was thus resurrected but redefined in the process.

According to the new wisdom, the central State should be less interventionist and act more as a facilitator of balanced development, providing a favourable context and concentrating on those fundamental areas in which government has a unique role to play. These areas of government priority include establishing a conducive legal framework, guaranteeing macro-economic stability, investing in basic social services and infrastructure, protecting the poor and vulnerable with safety nets, conserving the environment and promoting sustainable development policies. In addition, alternative controls to top-down government regulation should be explored, such as encouraging effective market-based tools to promote more efficient resource allocation. These include public-private partnerships and the creation of internal 'quasi-markets' in the provision of services such as education and health (see Chapters 5 and 6), as well as public participation to encourage greater accountability of public servants (Turner and Hulme, 1997; World Bank, 1997, 2002; Stiglitz, 2002).

There are different levels of government intervention, from central or federal level through to state and provincial authorities down to local or municipal administration. Many developing countries have large and impenetrable areas of terrain comprising jungle, mountain or desert, whose isolation is often reinforced by a systematic neglect of rural development on the official policy agenda and a poor communications infrastructure. Frequently, the central State may be poorly represented and have only a weak presence. In such cases, although national policies may be set centrally, their execution is very much conditioned by the constellation of regional and local political forces and bureaucratic structures. Government based in the capital is often perceived as being out of touch with local people and their wishes, with heavily centralized decision-making procedures and funding practices leading to the inefficient and ineffective use of resources.

14 *Social Policy for Development*

Increasingly, therefore, the decentralization of responsibilities and resources within the State apparatus both territorially and functionally has been seen as a major tool for streamlining development, including social policy. The term 'decentralization' can be interpreted in many ways (Rondinelli, 1983; Turner and Hulme, 1997). In most cases, it signifies some degree of 'deconcentration', namely, the transfer of authority from central to local government agencies, parastatals and quangos in terms of planning, control over budgets and related decision-making, including a degree of accountability. Purists would argue, however, that authentic decentralization should involve full 'devolution' of power to sub-national governments accountable to their local electorates. Recently, debates on decentralization have become closely entwined with that on the privatization of devolved social services functions such as contracting out of the State system and the introduction of voucher schemes in health and education.

Decentralization within the State, rather like the related notion of 'community participation', was heralded as something of a panacea for development problems and it is portrayed as having many potential advantages. These benefits include: (a) enhanced responsiveness to local needs and the preparation of locally specific, tailor-made plans; (b) stronger motivation and capacity of local field personnel given their greater responsibilities; (c) a reduced workload for agencies at the centre as local representatives take over many delegated tasks; (d) greater inter-agency coordination at the local level; and (e) greater government accountability through local participation (Rondinelli, 1983; Turner and Hulme, 1997).

However, there are also many dangers inherent in decentralization which is mere window-dressing or which contains no effective mechanisms of accountability. It has been forcefully argued, for example, that decentralization policies in many post-independence African countries such as Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania, were masks to disguise the retention of power at the centre by essentially authoritarian, neo-populist regimes (Kitching, 1982). Some success has been achieved with the Indian *panchayati raj* system of local government and in the case of the Philippines (Turner and Hulme, 1997). There have also been notable achievements in improving social service provision when the right balance has been struck between federal and local roles and responsibilities, as in the case of health care in Brazil's northeastern state of Ceará (Tendler, 1995). However, the effectiveness of decentralization policies in Latin America in promoting equity and efficiency has in general been undermined. This has been due either to persistent traditions of centralized government, or to the grip on power of local elites, which usually continue to exercise control over local resources either through the use of force or through the system of clientelistic politics. As discussed below, however, this monopoly has increasingly been challenged by civil society organizations in defence of their livelihoods.

Civil society

The partial rolling back of the State and the modification of its role from sole provider to partner in development has been accompanied by the rapid expansion

of civil society organizations (CSOs). 'Civil society' is an arena embracing a range of entities that have become key actors in the design and implementation of social policy. These include non-governmental organizations (NGOs) at both domestic and international levels, grassroots or community-based entities such as village associations, trade unions and the church as well as social movements that may bring together one or more CSOs in the pursuit of specific goals. Religious or 'faith-based' organizations are an increasingly important sub-category within this group. In Latin America, for example, Catholic entities were instrumental in spearheading radical community action and political protest during the years of military dictatorship in the 1970s and 1980s. More recently, Protestant and evangelical churches have greatly expanded their influence in the region through spiritual and community works. The private business sector is sometimes considered part of civil society but here it is treated separately.

Non-governmental organizations are perhaps the vital link since they are so critical for a number of reasons. They bring together a number of key ingredients for change: popular mobilization at the grassroots, wider political support at national and global levels for important causes and, critically, financial backing where such resources are scarce or non-existent. From occupying a relatively insignificant position in the early 1970s, usually as relief agencies, NGOs are now major contributors to social policy and social development. As a mark of their importance, some 12 per cent of all Western aid is channelled through NGOs (Clark, 1991; UNDP, 2000). In net transfer terms, NGOs contribute more resources than the World Bank. Arguably, the development and policy impact of NGOs is proportionately far greater than even these figures suggest. Clark (1991) identifies six major types of domestic and international development NGO functions, which are by no means mutually exclusive.

- *Relief and welfare agencies* such as Catholic Relief Services and missionary societies undertaking emergency and charitable works.
- *Technical innovation organizations* that operate their own pioneering projects such as the Intermediate Technology Development Group (ITDG) or the Aga Khan Foundation.
- *Public service contractors* working closely with government and official aid agencies, hired to provide services such as health, basic education and micro-credit, where government capacity is limited; for example, CARE and various social funds. Some NGOs are now so heavily dependent on such government funding that their ability to act autonomously is often, arguably, seriously undermined.
- *Popular development agencies* that operate community-based projects and may also become involved in lobbying for wider policy change as their role expands. Examples include Oxfam, ActionAid, Save the Children, the Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC) and FASE in Brazil.
- *Grassroots development organizations*, local, community-based southern NGOs which often have links with popular development agencies in their livelihood struggles and may receive external funding. They are often very small-scale but may expand considerably to embrace a web of connected grassroots actions. This would include well-known examples such as SEWA in India, the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh and Brazil's Movement of the Landless. Policy changes may also spring from such grassroots

16 Social Policy for Development

initiatives and their NGO links, such as the spread of sustainable agriculture for small farmers (Farrington and Bebbington, 1993; Blauert and Zadeck, 1998).

- *Advocacy groups and networks* have no field projects of their own but exist, either at the domestic or international level, for education and lobbying purposes to bring about policy reform. There are many examples of cases in which such CSO/NGO action has had a marked influence on policy formulation and implementation. These include, for example, the introduction of comprehensive resettlement policy guidelines by the World Bank and other development organizations during the 1990s. Other achievements include the campaign against the use of powdered milk as a substitute for breast-feeding and environmental pressure groups working in both the North and South pursuing a range of objectives from sustainable forest management to the campaign against global warming. Other action includes campaigns for debt relief as well as the anti-globalization movement (Keck and Sikkink, 1998).

The relationship of NGOs with the State is a major determinant of their development contribution, depending upon whether voluntary organizations act in parallel with government, in direct opposition or as a vehicle for strengthening the representation and bargaining power of weaker groups in society. In this sense, there has been a broad move from a 'supply-side' (technical, delivering projects) to a 'demand-side' (politicized, demanding reforms) approach (Edwards and Hulme, 1992; Clark, 1995), but globally speaking the picture is still very mixed. In some areas of the world such as the Indian sub-continent, it has been argued that NGOs work much more closely with government, possibly compromising their independence in the process. In other regions such as Latin America, NGOs have tended to be far more confrontational and in open opposition to mainstream government policy, such as on the environment and indigenous affairs, for example, while the situation in Africa is mixed (Turner and Hulme, 1997).

NGOs have some advantages over the public sector. They are in theory based on principles of voluntarism and local participation rather than top-down control. They are task-oriented and their members dedicated to achieving social or development goals as ends rather than as means of achieving political domination. NGOs are attributed with greater sensitivity to people's livelihood needs and often have greater technical skills. At the same time, their smaller scale and lack of red tape should make them more flexible and responsive, with the freedom to challenge official development priorities as appropriate.

More recently, words of caution have been expressed regarding the extent to which NGOs have lived up to expectations. Despite their virtues, NGOs are not the panacea for solving social development problems they were once held up to be. Their contractual role as service providers and project implementers can make NGOs heavily dependent on financial support from government and international agencies, compromising their traditional autonomy, bringing them 'too close for comfort' to the State and weakening their links with the grassroots (Hulme and Edwards, 1997). One of the major criticisms of NGOs is that, unlike most governments, they are almost totally unaccountable to the wider public (Edwards and Hulme, 1995). The strength of NGOs in terms of their heterogeneity may also be a weakness, as their sheer diversity and contrasting

philosophies can make coordination problematic if not impossible at times. Competition and rivalry rather than collaboration are, unfortunately, often the order of the day. In many countries, NGOs are able to offer better salaries and work conditions than government agencies, leading to a drain of qualified personnel from the public sector.

Turner and Hulme (1997) suggest that in future NGOs must recognize their limitations and acknowledge the fact that, although they have certain comparative advantages, they cannot replace the State. Rather, they argue, NGOs should help strengthen civil society to make it more effective and cohesive in articulating people's needs to negotiate with the State apparatus, while demanding greater public accountability. This is especially pertinent in debates about social spending allocations and the need for transparency in order to lessen the danger of misappropriation. Whether through the use of adversarial or collaborative tactics, NGOs still have a major role to play in making sure that government responds effectively to the needs of the poorer, deprived sectors of society which have conventionally been neglected in the policy-making process.

The private sector

Discussions of social policy often concentrate almost exclusively on the role of the State and NGOs, ignoring the increasingly crucial impact of the business sector on people's lives. The private sector comprises at least three major areas of activity: (a) the formal economy of firms and enterprises; (b) the informal sector, so significant in the South; and (c) international business and transnational corporations (TNCs). All have social policy implications to the extent that they create employment and unemployment, generate wages, salaries and other benefits, and engage in activities that may have other profound economic, social and environmental impacts. Indeed, the private sector is arguably the single most important actor on the stage, especially in nations where the State is relatively weak and ineffectual and/or closely controlled by business interests. The stereotypical example of such domination would be certain primary commodity-exporting countries of Central America (Burbach and Flynn, 1980). This potential corporate power is illustrated by the fact that the top 500 corporations account for 30 per cent of the world's gross product, 70 per cent of world trade and 80 per cent of world investment (Griesgraber and Gunter, 1996).

Liberalization and privatization within the context of economic stabilization and adjustment have provided the context for a more obvious and direct link between business and social policy, with mixed results. The sale of State assets to private business in the transport, telecommunications and other sectors in Latin America during the 1990s, for example, may yet prove to be in the public interest by providing more efficient and cost-effective services (Whitehead, 2000). Privatized health provision and pension schemes as well as expansion of internal markets and private university education such as those in Chile and Brazil may help expand access to basic services at least for some sectors of

18 *Social Policy for Development*

society. The contracting out or 'tertiarization' of health and education services from the State to the private sector has become a well-established trend. In rural areas, the appropriation of common property by private commercial interests such as cattle ranchers, logging enterprises and oil companies has had strong adverse impacts on the livelihoods of local and indigenous populations in the Andean highlands and Amazon Basin. This process has stimulated massive popular reaction and the generation at grassroots level of alternative policies for more sustainable forms of development, which are gradually being mainstreamed (Hall, 2000a).

Yet socially and environmentally sustainable development must be underpinned by economically sound practices. For example, if extractivism and agroforestry are to replace destructive slash-and-burn farming practices, thus reducing deforestation rates, markets must be developed for non-timber forest products that can yield an income to support such endeavours. Otherwise, projects will collapse once external support ceases, along with the livelihoods of those producers involved (see Chapter 3). The private commercial sector therefore clearly has a key role to play in helping to generate and sustain environmentally sound markets, a case in point being the expansion of 'green' certified timber produced under managed conditions with no harmful social or ecological impacts.

With some 50,000 companies operating at the multinational level, in addition to steadily expanding domestic business sectors in the South, the issue of 'corporate social responsibility' (CSR) has grown considerably in importance over recent years. The social responsibility of the private sector, 'concerns the relationships of a company not just with its clients, suppliers and employees, but also with other groups, and with the needs, values and goals of the society in which it operates' (UN, 2000a: 2). Many leading companies now attest to their public transparency and accountability through systems of 'social reporting' or 'social accounting'. Such preoccupations have been driven in part by growing pressure from civil society, especially powerful international campaigns designed to 'name and shame' large companies accused of social and environmental abuse. A well-known example is the campaign against child labour in the rug-making industry in India. Major protests and legal challenges have also been made against the socially and ecologically calamitous exploration activities of oil companies, including Texaco and BP, on indigenous territories in the Amazon jungle of Ecuador and Peru as well as Shell on Nigeria's Ogoni lands (Vidal, 1999; Kimerling, 2000). Aside from fear of public approbation, companies also have an incentive to declare their social credentials due to publication of the FTSE4Good and Dow Jones Sustainability indices, which screen enterprises in terms of socially responsible investment practices. Research indicates that corporate social programmes may also often have the side-effect of attracting and retaining socially conscious staff, especially in the wake of 11 September 2001 and the desire of individuals to personally contribute more to society which has been engendered (Murray, 2001).

There are various dimensions to CSR that should be distinguished: (a) *Legal*: this involves complying with local laws and following international guidelines on

matters such as labour, human rights and the environment. (b) *Philanthropic*: companies often donate money, staff time and other resources to benevolent causes as high-profile proof of their commitment to social responsibility, poverty alleviation, etc. (c) *Corporate citizenship*: going beyond legal compliance and charitable works, corporate citizenship implies becoming directly involved in dialogue and action on social issues with company stakeholders (employees, suppliers and markets). In a globalizing world especially, companies' social contracts must extend far beyond the immediate community in which the enterprise is situated.

There is thus increasing pressure for the adoption by companies of international guidelines to regulate activities and ameliorate their social impacts. In 1999, the Secretary-General of the United Nations launched the 'Global Compact' initiative, centred on a set of nine principles based on globally acknowledged human and social rights. Endorsed by sectors of the business community, the Global Compact is designed to stimulate greater commitment to basic social issues such as eliminating child labour, the right to collective bargaining, the elimination of forced and compulsory labour (slavery), discrimination in employment and environmental responsibility (UN, 2000a). These aims were underlined at the sequel to the *World Summit on Social Development* held in Geneva in June 2000, which stressed the need for '... increased corporate awareness of the interrelationship between social development and economic growth' (UN, 2000b; 2000c: 16). Efforts are under way to establish cross-sector partnerships between development NGOs, the private sector and local communities in an attempt to increase the poverty-alleviating potential of business activities. The 'Business Partners for Development' (BPD) network, for example, focuses on the social impacts of oil, gas and mining, while the Atlanta partnership based in Saikot, Pakistan, has campaigned to regulate child labour in the football manufacturing industry (RCD, 2001).

Critics argue that social reporting is motivated more by companies' preoccupations with their public image than by a genuine commitment to social justice or sustainable development, effectively an exercise in 'corporate gloss' (Cowe, 2001). They allege that social reporting appears to have become something of a bandwagon with corporate transparency more illusory than real. It has been pointed out, for example, that three-quarters of the UK's top 100 listed companies that provide such reports supply no quantitative data to back up their claims, even on straightforward issues such as the gender composition of their labour force (Cowe, 2001). Yet generally accepted standards and principles are being developed all the time, such as the AA1000 Framework for accountability monitoring of the Institute of Social and Ethical Accountability (ISEA, 2001) as well as those standards set by the United Nations (UN, 2000a). There can be little doubt that the business sector will play an increasingly important role in the formulation and implementation of social policy at all levels.

International development institutions

Having considered the State, civil society and private business sectors as major players in the social policy arena, a fourth major set of actors encompasses the

20 *Social Policy for Development*

international development institutions (IDIs) and related bodies. This collectivity is made up of several distinct groups of influential organizations: (i) multilateral agencies such as the World Bank and IMF; (ii) the regional development banks – IDB, AfDB and ADB; (iii) bilateral aid donors; (iv) UN agencies such as UNICEF, UNDP, WHO and UNRISD amongst others; and (v) regional and supranational actors such as the EU, NAFTA, the OECD, ILO, WTO and ECLAC. These bodies, together with the activities of major NGOs and transnational corporations as well as the internationalized responses of civil society, have created a relatively new global dimension to the social policy debate. Yet, as several authors have pointed out (Deacon, 1997; Mishra, 1999), unlike in other academic disciplines such as political science, in the social policy field globalization remains under-theorized and under-researched, although this situation is changing fast.

These groups of institutions impinge on social policy in distinctive and sometimes overlapping (although often contradictory) ways. Their influence will be considered at greater length in Chapter 9 but some major issues can be highlighted here. Undoubtedly the highest-profile of these are the World Bank and the IMF, largely as a result of their policies of stabilization and structural adjustment. In the case of the World Bank, structural adjustment loans (SALs) increased from 2 per cent of its total loan portfolio in 1996 to 39 per cent by 1999 (Randel et al., 2000). As already mentioned, the social policy implications of adjustment have been reflected in diverse ways such as public spending cuts affecting basic social services, unemployment and changing employment patterns (for example, expansion of the informal sector) affecting livelihoods, and the creation of social safety nets using devices such as social funds.

However, the World Bank's influence upon the social agenda is arguably much broader than this. It involves sector policy work in education, housing and health amongst others. In addition, the Bank's 'safeguard' policies in the areas of involuntary resettlement, indigenous and cultural affairs attempt to establish basic criteria for incorporating social dimensions into project design and implementation. Furthermore, this influence on social issues is underpinned by the formal prioritization of poverty alleviation alongside economic growth and targeting of the poorest, while enlisting the help of the NGO sector in this process (World Bank, 1991, 2000). The Bank has also been working towards a unified set of social policy principles and 'Social Development Strategy', although this process was still in its formative stages at the time of writing in 2003.

Bilateral aid institutions have traditionally been far more concerned with promoting their own commercial, political and strategic interests than with social policy matters. Japan and the USA, respectively the world's first and second largest donors, accounting for 37 per cent of OECD overseas development assistance (ODA), have been notorious in this respect. Overall, about two-thirds of bilateral aid is still tied to the purchase of donor country goods and technical services (Randel et al., 2000). Yet some donor countries have in recent years emphasized pro-poor policies and have attempted to mainstream a concern with social dimensions in their aid policies and projects. These include

Sweden, Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands and the UK through the DFID's Social Development Division. Regional development banks in Latin America (IDB), Africa (AfDB) and Asia (ADB) tend to take their policy cues from the World Bank in terms of addressing poverty and basic needs alongside encouraging economic growth. However, decisions tend to be less transparent and more heavily influenced by the political agendas of recipient countries rather than by technical considerations. Social policy dimensions remain poorly defined in most instances and the social policy agenda remains ambiguous or unclear. These issues are explored in more detail in Chapter 9.

Since it was established in 1919, the ILO has been instrumental in setting global labour and social standards. Based on the principle of tripartism (the notion that good governance must involve consensus amongst industry, workers and government), some 200 ILO conventions in the post-war period have been formulated, many of which have been ratified by significant numbers of nations. These cover employment policy, social security, social policy, wage-fixing machinery and working conditions as well as the protection of women, children and indigenous peoples. This European welfare policy orientation based on organized labour, corporatist social security structures for the formal labour sector has in recent years been challenged by the neo-liberal thinking of the IMF and World Bank. They view the ILO approach as inappropriate for developing countries on the grounds that it excludes the poor and those who remain outside of the formal labour sector. The OECD, in contrast, has developed a balanced set of economic and social policies, although fears have been expressed that mean-tested targeting could soon be introduced which would challenge the European notion of universal social support (Deacon, 1997).

Social policy has become prominent in discussions about the apparent contradiction between promoting free trade on the one hand and, on the other, guaranteeing basic labour and social rights. The ILO's role in support of international social standards has come to the fore in debates on 'social dumping', or the shedding of social costs by producer nations in order to become more competitive in world markets. Attempts by industrialized nations under the GATT and later the WTO to introduce social clauses in trading agreements in order to guarantee minimum labour standards have been resisted by some developing countries, who see this as an attempt by the North to impose a cost/price disadvantage. EU member states have attempted to give preferential treatment to trading partners that adhere to certain social practices, such as the non-use of forced labour, but such social clauses have come up against WTO rules and this remains a contentious issue.

At the sub-global, regional level, organizations such as the EU, the North American Free Trade Association (NAFTA) and the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) illustrate contrasting approaches to social policy matters. In Europe, the Social Chapter of the Maastricht Treaty of 1992 and the redistributive Structural Fund established in 1979 laid the foundation for attempts to build a regional social policy. Despite resistance from some member-states with their own political agendas, the dominance of the social-democratic centre has continued to move towards common social policies which

22 Social Policy for Development

provide for minimum standards while maintaining economic competitiveness (Deacon, 1997; Hutton, 2002). In Latin America, the growth in conventional statutory social policy has had very little impact on overall poverty (Abel and Lewis, 2001). ECLAC thus takes a broad approach to tackling poverty and deprivation in the region, seeing the attainment of greater equity through a combination of economic and social policy. It emphasizes investments in basic education, health and nutrition as well as strengthened political participation and a robust legal system rather than social security as the key to providing appropriate social policies for the region. This sentiment is well captured in the title of its policy document, *Equity, Development and Citizenship* (Ocampo, 2000). This contrasts strongly with NAFTA's approach, which envisages no redistributive mechanisms and seems not to recognize that its activities might possess any kind of social dimension.

Of the UN agencies, the UNDP and UNICEF have been especially prominent in developing a social policy agenda. In 1978, UNICEF and the WHO convened the path-breaking International Conference on Primary Health-Care at Alma-Ata in the Soviet Union (see Chapter 6). During the mid-1980s, long before the World Bank had expressed concern over the social impacts of structural adjustment, UNICEF specialists were prominent in denouncing the negative costs of adjustment. Annual publication of *The State of the World's Children* (from 1980) as well as via other seminal works such as *Adjustment with a Human Face* (Cornia et al., 1987) had a decisive influence on the Bank and IMF, obliging them to reconsider earlier narrow views. From 1990, the UNDP started publishing the *Human Development Report*, its multi-dimensional 'human development index' (HDI) constituting a new measure of economic and social progress. The HDI combines conventional GDP levels with other indices of life expectancy and educational achievement. In addition, international comparisons are made within the annual report in terms of country performance in related key areas such as gender, the environment and human rights (UNDP, 2000). The UN research institute, UNRISD, has also been increasingly active in examining social policy issues through its programme 'Social Policy in a Development Context' (UNRISD, 2001a, 2001b; Mkandawire, 2001, 2003). This adopts a broad approach to social policy and seeks to promote developmental goals, democracy and social inclusion, while questioning the neo-liberal privatization orthodoxy of the WTO.

A number of UN summit meetings throughout the early 1990s helped to highlight social development goals. These included the *World Conference on Education for All* (Jomtien, Thailand, 1990) and the follow-up *World Education Forum* (Dakar, Senegal, 2000), the *World Summit for Children* (1990), the *Rio Earth Summit* or *UNCED* (1992), the *World Conference on Human Rights* (Vienna, 1993) and the *International Conference on Population and Development* (1994). The *Social Summit* held in Copenhagen in 1995, to which the major UN agencies and many NGOs contributed, '... represented the most significant global accord on the need to tackle issues of poverty, social exclusion and social development' (Deacon, 1997: 87). As Deacon notes, it also clarified the battle lines between the World Bank/IMF anti-poverty and safety net social policy vision for the South

and Eastern Europe on the one hand and, on the other, an alliance of European and some developing countries that oppose social regulation. The sequel *World Summit on Social Development* held in Geneva in 2000 underlined the need to integrate social development with macro-economic growth and noted, '... a growing awareness of the positive impact of effective social policies on economic and social development' (UN, 2000b: 7).

The internationalization of social development issues through the policies and actions of overseas development assistance organizations, supranational NGOs and the business sector has lent support to the notion that national social policy is increasingly moulded by external agents. 'Strong' globalization theory views the powers of individual nation-states as having been eroded and national sovereignty undermined by the pressures of having to conform with the needs of globally influential institutions converging towards a neo-liberal consensus. This view has been criticized by others as unduly reductionist, underestimating the autonomy of nation-states and other domestic political forces in their dialogue with global actors on economic and social issues (Yeates, 2001). Indeed, it is argued that the social risks associated with globalization could force States to intervene more actively in order to expand social protection mechanisms. The above-mentioned clash of perspectives on the nature and scope of social policy between, for example, the EU, ILO and OECD on the one hand and, on the other, the World Bank, illustrates this tension very clearly. The former organizations subscribe to a social policy agenda centred around comprehensive, statutory welfare provision based on redistributive principles of the mature welfare state. The Bank, on the other hand, has endorsed a more selective, residual, targeted anti-poverty approach involving means-testing and much greater private provision which mirrors US domestic policy to a large extent (Hutton, 2002).

Despite ideological and institutional differences in perspective on this issue, there have been moves to try and define a common global standard for social policy. Deacon has identified five elements of a 'global social reformist project' or 'global governance discourse' (1997: 202–3). These consist of: regulating global competition, making the Bank and IMF more accountable, reforming the UN, strengthening global human rights and empowering international civil society. More specifically, at the request of the Development Committee of the World Bank/IMF and prompted by the East Asia financial crisis, the Bank produced a set of guidelines for 'good practice in social policy' (World Bank, 1998, 1999a). Drawing heavily on the 10 basic principles outlined at the Copenhagen Social Summit in 1995, the Bank outlined four major areas or goals: universal access to basic services, securing sustainable livelihoods, providing social protection for the weakest and fostering social integration. The Bank places a strong emphasis on social policy to deal with short-term hardship and speaks unequivocally of 'managing the social dimensions of crisis' through good social practices via safety nets, basic education, health and labour market policies (World Bank, 1999a, 1999b).

However, serious doubts have been raised about the feasibility of applying and monitoring such a common global standard. Arguably, any global principles

24 *Social Policy for Development*

should refer to long-term policy and not just to dealing with situations of financial crisis. Furthermore, even if a measure of common agreement could be reached, it is unlikely that such universal principles could be applied to all countries. In the final analysis, the practical application of any set of global principles is likely to be undermined by a '... lack of structures of power, authority and accountability capable of dealing with issues of this scope and scale' (Norton, 2000: 4).

Theoretical perspectives in social policy

The preceding sections of this chapter have discussed definitions of social policy, its goals and major implementing institutions. As an academic textbook, the present volume also seeks to identify major cross-cutting theoretical debates that underpin the design and practice of social policy. Since social policy is concerned primarily with the best ways of promoting people's welfare, it has tended to concentrate on practical issues. For many years, these were at the forefront of social policy thinking and theory was not regarded as very important. Many social policy experts believed that their profession should be primarily concerned with identifying social needs and social problems, formulating policy options and implementing appropriate solutions, neglecting theoretical issues in the process. However, it is more widely accepted today that theory plays a major role in shaping social policy decisions. It is also recognized that theoretical ideas have, in fact, always influenced social policy. Although these ideas were often implicit, social policy has always been based on assumptions about how social problems and needs could best be dealt with. Although it was previously argued by some that social policy is a technical field based on a scientific assessment of what works best, such opinions are heavily influenced by values and ideological beliefs.

Today, the influence of theory on social policy decisions is widely acknowledged. By recognizing the importance of theory, social scientists have been able to understand the ideological assumptions underlying different social policy approaches. An appreciation of theory has also helped explain why social policy decisions have been made and it has facilitated an analysis of the wider forces that have influenced the emergence of social policy. Theory has also helped to classify different types of social policy approaches, and this has resulted in the construction of different models of social policy that provide a better understanding of the field. This section is concerned with the role of theory in social policy. It describes and illustrates the different types of theory that characterize social policy. Special emphasis is placed on normative theory, which provides a value base for social policy. Generally, three types of social policy theory can be identified: (1) representational theory; (2) explanatory or analytical theory; and (3) normative theory.

Representational theory

This is concerned with classification. It seeks to reduce very complex social policy phenomena to more manageable categories and, in this way, to promote a better understanding of different social policy approaches. These categories are also known as typologies or models. One of the first attempts to construct a typology of social policies was Wilensky and Lebeaux's (1965) residual-institutional model. This model divided social policies into two categories. The first category, which the authors called the 'residual model', consists of social policies that are limited and meagre, and are referred to in previous discussions in this chapter of colonial social policy and of structural adjustment. They are used to supplement the family, voluntary sector and market when these institutions are unable to meet social needs. The second type, which they called the 'institutional' model, consists of social policies that play a frontline role in society and promote universal coverage and extensive social service provision. The residual-institutional model was subsequently expanded by Titmuss (1974), who added a third model that he called the 'industrial achievement-performance model'. This model, he believed, linked social policy to the economy and provided welfare services on the basis of merit, work performance and productivity. While Wilensky and Lebeaux's model sought to classify two major social policy approaches in the United States, Titmuss used his model to identify the dominant social policy approaches being used in different countries.

Since then, numerous models of social policy have been developed. One of the most widely cited is Esping-Andersen's (1990) 'three worlds' model. Like Titmuss' model, Esping-Andersen also groups countries in terms of their social policy approaches. However, the models developed by Wilensky and Lebeaux, Titmuss, Esping-Andersen and other scholars refer to the industrialized countries and, as MacPherson and Midgley (1987) showed, few attempts have been made to construct models that incorporate the developing countries of the South.

Explanatory or analytical theory

Such theory seeks to answer a variety of questions about the nature of social policy, its functions in society and the reasons social policies have evolved. This approach has generated a substantial body of knowledge that has given interesting answers to many questions. For example, different theoretical approaches have been used to explain the reasons governments around the world expanded social programmes during the middle decades of the twentieth century. As Midgley (1997) revealed, some theories emphasize the role of industrialization in motivating governments to extend social welfare provisions, while others believe that interest groups played a vital role in fostering

26 *Social Policy for Development*

social policy expansion. Yet others have concluded that social policies were expanded because governments genuinely wanted to improve social conditions and promote the welfare of their citizens. In turn, others have contended that governments adopted social policies because they realized that social programmes could prevent political unrest and maintain order. Unfortunately, as will be recognized, these different theories have not produced answers that are universally accepted, and explanatory social policy theory is still marked by sharp disagreements. Sharp disagreements also characterize a third type of social policy theory known as normative theory.

Normative theories

Normative theories are used to provide a value framework for social policy. They help to identify desirable social policies in terms of different sets of values, ideologies and political objectives. Normative social policy theory is closely associated with political ideologies. People on the political right will be committed to quite different social policies than those on the political left. But normative theory is linked not only to these familiar political ideologies. People of different religious points of view, people with strong nationalist beliefs, and people who believe that the best society is one based on free market principles take very different normative social policy positions.

Normative theories play a vital role in social policy. They influence the social policy decisions of political parties, governments, non-governmental organizations, popular social movements and official international bodies. These different groups prefer different normative theories and give expression to these theories in their social policy decisions. Normative social policy theory often evokes strong feelings. Many people have a strong commitment to their beliefs and they will oppose social policies that contradict their deeply felt views. Traditionalists oppose social policies that appear to undermine cultural beliefs or weaken the traditional family. Nationalists oppose social policies that appear to favour social groups who do not belong to the nation. Free marketers challenge the extension of government provisions, and statisticians will oppose the privatization of social services. It is obvious that social policy is infused with normative convictions. This is why it is important to understand different normative theories in social policy and to appreciate their role in shaping social policy decisions.

Studying normative theory

It was noted earlier that many social policy experts previously believed that social policy is a purely technical subject concerned with the practical aspects of solving social problems and meeting social needs. These experts believed that social policy should transcend ideological differences. This view reflected

what has been called the 'welfare consensus' of the post-World War II years when political parties of different ideological beliefs seemed to agree that the government should be responsible for health care, education, housing, social security and other social programmes. Many social policy writers at the time believed that ideology was not a very important factor in explaining the reasons for government involvement in social welfare. They claimed that governments expanded social programmes because of the forces of industrialization, the activities of interest groups and other non-ideological factors.

During the 1970s and 1980s, this belief was shaken by the strident arguments of those on the political right who insisted that social expenditure was causing economic stagnation, sapping the industrial countries of their economic vitality and creating a huge underclass of indolent people who were totally dependent on government. Economists associated with the political right published influential papers claiming that social security was harming economic growth (Feldstein, 1974). They also argued that the proportion of the population who were not working and who received generous social benefits from the government had increased substantially. This had, they argued, imposed an intolerable burden on the few producers who continued to work (Bacon and Eltis, 1976).

At the same time, Marxist writers were popularizing the idea that social welfare was incompatible with capitalism (Gough, 1979; Offe, 1984). They argued that the governments of the Western capitalist countries were not altruistic but had used social policy to exercise social control and promote the interests of capitalism. However, they claimed that these countries would soon face a crisis of legitimacy in which the fiscal burden of providing extensive social services in an attempt to pacify working people would prove to be unsustainable (O'Connor, 1973). It was at this time that the first systematic attempts were made to identify the major normative approaches to social policy. Initially, these attempts identified the major ideological orientations in social policy. The first account of ideology in social policy was published by George and Wilding in 1976. Although it was narrowly concerned with Britain and its political ideologies, it facilitated more sophisticated analyses in which political ideology was linked to major social science theories such as structuralism, functionalism and critical theory (Taylor-Gooby and Dale, 1981; Hewitt, 1992).

These efforts have now resulted in a much more extensive appreciation of the role and importance of normative theory in social policy. They have also shown just how complicated the study of normative theory in social policy has become. While George and Wilding identified four major normative positions in social policy, it is now recognized that there are many more. In addition, it is also accepted that the elemental positions they identified can be combined and linked to each other to form a very complex normative system. However, studies of normative social policy theory have focused primarily on the industrialized countries. Although little research into non-Western normative systems and their relevance to social policy has been undertaken, some social policy scholars have attempted to examine the role of indigenous normative systems on social policy in the South. For example, some scholars have claimed that social policy in the East Asian countries is based on Confucian beliefs (Jones,

28 *Social Policy for Development*

1993). Although opinions are divided on this subject, this discussion suggests that, in future, more attention will be paid to the role of indigenous values and beliefs in social policy.

Varieties of normative theory

Although it is very difficult to classify and analyse the bewildering variety of normative positions in social policy today, social policy scholars have built on George and Wilding's seminal contribution to extend the spectrum of ideological beliefs that have influenced social policy thinking. As was noted earlier, some writers have also sought to combine an account of ideology with social science positions that are not overtly ideological but which nevertheless provide a normative basis for social policy thinking. For example, Taylor-Gooby and Dale (1981) developed a classification in which they identified three groups of social scientists that have exerted a strong normative influence on social policy. The first group, which they called the 'individualists', includes Milton Friedman and Frederick von Hayek. The second group, which they called the 'reformists', includes William Beveridge, John Maynard Keynes, Richard Titmuss and Kenneth Galbraith. The third group, or 'structuralists', includes Fred Hirsch, Jürgen Habermas and Michel Foucault. The writings of these social scientists obviously transcend the ideological categories identified by George and Wilding, which have nevertheless exerted an influence on social policy thinking.

Another approach to understanding the role of normative theory in social policy comes from Midgley's (1993, 1995) analysis of key social development strategies. His analysis is based on what he calls the three dominant ideological traditions in Western social and political thought. These are 'individualism', 'collectivism' and 'populism'. These three traditions give rise to distinctive approaches that respectively emphasize the role of the market, the State and communities in social development. Midgley suggests that these ideological positions have provided a normative basis for many different social development policies and programmes. Sustainable development, the promotion of micro-enterprises, centralized development planning, community participation and many other interventions are all derived from these basic orientations, although in complex ways that sometimes involve the amalgamation of different orientations. The three ideological traditions are, therefore, the building blocks that are used to construct more complex normative systems and to inspire particular social development strategies.

(1) *The statist approach.* Social policy has historically been strongly influenced by statism. Indeed, the evolution of social policy in many parts of the world during the twentieth century owed much to the idea that governments could bring about significant improvements in social conditions by introducing a range of social services to meet social needs and raise the living standards of ordinary people. Statism is inspired by a collectivist ideology suggesting that the best society is one in which people cooperate to meet their common needs. Under the influence of collectivism, they form a variety of associations or

collectives and share their resources for the good of all its members. The ultimate collective is the State that is not, in collectivist thinking, a remote and bureaucratic organization but a body comprised of all citizens, which is answerable to the citizens and which serves their interests.

These ideas inspired nineteenth-century liberal reformers, social democrats and Marxists alike who believed that the State's power and ability to control and direct resources could be used to promote the well-being of all. Of course, their goal was to secure political office and ensure that comprehensive social services were introduced. While Marxists believed that it would only be possible to take control of the State through revolution, social democrats were optimistic that they could persuade the electorate to vote for them and that they would secure political power in this way. The success of social democratic parties in Europe during the middle decades of the last century resulted in a massive expansion of government social service provisions and, for this reason, these countries were often described as 'welfare states'. The normative ideas that influenced this expansion were not, at first, explicated, and as was noted earlier, many social policy experts paid little attention to the assumptions on which social policy expansion was based. The lack of awareness of theory was encouraged by the 'welfare consensus' of the time, which downplayed the role of ideology in social policy.

However, as noted above, the normative ideas attending social policy were subsequently recognized and formalized. The dominant position, which favoured government social welfare provision, became known as 'institutionalism' or 'welfarism'. Its leading exponents included Wilensky and Lebeaux (1965) whose famous typology already referred to above not only classified social policies but also took a normative position by asserting the superiority of the institutional over the residual approach. Titmuss (1968, 1971, 1974) developed this idea and in many eloquent publications offered a powerful moral justification for State welfare stressing its role in giving expression to people's altruistic feelings, promoting social integration and creating a caring and just society. Marshall's (1950) discussion of rights also informed the development of institutional theory. He argued that the notion of citizenship had slowly evolved in European countries through a process of struggle to secure civil and political rights for all. In the latter half of the twentieth century, these struggles had culminated in the recognition that people also had social rights. By ensuring that all citizens were educated, properly housed, adequately fed and provided with health and other social services, the welfare state embodied the ideal of social rights.

These normative ideas had a powerful influence on social policy in the decades following World War II. Many governments embraced the notion of social rights and many signed international treaties and conventions that guaranteed the provision of social services. Many accepted the role of social welfare in promoting social solidarity and believed that it was the duty of the State to ensure that the basic needs of all citizens were met. These ideas were not confined to the industrial countries of the North but were promoted internationally by the United Nations and other organizations as well as, of course, by

30 *Social Policy for Development*

many governments in the developing world. Yet by the 1970s institutional-welfarist theory was being widely challenged. As mentioned above, Marxists argued that governments were hardly motivated by altruism to care for their citizens and that they cynically used the social services to exert social and political control (Gough, 1979; Offe, 1984). Populists agreed, arguing that the State was out of touch with ordinary people and that social services were being administered by an indifferent and insensitive bureaucracy that had little real interest in helping those in need (Kitching, 1982; Midgley, 1995).

But by far the most forceful criticism of the institutional approach came from neo-liberal economists and others on the political right who claimed that government provisions were seriously damaging the economy and fostering indolence and irresponsibility (Feldstein, 1974; Friedman and Friedman, 1980; Murray, 1984). Although right-wing critics had been actively opposing government intervention for many years, it was only in the 1980s that their opposition resulted in retrenchments in social programmes. With the election in the 1980s of political parties with radical right-wing commitments not only in Britain and the United States, but in other parts of the world as well, the welfare consensus and the dominance of the institutional-welfarist approach was effectively ended.

Despite the demise of institutionalist theory, various attempts have been made to revitalize the statist approach and several forms of neo-institutionalism in social policy have been promoted. These include Giddens' 'Third Way' theory and Midgley's developmentalist theory. Other neo-institutionalist theories have also been proposed but these two examples are indicative of the ways social policy scholars are trying to reformulate earlier statist ideas. Third Way theory (Giddens, 1998) has provided a normative basis for the British Labour Party's approach to social policy. It emphasizes the need for a more pluralist welfare system in which the State seeks to promote greater individual responsibility, community involvement, market participation and voluntary provision in social welfare. The Third Way thus offers a new position on the ideological spectrum between the radical advocacy of free markets by neo-liberals (the new right) and the old statism of traditional social democrats (the old left) such as Titmuss who believed that the State should be the sole provider of social services.

Developmentalism is based on social development thinking that first emerged in the South and has been actively promoted by the United Nations and other international organizations (Midgley, 1995, 1999). Developmentalism offers a macro-perspective on social policy and seeks purposefully to link social and economic policies within a comprehensive, State-directed development process, involving both civil society and business organizations in promoting development goals. It regards economic development as a desirable and essential element in social welfare, and proposes that social programmes support the developmental commitment. Developmentalism urges the adoption of macro-economic policies that promote employment, raise incomes and attain other 'people-centred' economic development outcomes. It also recommends that social programmes be 'productivist' and investment-oriented by

promoting economic participation and generating positive rates of return to the economy.

By linking productivist social investment programmes to a comprehensive development process that is sustainable and people-centred, developmentalism offers a universalistic and interventionist approach that is committed to progressive social change. No lesser an institution than the World Bank has also reaffirmed the crucial role of an efficient and reformed State in guiding the development process, providing appropriate regulatory frameworks and a supportive policy environment within a Comprehensive Development Framework (World Bank, 1997, 2000). Research from many countries from Brazil to South Korea clearly shows that successful social policy formulation and implementation is a multi-institutional process in which public institutions commonly play a central role in directing progressive change (Grindle, 1980; Grindle and Thomas, 1991; Tendler, 1995; Mehotra and Jolly, 1998; Stiglitz, 2002).

(2) *The enterprise approach.* The enterprise approach is based on individualist ideology that stresses the fundamental importance and centrality of the individual in social life. Its roots have been traced to the Protestant reformation, the rise of rationalism during the Renaissance and the successful assertion of individual liberties over traditional feudal authority during the French and American revolutions and the English civil war. Individualism also finds expression in utilitarianism and, in its economic form, in the doctrine of *laissez-faire* and in free market economics.

As noted earlier, the enterprise approach previously exerted little influence in social policy. However, following the electoral successes of the Thatcher and Reagan administrations in the 1980s, it now shapes social policy thinking in many parts of the world. Under the influence of individualist ideology, many governments, including those in the political centre, have abandoned institutional welfarism and now appear to favour a minimal role for government in social welfare. With the imposition of strict public budget limits, the social services have been retrenched and they are increasingly contracted out to commercial providers. Social policy has been subordinated to the interests of free market capitalism and it now seems that residualism dominates social policy thinking.

The enterprise approach stresses the primacy of the market in social welfare. Neo-liberals believe that social policies should be compatible with the market economy and reinforce market relations. This means that social policies should never undermine the working of the market by imposing excessive taxation, or by facilitating the exit of people from the market unless they are genuinely unable to work through illness or disability. Social policies should encourage individual responsibility and hard work. Social needs should, as far as possible, be met through the market. This requires the creation of viable markets in the social services. Private commercial firms should be encouraged to provide health, education, social security and other services previously supplied by government. Government health programmes should be replaced with private medical care and social insurance should be abolished and replaced with

32 *Social Policy for Development*

commercially managed retirement accounts. Similarly, education and housing should be obtained through the market.

As a result of the influence of enterprise theory in social policy, governments around the world are increasingly contracting out the social services to commercial providers. While non-profit organizations are also encouraged to bid for contracts, commercial firms have been very successful in assuming responsibility for managing prisons, children's services, substance abuse clinics, homes for the elderly and many other programmes that were previously administered by government agencies. However, the use of commercial providers has been very controversial and many social policy writers have been critical of this trend.

The enterprise approach also finds expression in efforts to integrate the poor and the recipients of social benefits into the capitalist economy. A leading advocate of this approach is Stoesz (2000) who is very critical of government social programmes. He believes that these programmes marginalize poor people and keep them out of the productive economy. Instead of solving the problem of poverty, institutional welfarism has created a culture of welfare dependency and other ills that perpetuate deprivation. But, he contends, poor people and welfare clients are not lazy or unwilling to work. Rather, they lack the opportunities to participate in the market economy and enjoy the benefits that capitalism can bring. Stoesz argues that the oppressive weight of the welfare system must be lifted and welfare recipients and the poor must be given opportunities to participate in the market economy and learn to function within it. Mechanisms for promoting market integration include wage supplements, asset building and community capitalism. These mechanisms are comprised of policies and programmes that Stoesz describes as 'bootstraps capitalism'. If poverty is to be ended, he argues, welfare reform must itself be reformed to promote a dynamic process of bootstraps capitalism that integrates the poor into the market.

Stoesz's advocacy of market integration finds expression in 'welfare-to-work' programmes, which have become an important ingredient in social policy in the countries of the North. These programmes promote employment among those who previously received government social benefits. For example, the national welfare-to-work programme established in the United States in 1996 compels welfare clients to accept part-time employment as a condition for receiving benefits. As they adapt to employment, they are encouraged to work full-time and, indeed, the length of time they can continue to receive benefits is limited to five years.

The American legislation is based on the ideas of Mead (1992, 1997) who believes that governments must deal firmly with those who are dependent on welfare. Unlike Stoesz, Mead believes that the poor do not want to work and that they prefer to receive government benefits. Therefore, governments must actively promote employment and even use sanctions to ensure that this goal is achieved. Government should not waste resources trying to train or educate welfare clients or counsel or help them to cope with their problems. Instead, a firm, paternalistic approach that promotes 'work first' should be employed.

Since the number of people receiving benefits in the United States has fallen dramatically in recent years, the new welfare-to-work programme is widely viewed as a major success. However, many studies of the new American system are not optimistic that those who no longer receive welfare benefits will be able to raise their incomes to acceptable levels and permanently escape poverty. Nevertheless, many other countries are also adopting programmes of this kind in the belief that the 'work first' approach will be successful (Lodemal and Trickey, 2001). The popularity of the workfare approach in the North has led scholars such as Jessop (1994) to conclude that the institutional welfare state has now been replaced by a workfare state. In developing countries, the use of social funds to encourage individual productive enterprise through micro-credit and similar schemes mirrors something of this work ethic ideology.

(3) *The populist approach.* A third normative approach in social policy is based on populist ideology that emphasizes the involvement of 'the people' and their common values, beliefs and culture in social welfare. Although the concept of 'the people' is poorly defined, advocates of the populist approach believe that the people rather than individuals or collectives form the core of society and that the best society is one that recognizes and gives expression to their lifestyles and beliefs. Populist leaders often contrast the virtues of ordinary people with the interests of big business and government that, they contend, conspire to thwart the people's welfare. Many populist political leaders effectively use anti-establishment rhetoric to secure electoral support and they often advocate the expansion of social programmes that serve the needs of the people. Often, they promote nationalist sentiments and sometimes engage in anti-immigrant and other forms of negative ethnic rhetoric that appeals to the wider public.

Populist ideas also inform social movements, which emerge from time to time to gather widespread popular support for social and political causes. These movements are often comprised of loosely formed social groups and organizations, but they can be very effective in promoting social change. Many populists, also known as 'communitarians', believe that the community is the prime locus for people's activities and they stress the importance of communities in promoting a sense of belonging, fostering integration and meeting social needs. According to Etzioni (1994), for example, local groups may improve social conditions through their potential for strengthening individuals' entitlements and responsibilities as members of 'communities'. Together, populism and communitarianism comprise a very important normative perspective that has exerted a powerful influence in social policy thinking, particularly in the developing countries of the South.

Indeed, several scholars have written about the way the concept of development itself reflects strong populist tendencies (Kitching, 1982). Populism has certainly been a powerful theme in electoral politics in many developing countries and, in the form of nationalism, has exerted widespread influence. It has also provided a normative basis for social policy. For example, populism was an obvious factor in the expansion of the social services in Argentina during the time of President Juan Peron and it still exerts some influence on

34 *Social Policy for Development*

social policy in the country and in other Latin American countries as well. Populist ideas also informed the social policies of President Lyndon Johnson in the United States in the 1960s and, earlier, it had fostered the introduction of social programmes under Governor Huey Long and his brother Earl K. Long in Louisiana.

Social policy has also been influenced by radical populist ideas associated with social movements and revolutionary groups in many parts of the world. Radical populists have used confrontational tactics to pressure governments to address wrongs, introduce social reforms and expand social provisions. In the United States, campaigners like Saul Alinsky (1946, 1971) drew in their experiences of political organizing to formulate proposals that community organizers could use to bring about social change. His ideas have been widely adopted in many parts of the world. They have also been extended by numerous social activists who today advocate empowerment and 'conscientization' in organizing ordinary people to fight social injustice and improve social welfare conditions. Most notably, the Brazilian educationalist Paulo Freire (1972) advocated radical adult literacy training techniques as a tool for wider political action by the grassroots to press for economic and social justice (see Chapter 5). Of course, not all forms of populist engagement are based on conflict, and some organizers such as Mahatma Gandhi and Dr Martin Luther King have been strong advocates of non-violent resistance.

Social movements have brought about significant changes over the years and, as a result of their efforts, social policies in many countries have been substantially modified or expanded. The women's movement has played a major role not only in challenging traditional patriarchal arrangements and improving the status of women but in changing conventional social policy approaches towards education, health care, child welfare and family life. While it cannot be claimed that these gains have ended women's oppression, much has been achieved. Similarly, the environmental movement has not only drawn attention to the degradation of the natural world through industrialization, commercialization and consumerism but has secured important policy reforms that have improved the well-being of millions of people.

Community-based social programmes are now well established and form an integral part of the social service system. Previously, governments made extensive use of residential facilities to care for people in need. People in poverty, those with disabilities, neglected and abandoned children, the elderly and many other needy groups were housed in institutions and segregated from society. Today, services are more likely to be provided to needy people in their homes and in their communities. In addition, communities are now more frequently involved in the provision of social services. The developing countries have given international leadership in showing how local people can be actively involved in partnership with governments in creating community-based educational, health, housing and social service programmes. Often, these programmes adopt a productivist approach that links social programmes to economic development activities. Indeed, it was the formative involvement of local people in community-based schemes of this kind that created the

community development model which is now so widely used around the world not only to promote social welfare at the local level but to enhance local community economic development (Brokensha and Hodge, 1969; Dore and Mars, 1981).

Community development initiatives have also embraced more radical action approaches that incorporate ideas such as 'conscientization' and people's empowerment in the provision of community social programmes (Freire, 1972; Kane, 2001). Departing from the State-directed, traditional community development model, these programmes are organized by local people themselves or with the support of local activists and non-governmental agencies. While they may seek support from the government and international funding institutions, they stress the need for local governance and people's involvement in service delivery.

However, it is important to recognize that populism also offers a normative basis for social welfare approaches that may not be commended by all progressive social policy thinkers. For example, nationalism, as a form of populism, emphasizes the role of government social services in creating national cohesion and strengthening the people's capacity to resist external threats. During the 1930s, the Nazi government in Germany expanded social provisions to promote the health, vitality and well-being of what it called the Aryan nation. Those who were excluded from the government's definition of national citizenship, such as Jews, Romany people, Slavs, gays and others were not only denied access to these services but were eventually subjected to the genocidal horrors of exclusion. Tang (2000) has also noted, for example, how social welfare provision in the case of the East Asian 'tigers' has in the opinion of some been driven in part by nationalistic political goals.

Populist and nationalist ideology is often linked to the advocacy of the people's traditional values and beliefs. In more recent times, with the resurgence of Islamic movements, traditionalism has become an important normative influence in social policy. The governments of Iran, Pakistan and several other Muslim countries have modified their social policies by replacing established Western approaches with Koranic provisions. Perhaps the most extreme example was the Taliban government in Afghanistan. Traditionalism has transcended social service provisions and informed other dimensions of social policy in these countries as well. Policies relating to marriage and divorce, the education of women and other family matters are, increasingly, being shaped by Islamic teaching. Of course, social policy in some countries such as Saudi Arabia has historically reflected traditional beliefs (Dabbagh, 1993).

Similar tendencies that reaffirm traditional values in social policy can be identified in other countries such as India where Hindu beliefs are being more vigorously promoted by popular social movements. In East Asia, it has been argued that the economic success of the four 'tigers' (Taiwan, South Korea, Singapore and Hong Kong) may be attributed to the traditional values of hard work, thrift and family cohesion associated with Confucianism (Jones, 1993; Tang, 2000). In Latin America, traditional Catholic teachings have, under heavy Vatican pressure, again been emphasized since the late 1980s. This has helped

36 *Social Policy for Development*

to reduce the impact of the radical church and its Liberation Theology, so influential during the 1970s and early 1980s, and critical in the formation of contemporary 'popular education' movements (Kane, 2001).

In the United States, traditionalism has found expression in the writings of several social policy scholars such as Olasky (1992) and Tanner (1996) who believe that government should abolish social services because these are supposedly incompatible with traditional American cultural values. Olasky argues that the churches and charities have historically functioned to help those in need and that the government should take steps to encourage them to once again play their traditional role. These ideas have been very appealing to President George W. Bush who has created a new Federal government agency known as the Office of Faith-Based Services that, it is hoped, will revitalize religious charity.

Towards a holistic social policy

The three major normative approaches discussed above have all contributed to the emergence of a broader and more all-embracing notion of social policy. Thinking in this field retains the provision of safety nets and social services as central and important components of social policy. Some critics argue, indeed, that policy-makers continue to over-stress residualism because it enables them (especially international donors) to 'projectize' social policy (Tendler, 2003). However, the notion of social policy has clearly expanded substantially to include livelihoods and rights-based approaches to the alleviation of poverty and satisfaction of basic needs. 'Holistic' social policy thus incorporates elements of the statist, enterprise and populist paradigms. From statism comes recognition of the continued importance of pro-active government to make economic and social investments and regulate the private sector while meeting people's basic needs and guaranteeing fundamental freedoms. The enterprise approach stresses the need to protect vulnerable groups with tailored anti-poverty measures and to improve the efficiency of service provision via the use of economic incentives. Increasingly, the adoption of economically sound, market-based strategies is seen as an essential element within income-generating projects to strengthen livelihoods. Populist development traditions underline the centrality of active community mobilization mediated via a range of institutions as a means of articulating people's needs and enhancing their participation in the process of policy design and implementation.

There is no doubting the fact that these approaches continue to represent ideologically contrasting, and often contradictory, stances to the challenge of addressing poverty and deprivation. While they share some middle ground, they represent frequently conflicting perceptions of how the world works and how its problems are best tackled. Yet be that as it may, it can also be argued that there is nowadays in development discourse and action a greater acceptance

of social policy as a versatile actor performing diverse roles in accordance with different scenarios. There is, arguably, a more common understanding of social policy as a multi-dimensional notion aimed at addressing diverse social needs in diverse ways. While it may be premature to speak of a 'globalized' social policy, there has undoubtedly been a marriage of sorts in terms of theory, policy and practice of social policy. Some of these basic ideas are brought together in Table 1.1 in terms of normative theories and their implications for defining the leading players, target audiences and the combination of policies considered appropriate for tackling the problems within a given context.

Be that as it may, however, the ultimate test of new social policy formulations resides in how effective such approaches prove to be in effectively addressing poverty and deprivation. In the final analysis, no matter how policies are redefined and repackaged, political commitment is required at the domestic and international levels to seriously tackle these social issues and allocate resources accordingly. In the case of Latin America, for example, a brand of neo-liberal 'New Social Policy' involving a 'pragmatic blend of State provision, self-help solutions, private initiative and NGO assistance' was successful during the 1990s in neutralizing critics. Yet it has not faced up to basic problems of inequities in the distribution of power and wealth or persistent poverty, generating political tensions which have exploded into violence in countries such as Venezuela, Mexico, Bolivia and Ecuador (Abel and Lewis, 2002).

The remainder of this volume will explore in more detail various dimensions of social policy for development. Chapter 2 will examine concepts of poverty and social exclusion and the policy implications for addressing these issues in the South. Chapter 3 considers changing approaches to rural development in the evolution from modernization towards a sustainable livelihoods policy approach, while Chapter 4 analyses urban development and social policy. The links between basic education and social development are discussed in Chapter 5, while Chapter 6 looks at changing health policies and the gradual demise of primary health care in the context of economic liberalization. Chapters 7 and 8 respectively examine social work and social security policies in the developing world. Finally, Chapter 9 explores the specific contributions of overseas development assistance to advancing the social policy agenda.

Recommended Reading

The following sources offer a discussion of major themes within the evolving field of social policy in developing countries.

- Mkandawire, T. (ed.) (2003) *Social Policy in a Development Context*. Geneva: UNRISD. This brings together a series of papers arising from the research project of the same title, running from 2000–05. Its main themes are social policy in relation to macro-economics, late industrializing countries, democratization, globalization and gender.

Table: 1.1 Normative theories and their social policy implications

Social policy traditions in normative theory	Main actors	Target groups/goals	Social policy implications
(1) <i>Statist Approach</i>	Central State (top-down)	Household welfare	Incrementalism (South) Welfare state (North) Statutory social services Citizenship rights
(2) <i>Enterprise Approach</i>	Market	Individual support	Residualism Safety nets/social funds Means-testing Privatization/quasi-markets Welfare-to-work
(3) <i>Populist Approach</i>	The people (bottom-up)	Community advancement	Community development Communitarianism Conscientization Social movements Indigenous knowledge/values



HOLISTIC SOCIAL POLICY

Actors	Target groups/goals	Policies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State (central, decentralized) • Civil society (NGOs, communities, social movements) • Private business sector (domestic, supra-national, transnational) • International development institutions (multilateral, bilateral, UN agencies, regional bodies) 	Individual, household, community Enhancement of well-being for all, enhancement of human capital, international competitiveness of labour, building social cohesion and combating exclusion (by class, gender, ethnicity)	Basic social services (health, education, housing, social security) Safety nets/social funds Sustainable livelihoods support Cross-sector approach Entitlements, social rights, capabilities Participatory/inclusive Accountability

- Midgley, J. (1997) *Social Welfare in a Global Context*. London: Sage. This book provides a comprehensive overview of social welfare policies and programmes in the international context. It contains chapters dealing with applied international social welfare paying attention to the contribution of social work and social development.
- Midgley, J. (1995) *Social Development: The Developmental Perspective in Social Welfare*. London: Sage. A discussion of the social development approach to harmonizing economic and social policies in the development process.
- Yeates, N. (2001) *Globalization and Social Policy*. London: Sage. A succinct and readable analysis of globalization, its impact on social policy formulation and implementation, set against the continuing power of the State.
- Kennett, P. (2001) *Comparative Social Policy: Theory and Research*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press. Intended as a textbook, this useful volume offers an insightful account of globalization, social policy and social development around the world.

References

- Abel, C. and Lewis, C. (eds) (2002) 'Exclusion and engagement: a diagnosis of social policy in Latin America in the long run', in C. Abel and C. Lewis (eds) *Exclusion and Engagement: Social Policy in Latin America*. London: Institute of Latin American Studies, University of London, pp. 3–53.
- Adelman, I. and Morris, C. (1965) *Economic Growth and Social Equity in Developing Countries*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Alinsky, S. (1946) *Reveille for Radicals*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Alinsky, S. (1971) *Rules for Radicals*. New York: Random House.
- Bacon, R. and Eltis, W. (1976) *Britain's Economic Problems: Too Few Producers*. London: Macmillan.
- Baer, W. and Love, J. (eds) (2000) *Liberalization and its Consequences: A Comparative Perspective on Latin America and Eastern Europe*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Blauert, J. and Zadek, S. (eds) (1998) *Mediating Sustainability: Growing Policy from the Grassroots*. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Booth, D. (ed.) (1994) *Rethinking Social Development*. London: Longman.
- Brokensha, D. and Hodge, P. (1969) *Community Development: An Interpretation*. San Francisco, CA: Chandler.
- Burbach, R. and Flynn, P. (1980) *Agribusiness in the Americas*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Cernea, M. (ed.) (1991) *Putting People First: Sociological Variables in Rural Development*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chambers, R. and Conway, G. (1992) 'Sustainable rural livelihoods: practical concepts for the 21st century', *IDS Discussion Paper 296*. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.
- Clark, J. (1991) *Democratizing Development: The Role of Voluntary Organizations*. London: Earthscan.
- Clark, J. (1995) 'The State, popular participation and the voluntary sector', *World Development*, 23 (4): 593–601.
- Conway, T. (2000) *Social Protection: New Directions for Donor Agencies*. London: DFID.
- Conyers, D. (1982) *An Introduction to Social Planning in the Third World*. London: John Wiley.
- Cornia, G., Jolly, R. and Stewart, F. (1987) *Adjustment with a Human Face*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

40 Social Policy for Development

- Cowe, R. (2001) 'Inside track: corporate gloss obscures the hard facts', *Financial Times*, 11 December.
- Dabbagh, A. (1993) 'Ideology and non-Western culture: an Islamic perspective', *Social Development Issues*, 15 (1): 17–18.
- De Haan, A. (2000) 'Components of good social policy: lessons emerging from research', *mimeo.*, Department for International Development.
- Deacon, B., with Hulse, M. and Stubbs, P. (1997) *Global Social Policy: International Organizations and the Future of Welfare*. London: Sage.
- Devereau, S. and Cook, S. (2000) 'Does social policy meet social needs?', *IDS Bulletin*, 31 (4): 63–73.
- Dore, R. and Mars, Z. (eds) (1981) *Community Development*. London: Croom Helm.
- Edwards, M. and Hulme, D. (eds) (1992) *Making a Difference: NGOs and Development in a Changing World*. London: Earthscan.
- Edwards, M. and Hulme, D. (eds) (1995) *Non-Government Organizations: Performance and Accountability: Beyond the Magic Bullet*. London: Earthscan.
- Ellis, F. (2000) *Rural Livelihoods and Diversity in Developing Countries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990) *Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Etzioni, A. (1994) *The Spirit of Community: The Reinvention of American Society*. New York: Touchstone.
- Farrington, J. and Bebbington, A., with Wellard, K. and Lewis, D.J. (1993) *Reluctant Partners? Non-Governmental Organizations, the State and Sustainable Agricultural Development*. London: Routledge.
- Farrington, J., Carney, D., Ashley, C. and Turton, C. (1999) 'Sustainable livelihoods in practice: early applications in rural area', *Natural Resource Perspectives*, No. 42, June. London: Overseas Development Institute.
- Feldstein, M. (1974) 'Social security, induced retirement and aggregate capital accumulation', *Journal of Political Economy*, 83 (4): 447–75.
- Freire, P. (1972) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Friedman, M. and Friedman, R. (1980) *Free to Choose: A Personal Statement*. New York: Avon.
- George, V. and Wilding, P. (1976) *Ideology and Social Welfare*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Ghai, D. (ed.) (1991) *The IMF and the South: The Social Impact of Crisis and Adjustment*. London: Zed Books.
- Giddens, A. (1998) *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gough, I. (1979) *The Political Economy of the Welfare State*. London: Macmillan.
- Graham-Brown, S. (1991) *Education in the Developing World: Conflict and Crisis*. London: Longman.
- Griesgraber, J. and Gunter, B. (eds) (1996) *Development: New Paradigms and Principles for the Twenty-First Century*. London: Pluto Press.
- Grindle, M. (ed.) (1980) *Politics and Policy Implementation in the Third World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Grindle, M. and Thomas, J. (1991) *Public Choices and Policy Change: The Political Economy of Reform in Developing Countries*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hall, A. (ed.) (2000a) *Amazonia at the Crossroads: The Challenge of Sustainable Development*. London: Institute of Latin American Studies, University of London.
- Hall, A. (2000b) 'Privatizing the commons: liberalization, land and livelihoods in Latin America', in W. Baer and J. Love (eds), *Liberalization and its Consequences: A Comparative Perspective on Latin America and Eastern Europe*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 232–61.

- Hardiman, M. and Midgley, J. (1982) *The Social Dimensions of Development*. London: John Wiley.
- Helmores, K. and Singh, N. (2001) *Sustainable Livelihoods: Building on the Wealth of the Poor*. London: Kumarian Press.
- Hewitt, M. (1992) *Welfare Ideology and Need: Developing Perspectives on the Welfare State*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Hulme, D. and Edwards, M. (eds) (1997) *NGOs, States and Donors: Too Close for Comfort?* London: Macmillan and New York: St Martin's Press.
- Hutton, W. (2002) *The World We're In*. London: Little, Brown.
- IIED (2001) 'Environmental and human rights: a new approach to sustainable development', *Opinion: World Summit on Sustainable Development*. London: International Institute for the Environment and Development.
- ISEA (2001) 'The accountability challenge' (www.accountability.org.uk).
- Jessop, B. (1994) 'The transition to post-Fordism and the Schumpeterian workfare state', in R. Burrows and B. Loader (eds) *Towards a Post-Fordist Welfare State?* New York: Routledge, pp. 13–27.
- Jones, C. (1993) 'The Pacific challenge', in C. Jones (ed.) *New Perspectives on the Welfare State in Europe*. London: Routledge. pp. 198–217.
- Kane, L. (2001) *Popular Education and Social Change in Latin America*. London: Latin America Bureau.
- Kanji, N. and Manji, F. (1991) 'From development to sustained crisis: structural adjustment, equity and health', *Social Science and Medicine*, 33 (9): 985–93.
- Keck, M. and Sikkink, K. (1998) *Activists beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Kimerling, J. (2000a) 'Oil development in Ecuador and Peru: law, politics and the environment', in A. Hall (ed.), *Amazonia at the Crossroads: The Challenge of Sustainable Development*. London: Institute of Latin American Studies, Institute of London, pp. 73–96.
- Kitching, G. (1982) *Development and Underdevelopment in Historical Perspective*. London: Methuen.
- Lipton, M. (1977) *Why Poor People Stay Poor: Urban Bias in World Development*. London: Temple Smith.
- Lodermal, I. and Trickey, H. (eds) (2001) *An Offer You Can't Refuse: Workfare in International Perspective*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- MacPherson, S. (1982) *Social Policy in the Third World*. London: Wheatsheaf.
- MacPherson, S. and Midgley, J. (1987) *Comparative Social Policy and the Third World*. Brighton: Wheatsheaf.
- Marshall, T.H. (1950) *Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mead, L. (1992) *The New Politics of Poverty*. New York: Basic Books.
- Mead, L. (ed.) (1997) *The New Paternalism: Supervisory Approaches to Poverty*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Mehotra, A. and Jolly, R. (eds) (1998) *Development with a Human Face: Experiences in Social Achievement and Economic Growth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Midgley, J. (1993) 'Ideological roots of social development strategies', *Social Development Issues*, 15 (1): 1–13.
- Midgley, J. (1995) *Social Development: The Developmental Perspective in Social Welfare*. London: Sage.
- Midgley, J. (1997) *Social Welfare in Global Context*. London: Sage.
- Midgley, J. (1999) 'Growth, redistribution and welfare: towards social investment', *Social Service Review*, 77 (1): 181–8.

42 Social Policy for Development

- Midgley, J., Tracy, M.B. and Livermore, M. (eds) (2000) *The Handbook of Social Policy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mishra, R. (1999) *Globalization and the Welfare State*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Mkandawire, T. (2001) 'Social policy in a development context', *Social Policy and Development Programme*, Paper No. 7. Geneva: UNRISD.
- Mkandawire, T. (ed.) (2003) *Social Policy in a Development Context*. Geneva: UNRISD.
- Murray, C. (1984) *Losing Ground: American Social Policy, 1950–1980*. New York: Broadway Books.
- Murray, S. (2001) 'Social responsibility, a lure for recruits', *Financial Times*, 13 December.
- Myrdal, G. (1984), 'International inequality and foreign aid in retrospect', in G. Meier and D. Seers (eds) *Pioneers in Development*. New York: Oxford University Press. pp. 151–65.
- Narayan, D. and Ebbe, K. (1997) *Design of Social Funds*, Discussion Paper 375. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Norton, A. (2000) 'Can there be a global standard for social policy? The "social policy principles" as a test case', *ODI Briefing Paper 2*, May. London: Overseas Development Institute.
- Ocampo, J. (2000) *Equidad, desarrollo y ciudadanía*. Santiago: CEPAL/ECLAC.
- O'Connor, J. (1973) *The Fiscal Crisis of the State*. New York: St Martin's Press.
- Offe, C. (1984) *Contradictions of the Welfare State*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Olasky, M. (1992) *The Tragedy of American Compassion*. Washington, DC: Regnery.
- Randel, R., German T. and Ewing, D. (eds) (2000) *The Reality of Aid 2000*. London: Earthscan.
- RCD (2001) 'Partnerships – how do they impact poverty alleviation?', *Resource Centre Discussion Forum*, 23 October. London: Resource Centre for the Social Dimensions of Business Practice.
- Rondinelli, D. (1983) *Development Projects as Policy Experiments*. London: Methuen.
- Scoones, I. (1998) 'Sustainable rural livelihoods: a framework for analysis', *Working Paper 72*. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.
- Stewart, F. (1995) *Adjustment and Poverty: Options and Choices*. London: Routledge.
- Stewart, F., Ranis, G. and Ramirez, A. (2000) 'Economic growth and human development', *World Development*, 28 (2): 197–219.
- Stiglitz, J. (2002) *Globalization and its Discontents*. London: Penguin.
- Stoesz, S. (2000) *Poverty of Imagination: Bootstraps Capitalism, Sequel to Welfare Reform*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Subbarao, K. (1997) *Safety Net Programs and Poverty Reduction: Lessons from Cross Country Experience*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Tang, K. (2000) *Social Welfare Development in East Asia*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Tanner, M. (1996) *The End of Welfare: Fighting Poverty in the Civil Society*. Washington, DC: Cato Institute.
- Taylor-Gooby, P. and Dale, J. (1981) *Social Theory and Social Welfare*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Tendler, J. (1995) *Good Government in the Tropics*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Tendler, J. (2003) 'Why social policy is condemned to a residual category of safety nets and what to do about it', paper prepared for the UNRISD project on, *Social Policy in a Development Context*. Geneva: UNRISD.
- Titmuss, R.M. (1968) *Commitment to Welfare*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Titmuss, R.M. (1971) *The Gift Relationship*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Titmuss, R.M. (1974) *Social Policy: An Introduction*. London: Allen and Unwin.

- Turner, M. and Hulme, D. (1997) *Governance, Administration and Development: Making the State Work*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- UN (2000a) *Development of Guidelines on the Role and Social Responsibilities of the Private Sector: Report of the Secretary-General*. Geneva: United Nations.
- UN (2000b) *Twenty-Fourth Special Session of the General Assembly entitled 'World Summit for Social Development and Beyond: Achieving Social Development for All in a Globalizing World': Report of the Secretary General*. Geneva: United Nations.
- UN (2000c) *Resolution Adopted by the General Assembly, S-24/2. Further Initiatives for Social Development*. Geneva: United Nations.
- UNDP (1990) *Human Development Report 1990*, United Nations Development Programme. New York: Oxford University Press.
- UNDP (2000) *Human Development Report 2000: Human Rights and Human Development*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- UNRISD (2001a) *UNRISD Research Programme: Social Policy in a Development Context*. Geneva: UNRISD.
- UNRISD (2001b) *Social Policy in a Development Context: Report of the UNRISD International Conference 23–24 September 2000, Tammsvik, Sweden*. Geneva: UNRISD.
- Vidal, J. (1999) 'Shell fights fires as strife flares in delta', *The Guardian*, 15 September.
- Waterston, A. (1965) *Development Planning: Lessons of Experience*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Whitehead, L. (2000) 'Privatization and the public interest: partial theories, lopsided outcomes', in W. Baer and J. Love (eds), *Liberalization and its Consequences: A Comparative Perspective on Latin America and Eastern Europe*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 262–92.
- Wilensky, H. and Lebeaux, C. (1965) *Industrial Society and Social Welfare*. New York: Free Press.
- Williamson, J. (1990) 'What Washington means by policy reform', in J. Williamson (ed.) *Latin American Adjustment: How Much Has Happened?* Washington, DC: Institute for International Economics.
- World Bank (1990) *World Development Report 1990: Poverty*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank (1991) *World Development Report 1991: The Challenge of Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank (1997) *World Development Report 1997: The State in a Changing World*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank (1998) *Communiqué of the Development Committee*, 5 October. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank (1999a) *Principles and Good Practice in Social Policy: Issues and Areas for Public Action*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank (1999b) *Managing the Social Dimensions of Crisis: Good Practices in Social Policy*, September 14. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank (2000) *World Development Report 1999/2000*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank (2001) *World Development Report 2000–2001: Attacking Poverty*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank (2002) *World Development Report 2003: Sustainable Development with a Dynamic Economy*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Yeates, N. (2001) *Globalization and Social Policy*. London: Sage.