Foreign Aid and Economic Conditionality in Africa, 1960-2010: A Historical Analysis of Complex Relations

Hysaint Eiguedo Okoeguale[1,*], Eguzoro Uchechi Ibukun[1] and Ejovi Oghenemarho Emilia[2]

[1]Department of History and Strategic Studies, University of Lagos, Akoka, Lagos, Nigeria

[2]Department of History and International Studies, University of Benin, Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria

Abstract: This study examines the nature and patterns of foreign aid and economic conditionalities in sub-Saharan Africa from the early 1960s, when most African countries gained independence, to the early 2000s, a period that saw the rise, consolidation, and gradual transformation of economic conditionality as a central feature of aid relations. It notes that economic conditionality refers to the policy requirements, often based on neoliberal economic principles, that donor countries and multilateral institutions, such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, impose on recipient states as a precondition for accessing loans, debt relief, or development grants. The article argues that these conditions were most aggressively implemented during the 1980s and 1990s, especially through Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs), which sought to reshape African economies by enforcing market liberalization, privatization, and fiscal austerity. The focus on sub-Saharan Africa is intentional, as this region was disproportionately targeted for policy-based lending and remains the most aid-dependent part of the continent, making it a crucial site for assessing the long-term impact of foreign aid conditionalities. This study scrutinizes the rationale behind these aid conditions by analyzing the policy objectives of donor institutions such as the IMF, the World Bank, and major Western governments, as well as the perspectives of African scholars and policymakers. The study draws on theoretical debates among dependency theorists, neoliberal economists, and postcolonial scholars, who disagree on whether conditional aid promotes sustainable development or reinforces neocolonial dependency.

Keywords: Aid conditionality, dependency, Structural Adjustment Programs, Fiscal Austerity, and privatization.

INTRODUCTION

Foreign aid comes in different forms, including bilateral aid, which is direct assistance from one country to another. There is also multilateral aid, channeled through institutions like the World Bank, IMF, or African Development Bank, in the form of humanitarian assistance for emergencies such as famine or conflict and developmental support, which offers long-term help for sectors like health, education, and infrastructure. This has long been a key aspect of Africa's relations with the advanced economies of the Global North (Adeogun; 2025). Since the post-colonial period of the 1960s, foreign aid has served as a major channel through which Western powers—including the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, and France—delivered humanitarian support, economic recovery programs, and development aid to the newly independent African nations like Nigeria, Ghana, and Kenya. These aids were managed through both bilateral agreements and multilateral agencies, such as the World Bank and the United Nations Development Programs, which were often influenced by Cold War politics and post-colonial reconstruction efforts (Killick; 1998).

However, the conditional aid that was disbursed by international financial institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank during the 1980s and 1990s, mostly through Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs), has been criticized for promoting economic dependency, undermining national sovereignty, and imposing neoliberal economic reforms that often clashed with Africa's domestic development priorities and socio-political realities. At the core of this analysis is the concept of economic conditionality. This policy tool was formalized by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) in the early 1950s, specifically after the adoption of its Stand-By Arrangements (SBAs) in 1952. The term gained wider recognition and usage during the debt crisis of the 1980s when both the IMF and the World Bank began to systematically include structural reform requirements, such as privatization, trade liberalization, and fiscal austerity, as preconditions for receiving loans or debt relief for African states. Some African countries, such as Ghana (1983) and Zambia (1985), adopted Structural Adjustment Programs under these conditions to secure foreign funds, which were largely directed at balancing budgets, servicing external debt, and reviving collapsing economies, often at the expense of public services and local industries (Bolarinwa; 2025).

Significantly, foreign aid in the form of conditional loans and structural adjustment support became a key part of Africa's international relations in the early 1980s

*Address correspondence to this author at the Department of History and Strategic Studies, University of Lagos, Akoka, Lagos, Nigeria;
Email: heiguedo@unilag.edu.ng

and 1990s as many countries faced worsening economic decline, rising external debt, and institutional breakdowns. In response to the global oil shocks and falling commodity prices, countries such as Ghana (1983), Zambia (1985), and Nigeria (1986) sought help from the IMF and the World Bank. The aid provided was tied to Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) that required major economic reforms, including the removal of subsidies, currency devaluation, downsizing of the public sector, and liberalization of trade policies (Mosley et al.; 1995).

Against this background, aid donors such as the United States, the United Kingdom, and Germany, along with multilateral institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, presented foreign aid not merely as humanitarian assistance, but as a strategic instrument to restructure African economies, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, along neoliberal economic lines. Countries such as Kenya, Ghana, Senegal, and Malawi were encouraged, and at times pressured, to implement free-market reforms, including currency devaluation, trade liberalization, and reduction of state subsidies, under the framework of Structural Adjustment Programs (Mkandawire and Soludo; 1999).

These often involve requirements such as privatization, liberalization, fiscal austerity, and governance reforms. Privatization meant that state-owned enterprises were sold to private investors to reduce government spending and improve efficiency. For instance, under the Structural Adjustment Program adopted by Nigeria in 1986, several parastatals, including the Nigerian Airways and parts of the Nigerian National Shipping Line, were either commercialized or privatized (Ihonvbere; 1998). Trade liberalization refers to the removal of import tariffs and subsidies, allowing foreign goods to compete freely in domestic markets. In Ghana's 1983 Economic Recovery Program, liberalization policies led to a flood of imports, which undermined local textile industries (Herbst; 1993). Fiscal austerity meant reducing government expenditure, particularly on social services such as education, health, and public sector wages. Zambia, under IMF pressure in the mid-1980s, slashed public spending and removed maize subsidies, which led to massive price hikes and sparked civil unrest, including the 1990 food riots in Lusaka (Langdon and Kimenyi; 1996). Lastly, governance reforms, often referred to as anti-corruption measures, transparency initiatives, and civil service restructuring, were adopted. In Kenya, aid disbursement in the 1990s was tied to the introduction of multiparty democracy and the strengthening of public institutions, though with mixed results in terms of actual implementation (Baylies and Bujra; 1991).

While neoliberal thinkers such as Anne Krueger and Jeffrey Sachs argue that conditions such as privatization and market reforms promote economic efficiency and fiscal discipline, critics such as Thandika Mkandawire, Joseph Stiglitz, Claude Ake, and Dambisa Moyo contend that these externally imposed policies often undermine local priorities, erode sovereignty, and exacerbate poverty. By engaging both primary sources, such as policy documents and public statements, and secondary academic literature, this study assesses the practical outcomes of conditional aid across selected African countries and explores the long-term implications for African development (Osaghae; 2025).

Through case studies including Nigeria and Ghana, this study carefully examines whether conditional aid has improved or limited Africa's development.

ORIGINS OF FOREIGN AID IN AFRICA AND THEIR THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

Undoubtedly, in the decades following African decolonization, aid became a central tool through which donor countries sought to influence, support, or shape the trajectories of emerging states across the African continent. Its primary aim was to support economic development, humanitarian needs, or strategic geopolitical interests. In 1961, newly independent Tanzania received one of its earliest major aid packages from Sweden, which provided technical expertise and funding to support rural development and education initiatives. This kind of assistance exemplifies what is broadly referred to as foreign aid. This international transfer of resources, whether in the form of financial capital, goods, or services, from one country or international institution to another, supports economic development, humanitarian relief, and strategic interests (Lancaster; 2007). In 1975, Nigeria received bilateral aid from the United Kingdom in the form of technical assistance and educational funding, aimed at supporting post-civil war reconstruction and strengthening administrative capacity. At other times, it may be multilateral, distributed through international organizations such as the United Nations, the World Bank, or the African Development Bank.

Significantly, the forms of aid taken are diverse, ranging from grants (which are non-repayable),

concessional loans (repayable with favorable terms), and technical assistance (such as the provision of expertise or training), to emergency humanitarian aid designed to respond to crises. In 1979, Egypt received a substantial aid package from the United States following the signing of the Camp David Accords. This contributed to Egypt's decision as the first Arab country to officially recognize the state of Israel. Although the aid was seen as support for peace and development, it was closely tied to U.S. strategic interests in the Middle East (Mosley et al.; 1995). This shows how, although foreign aid is frequently portrayed as a humanitarian gesture, its distribution has often been shaped by the political and economic agendas of donor countries. In Africa, similar patterns were evident in the 1980s, when countries such as Kenya and the DRC continued to receive substantial Western aid despite their poor human rights records, largely due to their alignment with Western powers during the Cold War international system (Browne; 2006). Fundamental to the concept of foreign aid is economic conditionality. In finance and economics, it often refers to the provision of benefits, loans, debt relief, or foreign aid by the donor to the recipient. It refers to the set of policy prescriptions or reforms that recipient countries are required to adopt to access financial assistance. These conditions are often attached to aid packages by international financial institutions, especially the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. Forinstance,in 1983, facing severe inflation and currency depreciation, Ghana turned to the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank for financial assistance. In exchange for a loan package, the country was required to implement a Structural Adjustment Program (SAP) that included policies such as currency devaluation, removal of subsidies, and privatization of state-owned enterprises. This instance reflects how international financial institutions often attach stringent economic conditions to aid packages, with the stated aim of restoring macroeconomic stability and promoting market-based reforms (Herbst; 1993).

However, critics such as Thandika Mkandawire, a Malawian economist and historian, Joseph Stiglitz, a Nobel Prize-winning economist and former chief economist at the World Bank, and Claude Ake, a Nigerian political scientist, argue that economic conditionalities frequently amount to externally imposed mandates that undermine national sovereignty and economic autonomy, often leading to social discontent and political unrest. These scholars, rooted in African political economy and development studies, link conditionality to rising social discontent and political unrest across the continent. A striking historical example occurred in Zambia in 1990, where the IMF-mandated removal of maize subsidies under a Structural Adjustment Program triggered nationwide protests, riots, and dozens of deaths, highlighting the political volatility such conditions could provoke. With these historical dynamics in mind, understanding foreign aid and economic conditionality in Africa requires engagement with a range of theoretical perspectives.

One of the most influential approaches is dependency theory, which was first developed in the late 1950s and 1960s by Latin American economists and sociologists such as Raúl Prebisch, Andre Gunder Frank, and Fernando Henrique Cardoso. The theory explains that the global economic system is structured in a way that benefits the developed (core) countries while perpetuating underdevelopment in peripheral (developing) nations. Theotonio Dos Santos, a Brazilian political economist and one of the major architects of dependency theory, argued that foreign aid, especially when tied to economic conditionalities, reproduces global power asymmetries by keeping peripheral nations reliant on the core for financial and policy direction. His work, rooted in Marxist and historical-materialist analysis, emphasized that aid under such conditions often serves the strategic interests of donor countries rather than the genuine development needs of recipients in Africa and other parts of the Global South (Dos Santos; 1970). Conditional aid has historically functioned as a modern instrument of domination. A striking example is Senegal in the 1980s, which, under pressure from the IMF and World Bank, implemented a series of structural adjustment reforms that included cutting food subsidies, liberalizing trade, and reducing state investment in agriculture. These policies led to increased foreign dependence, food insecurity, and rising social inequality. By the late 1980s, Senegal's external debt had ballooned, and its economy remained structurally dependent on foreign capital and imported goods. This reflects a broader pattern across sub-Saharan Africa, where aid tied to neoliberal reforms often locks countries into cycles of indebtedness and economic subservience, while facilitating the continued extraction of value through debt servicing, resource exports, and the adoption of Western development models at the expense of locally grounded alternatives (Ndulo; 2003).

In contrast, the liberal institutionalist school of thought emphasizes the role of international

cooperation, institutions, and norms. It takes a more optimistic view of aid and conditionality. They argue that, when properly designed, foreign aid tied to policy reform can strengthen institutions, promote good governance, and encourage development. For instance, in the early 2000s, Tanzania was often cited by liberal institutionalists as a success story. After implementing governance and fiscal reforms in partnership with the World Bank and bilateral donors, the country received debt relief under the Highly Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative, and aid flows increased substantially in support of its national poverty reduction strategy (Brown; 2006). This perspective holds that conditionality can be developmental if aligned with the recipient country's priorities and monitored transparently through international frameworks. From this perspective, conditionality is not a tool of coercion but a mutually agreed-upon framework designed to encourage sound economic policies, institutional reforms, and responsible governance. According to this view, conditional aid ensures accountability and helps recipients implement necessary reforms they might otherwise avoid due to domestic political constraints (Omoweh; 2002).

While liberal institutionalists emphasize cooperation and mutual benefit, realism offers a more cynical but influential interpretation of foreign aid. Rooted in the disciplines of international relations and political science, realist theorists such as Hans Morgenthau and Stephen Krasner argue that states act primarily to advance their national interests, and that foreign aid is often a tool of power projection rather than altruism. This perspective is particularly relevant when analyzing aid during the Cold War, when superpowers used development assistance to secure alliances and ideological loyalty. For example, in the 1980s, the United States continued to provide substantial aid to Mobutu Sese Seko’s regime in Zaire (now the Democratic Republic of Congo), despite widespread corruption and authoritarianism, largely because of Mobutu’s strategic alignment with the West against Soviet influence in Africa (Krasner; 1976). In this view, aid primarily serves to protect donor interests rather than fostering meaningful development in recipient countries.Extending the critique of aid as a tool of power, postcolonial theorists provide an even deeper structural analysis by tracing the enduring legacies of empire in global development. Scholars such as Edward Said (a literary theorist and cultural critic), Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o (a Kenyan writer and decolonial theorist), and Achille Mbembe (a Cameroonian historian and political theorist) argue that foreign aid often perpetuates the unequal power relations established during colonialism, masking control as benevolence. This perspective sees aid not just as a policy tool, but as part of a discursive and institutional system that keeps former colonies economically dependent and politically subordinate. A historical example was France’s post-independence aid to its former colonies in West Africa, which was tied to continued use of the CFA franc, French military presence, and preferential trade agreements (Nwoke; 2025).

THE RATIONALITY OF ECONOMIC CONDITIONALITY FOR AFRICAN COUNTRIES

To begin with, economic conditionality remains one of the most controversial aspects of foreign aid in sub-Saharan Africa, especially in countries such as Zambia, Ghana, and Tanzania, where the implementation of Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) during the 1980s and 1990s caused significant social and economic upheaval. It refers to the policy reforms that recipient countries must undertake to gain access to external financial support. These conditions were aimed at restructuring national economies to align with liberal economic principles such as free markets, privatization, and reduced government intervention. For instance, in Kenya, under World Bank guidance in the early 1990s, the government privatized over 200 state-owned enterprises, including major utilities and agricultural marketing boards, often leading to mass layoffs and weakened public services. Similarly, in Mozambique, economic reforms under an IMF-supported structural adjustment plan led to trade liberalization and the removal of price controls, which disproportionately impacted the poor and rural communities. These examples demonstrate how conditionalities were not just technical recommendations but powerful tools through which international donors reshaped African political economies, often prioritizing market orthodoxy over social welfare and local needs. Therefore, it can be argued that the overturning of the existing relations of production was necessary for overcoming underdevelopment (Ake; 1983). Ultimately, such policies reinforced the central argument of this paper: that economic conditionality often functioned less as a neutral development mechanism and more as a means to sustain structural economic dependence.

Although economic conditionalities are often presented by international financial institutions like the

IMF and World Bank as essential tools for ensuring fiscal responsibility and promoting economic growth, they have sparked intense debate among African scholars, Policymakers, Civil Society Groups, and Donor Agencies. Critics argue that these conditions often favor donor interests and neoliberal orthodoxy over local needs, while supporters contend that they foster discipline and accountability in economic governance. This ongoing debate focuses on the appropriateness, motives, and long-term effects of linking aid to structural reforms, especially in environments characterized by poverty, institutional fragility, and postcolonial dependence (Harrison; 2004).

The justification for conditionality is rooted in the belief espoused by institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and donor governments like the United States and the United Kingdom that aid without accompanying policy reform was unlikely to result in sustainable development. This rationale was central to the Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) introduced across sub-Saharan Africa in the 1980s, where reforms were seen as prerequisites for improving macroeconomic stability, reducing inflation, and encouraging private investment (World Bank; 1989).

Furthermore, institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, along with major Western donors like the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the UK's Department for International Development (DFID), contend that aid should be accompanied by reforms aimed at improving macroeconomic stability, institutional transparency, and public financial management. This position gained particular prominence during the 1990s, when African countries such as Uganda and Tanzania received increased budgetary support only after implementing governance reforms that aligned with donor expectations (Killick; 1998). These measures were presented as necessary to ensure that aid would be used effectively, but they also reinforced the role of donors in shaping Africa's internal economic policies. From this perspective, conditionality is not just a control mechanism but a form of partnership that encourages accountability, prevents misuse of funds, and helps countries avoid repeating past mistakes. However, while this argument holds in theory, historical evidence from countries like Zambia, Ghana, and Mozambique suggests that such conditions have often prioritized donor interests over local realities, leading to social unrest, weakened state capacity, and increased dependency. This study, therefore, contends that, rather than promoting genuine partnerships, economic conditionality has frequently functioned as an extension of external control, undermining African agency in shaping their development trajectories (Mkandawire and Soludo; 1999).

Indeed, scholars such as Thandika Mkandawire, Joseph Stiglitz argue that conditionality often serves the interests of donors more than those of the recipients. Nowhere was this more evident than during the implementation of the Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) in countries such as Ghana, Zambia, Nigeria, and Côte d'Ivoire during the 1980s and 1990s. Although SAPs were initially introduced to reduce macroeconomic imbalance and boost competitiveness, their implementation often resulted in adverse social outcomes (Ogbinaka; 2025). In many countries, these reforms led to increased unemployment, reduced access to social services, and greater income inequality. For instance, in Nigeria, the introduction of SAPs in 1986 involved a sharp devaluation of the naira and the removal of key subsidies. While these measures were intended to correct economic imbalances, they led to widespread inflation and hardship for ordinary citizens, especially the urban poor. The restructuring of public enterprises was often carried out hastily, with little transparency or regard for social welfare, resulting in job losses and declining service delivery. Public backlash was fierce, leading to protests, strikes, and a general sense of disillusionment with foreign-imposed economic reforms (Nwoke; 1988).

Similarly, in Ghana, one of the earliest and most cited adopters of Structural Adjustment Programs, the government under the leadership of Flight Lieutenant Jerry Rawlings launched the Economic Recovery Program (ERP) in April 1983. Backed by the IMF and World Bank, this program included the devaluation of the cedi, the removal of subsidies on basic goods, the retrenchment of civil servants, and the privatization of over 100 state-owned enterprises. These reforms aimed to address severe economic stagnation, balance-of-payment deficits, and inflation, which had troubled the country throughout the late 1970s and early 1980s. Initially, Ghana was praised by international donors as a model for reform: by the mid-1980s, inflation had fallen from over 100% in 1983 to around 40% in 1986, foreign exchange inflows improved, and cocoa exports—the country's primary foreign exchange earner—rose significantly. However, the long-term effects of these reforms were more uncertain. While some economic indicators improved

under Ghana's Economic Recovery Program, most of the gains remained macroeconomic and did not immediately lead to better living standards for most citizens. By 1986, inflation had decreased from over 100% in 1983 to about 40%, and the fiscal deficit as a share of GDP was significantly reduced. The country also saw an increase in foreign direct investment and export earnings, especially from cocoa, which grew due to better producer prices and sector investments. Ghana's GDP growth rate, which had been negative in the early 1980s, rose to an average of 5% annually between 1984 and 1989, according to World Bank reports. Yet, these macroeconomic gains came with a high social cost. The removal of subsidies on essential items such as food and fuel caused a sharp increase in living costs, hitting low-income households the hardest. Indeed, public sector retrenchments from 1985 to 1989 led to the dismissal of roughly 50,000 workers, resulting in higher unemployment and underemployment (Bolarinwa; 2025). The government's spending on public education and healthcare was also significantly reduced. In 1987, user fees—commonly called the "cash and carry" system—were introduced in hospitals, making healthcare access difficult for many Ghanaians. These hardships fueled growing public discontent and labor unrest, with numerous strikes and protests in urban centers such as Accra and Kumasi during the late 1980s.

Public sector retrenchment, the introduction of user fees for health and education, and cuts in government spending exacerbated poverty and widened the gap between urban and rural populations in Ghana throughout the late 1980s and early 1990s. According to the Ghana Living Standards Survey (GLSS) conducted in 1988, poverty levels remained above 35% nationally, with rural poverty disproportionately higher, particularly in the northern regions, where access to social services was already limited (Republic of Ghana; 1989). The introduction of user fees under the "cash and carry" system led to a decline in hospital visits by the poorest households by over 25%, especially in rural areas where people could not afford upfront payments for basic health care. Meanwhile, retrenchment in the public sector affected urban middle-income earners, contributing to rising unemployment in cities like Accra and Takoradi. These outcomes contributed to growing economic inequality, as urban residents with access to informal income streams and social networks were better able to cope with austerity measures than their rural counterparts.

As criticisms of Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) intensified throughout the 1990s, particularly over their social costs and lack of local ownership, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank introduced new aid frameworks in the early 2000s designed to soften and rebrand conditionality. Chief among these were the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), first implemented in Tanzania and Uganda around 2000-2001 as a prerequisite for debt relief under the Highly Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative (Killick; 2004). These frameworks emphasized country-led development planning, requiring African governments to consult with civil society and tailor their reform agendas to national priorities. Similarly, budget support mechanisms adopted in countries like Mozambique and Ghana replaced project-based aid with direct financial transfers to national budgets, theoretically enhancing transparency and aligning donor support with national development strategies. However, many African scholars and civil society groups remained skeptical, arguing that PRSPs often continued to reflect donor influence and neoliberal policy biases under a new label. While procedurally more participatory, these reforms did not fundamentally reverse the power imbalance inherent in the aid relationship. Rather than focusing solely on economic liberalization, these programs incorporated governance-related conditions, including anti-corruption reforms, human rights protections, gender equity, and democratic accountability. While these shifts marked a move toward a more holistic view of development, concerns persisted about the extent to which these conditions reflected donor priorities rather than genuine local needs (Ogbinaka; 2025).

Furthermore, bilateral aid donors have increasingly used conditionality to pursue political and ideological objectives. For example, U.S. foreign aid in the early 2000s to countries like Uganda was tied to abstinence-based HIV/AIDS education programs, reflecting domestic policy preferences rather than scientific consensus or recipient priorities. Similarly, the European Union has conditioned development assistance to North and West African countries on their cooperation in stemming irregular migration to Europe. In such instances, aid becomes less about development and more about advancing donor foreign policy agendas, often at the expense of recipient sovereignty.

The rise of non-traditional donors, especially China, has further complicated the global aid landscape. Unlike Western institutions, China typically provides development assistance without demanding macroeconomic or governance-related reforms. Its aid

is largely centered on infrastructure, trade, and capacity-building, with a strong emphasis on mutual benefit and non-interference. This has made Chinese aid particularly attractive to African leaders wary of Western conditionalities. However, critics argue that the absence of transparency, environmental safeguards, and labor protections in many Chinese-funded projects raises new concerns about sustainability and long-term accountability.

Despite its evolution, the system of aid conditionality continues to pose fundamental questions about power, ownership, use, abuse, and effectiveness in Africa's development. While conditionality may, in some cases, help to discipline reckless economic management or promote essential reforms, it also risks undermining national sovereignty, weakening democratic institutions, and imposing externally driven models of development. In many cases, the failure of conditionality to deliver lasting change reflects not just flaws in design or implementation but a deeper disconnect between donor expectations and the lived realities of African societies.

IMPLEMENTATION OF FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS: LESSONS FROM NIGERIA, GHANA, AND ETHIOPIA

Nigeria: A Cautionary Tale of Structural Reform

To understand the real-world implications of foreign aid and economic conditionality in Africa, it is essential to examine concrete national experiences. This section explores how conditional aid has shaped economic policy and development outcomes in Nigeria, Ghana, and Ethiopia, three countries with distinct political histories, economic structures, and trajectories of engagement with donor institutions. Through these case studies, one observes both the rationale behind aid conditionality and its often-contradictory consequences, including policy dependency, institutional distortion, and contested sovereignty.

Understandably, Nigeria's engagement with foreign aid and economic conditionality intensified in the mid-1980s, during a period of deep economic crisis. This development was consequent upon the collapse of global oil prices in 1981-1982. Nigeria's oil-dependent economy plunged into debt and inflation. Under General Ibrahim Babangida, the military government sought assistance from the IMF and World Bank, culminating in the adoption of a Structural Adjustment Program (Falola and Heaton; 2008) (SAP) in 1986.

The Structural Adjustment Program included far-reaching reforms. Against this background, the naira was devalued by nearly 50% fuel and food subsidies were withdrawn, state-owned enterprises were privatized, and import licensing was scrapped in favor of trade liberalization (IMF; 1986). These measures aimed to stabilize the macro economy and attract foreign investment. However, the consequences were immediate and severe. The devaluation of the naira spurred triple-digit inflation, eroding real wages and purchasing power. Subsidy removal drastically increased the cost of basic goods, while the privatization process was marred by accusations of corruption, as state assets were often sold to politically connected elites (Osaghae; 1998).

By the 1990s, the social impact of the Structural Adjustment Program was evident. Unemployment surged, especially among urban youths, and real incomes were on a downward spiral. Protests erupted across major cities, including Lagos and Kaduna, led by trade unions and student groups. The Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU) declared multiple strikes in the late 1990s, citing the erosion of education funding due to SAP. Although GDP growth briefly improved in 1988 and 1989, the longer-term effects included weakened public institutions, rising inequality, and a deep public distrust of donor-imposed policies.

GHANA: REFORM FROM ABOVE AND THE STRAINS BENEATH

Like Nigeria, Ghana's experience with economic conditionality also began in the early 1980s, under the leadership of Flight Lieutenant Jerry Rawlings. Facing runaway inflation (over 100% in 1983), food shortages, and institutional collapse, Ghana implemented the Economic Recovery Program (ERP) in 1983, in partnership with the IMF and World Bank (Hutchful; 2002).

Significantly, the ERP introduced sweeping reforms such as trade liberalization, currency devaluation, civil service retrenchment, and privatization of over 100 state-owned enterprises. Initially, the macroeconomic results were positive. By 1986, inflation had declined to around 40%, and GDP grew at an average of 5% between 1984 and 1989. Cocoa production and export earnings rebounded due to improved producer prices and donor-funded inputs (World Bank; 1993).

Yet these gains were accompanied by significant social dislocation. Approximately 50,000 public workers

were laid off between 1985 and 1989. The introduction of user fees under the “cash-and-carry” system in 1987 led to a decline in healthcare utilization, particularly among rural populations (Ghana Statistical Service; 1989). A 1988 Ghana Living Standards Survey found that poverty remained widespread, especially in northern regions. Critics such as Eboe Hutchful and Thandika Mkandawire argued that Ghana’s SAP emphasized fiscal discipline over human development and reinforced dependency on donor finance (Hutchful; 2002). Over the years, donor fatigue set in, and Ghana’s structural vulnerabilities, its heavy dependence on cocoa, and its reliance on foreign aid remained unresolved. Although Ghana was praised as a “model reformer,” its experience highlighted the limitations of externally driven reform, particularly in its failure to address social equity and long-term sustainability.

ETHIOPIA: NEGOTIATING CONDITIONALITY AMID DEVELOPMENTAL SOVEREIGNTY

Ethiopia presents a more recent and nuanced case. Historically shielded from deep Western involvement due to its imperial legacy and the Marxist orientation of the Derg regime (1974–1991), Ethiopia began receiving significant foreign aid following the rise of the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF) in 1991 (Aalen and Tronvoll; 2009).

Under Prime Minister Meles Zenawi, Ethiopia pursued a strategy of state-led development, heavily reliant on aid to finance infrastructure, agriculture, and social services. Donors such as the World Bank, IMF, USAID, and the UK’s DFID provided substantial funding, but tied it to conditions concerning governance, decentralization, and market reforms. Ethiopia selectively implemented these conditions, agreeing to macroeconomic discipline and decentralization, while resisting liberalization in key sectors such as telecommunications and banking.

Between 2001 and 2010, Ethiopia recorded impressive development outcomes- poverty rates dropped from 44% to 30%, primary school enrolment soared, and road networks expanded dramatically (UNDP; 2010). However, the political cost of conditionality became clear during the 2005 elections, when donor criticism of post-election violence led to the suspension or redirection of some aid funds. This underscored the limits of Ethiopia’s developmental autonomy. Critics such as Alex de Waal and Gebreslassie Tesfaye have noted that Ethiopia succeeded in using aid to fund national priorities, but struggled to escape the leverage of conditional donors fully.

From the above analysis of national experiences, it becomes clear that foreign aid and economic conditionality, if not carefully negotiated and contextually adapted, risk exacerbating the very problems they are meant to solve. These lessons are critical for reimagining aid relationships in Africa towards models that prioritize partnership, national ownership, and long-term resilience over compliance with externally crafted reform packages.

THE RIPPLE EFFECT OF AID CONDITIONALITY ON AFRICA’S GROWTH PATH

Undoubtedly, the effects of foreign aid conditionality on African development have been wide-ranging, complex, and often contradictory. While some argue that conditional aid has helped to promote fiscal discipline, macroeconomic stability, and governance reforms, others contend that it has exacerbated inequality, weakened state capacity, and entrenched dependency. A balanced assessment must therefore consider both the intended outcomes of conditionality and the unintended consequences that have emerged across the continent (Onyekpe; 2025). On the positive side, conditionality has sometimes succeeded in forcing governments to undertake necessary reforms that they may have otherwise postponed due to domestic political constraints. In countries plagued by fiscal indiscipline or inefficient state enterprises, conditions attached to aid have led to greater budgetary oversight, reduced inflation, and enhanced revenue collection. For instance, in the early 2000s, countries like Uganda and Tanzania implemented governance reforms under donor supervision that improved transparency in public finance and contributed to modest reductions in poverty. Similarly, the shift from general budget support to targeted poverty-reduction programs encouraged governments to direct resources to priority sectors like health and education. In addition to economic reforms, conditional aid has been used to promote political accountability and institutional development. Donors have increasingly linked aid to improvements in governance, democratization, and respect for human rights. In some cases, such as Kenya and Malawi, the threat of aid suspension has pressured governments to hold fairer elections, release political prisoners, or strengthen anti-corruption mechanisms. These political conditions, though controversial, have helped open democratic

spaces in countries where donor leverage remains strong (Bolarinwa; 2025).

Moreover, the conditionality model has facilitated the standardization of development practices across Africa. Through the frameworks established by the IMF, World Bank, and other multilateral institutions, African governments have adopted common principles of financial accountability, market liberalization, and civil service reform. This has contributed to improved investor confidence, better alignment with global trade norms, and more predictable policy environments in several countries. In this sense, conditionality has played a role in integrating African economies more fully into the global economic system. However, these achievements are tempered by a range of negative impacts, many of which stem from the rigid and often externally imposed nature of conditionality. One of the most significant criticisms is that conditional aid has undermined national sovereignty and democratic ownership of policy. Rather than enabling African countries to design development strategies based on local needs and realities, aid conditionalities often required governments to adopt one-size-fits-all models derived from neoliberal orthodoxy. These externally mandated policies rarely accounted for local institutional capacities, cultural dynamics, or political contexts. As a result, many reforms were implemented without meaningful consultation or participation, leading to weak implementation, public resistance, and eventual reversal.

The social costs of conditional aid have also been severe. During the era of structural adjustment, the downsizing of the public sector and the removal of subsidies placed immense burdens on vulnerable populations. In Zambia, for example, the reduction of subsidies for maize and the introduction of user fees in hospitals and schools in the 1990s led to a dramatic decline in access to basic services. The poor, particularly women and children, bore the brunt of these cuts. In countries like Mali and Senegal, similar reforms undermined food security and sparked widespread protests. Rather than lifting people out of poverty, these programs often intensified social inequalities and eroded public trust in both domestic institutions and international donors.

Another long-term consequence of aid conditionality is the entrenchment of dependency. While donors intended to promote self-reliance through conditional aid, the result in many cases has been the opposite. African states frequently became reliant on donor funding not only for development projects but also for basic budgetary needs. This dependency limited the incentive to develop internal revenue systems or pursue alternative financing models. Moreover, the frequent shifting of donor priorities and inconsistent enforcement of conditions created a volatile aid environment, making long-term planning difficult. Many African countries were caught in a cycle of partial reform, continued aid inflows, and ongoing economic fragility.

In addition to economic and social concerns, conditionality has often had political ramifications. By empowering donor institutions and sidelining domestic parliaments and civil society, conditional aid weakened the accountability of African leaders to their own citizens. In several instances, governments used compliance with donor conditions as a shield against internal criticism, justifying unpopular policies as externally required. This not only undermined democratic legitimacy but also reduced the responsiveness of leaders to local demands.

Recent developments have also shown how geopolitical interests can distort the application of conditionality. Donors have at times applied conditions selectively, ignoring governance failures in strategic allies while punishing less compliant governments. This inconsistency has damaged the credibility of conditionality as a tool for promoting good governance and raised concerns about the politicization of development aid.

Despite these challenges, there is growing recognition among African scholars and policymakers that the failure lies not with aid itself, but with the terms on which it is delivered. Conditionality, if reimagined, could still play a constructive role. To do so, it must shift from a model of compliance to one of collaboration, where African states take the lead in defining development priorities and donors provide support based on mutual respect and partnership. Mechanisms that enhance transparency, empower local actors, and build long-term capacity are far more likely to succeed than rigid conditionalities imposed from abroad.

In summary, while conditional aid has in some instances promoted reform and strengthened governance, its broader legacy in Africa is mixed at best. The costs in terms of sovereignty, social welfare, and democratic accountability have often outweighed the benefits. Moving forward, there is a pressing need

to rethink how foreign aid is designed and delivered, ensuring that it supports rather than supplants the aspirations and agency of African nations.

LESSONS OF HISTORY AND THE WAY FORWARD

The relationship between foreign aid and economic conditionality in Africa has been one of both promise and paradox. While aid has undoubtedly played a significant role in financing development efforts, responding to humanitarian crises, and supporting state-building across the continent, the conditionalities attached to it have often complicated these efforts. Rather than serving purely as neutral instruments of reform, aid conditions have frequently reflected the political and economic ideologies of donor states and institutions, leading to outcomes that are, at best, uneven and, at worst, detrimental to long-term development and sovereignty.

From the structural adjustment era of the 1980s and 1990s to the governance-centered frameworks of the 2000s and beyond, the rationale behind conditional aid has remained largely consistent: to ensure that financial support is matched by reforms that increase efficiency, accountability, and macroeconomic stability. Yet, as seen in the experiences of countries such as Nigeria, Ghana, and Ethiopia, these conditions have too often been implemented in ways that undermine local agency and impose rigid development models, with insufficient sensitivity to social context and institutional capacity.

The negative consequences of conditionality, such as austerity-driven cuts to health and education, currency devaluation, weakened state legitimacy, and dependency, have been felt most acutely by ordinary Africans. These costs challenge the legitimacy and effectiveness of conditional aid and call into question the donor-recipient relationship that has dominated Africa’s international relations for decades. At the same time, the emergence of alternative development partners, particularly China, has opened new avenues for financing and investment, albeit with their own risks of debt dependency, lack of transparency, and limited social safeguards.

In light of these realities, it is significant that the future of foreign aid in Africa be reshaped around principles of partnership, ownership, and contextual responsiveness. Conditionality, if it is to continue, must be reimagined. Rather than top-down impositions, conditions should emerge from genuine dialogue between donors and recipients, grounded in mutual respect and aligned with nationally defined development goals. This includes supporting African states in designing reforms that reflect local needs, cultures, and governance structures, rather than forcing adherence to externally defined blueprints.

Furthermore, African governments must take greater initiative in strengthening domestic institutions, improving fiscal governance, and investing in policy research. By doing so, they enhance their bargaining power in aid negotiations and reduce over-reliance on external assistance. Regional bodies, such as the African Union and ECOWAS, can play a stronger role in coordinating development strategies, promoting South-South cooperation, and establishing shared standards for aid effectiveness that reflect African priorities. Donors, on their part, must acknowledge the limitations of past approaches and adopt more flexible, transparent, and inclusive aid practices. This includes supporting participatory policymaking processes, channeling more aid through local institutions and civil society, and evaluating program success based on long-term outcomes rather than short-term compliance. Indeed, countries differ in their economic success due to their distinct institutions, the rules that govern how the economy operates, and the incentives that motivate individuals. Moreso, political and economic institutions, which are ultimately the choice of society, can be inclusive and encourage economic growth. Or they can be extractive and become impediments to economic growth (Acemoglu and Robinson; 2012).

CONCLUSION

The study argues that while conditional foreign aid can serve developmental purposes, its benefits are often undermined by the rigid and sometimes externally driven economic conditions attached to it. These conditionalities have, in many cases, prolonged Africa’s dependency on external financing and reinforced structural inequalities within the global economic system. For example, Zambia’s reliance on IMF loans in the 1980s and 1990s led to repeated cycles of borrowing and austerity without achieving sustained growth, while essential sectors like health and education were severely underfunded (Baylies and Bujra; 1991). In contrast, some countries have attempted to assert strategic autonomy. For instance, Botswana rejected IMF structural adjustment advice in the 1980s and pursued its gradual development model based on diamond revenue and prudent fiscal management, maintaining control over its economic

policy (Jefferis; 1995). In recent years, Rwanda sought to reduce aid dependency by investing massively in domestic resource mobilization and forming diversified partnerships with non-Western actors like China and India. Such strategies highlight how African states can resist blanket economic prescriptions and prioritize national development goals.

Finally, foreign aid and economic conditionality remain central to Africa's international engagement, but their future depends on a fundamental rethinking of how they are structured and delivered. Africa's development cannot be engineered from abroad; it must be owned and led from within. Aid that respects this principle, offered in good faith, tailored to the context, and free from coercive strings, can still contribute meaningfully to Africa's progress. The task ahead is to move from conditionality to collaboration, from dependency to partnership, and from externally dictated development to a future shaped by African voices, visions, and values.

REFERENCE

Oral interview with Professor Adebayo Adeogun, (Ogume, Novena University, Ogume, Delta State, 4th July 2025, Time: 10:00 am -10:20 am).

Tony Killick, *Aid and the Political Economy of Policy Change* (London: Routledge, 1998), 23–26; See also, Carol Lancaster, *Foreign Aid: Diplomacy, Development, Domestic Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 67–70. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203446539

Oral interview with Dr Joshua Bolarinwa, (Lagos, Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, 20th August 2025, Time: 3:15-4:00 pm).

Paul Mosley, Jane Harrigan, and John Toye, *Aid and Power: The World Bank and Policy-Based Lending*, Vol. 1 (London: Routledge, 1995), 75–85; See also, Tony Killick, *Aid and the Political Economy of Policy Change* (London: Routledge, 1998), 42–46. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203446539

Mkandawire, Thandika, and Charles Soludo. *Our Continent, Our Future: African Perspectives on Structural Adjustment* (Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 1999), 22–30; See also, Lancaster, Carol. *Foreign Aid: Diplomacy, Development, Domestic Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 92–98.

Julius Ihonvbere, *Economic Crisis, Civil Society, and Democratization: The Case of Nigeria* (Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 1998), 45–47.

Jeffrey Herbst, *The Politics of Reform in Ghana, 1982–1991* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 88–91. https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520309852

Carolyn Baylies and Janet Bujra, *The Politics of Austerity and Food Riots in Zambia*, *Review of African Political Economy* 52 (1991): 49–60.

Steven Langdon and Mwangi S. Kimenyi, "The Politics of Aid Conditionality in Kenya," *Journal of Modern African Studies* 34, no. 2 (1996): 279–294.

Oral interview with Professor Eghosa Osaghae, ((Lagos, Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, 25th July 2025, Time: 2:15-2:50 pm).

Carol Lancaster, *Foreign Aid: Diplomacy, Development, Domestic Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 58–62. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226470627.001.0001

Paul Mosley, Jane Harrigan, and John Toye, *Aid and Power: The World Bank and Policy-Based Lending*, Vol. 1 (London: Routledge, 1995), 12–20; See also, Thandika Mkandawire and Charles Soludo, *Our Continent, Our Future: African Perspectives on Structural Adjustment* (Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 1999), 15–18.

Stephen Browne, *Aid and Influence: Do Donors Help or Hinder?* (London: Earthscan, 2006), 45–50; See also, Carol Lancaster, *Foreign Aid: Diplomacy, Development, Domestic Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 102–110. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226470627.001.0001

Jeffrey Herbst, *The Politics of Reform in Ghana, 1982–1991* (Berkeley: University of California Press,1993), 88-92. https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520309852

Theotonio Dos Santos, "The Structure of Dependence," *American Economic Review* 60, no. 2 (1970): 231–236.

Muna Ndulo, "Structural Adjustment Programs in Africa," *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* 10, no. 1 (2003): 1–18. https://doi.org/10.2979/gls.2003.10.1.315

Stephen Brown, "Foreign Aid and Democracy Promotion: The Case of Tanzania," *Journal of Modern African Studies* 44, no. 2 (2006): 299–319.

Daniel Omoweh, "Economic Diplomacy and the Post-Adjustment Nigerian Economy: A Postscript" in *The Economic Diplomacy of the Nigerian State* ed. U. Joy Ogwu and Adebayo Olukoshi (Lagos: Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, 2002), 214

Stephen D. Krasner, "State Power and the Structure of International Trade," *World Politics* 28, no. 3 (1976): 317–347; See also, Hans Morgenthau, "A Political Theory of Foreign Aid," *American Political Science Review* 56, no. 2 (1962): 301–309. https://doi.org/10.2307/2009974

Oral interview with Professor Chibuzor Nwoke, (Ibadan, Leeds City University, Ibadan, 22nd July 2025, Time: 2:00pm- 2:45pm).

Claude Ake, *A Political Economy of Africa*, (Ibadan: Longman Group Limited, 1983), 188.

Graham Harrison, *The World Bank and Africa: The Construction of Governance States* (London: Routledge, 2004), 45–57.

World Bank, *Sub-Saharan Africa: From Crisis to Sustainable Growth* (Washington, D.C.: World Bank, 1989); See also, Paul Mosley, Jane Harrigan, and John Toye, *Aid and Power: The World Bank and Policy-Based Lending*, vol. 1 (London: Routledge, 1991), 23–34.

Tony Killick, *Aid and the Political Economy of Policy Change* (London: Routledge, 1998), 99–110; See also, David Booth, *Aid, Institutions and Governance: What Have We Learned?* (London: Overseas Development Institute, 2003), 15–18. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203446539

Mkandawire and Soludo, *Our Continent, Our Future*, 20–33; Loxley, *Structural Adjustment in Africa*, 85–92.

Oral interview with Professor Karo Ogbinaka, (Lagos: University of Lagos, 19th August 2025, Time: 3:00 pm – 3:20 pm)

Chibuzor Nwoke, "Conceptual Perspectives on the Peripheral Position of Third World Countries, in the International Economic System," in *Nigeria's Economic Relations with the Major Developed Market-Economy Countries, 1960-1985* ed. R.A. Akindele and Bassey Ate (Lagos: Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, 1988), 56.

Oral interview with Dr Joshua Bolarinwa, (Lagos, Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, 20th August 2025, Time: 3:15-4:00 pm).

Republic of Ghana, *Ghana Living Standards Survey Report of the First Round (GLSS 1), 1987–1988* (Accra: Ghana Statistical Service, 1989), 55–63.

Tony Killick, *The Developmental Effectiveness of Aid to Africa* (London: Overseas Development Institute, 2004), 17–25.

Oral interview with Professor Karo Ogbinaka, (Lagos: University of Lagos, 19th August 2025, Time: 3:00 pm – 3:20 pm

Toyin Falola and Matthew Heaton, *A History of Nigeria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 202–212. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511819711

IMF, *Nigeria: Staff Report for the 1986 Article IV Consultation* (Washington, D.C.: IMF, 1986), 5–12.

Eghosa Osaghae, *Crippled Giant: Nigeria Since Independence* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998), 176–182. https://doi.org/10.2979/1434.0

Eboe Hutchful, *Ghana's Adjustment Experience: The Paradox of Reform* (Oxford: James Currey, 2002), 32–50.

World Bank, *Ghana: Adjustment and Growth, 1983–1991*, Report No. 11888-GH (Washington, D.C.: World Bank, 1993), 10–15.

Ghana Statistical Service, *Ghana Living Standards Survey Report of the First Round (GLSS 1), 1987–1988* (Accra: GSS, 1989), 62–67.

Eboe Hutchful, *Ghana's Adjustment Experience: The Paradox of Reform*, 32-50

Lovise Aalen and Kjetil Tronvoll, *The End of Democracy? Ethiopia's 2005 Elections* (Uppsala: Nordic Africa Institute, 2009), 23–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/03056240903065067

UNDP, *Ethiopia Human Development Report 2010* (New York: UNDP, 2010), 8–16.

Oral interview with Professor J.G.N. Onyekpe, (Lagos, University of Lagos, 6th October 2025, Time: 6:30pm-7:00pm)

Oral interview with Dr Joshua Bolarinwa, (Lagos, Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, 20th August 2025, Time: 3:15-4:00 pm

Daron Acemoglu and James Robinson, *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity, and Poverty*, (London, Profile Books Limited, 2012), 87. https://doi.org/10.1355/ae29-2j

Carolyn Baylies and Janet Bujra, *The Politics of Austerity and Food Riots in Zambia*, *Review of African Political Economy* 52 (1991): 49–60.

Keith Jefferis, "The Role of Macroeconomic Policy in Botswana's Development," *World Development* 23, no. 11 (1995): 1841–1856. https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X(94)00145-O

Received on 19-09-2025 Accepted on 17-10-2025 Published on 21-11-2025

https://doi.org/10.6000/2817-2310.2025.04.06

© 2025 Okoeguale *et al.*
This is an open-access article licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the work is properly cited.