Integrating a family perspective in development: International experiences

Paper pared for the Expert Group Meeting on Family and the Sustainable Development Goals in the Arab Region

Zitha Mokomane
Department of Sociology
University of Pretoria, South Africa
Zitha.Mokomane@up.ac.za

Introduction

The family has for a long time been universally recognised for the contribution it makes to society through its various roles that include instrumental, affective, nurturance, and support (Peterson, 2009); Bogenschneider et al, 2012:514). Although dysfunctional families – in which conflict, misbehaviour, neglect, or abuse occur continually or regularly – have the ability to foster and legitimize oppression of certain family members, an established body of research evidence has consistently shown that *stable and supportive* families are associated with several positive outcomes. Indeed, as Ziehl (2003) posits, along with the economy, polity and education, the family is one of the essential sectors without which no society can function.

Despite its fundamental role in society, the family is very rarely an explicit priority in development policymaking, implementation and evaluation (Bogenschneider et al, 2012:514). Nowhere is this more striking than in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) that aim to make a positive change for both *people* and the planet. Across all the 17 SDGs and 169 targets, only family planning and family farming are explicitly mentioned; families, family members, and family policymaking are only indirectly referred to in a few places throughout the agenda (DESA, 2016). One may therefore ask, as Marcia Barlow (2015:3), does:

- How do you solve the problem of **poverty and hunger** *(SDG 1)* without considering the role of the family in meeting temporal needs and providing sustenance to its members?
- How do you achieve **education** of all the world's children *(SDG 4)* without considering the day-to-day involvement and efforts of parents?
- How do you reduce **maternal and child mortality** (*SDG 3)* without recognizing the role of mothers, fathers and families and what is occurring in the home?
- How do you combat **HIV/AIDS and other diseases** *(SDG 3)* without the day-to-day involvement, teaching and caring of committed parents and family members?

It is with this background that the integration of family issues into development policymaking and implementation is increasingly been seen as a one of the best ways of shifting the rhetoric from appreciating families to prioritising them as worthy of political action (Bogenschneider et al, 2012:514) and as an important component of national and regional development plans. Drawing from a number of international experiences, this paper will discuss some of the lessons learned in the integration of family policies into national plans and programmes and the extent to which this can be used in the localization of SDGs.

The family in the SDGs

A United Nations flyer entitled *Family & 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development[1]* colourfully reads "Families and family policies are key for a sustainable future especially when aiming [at]:

- SDG 1:   End poverty in all its forms everywhere
- SDG 2:   End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture
- SDG 3:   Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages
- SDG 4:   Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all

---

[1]   Available at https://www.un.org/development/desa/socialperspectiveondevelopment/wp-content/uploads/sites/27/2016/06/SDGs-Families.pdf

- SDG 5:   Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls
- SDG 8:   Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all
- SDG 10:   Reduce inequality within and among countries and
- SDG 11.   Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable

It is somehow easy to understand the focus on the foregoing eight SDGs. Their association with, or impact on families is relatively more direct than with the other SDGs. Poverty, for example, has been shown to be relatively higher in certain types of households and families. In developing countries these include single parent households, particularly those headed by women; migrant families; families living in rural areas and urban slums; and households affected by HIV and AIDS (Mokomane, 2012). In developed countries the risk of poverty and deprivation also tends to be higher among migrant families, sole parent families and well as in those families living in urban areas; those where the education level of parents is low; those with low work intensity; and in large families (Richardson & Bradshaw, 2012).

With regards to SDG2. risk and vulnerability to hunger and food insecurity is higher among families and households living in rural areas and depending on agriculture, as well as those living in tropical ecology (Handley et al, 2009). In essence because in rural areas income and food production strongly overlap, common harvest failures not only affect crop-dependent households but can also lead to market failure and food price volatility that increase the cost of the basket of basic goods and prices of staples. The resultant food insecurity tends to play a major role in keeping poor families poor and also creates "a critical barrier to agricultural and non-agricultural growth as it provides a strong disincentive to diversification into more remunerative cash crops and non-farm activities and ties up productive resources in often inefficient, low-productivity subsistence production" (Dorward et al, 2006:17).

Some of the most celebrated achievement of the Millennium Development Goals –the predecessors of the SDGs – was the notable reductions in the global maternal mortality ratio, under-five mortality rates and neonatal mortality rate between 2000 and 2015 (Price, 2016). Families and their members across the world however are still grappling with a number of health issues that can hamper the achievement of SDG 3 These include substance use and substance-use disorders that not also create a significant public health burden but can also lead to family violence, child neglect, and sexual abuse, among other ills. Other effects of substance abuse include feelings of abandonment, anxiety, fear, anger, concern, embarrassment, or guilt among both nuclear and extended family members. It has also been shown that these effects can continue for generations and have a negative impact on role modelling, trust, and concepts of normative behaviour, which can damage the relationships between generations (Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, 2004).

The family unit has also been recognised as being at the centre children's education (Matunga, 2016). Parental involvement in their children's education at all levels –preschool, elementary, secondary has particularly been linked with children's improved test scores in certain subjects, lower dropout rates, overall improved quality of the education received by the children, and better planning for and transitions into adulthood (Earle et al, 2011). To this end, the family is an important role player in the achievement of SGD 4.

One of the main impediments to efforts aimed at achieving gender equality in contemporary society (SDG 5) is gender-based violence that can be explained by deeply-rooted unhealthy norms and relational patterns that often take place within the family. In essence, while many families adequately playing their protective roles, there still are many dysfunctional ones that provide a base for gender-

based abuse and the deep psychological imprint that go with it (Walsh, 2016). It has been shown, for example, that most male abusiveness originates from deep-seated emotions from wounds inflicted early in childhood, leading to a fragile insecurity and hyper-sensitive sense of masculinity. Without intervention, the achievement of SDG 5 will be hampered as boys can grow to become men who resort to physical violence when provoked by a threat to their insecure sense of masculinity (Dutton and Golant, 1995).

Closely linked to SDG 5 on education is the concept of human capital which is inclusive of, but not limited to the skills, knowledge, and experience of an individual. These are important for the successful engagement in productive employment through which individuals can achieve their desired livelihoods (Chambers and Conway, 1991) and economies can realise sustained, inclusive and sustainable growth – all important ingredients in ensuring full and productive employment and decent work for all (SDG 8). Strong and stable families have been shown to foster the accumulation of human capita with evidence showing that children from such families tend to graduate from high school and college at higher rates. They are also more likely to be gainfully employed as adults and to work more hours (Wilcox, 2016).

One of the targets of SDG 10 is to "facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through the implementation of planned and well-maned migration policies" (10.7). However, the circumstances in which most people in poor, and/or conflict areas leave their countries of origin often involve the separation of families. leads to hardship and sometimes to tragic consequences including mental health issues often due to distress related to the fear of, or actual, separation from family members (Sourander, 2003) related to Fostering resilience in refugee families through promoting social, economic and political inclusion for all is thus crucial to reducing inequalities within and among countries, and building sustainable communities.

Finally, in the pursuit to achieve SDG 11, it is noteworthy that structures of urbanization do not affect the individual alone, they affect the entire supportive structures that allow persons with disabilities to live meaningful and productive lives – and a major source of that support comes from families.

The table below illustrates the extent to which the remaining SDGs that were not explicitly highlighted by the United Nations, also have links with families and their members. Examples of family-focused interventions that can be adopted for the achievement of the goals are also shown. The table drew almost solely from the the 2016 compilation of papers on "family capital and the SDGs" by Susan Roylance.

SDG	Relation to the family/family members	Suggested interventions
SDG 6: Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation	Improving access to safe water and sanitation facilities leads to healthier families and communities (UNICEF, 2016)	Integrating water purification methods into the homes of developing countries provides greater health to the family. (Wixom & Wixom, 2016)`
SDG 7: Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all.	Inefficient cooking fuels and technologies produce high levels of household air pollution with a range of health-damaging pollutants. Exposure is particularly high among women and young children, who spend	Integrating more efficient cooking methods into homes lowers health hazards, conserves energy for the planet, protects the environment and saves time families spend in

	the most time near the domestic hearth (Wixom & Wixom, 2016)	gathering fuel (Wixom & Wixom, 2016)
SDG 9: Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation	Each family unit empowered by an adequate infrastructure (the basic physical systems and structures essential to the operation of a society or enterprise) can use their combined family capital to provide a greater contribution toward achieving all of the SDGs as shown in see Appendix A (Obadiah, 2016).	Provide the necessary infrastructure for the family to utilize their resources, talent and energy to become self-sufficient, and contribute to the community (Obadiah, 2016).
SDG 12: Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns.	The concept of sustainability arises at the family level where children are taught fundamental values and ethics that will guide them later in life as producers, consumers and good stewards of the environment (Santoro, 2016)	Through creativity and innovation in production and consumption families will continue to play a role in sustainability.
SDG 13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts	Families can be vulnerable to the impact of climate-change related disasters. Young children and older adults are especially sensitive to disease and malnutrition. If emergency supplies are not available during the recovery from the disaster, then children and seniors may be affected before other healthy adults (Birrell, 2016)	When a disaster strikes, people naturally want to connect with family and friends. An emergency plan can help people make those connections. Deciding in advance where to go, who to talk to and what to do, will help them to reunite with loved ones (Birrell, 2016).
SDG 14: Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development	Oceans provide livelihoods and tourism benefits, as well as subsistence and income for many families (Mutanga, 2016)	The SGDs must be broken down to the family unit, making sense to those who survive from the proceeds of the waters and aquatic environment: fishermen, traders or residents whose natural and/or ancestral dwelling is around the waters (Mutanga, 2016)
SDG 15: Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss	The problems of focus in this SDG have an impact on almost every aspect of the family livelihoods especially in developing countries that rely mostly on the agricultural sector	With programmes to provide the proper education and support, these problems can be halted and turned around to make the land sustainable for families and communities (Roylance, 2016)
SDG 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels.	Efforts to attain this goal include significantly reducing all forms of violence and related deaths as well as ending abuse, exploitation, trafficking ad all forms of violence against and torture of children (Pineda et al, 2016)	There is no better training ground for the development of these essential values and characteristics than at home with a family (Pineda et al, 2016)

SDG 17: Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development	Partnerships of various kinds did more to bring people out of poverty and enhance development during the MDG period	This is s re-work and expansion of MDG 8 on Global partnerships

Integrating a family perspective

The purpose of the foregoing section was to illustrate that family issues are, indeed, an integral part of the overall development agenda, regardless of the themes or focus area. To this end, it is imperative to make family concerns an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes. For the most part, policies and programmes are often aimed at specific family members such as children, older people or people with disabilities. Evidence from many African and Latin American countries have, for example, revealed the many positive outcomes of child-focused policies and programmes on the health and development outcomes of children as well as overall family well-being. It has been argued that there are various pathways to these results. One is that child benefits enable families to essentials such as food, clothing, books and other expenditure-related inputs that are valuable in maintaining basic child welfare and for enhancing child development. Another channel may have indirect effects such as reducing family stress and improving household relations, increasing the chance and opportunities for employment, and overall enhancing families' ability to function, learn, and improve their socio-economic status (Mokomane, 2012:30).

Other interventions are issue or theme-focused such as the many social protection and cash transfer programmes also prevalent in Latin America and the Caribbean, East and southern Africa, and some parts of Asia. Ghana's flagship social protection programme – the Livelihood Empowerment Against Poverty (LEAP) – an empowerment driven poverty-reduction initiative which had positive impacts on families is an example in this regard:. Box 1 describes some of the key features of the programme and its noted impact on families and their members.

Box 1 Livelihood Empowerment Against Poverty (LEAP), Ghana

Introduced in March 2008, with the overall objective to empower poor families to "leap" out of poverty, LEAP is a social cash transfer program which provides cash and health insurance to extremely poor households across Ghana to alleviate short-term poverty and encourage long-term human capital development. Since its launch it has expanded each year and by June 2013 it was reaching over 71, 000 households across all 10 regions of Ghana, with an annual expenditure of approximately USD20m. The program is funded from general revenues of the Government of Ghana (50 percent), donations from DFID and a loan from the World Bank, and implemented by the Department of Social Welfare in the Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection.

LEAP eligibility is based on poverty and having a household member in at least one of three demographic categories: households with orphan or vulnerable child, elderly poor, or person with extreme disability unable to work. Initial selection of households is done through a community-based process and is verified centrally with a proxy means test. A unique feature of LEAP, is that aside from direct cash payments, beneficiaries are provided free health insurance through the National Health Insurance Scheme where funds to cover enrolment in health insurance are transferred directly to the local health authority who then issues cards to LEAP households.

Despite noted weakness such as inconsistent implementation; mixed results on health utilization and morbidity; no impact on household consumption partly due to the irregular payments, the lumpy nature of payments when made, and the low level of benefits, LEAP has had significant positive impacts on the lives of beneficiaries and their families. These include:

Positive impacts on children's schooling: LEAP has increased school enrolment among secondary school aged children by 7percentage points (pp), and reduced grade repetition among both primary and secondary aged children. Among primary aged children LEAP has reduced absenteeism by 10 percentage points. Furtehrmore beneficiary families are now able to keep up with additional fees and also spend more on school books and uniforms

Improved food security Food insecurity has significantly reduced for LEAP families (by 25 pp) especially for those headed by women (by 32 pp) between 2010 and 2012. As payments were made in lump sums in recent years due to delays in the programme receiving its funds, families were able to pay for items in bulk such as food grains and rice which has strengthened their ability to withstand economic shocks. LEAP has also allowed for improvements and changes in the diets of beneficiaries

Enabled families to focus on their health needs. As of early 2012, 90% of LEAP families were enrolled in the National Health Insurance Scheme which was an increase of 7 percentage points compared to 2010. Another main outcome of LEAP is the increased number of beneficiaries seeking preventative care. The programme has also enabled beneficiaries to maintain their health, paying for prescriptions and medicines and even major operations.

Positive impacts on non-consumption: LEAP has led to a significant increase in the likelihood of holding savings (11 pp) and has also had an impact on debt repayments and reduced loan holdings, particularly among female headed households.

Investment opportunities. A number of beneficiaries have used their LEAP payments for longer term investment activities as well as for petty trading, investing in animals and household items. Others have started vegetable gardens or increased on farm productivity by hiring labour, purchasing farm assets and inputs and, in a few instances, by embarking on more ambitious livelihood diversification strategies.

Productivity impacts of LEAP. Among households with four members or less there are positive impacts of own labour supplied to the farm by men and women, and on expenditure on seeds. On the other hand, there are reductions in labour hired in by households.

Improved local economics. LEAP beneficiary families spend about 80% of their income inside the local economy, and as a result, the entire community benefits from the programme.

Strengthened social networks: The pattern of impacts of LEAP suggests that the program is allowing beneficiaries to re-establish or strengthen social networks. In a society where reciprocity is critical to the maintenance of traditional social welfare mechanisms, LEAP is enabling beneficiaries to contribute to various groups in their communities such as livelihood/ farming groups and savings groups. At the family level, LEAP has strengthened the capacity of beneficiaries to contribute to key social events and ceremonies in their communities. This has improved their self-esteem as well as increased their visibility and social status in their communities

Happier household heads: LEAP has had led to a 16 pp increase in household heads who feel happy about their life, especially among female-headed and smaller households.

Sources: Handa et al (2013); Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection, Ghana (2013)

The literature including the compilation by Susan Boylance includes many more "best practice" programmes and interventions that can enhance efforts aimed at achieving the various SDGs. I wish to argue, however, that to the extent that family issues cut across virtually all the goals, it is imperative to mainstream the family and into all policymaking and implementation. Borrowing from the 1997 definition of gender mainstreaming by the United Nations Economic and Social Council we can define family mainstreeting as:

> … the process of assessing the implications for families and their members of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in any area and at all levels. It is a strategy for making the concerns and experiences of families as well as their members an integral part of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and

programmes in all political, economic and societal spheres, so that family members benefit equally, and inequality is not perpetuated.

The basic principles of the mainstreaming strategy include:
- The establishment of adequate accountability mechanisms for monitoring progress.
- The initial identification of issues and problems across all area(s) of activity so that differences and disparities can be diagnosed.
- Never making the assumptions that issues or problems are neutral from a family perspective
- Clear political will and allocation of adequate resources for mainstreaming, including additional financial and human resources if necessary, are important for translation of the concept into practice.
- Mainstreaming does not replace the need for targeted, family-specific policies and programmes, and positive legislation; nor does it do away with the need for f units or focal points.

In addition to the foregoing, the following recommendations made at a 2003 United Nations Consultative Meeting on "Mainstreaming the Family Issue"[2] the still worthy of consideration even, 14 years after the meeting:

- The is need for the establishment of three institutional pillars: (1) a national commitment at the highest level of government, preferably in the form of a declaration, or proclamation, by the Head of State; (2) an effective national coordination mechanism, and (3) appropriate family support legislation that takes into account the country's cultural, environmental, social and economic conditions.
- The maintenance of a healthy partnership between Governments and concerned organizations of civil society (including NGOs, academia, professional societies and institutions, trade unions, employers federations, chambers of commerce and industry, the legal and medical professions, and other stake holders), especially through their participation in the national coordination mechanism
- the provision of technical assistance to national coordination mechanisms, diagnostic studies, exchanges of expertise and experiences on salient family issues, orientation and training, research and data collection, information dissemination, networking at sub-regional, regional and inter-regional levels, and policy and programme coordination

The following international experiences are examples of how these principles can be operationalised.

Box 2: Impact Lens (Bogenschneider et al, 2012)

Family impact lens can be broadly described as a tool that the past, present and probable future effects on family well-being of a rule, legislation, law, programme, agency or organisation. It can highlight when certain types of families are inadvertently, undervalued, overlooked, or poorly served (Bogenschneider, 2014:160). The tool can be administered using a guidelines consisting of questions aimed at soliciting information on the following five principles:

Principle 1 (Family responsibility): How well does the policy, programme or practice aim to support and empower the functions that families perform for society—family formation, partner relationships, economic support, childrearing, and caregiving. Substituting for the functioning of families should come only as a last resort.

Principle 2 (Family stability): How well does the policy, programme or practice encourage and reinforce couple, marital, parental, and family commitment and stability, especially when children are involved.

---

[2] See http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/family/docs/cm1012dec03.pdf

Principle 3 (Family relationships): How well does the policy, programme or practice recognize the strength and persistence of family ties, whether positive or negative, and seek to create and sustain strong couple, marital, and parental relationships.

Principle 4 (Family diversity): How well does the policy, programme or practice acknowledge and respect the diversity of family life and not discriminate against or penalize families solely based on their cultural, racial, or ethnic background; economic situation; family structure; geographic locale; presence of special needs; religious affiliation; or stage of life

Principle 5 (Family engagement): How well does the policy, programme or practice encourage partnerships between professionals and families. Organizational culture, policy, and practice should include relational and participatory practices that preserve family dignity and respect family autonomy.

Source: Adapted from Bogenschneider, K., Little, O., Ooms, T, Benning, S. & Cadigan, K. (2012). The family impact handbook: How to view policy & practice through the family impact lens. https://www.purdue.edu/hhs/hdfs/fii/wpcontent/uploads/2015/06/fi_handbook_0712.pdf Retrived10 November 2017

Box 3: Family Impact Statements: Australia

A Family Impact Statement is an assessment - prior to the actual enactment and implementation of new legislation or regulations – of the 'likely' or 'potential' effect on families of the proposed changes. In this sense, it is akin to the better-known 'Environmental Impact Statement' often required before governments or businesses alter the location of a waste chemical dump, a freeway, a new housing estate, or a new logging claim.

It is not mere speculation or conjecture; it uses the known data on families and their composition, circumstances, needs, etc., and the known research on family life and the area of regulation (e.g. work, health, safety, education) to project likely impacts, both positive and negative, on their way of life. The broad value assumption underlying any Family Impact Statement is, of course, that damage to family life should be avoided and family wellbeing should be promoted within the constraints of government resources and related policy objectives.

A later stage is to conduct research monitoring the actual impacts of the [sectoral] changes as they affect the work and life experiences of a range of … families.

Just as an Environmental Impact Statement must look at several aspects of 'the environment', so too a Family Impact Statement must look at several aspects of 'the family'. To claim that any proposed change (whether to tax, welfare benefits, health costs or education systems) will "benefit … families" is to ignore the reality that there is no one thing called 'the … family' and that family life today is very diverse and complex, changing across the life cycle as people leave home, partner, have children, separate, remarry and grow older. [For example], workplace relations and job conditions will affect differently a young single person living at home with parents compared with an older divorced father living alone; or a young married couple with children where both partners are in paid jobs compared with a one-income couple, husband employed, mother on home duties; or a highly-skilled, educated professional compared with a person lacking in self-confidence and marketable skills.

Similarly, family impacts need to be teased out into various aspects, such as financial impacts, the likely effects on personal wellbeing, marital relationships, the capacity to care for children, parenting time and quality, or special caring responsibilities for the aged and disabled, plus the family's involvement in community activities.

Ideally, a Family Impact Statement should look at the likely differential effects of proposed legislation on different family types, at various income levels, in a variety of [sectors] and geographic regions.

Source: adapted from Edgar, D. (2005). *Family Impact Statement on WorkChoices – the proposed industrial Relations Regime.* http://www.patriciaedgaranddonedgar.com/Content/Article/pdf/FamilyImpactStatementOnWorkChoices_2005.pdf Retrieved 10 November 2017

Box 4: HIV and AIDS Response Coordination-Botswana

The national HIV and AIDS response in Botswana is a multi-sectorial approach that is coordinated by different sectors at the national, district and local level. At the district level the response is

facilitated by the District Multi-sectoral AIDS Committee (MDSAC), District AIDS Coordinators and Assistant District AIDS Coordinators (ADACs). These are key individuals tasked with developing and coordinating interventions and the annual district HIV and AIDS plan. Below is an overview of their roles:

The **DMSAC's** main role is to coordinate HIV and AIDS activities at the district and sub-district level. It is not directly involved in the implementation of activities, but it is tasked with ensuring that priority areas are included in all planned activities, and that they are in line with the national policies and strategies for the response. The DMSAC is also tasked with mobilizing resources for the district and sub-districts, where present. It is also the DMSAC's responsibility to design strategies to overcome barriers to an effective response, while ensuring that no one is left-behind by advocating against the stigma and discrimination of people living with HIV and AIDS, and by mainstreaming HIV and AIDS into social and economic development programming.

District AIDS Coordinators and ADACs are critical to the management and coordination of the district response. As secretariats to the DMSAC, they manage inputs, facilitate the development of multi-sectorial annual HIV & AIDS Action Plan, support local level capacity building for implementation, mobilize resources, coordinate strategic implementation partnerships across sectors, and monitor and document district responses

All in all:

Mainstreaming is not about adding a "[family component]" … into an existing activity. It goes beyond increasing families' participation; it means bringing the experience, knowledge, and interests of [family members] to bear on the development agenda

References

Birrell, R. (2016). Emergency preparedness for natural disasters. In S. Roylance (Ed.). *Family Capital and the SDGs: Implementing the 17 Sustainable Development Goals.* New York: Sustainable Families Group.

Bogenschneider, K. Family policy matters: How policymaking affects families and what professionals can do. New York: Routledge.

Bogenschneider, K., Ooms, T., Benning, S., Cadigan, K & Corbett, T. (2012). The family impact lens: A family-focused, evidence-informed approach to policy and practice. *Family Relations,* Vol 61:514-531

Center for Substance Abuse Treatment. (2004). *Substance Abuse Treatment and Family Therapy.* https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK64258/

Chambers, R., & Conway, G. R. (1991). *Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: Practical Concepts for the 21st Century.* IDS Discussion Paper 296.

DESA. (2016) 2016 Family Expert Group Meeting: Summary of the Proceedings. http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/family/docs/egm16/summary.pdf

Dorward, A., Wheeler, R.S., MacAulan, I., Buckley, C.P., Kydd, J. & Chirwa, E. (2006). *Promoting agriculture for social protection or social protection for agriculture: Strategic policy and research issues discussion paper.* http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.359.5958&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Earle, A., Mokomane, Z., & Heymann, J. (2011) International perspectives: Lessons from the world's most effective economies. *Future of Children*, Vol. 21 (2): 181-200.

Handley, G., Higgins, K. and Sharma, B. (2009). *Poverty and poverty reduction in sub-Saharan Africa: An overview of issues.* ODI Working Paper 299.

Matunga, M. (2016). Education. In S. Roylance (Ed.). *Family Capital and the SDGs: Implementing the 17 Sustainable Development Goals.* New York: Sustainable Families Group*.*

Mokomane, Z. (2012). *Anti-Poverty Family-Focused Policies in Developing Countries.* Background paper prepared for the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/family/docs/BP_POVERTY.pdf

Obadiah, J.S. (2016). Infrastructure. In S. Roylance (Ed.). *Family Capital and the SDGs: Implementing the 17 Sustainable Development Goals.* New York: Sustainable Families Group.

Peterson, R., 2009. *Families first: Keys to successful family functioning.* www.ext.vt.edu.

Price, R.R.. (2016). Health. In S. Roylance (Ed.). *Family Capital and the SDGs: Implementing the 17 Sustainable Development Goals.* New York: Sustainable Families Group.

Richardson, D. and Bradshaw, J. (2012). *Family –oriented anti-poverty policies in developed countries.* Background paper prepared for the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Available at www.un.org/esa/socdev/family/docs/BACKGROUNDPAPERRICHARDSON.pdf

Roylance, R.C. (2016). Halt & reverse land degradation. In S. Roylance (Ed.). *Family Capital and the SDGs: Implementing the 17 Sustainable Development Goals.* New York: Sustainable Families Group.

Santoro, V. (2016). Energy efficiency. In S. Roylance (Ed.). *Family Capital and the SDGs: Implementing the 17 Sustainable Development Goals.* New York: Sustainable Families Group.

Sourander, A. (2003). Refugee families during asylum seeking. *Nordic Journal of Psychiatry*, Vol. 57 (3); 203-207.

Walsh, L.R. (2016). Gender equality. In S. Roylance (Ed.). *Family Capital and the SDGs: Implementing the 17 Sustainable Development Goals.* New York: Sustainable Families Group.

Wilcox, W.B. (2016). Strong families, prosperous states. In S. Roylance (Ed.). *Family Capital and the SDGs: Implementing the 17 Sustainable Development Goals.* New York: Sustainable Families Group.

Wixom, B. & Wixom, W (2016). Sustainable consumption & production. In S. Roylance (Ed.). *Family Capital and the SDGs: Implementing the 17 Sustainable Development Goals.* New York: Sustainable Families Group.

Zeihl,S.C. (2003). The Family and Social Cohesion. In D. Chidester, P. Dexter & W. Jones (Eds.), *What Holds us Together: Social Cohesion in South Africa.* Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Appendix A

SDG 1: End poverty
A good infrastructure is a key for eradicating poverty – for several reasons. Very basically, without roads it is difficult to transport produce to market. Some may need electricity to develop rural industries. Good infrastructure also fosters good health, as people can easily access health facilities. Healthy people become more productive

SDG 2: Sustainable agriculture
A good example comes from Mumias, in western Kenya. It was a very poorly-developed community before the Mumias sugar factory came into existence. Local farmers now have markets for their crops, with most farmers still engaged in sugarcane planting.

Since then the area has seen many developments in the infrastructure. The main roads are now tar marked, and there are numerous schools, banks, hospitals and colleges.

All these have contributed to the income of the local people, as more people have been attracted to the town. Numerous shops in the town allow local people to engage in enterprise.

SDG 3: Health
Good health facilities (doctors' offices, clinics, hospitals) are also part of the infrastructure needed – providing easy access to health care. Again, when people are healthy, they become more productive.

SDG 4: Education
Basic social services, such as schools and hospitals, are included in a community's infrastructure.
Just like a human skeleton, if all of the parts are not linked together, the body cannot perform all of the desirable functions. All components are necessary to help the community run smoothly.

SDG 6: Water and sanitation
Cities and other rural settlements can increase the availability to fresh water through drilling wells or building systems to transport clean water for their citizens. Proper waste management facilities also contribute to a healthier family and community.

SDG 7: Energy
A good example of how an improved infrastructure spurs growth and development is the government initiative of Kenya to electrify rural areas. With electricity available, people are now able to develop commerce in rural areas. This, in turn, attracts small industries, which attracts people and other facilities, such as hospitals, schools, etc.

SDG 8: Economic growth
Without a strong infrastructure a society cannot progress. The Oxford Dictionary defines infrastructure as: "the basic physical and organizational structures and facilities (e.g., buildings, roads, and power supplies) needed for the operation of a society or enterprise."2 Viewed functionally, infrastructure facilitates the production and distribution of goods and services.

SDG 11: Cities and human settlements
Infrastructure is the framework that makes it possible for all the systems within the society to function. It includes: roads, utilities such as water supplies and electricity, communication structures, etc.

Source: Obadiah, J.S. (2016: 179-181)