Foreign Aid and Africa's Hunt for Development: Implications for Global Least Developed Countries (LDCs)

Okon Effiong Udoh
Department of International Relations
Faculty of Social Sciences
Madonna University, Nigeria
Okija Campus
Mobile: 08035790993, 08023123566
Email: drokon90@yahoo.com; effiongudoh@madonnauniversity.edu.ng

Asuquo U. Inyang
Directorate of Public Order and Information Management
Faculty of Social Sciences
University of Uyo
Email: asuinyang@yahoo.com
Mobile: 08032754019

Abstract
This paper examined the effectiveness or otherwise of foreign aid that flows from the donor, that is, Developed Countries (DCs) in Europe and America, to the recipient countries, that is, the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) in Africa and other third-world countries. The study aimed to identify the factors – external or internal that act as barriers to the route of development of the recipient states. Using the historical descriptive research methodology and adopting the Public Interest Theoretical frame of analysis, some of the critical issues discussed included fungibility of foreign aid as well as the role of foreign aid in development financing. It was found that both external and internal factors from the donor and the recipient countries are responsible for the low impact and, at times, outright failure of foreign aid in African and other Third World countries. It was recommended that Foreign aid should be encouraged for economic prosperity and that the recipient countries, such as Nigeria, should introduce strong policies that will scrutinise the conditions attached to this aid, to achieve their targets.

Keywords: Official Development Assistance (ODA), Development Assistance Committee (DAC), Dutch disease effects, Overseas Development Institute (ODI).

Introduction
Foreign aid, also referred to as external assistance, involves the voluntary transfer of capital, goods, and services across national borders from a donor - whether a sovereign state or an international body - to another country, termed the recipient (Zhukova, 2020). The core objective of such transfers is to support the development of the recipient nation, typically through either grants or loans (Zhukova, 2020). This form of aid may be humanitarian, economic, or military in nature.

Given differing perspectives on what precisely constitutes foreign aid, economists often define it as any capital movement from developed nations to less developed countries (LDCs), provided it meets two conditions. As noted by Todaro (2009), these are: (1) the aid must not be commercially motivated from the donor's viewpoint, and (2) it must be extended on favourable terms - such as offering interest rates lower than those available to the recipient in international markets.

However, foreign aid is not always driven purely by altruism. Donor nations frequently pursue their own political, economic, military, or strategic goals through aid. As Karl Marx might argue, such assistance is rarely devoid of self-interest. For example, donor countries may use aid to exert political influence. This was evident in Nigeria's case in October 2011 and again in June 2013, when the UK threatened to withdraw aid over Nigeria's proposed anti-same-sex legislation - a move also supported by Canada's Foreign Affairs Minister, John Baird (Punch Newspaper, June 15, 2013).

There are numerous forms of foreign aid, including but not limited to food relief, project-based funding, balance of payment support, technical cooperation, and aid aimed at human development (Todaro & Smith 2009). Aid sources can generally be categorised into two main types: public development assistance, which includes bilateral aid from individual national governments and multilateral aid from institutions like the World Bank, and private development assistance provided by NGOs (p. 533). Since the 1980s, there has been intense scholarly debate over the effectiveness of foreign aid in Sub-Saharan Africa, with much of the discourse highlighting its shortcomings (Park, 2020). Critiques often point to the ineffectiveness of aid in achieving sustained poverty alleviation and economic growth, despite the continent receiving vast sums. Park (2020) describes Africa's aid experience as a tragic narrative of substantial inflows - amounting to hundreds of billions of dollars, with little developmental progress to show. For instance, although Western nations have injected over \$600 billion into Africa as aid (Akonor, 2008), many parts of the continent remain underdeveloped, with some nations like Somalia and Mali teetering on collapse.

Conchesta (2008) argues that in nations marked by low-income levels, high unemployment, minimal industrial activity, and widespread poverty, aid alone cannot transform the economy. Nevertheless, humanitarian assistance has made notable contributions by saving lives, delivering health services to disadvantaged populations, and supplying essential medicines during crises. Developmental aid continues to be viewed as crucial for Africa (including Nigeria) because of its potential to foster investment, stimulate economic growth, combat poverty, raise living standards, introduce new technologies and production methods, and create employment opportunities (OECD-DAC, 1999; Bakare, 2011).

Statement of the Problem

Over the past several decades, foreign aid to Africa has remained a contentious and widely debated topic. Estimates suggest that the continent has received over one trillion U.S. dollars in aid within the last 50 years (Moyo, 2009). Despite the massive inflow of resources, there is significant disagreement among academics and development practitioners regarding its actual impact. A critical observation is that while aid as a share of income has increased over time, Africa's economic growth rate has paradoxically declined during the same period (Akonor, 2008).

One of the early and vocal critics of foreign aid, Peter Bauer - a Hungarian-born British economist - challenged the effectiveness of state-to-state aid, arguing that it often undermines development. According to Bauer (2000), such aid bolsters government overreach, weakens incentives for economic productivity, and discourages civic initiative and entrepreneurial spirit. In a similar vein, Zambian economist Dambisa Moyo, in her influential book *Dead Aid* (2009), disputed the positive narrative surrounding aid, contending that it has not only failed but also aggravated Africa's socio-economic challenges. Adding to this critical discourse is William Easterly, a professor of economics at New York University, who attributes poverty in developing nations to a lack of political and economic freedoms. In his view, true development can only be achieved by restoring these rights, not through continuous aid transfers.

Critics like Bauer, Moyo, and Easterly underscore a range of negative consequences associated with official development assistance, including dependency, corruption, currency instability, and missed opportunities in the global economy (Tigist, 2021). Empirical research supports these critiques. A study conducted by Professor Shaomeng Jia of Alabama State University, along with Associate Professor Claudia R. Williamson from Mississippi State University, analyzed data spanning from 1962 to 2013. Their findings revealed that in the absence of robust institutions and effective governance, leadership by positive example (a situation better known as tupocracy), foreign aid had little to no lasting impact on economic growth in Africa (Tigist, 2021).

It is in light of these realities that the present study seeks to investigate the specific challenges encountered by Nigeria, a recognised Less Developed Country (LDC), in incorporating foreign aid and grants into its broader development agenda.

Conceptual Clarification

According to Todaro & Smith (2009), foreign aid refers to the international transfer of public resources (either as grants or concessional loans) provided directly from one government to another (bilateral aid) or through multilateral organisations such as the World Bank. A central objective of most Official Development Assistance (ODA) to developing nations is to promote economic development and improve overall welfare, often assessed by its influence on economic growth (Todaro & Smith, 2009). Foreign aid encompasses not only financial support but also includes technical assistance, training, equipment, and the supply of essential commodities like food, healthcare services, infrastructure, and transportation.

The term, foreign aid extends beyond simple monetary transactions between states. It broadly covers all state-initiated resource flows from wealthier nations (donors) to developing or underdeveloped countries (recipients). However, this inclusive approach to defining aid introduces conceptual ambiguity, as some resource flows may not strictly qualify as foreign aid despite being categorised as such (Ajayi & Oke, 2013).

Tadesse (2011) provides a widely accepted definition of foreign aid, describing it as encompassing all official grants and concessional loans - whether in cash or kind - aimed at transferring resources from industrialised to less developed countries, primarily for development and income redistribution purposes. Similarly, the United Nations (2009) describes economic aid as long-term loans and outright grants provided for non-military purposes by both national governments and international organisations. Mosley et al. (1991) emphasise that foreign aid involves the transfer of real resources between countries - transfers that would not typically occur through standard market transactions unless promoted by specific governmental actions. The OECD’s Development Assistance Committee (DAC), along with scholars such as Abdul et al. (2018) and Masud et al. (2006), identify three main criteria for classifying assistance as ODA: (1) it must be provided by official agencies; (2) its primary purpose should be to encourage economic growth and welfare; and (3) it must contain a grant element of at least 25 percent.

Berthelemy (2006) distinguishes between bilateral and multilateral aid. Bilateral aid involves direct transfers from one government to another, often influenced by strategic political, economic, or humanitarian motives. This type of aid supports long-term goals like democracy promotion, development, and economic stabilisation. In contrast, multilateral aid involves funds pooled by multiple donor governments and distributed by institutions such as the IMF, the World Bank, or the United Nations, to address poverty and development needs in recipient countries.

Barrett (2009), in his analysis of food aid, raises questions about whether such assistance constitutes development support, trade facilitation, or both. He notes that food aid programs can relieve the foreign exchange burden by allowing countries to import vital inputs, or they can generate local revenue through the domestic sale of donated food - revenue that may then be reinvested in agricultural research or rural infrastructure. Nevertheless, these programmes may produce adverse effects, such as reduced competitiveness of local agriculture in global markets, a phenomenon akin to the "Dutch disease."

Riddell (2007) highlights technical assistance as another major category of aid. This form of support involves transferring specialised knowledge, skills, and advisory services. For decades, developing countries have received technical aid in the form of educational personnel and vocational trainers, especially at the primary and secondary levels. Institutions like the London-based Overseas Development Institute (ODI) have long operated fellowship programmes that place graduate economists in strategic roles within the ministries of developing countries. Project aid (a once-dominant form of ODA) has declined since the mid-1990s, though it still exists in targeted sectors such as health, education, agriculture, rural development, infrastructure, transportation, and water supply (Abdul, 2018; Riddell, 2007). These projects aim to deliver specific outputs by providing essential resources, expertise, and systems to the host countries (Alesina & Dollar, 2000).

Theoretical Framework

Public Interest Theory

Public Interest Theory, originally developed by economist Arthur Cecil Pigou, posits that government regulation arises primarily as a response to public demand aimed at addressing inefficient or unfair market practices (Djankov et al., 2002). According to this theory, the role of regulation is to safeguard and serve the welfare of the general public (Hantke-Domas, 2003). As a component of welfare economics, Public Interest Theory offers a foundation for why and how regulatory interventions are justified within market systems (Den-Hertog, 2000; Aranson et al 1990).

This theory operates on the assumption that without regulatory oversight, markets can become monopolistic, leading to unfair practices and economic disparities. For instance, in markets where collusion between suppliers undermines competition, antitrust laws are implemented to restore fairness. Similarly, in industries where technological factors create natural monopolies, economic regulation steps in to prevent exploitation. Thus, regulation under this theory is presented as a mechanism to serve collective interests and correct market failures.

Public Interest Theory is also highly relevant to the discourse on foreign aid. For over eight decades, it has provided a theoretical lens for understanding aid as a tool to bridge funding or investment shortfalls in developing nations. The theory suggests that aid is essential for breaking the cycle of poverty, often referred to as the “poverty trap” (Sachs, 2005). In this context, aid functions not only as a financial mechanism but also as a policy tool to promote stability and development in less developed countries (LDCs). Anwar (2000) further elaborates on the political dimension of this theory, noting that politicians in donor countries often support foreign aid initiatives based on strategic motives, including the desire for re-election. Political leaders may use aid programs as a way to appeal to humanitarian values or international diplomacy, thereby enhancing their political capital at home.

In summary, the assumptions and propositions of Public Interest Theory closely align with the realities of foreign aid dynamics in many developing countries. Given its relevance and applicability, this theory has been chosen as the conceptual foundation for the present study.

Analysis

Economic Development

Economic development is frequently mistaken for economic growth, though the two are distinct in meaning and scope. While economic growth refers to an increase in a country's output or income, economic development encompasses structural transformation that includes technological advancement, enhanced productivity, increased employment opportunities, and an overall improvement in the quality of life. As Easterly (2005) explains, economic development is the transition from low-income economies to modern, industrialised societies. This transformation must be supported by progress in infrastructure, governance, institutions, and social systems (Myint & Krueger, 2016).

According to the United Nations Human Development Report (1994), the essence of development is to create an environment that allows individuals to realise their potential and expand opportunities for both current and future generations. Development is multidimensional and cannot be captured by a single metric. Traditionally, per capita income has served as a primary indicator. However, development scholars increasingly incorporate social indicators such as literacy rates, health outcomes, and employment levels. In recent times, composite indices like the Human Development Index (HDI) (which considers human capital, poverty levels, mortality rates, and population growth) are widely used to offer a more holistic measure of development.

Failure of Aid: Internal or External Factors

The debate surrounding foreign aid effectiveness often centres on whether the shortcomings are due to internal deficiencies within recipient countries or to external systemic challenges, such as the inequities of the global economy. Akonor (2008) contends that aid functions more as a temporary relief than a transformative solution for Africa, arguing that sustainable development requires investment in large-scale infrastructure projects like transportation networks and power systems, rather than fragmented or short-term interventions.

Dependency theorists continue to assert that underdevelopment is largely a product of the global capitalist system. Frank (1966), for instance, argues that the deeper a country's integration into the capitalist world system, the more it suffers from marginalisation and dependency. In contrast, Bauer (2000) critiques foreign aid for fostering a mindset of dependence, discouraging self-reliance and domestic innovation. He emphasises that true development arises from internal motivation, institutional integrity, and social organisation — not from continuous external support.

A more balanced view is offered by scholars such as Prah (2002), who acknowledges both internal and external factors as contributing to Africa's underdevelopment. While systemic global issues do play a role, Prah believes that internal governance failures — such as poor leadership, corruption, and lack of strategic vision — are equally to blame. Calderisi (2006), however, places the bulk of the responsibility on recipient countries, arguing that cultural and institutional failures, rather than global inequalities or colonial history, are the real obstacles to progress. He cites five African countries — Uganda, Ghana, Mozambique, Tanzania, and Mali — as examples of relative success due to their governments' commitment to reform and transparency.

While the structural imbalance in global economic relations undeniably affects development outcomes in the Global South, this study maintains that exclusive blame on external actors is overly simplistic and counterproductive. The persistent underdevelopment in many parts of Africa is equally, if not more, the result of poor governance, lack of accountability, and irresponsible leadership in recipient countries. Leaders in many aid-dependent nations have failed to demonstrate thrift, strategic foresight, and the political will required to translate aid into long-term development outcomes.

Factors that Influence Aid Effectiveness

In a 1995 IMF seminar, Jayco emphasised that although Africa's future ultimately lies in the hands of its people, external assistance remains essential in addressing the continent's macroeconomic hurdles. He identified the World Bank's six guiding principles — selectivity, focus on results, client orientation, cost-efficiency, financial integrity, and partnership - as essential for shaping effective donor strategies. On the recipient side, effectiveness relies on key practices such as transparency, public investment planning, budget reviews, donor alignment with national programs, and medium-term fiscal frameworks (Christensen, 1995).

Despite these well-considered recommendations, more than two decades later, foreign aid outcomes in Africa and much of the developing world remain underwhelming. This raises questions about whether these principles have been implemented meaningfully or whether they simply exist on paper without genuine commitment. The idea of a "partnership" between wealthy donor countries and economically weaker recipients is also questioned - how equitable can such a partnership truly be? Nonetheless, in the context of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), Gupta et al (2006) argue that a scale-up in aid to Africa is necessary. For such increased aid to yield results, recipient nations must adopt policies that foster accountability and reduce corruption, ensuring that aid absorption leads to real progress.

Chakravarti (2005) suggests that effective governance, built on capable bureaucracies and principled leadership, is central to maximising aid benefits. This view appears to conflict with neoliberal advice that promotes minimal government interference. While critics claim that aid undermines state capacity, Goldsmith (2003) finds little empirical support for the idea that less aid correlates with better administrative outcomes. Nor is there convincing evidence that countries receiving more aid always perform better. In short, the link between aid and bureaucratic quality is not straightforward.

The 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness aimed to tackle these complexities by promoting recipient ownership, donor alignment, coordination, results-driven strategies, and mutual accountability (Stern et al., 2008). These principles, though not new, represent a formal agreement between donors and recipients on improving aid outcomes. However, the **2008** Accra High-Level Forum revealed that political challenges have hampered progress. The final synthesis report candidly admitted that, while useful, the Paris Declaration is "far from a cure-all" for development challenges (Stern et al., 2008).

Ayittey (2006) offers a more inward-looking perspective, stressing the need to dismantle what he calls Africa's "vampire states," that is, governments led by corrupt and autocratic leaders who plunder national wealth and then look to foreign donors to cover basic needs. He cites notorious examples like Daniel Arap Moi, Robert Mugabe, and Sani Abacha, accusing them of enriching themselves while neglecting national development goals. In such cases, state institutions often lack the capacity and legitimacy to lead meaningful reform.

From the donor perspective, Eyben (2006) argues that aid is fundamentally relational. She advocates for stronger relationship management, arguing that the quality of engagement between donor and recipient matters just as much as financial oversight. Using complexity theory, she asserts that treating aid as a catalyst requires active involvement, yet donors often remain distant and disconnected. This detachment hinders effectiveness, especially when donors hesitate to confront recipients about governance failures. Calderisi (2006) also criticises donors for internal inefficiencies and conflicting advice. He proposes merging major institutions like the World Bank and IMF to streamline their roles — though incorporating UNDP would be challenging due to differing development priorities and evaluation criteria.

Browne (2006) has an issue with how aid is allocated, arguing that it often reflects donor interests - geopolitical, commercial, or historical - rather than recipients' development needs. He insists that true development must be led from within, with developing nations taking more responsibility and donors focusing their funds on global public goods that benefit all.

Similarly, Lancaster (1999) links Africa's development woes to slow economic growth and weak investment and savings rates, while Ayittey (2002) attributes the problem to poor leadership and complicit Western influence.

Interestingly, Azarnert (2004) presents data suggesting that aid can influence population growth and fertility rates, sometimes positively. He cites Botswana as a standout example: with a small population of 1.9 million and a growth rate of 1.2%, the country transformed into a middle-income nation with a per capita GDP of nearly $15,800 in 2008. While Botswana's mineral wealth plays a role, its success underscores the importance of having a capable, innovative, and self-reliant populace.

Ultimately, Lancaster (1999) summarises the situation aptly by describing aid as a **"**double-edged sword**."** In conducive political and economic settings, it can support development, but where corruption and mismanagement prevail, aid risks becoming wasted resources. As Ayittey also notes, it is only when leadership is transparent and accountable — **"**tupocratic" rather than autocratic **-** that foreign aid can truly make a difference.

The Role of Aid in Development Financing

Foreign aid continues to play a significant role in financing development across Africa, supporting a broad spectrum of activities. These include investment projects, technical assistance (often integrated within larger projects or provided independently), direct budgetary support, and debt relief through various cancellation initiatives (Wangwe, 2006). Historically, the bulk of global aid has been channelled into capital investment projects - such as the development of infrastructure, expansion of essential social services, and the funding of scientific research. The allocation of aid across sectors has varied between countries and over time. Earlier phases of aid delivery were more focused on economic infrastructure and directly productive sectors. In contrast, recent trends show a greater emphasis on social sectors and economic governance, aligning more closely with sector-wide approaches rather than isolated project-based interventions. Notably, although technical assistance experienced a decline for several decades, it has seen a resurgence in recent years, now comprising approximately one-quarter of total aid flows to Africa (Wangwe, 2006).

In the post-independence era, countries like Botswana relied heavily on aid in the form of budgetary support, particularly before their domestic revenue systems became robust. However, the share of aid directed toward budget support diminished throughout the 1970s. It gained momentum again during the 1980s, coinciding with the implementation of structural adjustment and sectoral reform programmes aimed at economic policy restructuring (Wangwe, 2006).

Debt relief has emerged as another critical dimension of aid in recent decades. Donor governments and international financial institutions have increasingly focused on alleviating the unsustainable debt burdens of African nations through mechanisms such as bilateral debt rescheduling, full debt cancellations, and global initiatives like the World Bank's Highly Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) programme. Many of the eligible countries under this initiative are African states.

Nonetheless, the actual utility and impact of aid can be obscured by the complexity of its disbursement and the lack of transparency surrounding its end use. In some instances, aid figures may appear substantial, but the funds do not always translate into tangible or sustainable development outcomes due to misallocation, inefficiencies, or administrative overhead.

Conclusion

Globally, especially in developing regions such as Africa and countries like Nigeria, the drive for economic development remains a pressing concern. However, the original developmental intentions of many foreign aid programmes have often been compromised by the commercial and geopolitical interests of donor nations. As White (2001) observes, foreign aid is rarely a neutral tool for development; instead, it frequently serves the strategic interests of donors and operates within dominant global power structures.

Despite being endowed with vast natural resources - such as gold, oil, cobalt, and diamonds etc. - many African nations continue to rely heavily on financial institutions like the World Bank and IMF, often incurring loans with stringent conditions and unsustainable interest rates. This paradox underlines the dependency dilemma: rather than fostering self-reliant growth, aid can erode domestic initiative, deepen dependency, and hinder innovation. In many instances, aid has evolved into a form of economic subjugation, enabling donor countries to exert ideological and policy influence over recipient states.

The absence of financial transparency and accountability remains a pervasive issue across many developing countries. Corruption, particularly the misappropriation of public funds by political elites, has become systemic. In countries like Nigeria, the diversion of state resources into private accounts by government officials undermines institutional trust and significantly impedes socio-economic progress. Indeed, corruption and leakages represent some of the most formidable barriers to sustainable development across the Global South.

For foreign aid to transit from being a source of dependency to a catalyst for growth, recipient nations must take proactive steps to reform governance structures, enhance public financial management, and reduce susceptibility to donor-driven conditionalities. Ultimately, the responsibility for effective development lies not only with the providers of aid but also, crucially, with the recipients, who must chart their paths with tupocracy, integrity, transparency, and strategic foresight.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and critical discussions presented in this study, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. **Promotion of Strategic Foreign Aid Utilisation:** Foreign aid should be encouraged and strategically leveraged as a catalyst for sustainable economic development and poverty reduction in developing countries, particularly in Africa.
2. **Policy Reforms and Conditionality Oversight:** African recipient governments should formulate and enforce robust policy frameworks aimed at critically evaluating and negotiating the conditions attached to foreign aid. This will ensure that such conditions align with national development priorities and do not compromise sovereignty or long-term growth.
3. **Efficient Management and Accountability of Aid Resources:** Aid inflows to Least Developed Countries (LDCs) must be transparently managed and directed toward productive, growth-enhancing projects. Strengthening institutions responsible for public financial management is key to ensuring that aid achieves its intended developmental impact.
4. **Scope for Further Research:** Future studies should investigate the specific impact of foreign aid on the development trajectories of individual African countries, with a focus on case studies such as Nigeria. This will provide nuanced insights into the dynamics of aid effectiveness at the sub-national or national level.

References

Abdul, Z. H., Adamu, A. & Ogwuche, I. P. (2018). Effect of Foreign Aid on Economic Development in Nigeria. *AE-Funai Journal of Accounting Business and Finance (FJABAF), 3*(1), 15 – 29.

Ajayi, L. B., & Oke, M. O. (2012). Effect of external debt on economic growth and development of Nigeria. International Journal of Business and Social Science, 3(12), 297-304.

Akonor, K. (2008). Foreign Aid to Africa: A Hollow Hope? *New York University Journal of International Law and Politics*, 40, 1071–1078.

Alesina, A., & Dollar, D. (2008). Who gives foreign aid to whom and why? *Journal of Economic Growth, 5(1), 33-63.*

Anwar, M. (2000). *who determines the foreign aid to developing countries*: A public choice approach. *Journal of Commerce, 3*, 9-29.

Aranson, P. H. (1990). Rational ignorance in politics, economics and law. *Journal des Economistes et des Etudes Humaines, 1*(1), 25-42.

Aranson, P. H., Gellhorn, E., & Robinson, G. (1990). A theory of legislative delegation. *Cornell Law Review, 68*(1), 1–67.

Ayittey, G. (2002). Why Africa is poor. In J. Morris (ed) *Sustainable development: promoting progress or perpetuating poverty*. Profile Books. pp. 57-75.

Azarmert L. (2004). Foreign aid and population growth: evidence from Africa. Forum Paper. African Development and Poverty Reduction: The Macro-Micro Linkage, South Africa.

Bakare, A. S. (2011). The microeconomic impact of foreign aid in sub-Saharan Africa: The case of Nigeria. *Business and Management Review, 1*(5), 24-32.

Bakoup, F. (2013). promoting economic reforms in developing countries: Rethinking budgetary aid? Working Paper Series No. 167, African Development Bank Group, Tunis, Tunisia.

Bauer, P. (2000). *From subsistence to exchange and other essays*. Princeton University Press.

Berthelemy, J. (2006). Bilateral donors' interest vs. recipients' development motives in aid allocation: Do all donors behave the same?" *Development Economics, 10*(2), 179-194. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9361.2006.00311.x

Brewster, H., & Yeboah, D. (1994). *Aid and the growth income in aid-favoreddeveloping countries*: policy issues. Oxford University Press, 18(2), 145-162.

Browne, S. (2006). *Aid and influence*: *Do donors help or hinder?* Earthscan.

Calderisi, R. (2006). *The trouble with Africa*: Why foreign aid is not working. Palgrave Macmillan.

Chakravarti, A. (2005). *Aid institutions and development*: *New approaches to growth, governance, and poverty*. Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.

Christensen, B. V. (1995). Review of issues of aid effectiveness. In L. Claire (Ed.), *External assistance and policies for growth in Africa*. International Monetary Fund. pp. 80-100.

Conchesta, N.K. (2008). Foreign Aid and Economic Growth: The Case of Tanzania. Unpublished MSc. Thesis, University of Dar Es Salaam.

Den Hertog, J. A. (2000). General theories of regulation. In B. Bouckaert & G. De Geest Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Law and Economics* (Vol. 1, pp. 223–270). Edward Elgar.

Den-Hertog, P. (2000). Knowledge-intensive business service as co-producers of innovation. *International Journal of Innovation Management 4*(4), 491-528.

Devarajan, S., Rajkumar, A. S., & Swaroop, V. (1998, October). *What does aid to Africa finance?* Policy Research Working Paper No. 2092. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Djankov, S., La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., & Shleifer, A. (2002). The regulation of entry. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 117(1), 1–37. https://doi.org/10.1162/003355302753399436.

Easterly, W. (2005). *Can foreign aid save Africa*? Clemens Lecture Series, Saint John's University.

Eyben, R. (2006). Making relationships matter for aid bureaucracies. In Eyben, R. (Ed.), *Relationships for Aid*. Earthscan. pp. 30-60.

Frank, A. G. (1966). the development of underdevelopment. *Monthly Review*, *18*(4), 17–31.

Goldsmith, A. A. (2003). Foreign aid and state administrative capability in Africa. In Nicolas Van de W. Nicole B. & Vijaya R. (eds). *Beyond structiral adjustment: the institutional context of African development.* Palgrave Macmillan. Pp. 183-221.

Gupta, S., Powell, R., & Yang, Y. (2006). *The macroeconomic challenges of scaling up aid to Africa: a checklist for practitioners.* International Monetary Fund.

Hantke-Domas, M. (2003). *The public interest theory of regulation*: Non-existence or misinterpretation? *European Journal of Law and Economics*, 15(2), 165-194. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021814416688.

Jaycox, E. V. K. (1995). Meeting the challenges of African development. In L. Claire (Ed.), *External Assistance and Policies for Growth in Africa*. International Monetary Fund.

Kabete, C. N. (2008). *Foreign aid and economic growth*: *The case of Tanzania*. Institute of Social Studies (ISS), Netherlands.

Lancaster, C. & Wangwe, S. (2000). Managing a smooth transition from aid dependence in Africa. Policy Essay No. 28. Overseas Development Council.

Lancaster, C. (1999). Aid effectiveness in africa: an unfinished agenda. *Journal of African Economies*, 8(4), 487-503.

Lensink, R. & White, H. (2001). Are there negative returns to aid? *Journal of Development Studies*, 37(6), 42–65.

Masud, B., Feeny, S., Hermes, N., Lensink, R., & McGillivray, M. (2006). Controversies over the impact of development aid: It works; it doesn't; it can, but that depends. *Journal of International Development*, 18(7), 1031–1050. https://doi.org/10.1002/jid.1335.

Mosley, P., Harrigan, J., & Toye, J. (1991). *Aid and power: The world bank and policy-based lending*, 1. Routledge.

Moyo, D. (2009). *Dead aid: Why aid is not working and how there is a better way for Africa.* Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Myint, H, Krueger A.O. (2016) Economic development. https://www.britannica.com/topic/economic-development.

Nwangwe, S. (2006). *Foreign aid in Africa: Role, experience and challenges.* Daima Associate Ltd.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. (1999). Efforts and policies of the members of the development assistance committee. development co-operation report 1998.

Park, J. D. (2020). *Re-inventing Africa's Development*: *Linking Africa to the Korean development model*. St Philip Street Press.

Prah, K. K. (2002). *Culture, the missing link in development planning in Africa*. In K. Kwame (Ed.), Where has aid taken Africa? Re-Thinking development. Media Foundation for West Africa. pp. 107-126.

Riddell, R. C. (2007). Does foreign aid really work? *Ethics & International Affairs, 21*(4), 477-480.

Sachs, J. (2005). *The end of poverty: Economic possibilities for our time*. The Penguin Press.

Tadesse, T. (2011). Foreign aid and economic growth in Ethiopia: A cointegration analysis", *Economic Research Guardian, Weissberg Publishing, 1*(2), 88-108.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (1998). *Development co-operation report 1998: Efforts and policies of the members of the development assistance committee*. OECD Publishing. DOI: 10.1787/dcr-1998-en.

Tigist, M. M. (2021). International aid to Africa needs an overhaul. Tips on what needs to change. theconversation.com.

Todaro, M. P., & Smith, S. C. (2009). *Economic development* (10th ed.). Pearson Education Limited.

United Nations. (1994). The UN human development report.

Wangwe, S. (2006). *Foreign aid in Africa: Role, experiences and challenges. Background Paper for the African Development Bank Conference, Tunis, 22 November 2006).* Dar es Salaam: Daima Associates.

Wood, B., Kabell, D., Sagasti, F., Muwanga, N. (2008). Evaluation of the implementation of the paris declaration. Phase One Synthesis Report

Zhukova, L. (2020). Ensuring of the institutional status of the state under global challenges. *Baltic Journal of Economic Studies, 6*(2), 39-42 DOI: 10.30525/2256-0742/2020-6-2-39-42.

Zunera A. R. & Dirk-Jan, K. (2021). What happens to aid fungibility when the recipient Government takes control? Effect of aids ownership in Rwanda. *Development Review.* https://doi.org/10.1111/dpr.12604.