



Research Article

Volume-02|Issue-12|2021

Foreign Aids Policy Framework and Poverty Alleviation in Nigeria, 2010-2020

Okeke, Christian Chidi^{*1}, Nwanolue, Bonn Obiekwe Godwin², Obiora, Charles Arinze³¹Lecturer, Political Science Department, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria²Lecturer, Political Science Department, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Igbariam Campus, Anambra State, Nigeria³Lecturer, Political Science Department, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Igbariam Campus, Anambra State, Nigeria

Article History

Received: 01.12.2021

Accepted: 18.12.2021

Published: 29.12.2021

Citation

Okeke, C. C., Nwanolue, B. O. G., & Obiora, C. A. (2021). Foreign Aids Policy Framework and Poverty Alleviation in Nigeria, 2010-2020. *Indiana Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(12), 56-63.

Abstract: Generally speaking, policies are important for effectiveness of foreign aids. As a result, such aids have been identified as successful only when they are associated with good policies and institutional environment within the recipient country. In view of the high poverty rate in Nigeria, there is a palpable concern over the nature and role played by the existing national policy framework on foreign aids' inflow into the country in the task of achieving poverty alleviation – which has not received adequate scholarly attention over time. Filling that gap was the key objective of this study which seeks to examine how the policy framework governing foreign aids inflow into Nigeria sustained her poverty alleviation efforts from 2010 to 2020. Anchored on the Aid Conditional Theory, the study adopted ex-post facto research design and documentary method for data collection. Qualitative descriptive method was used for data analysis. Among other things, the study found out that the policy framework governing foreign aids' inflow into the country did not sustain poverty alleviation from 2010-2020 as it is not definitive and lacked robust and procedural details relating to tracking and utilization of aids inflow. In view of the finding, the study recommended that there is need to strengthen Nigeria's foreign aids policy framework through appropriate legislation for a better outcome.

Keywords: Foreign aids, poverty alleviation, policy framework, aid effectiveness, aid inflow.

Copyright © 2021 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0).

INTRODUCTION

Nigeria's record on poverty has remained consistently disappointing. In fact, the horrible record has, over the years, rubbished all efforts at addressing the challenge including the adoption of foreign aids as a strategy. For instance, World Bank (2019); Dangana (2011); Asogwa & Okoli (2008); Okoye (2002); Kale (2012); Mohammed (2008); & Obi (2007) share the same view that poverty in Nigeria has remained high, ravaging, real, paradoxical and pervasive for decades now. This is irrespective of the economic growth recorded at some point. World Bank (2019); Omoniyi (2018); & National Bureau of Statistics (2010) believe that Nigeria's extreme poverty rate is, in fact, increasing and remains an obstacle or limitation to economic growth in the country. According to World Bank (2020h), of the 736 million living in extreme poverty worldwide, half live in just five countries: Nigeria, India, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia and Bangladesh.

Obviously, the poverty case of Nigeria manifests in such a manner that as the country gets richer, only a few benefits while the majority continues to suffer from poverty and deprivation (Oxfam, 2017). The degree of poverty rate in Nigeria is such that the country currently hosts more of the world's extreme poor than any other country despite being richly blessed (World Bank, 2019) with almost four out of ten

Nigerians reported to have lived below the national poverty line in 2016 (World Bank, 2018). Foreign aids have, as well, failed to assist pull the over 83 million poor Nigerians out of their poverty despite the fact that Nigeria received billions of foreign aids inflow into the country from 2010 to 2020, part of which was to help tackle the poverty challenge. Curiously, she was one of Africa's top ten recipients of foreign aids (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2019) while the general foreign aids inflow into the country rose from US\$2,052,360,000 billion in 2010 to US\$3,358,790,000 in 2017. In 2011, it stood at US\$1,809,860,000 and further increased to US\$1,916,170,000 and US\$2,515,720,000 in 2012 and 2013 respectively. The country also received US\$2,478,600,000 in 2014; US\$2,431,540,000 in 2015 and US\$2,498,190,000 in 2016 (Ayodele et al., 2005; & Mbah & Amassoma, 2014). Between 2015 and 2020, she received foreign aids totalling US\$26.94 billion (Agbah, cited in News Agency of Nigeria, 2020).

Be that as it may, the key concern is whether the policy framework governing the aids inflow has features that should support the impact of the overseas' assistance on poverty alleviation in the country. It is in the light of the foregoing that this study sought to examine how the policy framework governing foreign aids inflow into Nigeria sustained her poverty alleviation efforts from 2010 to 2020. The study

therefore approached this task by thoroughly examining the nature of and constraints faced by the policy framework, and from that standpoint arrived at certain conclusions as to why foreign aids failed to address the Nigeria's poverty challenge from 2010 to 2020.

Statement of the Problem

Policies are unarguably important for effectiveness of foreign aids (Madhusanka, 2021). In essence, aids are successful only when they are associated with good policies and institutional environment within the recipient country (Halonen-Akatwijuka, 2004; & Burnside & Dollar, 2000). This explains why Madhusanka (2021) contended that poor institutions turn foreign aids into a curse and averred that appropriate management of the foreign resources is important by way of ensuring proper monitoring of the aids-utilizing projects and to avoid mis-utilization of funds. Instructively, the importance attached to the nature of policy framework in aids recipient countries informed the caution given by Murshed & Khanaum (2014) to the effect that recipient countries should give proper importance to their policies as well as the way aid resources are prioritized, channeled and processed. But a key question is: how healthy is Nigeria's policy framework to contribute to better outcome and poverty alleviation?

Specifically, poor framework for monitoring and evaluating the inflow and utilization of the foreign aids remains a factor militating against the effectiveness of foreign aids in the country and the lack of an effective framework makes it difficult for foreign aids to achieve intended results (Chukwuemeka *et al.*, 2014). In fact, all the poverty alleviation initiatives in Nigeria since independence yielded very little fruit as they lacked clearly-defined policy framework with proper guidelines for poverty alleviation (Hussaini, 2014). Instructively, a number of policies and programmes have been designed over the years with the purpose of alleviating poverty and inequality but in the majority of cases, these policies and programmes have not been implemented effectively to result in meaningful impact on poverty (Oxfam, 2017). At policy formulation level, Nigeria is faced with several challenges regarding official development assistance which include inadequate involvement of Nigerians, high-cost of technical assistance, donor-driven approach to aid delivery, proliferation of aid agencies, uneven spread of donors' activities, institutional weakness, improper coordination between donors and government, lack of coordination between Federal and sub-national governments, and problem of counterpart funding (Akpan & Udoma, 2011). In the same vein, the formulation and implementation of donor-assisted programmes in the country are characterized by inadequate involvement of Nigerians, high cost of technical assistance, donor-driven approach to aid delivery, proliferation of aid agencies, uneven spread of donors' activities, institutional weaknesses, inadequate

coordination and problem of counterpart funding (NPC, 2007).

It is these problems that necessitated this study. As such, the study sought to examine the interplay between the foreign aids policy framework governing inflows into Nigeria and poverty alleviation efforts in the country from 2010 to 2020. It undertook this task since scholars have paid scanty attention to the subject matter, particularly as it affects the period covered by the study – 2010 to 2020.

Objectives of the Study

The primary objective of this study was to investigate the correlations between foreign aids policy framework and poverty alleviation in Nigeria, from 2010 to 2020. Specifically, the paper sought:

- To examine how the policy framework governing foreign aids inflow into Nigeria sustained her poverty alleviation efforts from 2010 to 2020
- To interrogate the nature and strength of the policy framework governing foreign aids inflow into Nigeria in relation to its capacity to sustain her poverty alleviation efforts from 2010 to 2020 or otherwise

Research Question

The study was guided by the following research question:

- How has the policy framework governing foreign aids inflow into Nigeria affected her poverty alleviation efforts from 2010 to 2020?

Significance of the Study

The study investigated the correlations between foreign aids policy framework and poverty alleviation in Nigeria, from 2010 to 2020, with specific objectives to examine how the policy framework governing foreign aids inflow into Nigeria sustained her poverty alleviation efforts from 2010 to 2020 as well as to interrogate the nature and strength of the policy framework governing foreign aids inflow into Nigeria in relation to its capacity to sustain her poverty alleviation efforts from 2010 to 2020 or otherwise. The outcome of the study would therefore assist policy makers in Nigeria to re-evaluate the country's foreign aids policy framework, with a view to strengthening it through appropriate legislation in order to enhance aids effectiveness in the country. The study also contributed to knowledge by exploring an area in aids' effectiveness discourse (foreign aids policy framework) that has received insufficient attention of scholars, particularly by interrogating its impact on poverty alleviation covering the period 2010 to 2020.

METHODOLOGY

The qualitative mechanism of data collection and analysis was applied in this study.

Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored on the Aid Conditional Theory which argues that the recipient's socio-economic context plays a determining role in to what extent aid can raise growth. In other words, aid effectiveness is conditioned by the prevailing institutional and policy environment in recipient countries. Championed by scholars who include Burnside & Dollars (2000); Ramiarison (2010); & Rodrik (2003), the theory contends that it is donors' ignorance in allocating more aid to countries with unsound economic policies that lowered the potential for aid to support growth. It specifically accused bilateral donors of not favouring good policy in their aid delivery and as a result, their aid tended to encourage government consumption, unlike multilateral aid which is always allocated in support of good policy.

The scholars maintained in their arguments under the Aid Conditional theory that aid does promote growth and should be allocated to countries that have adopted good policies. In essence, the theory avers that aid is to be allocated to those countries which have already good policies and which are poor. The theory is in further contention that large inflows of aid advocated by another theory - the Big Push Theory are only indispensable to poor countries after they have achieved significant progress with policy reform. It is, thus, the position of the theory that the reasons why aid is not affective are found within recipient but that donors' faults are located in their giving aid to countries lacking good policies and good institutions (Ramiarison, 2010). In fact, Ramiarison (2010) listed elements of the country policy and institutional assessment index to include quality of public administration as well as transparency and accountability in the public sector.

This theory is therefore apt for this study. It provided the basis for proper evaluation of the Nigeria's foreign aid policy framework with a view of determining how it sustained her poverty alleviation efforts from 2010 to 2020. In essence, the theory appropriately guided the analysis of data.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Perspectives on Relevance of Policy Framework for Aid Effectiveness

The position of National Planning Commission (2007) is that the cutting edge in attracting increased Official Development Assistance is a policy environment which encourages transparency and accountability, good governance, macroeconomic stability, predictable investment climate and a strong human and institutional capacity. What this means is that an increased foreign inflow is encouraged by an effective policy framework. This point is also emphasized upon by Halonen-Akatwijuka (2004) who affirmed, *inter alia*, that foreign aids achieve more in a good policy and institutional environment.

According to Burnside and Dollar (2000); & Tan, (cited in Madhusanka, 2021) aids are successful only when associated with good policies within the recipient country. In fact, Madhusanka (2021) did not only stress the fact that policies are important in the effectiveness of foreign aids but consequentially insisted that there is a need of not only the effective policies, but also proper monitoring of the aids-utilizing projects to avoid misutilization of funds and mismanagement of the foreign resources. Queuing behind that proposition, Murshed & Khanaum (2014) suggested that recipient countries should give proper importance to their policies and by extension the way aid resources are prioritized, channeled and processed.

In the same vein, Monye *et al.* (2010) maintained that poor institutions count as one of the factors that constrain developing countries. Even Easterly (2006) was sarcastic in adding that lack of good institution and governance means throwing more money at the problem of development without commensurate results. Obviously, poor institutions turn foreign aids into a curse (Madhusanka, 2021).

Nature, History and Goals of Nigeria's Foreign Aid Policy Framework

In Nigeria, the Federal Ministry of National Planning (formerly National Planning Commission) and the Federal Ministry of Finance before their merger were the two institutions saddled with coordinating Overseas Development Assistance, such that while the former was responsible for coordinating all grants and technical assistance, the latter coordinated all concessional loans. The practical reality, nonetheless, is that foreign aids are found in most ministries, departments, agencies and at sub-national governments, meaning that ODA coordination remains a major challenge (Akpan & Udoma, 2011). The major implication of this reality is that ODA flowed to a federal ministry but was never reflected in the ODA databank of the then National Planning Commission (NPC) and sometimes without the knowledge of both the NPC and the Federal Ministry of Finance. The institutional weakness, no doubt, has its own price.

According to MBNP (2015), the challenge with regards to the fragmentation of aid coordination stems from the fact that legislative provision specific to aid management is rather not definitive and lacks robust details relating to the tracking of aid inflows and utilization as well as the management and coordination of development partners' activities in Nigeria. It posits that the lack of coherent regulations and procedures for handling aid has tended to make donors and individual ministries, departments and agencies both at the central and sub-national levels of government to be seemingly striving to strike quick deals in the face of perceptible needs to meet.

In order to address the challenge, however, Nigeria came up with a document on aid policy which was launched as Technical Cooperation Policy in 1995. According to Akpan & Udoma (2011), the document which was launched during the military rule and lacking stakeholders' input focused purely on grant and technical assistance without any emphasis on concessionary loans. The document was however reviewed in 2007 by the National Planning Commission. After acceding to the Paris Declaration, the Government of Nigeria set out to implement it by drawing up its first aid policy paper in 2007.

In accordance with the Paris Declaration, Nigeria's aid policy outlined three broad objectives which are to ensure that aid achieves more by using donor funds better; to achieve ownership of donor-funded programmes through the leadership of the Nigerian government and the involvement of Nigerian experts; and to create an effective monitoring and evaluation framework to ensure that government and development partners are result-oriented. But in order to assess existing practice on aid in Nigeria, the NPC reviewed the aid policy between 1999 and 2007 (Monye *et al.*, 2010). It was also reviewed in 2019.

The general and specific goals of aid policy in Nigeria include improving the standard of living of the citizens through poverty reduction programmes and growth enhancement initiatives; encouraging coordinated inflow of assistance into the national priority sectors as defined in the National Development Framework; improving national absorptive capacity and effective management of aid resources; and promoting peace, stability and national unity. Others are ensuring the effective use of aid resources through good governance and complementary public policies; increasing the national absorptive capacity of aid with a view to meeting the millennium development goals and other important global and regional initiatives; strengthening the institutional capacity of national focal point and non-state actors involved in the management and implementation of aid; integrating aid into the medium and long term national development framework; and ensuring that aid creates multiplier effects on the domestic economy. It equally provided for technology transfer and development of indigenous technology; promoting efficient and unified systems for the management of aid; and improvement in collaboration between Nigeria and its development partners (NPC, 2007).

On the other hand, Akpan & Udoma (2011) gave an account of the underlying principles of Nigeria's aid policy as involvement of suitably qualified Nigerian professionals and officials in the preparation, formulation and implementation of projects and programmes funded from aid to ensure ownership and sustainability; increasing utilization of aid resources on technical assistance in favour of Nigerian experts;

integration of aid flows into the national plans and annual budgets; and sensitivity to geopolitical spread of projects and programmes funded from aid with 50 percent of the funding driven by performance criteria so as to stimulate competition between States. Others are consideration to be given to certain minimum development goals such as where considerable risks exist that some otherwise performing states may be adversely affected by non-performance by other States such as the fight against HIV/AIDS and immunization of children; use of transparent and accountable procedures in the procurement of goods and services as may be mutually agreed with Nigeria's development partners; where Nigerian goods are equivalent standard with foreign ones, preference should be given to the made-in-Nigeria goods; residency for expatriate utilized in the formulation and implementation of aid programmes and projects shall be for a maximum of twenty-four months at a time, with allowance made for a longer time period in case of a complex programme/project; and adequate provision for counterpart funding in the annual budget.

The principles also include prevention of fraud, corruption and improper diversion of aid funds through regular Value-For-Money audits, reviews, studies and investigations; sanctions for violation of the rules, regulations, guidelines, and elements of policies stated in this policy document; evaluation of aid implementation at all stages should involve Nigerian officials and experts; all project designs for aid shall be environmentally friendly and indices for measuring such friendliness shall be clearly stated by the proponent; and involvement of civil society organizations in the implementation and evaluation of aid projects and programmes.

Policy Framework and Challenges of Aid Effectiveness in Nigeria

It is a consensus that for aid to be effective, it must be aligned with national development strategies, institutions and procedures. That means that aid is most effective when it supports a country-owned approach to development but less effective when countries feel that aid policies and approaches are driven by donors that provide assistance (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2008). According to the OECD, ownership is critical in achieving development results and is central to the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. Thus, the Paris Declaration of March 2005 was based on the core principles of ownership, alignment, harmonization and managing for results and mutual accountability.

In the context of the Declaration, OECD (2008) notes that ownership specifically concerns a country's ability to carry out two interlinked activities: exercise effective leadership over its development policies and strategies; and coordinate the efforts of various development actors working in the country.

Ideally, the ownership principle of the Paris Declaration enjoins partner countries to exercise effective leadership over their development policies and strategies, and to coordinate their actions through broad consultative processes. And in Nigeria, attempts have been made to achieve harmonization through coordination at three levels: domestic government to government coordination, government to donor coordination, and donor to donor coordination (NPC, 2008; & Ojo & Umo, 2007).

Basically, Nigeria was not a signatory to the Paris declaration in 2005 but acceded to it in 2007 in the belief that its implementation would enhance aid effectiveness for three main reasons. First, it goes beyond previous agreements; it is action-oriented and aims to achieve ownership, alignment, harmonization, management for results and mutual accountability. Second, it has developed twelve indicators to help monitor the achievement of results. And third, it should enhance accountability for aid, and in the relationship between donors and the recipient country (OECD, 2005). However as enunciated by MBNP (2015), the challenges of aid coordination and management in Nigeria are enormous and include poor aid alignment, poor compliance with country systems in aid delivery, aid fragmentation and high transaction cost, limited capacity for aid delivery, conditionality and unpredictability of aid. As a result, the challenges limit the effectiveness of aid delivery and implementation. And as Etaba (cited in Forster, 2020) rightly emphasized, without open, honest and transparent sharing of aid information, it was impossible to track funding, let alone measure impact of aid investments.

The implication, therefore, is that it stands, the current practices of aid management in Nigeria show that most of the assistance of the development partners do not properly synergize with government priorities and systems (MBNP, 2015). As it points out, despite the hordes of reforms that are being undertaken both at the national and sub-national levels of government, the 2011 Monitoring Survey on the status of implementation of Paris Declaration of Aid Effectiveness indicated no remarkable improvement in public financial management and procurement systems. In fact, through the practice of direct project intervention, donors have assumed the leadership role and designed programmes to match their own priorities.

In the past, the NPC which was the legally mandated lead agency has not been very effective. As a result, there have been numerous cases where donors moved in to negotiate and implement policies, programmes or projects without adequate reference to the Commission, thus making donor-funded programmes more supply-driven (NPC, 2008; & Ojo & Umo, 2007). More so, as foreign aids' disbursement in Nigeria is mainly through project and programme support, sector-wide approach and humanitarian

assistance with almost no budget support as Nigeria is largely not aid dependent (MBNP, 2015), the impact is insignificant. As such, the aid inflow not made to align with national development plans and strategies will continue to be ineffective. And currently, donor programmes are not aligned to Nigeria's priorities (Monye *et al.*, 2010).

On the other hand, just as OECD (2008) puts it, comprehensive and transparent reporting on aid and how it is used, is an important means of ensuring that donors align aid flows with national development priorities. According to it, the degree to which development assistance to the government sector is fully and accurately reflected in the budget provides a useful indication of the degree to which serious effort is made to connect aid programmes with country policies and processes, and also allows partner-country authorities to present accurate and comprehensive budget reports to their parliaments and citizens.

Instructively, capacity constraint is what undermines the ability of partner countries to capture, coordinate and utilize aid flows more effectively and this poses significant challenge to aids effectiveness in Nigeria. Forster (2020) attempted to drive this point home when he informed that without direct access to timely, comprehensive and disaggregated aid data, the Central Bank of Nigeria has to rely on the International Cooperation Division's Development Assistance Database (DAD) to determine the inflows of aid information, noting unfortunately that due to inconsistent provision of data by donors in Nigeria, the DAD, at first glance, appears to be missing many hundreds of millions of dollars of aid spending. Under such circumstances, the apex bank has to estimate the incoming aid flows, making a further estimate of how much money remains in the country.

It is in this light that OECD (2008) posits that donor-use of a partner-country's established institutions and systems increases aid effectiveness by strengthening the partner's long-term capacity to develop, implement and account for its policies – to both citizens and its parliaments. Obviously, it rightly points out that the Paris Declaration encourages donors to increase their use of country systems that are of sufficient quality, and to work with partner countries to strengthen systems that are currently weak. To that extent, the Paris Declaration encourages donors to avoid, to the maximum extent possible, creating dedicated structures for day-to-day management and implementation of aid-financed projects and programmes. Yet the number of parallel project implementation units in Nigeria reported as part of the 2008 Survey stands at 11. The country report notes that donors, having doubts about government capacity to implement projects effectively, establish parallel project implementation units to improve the speed of delivery of projects and to enable them to use their own

procurement systems (OECD, 2008). However, Etaba (cited in Forster, 2020) cautions that Nigeria is a sovereign state and as such actions undertaken by foreign groups within Nigeria's borders must be subject to the government's approval, no matter how important or well-meaning they are.

Foreign Aid Policy Framework and Poverty Alleviation in Nigeria

Poverty alleviation efforts of successive administrations have not been successful despite the policy framework aforementioned. The efforts failed even in the face of the following policies which have been adopted in poverty alleviation programmes in Nigeria which include trade and payment liberalization; tariff reform and rationalization for the promotion of industrial diversification; deregulation and greater reliance on market forces particularly in the downstream activities of the crude oil industry; adoption of appropriate pricing policies of all commodities, and adoption of measures to stimulate production and broaden the supply base of the economy (Taiwo & Agwu, 2016). The effect is that poverty in the country has remained high (World Bank, 2019; & Dangana, 2011; Mohammed, 2008). According to the National Bureau of Statistics (2010); & Omoniyi (2018), the proportion of Nigerians living in poverty is increasing every year while poverty occupies the position of an obstacle or limitation to economic growth. Currently, Nigeria hosts more of the world's extreme poor today than any other country while almost four out of ten Nigerians lived below the national poverty line in 2016 (World Bank, 2019; & World Bank, 2018).

Efforts towards poverty alleviation in Nigeria faced a big and contemporary challenge with the outbreak of Coronavirus disease in Nigeria on February 27, 2020 with its unpleasant impacts on the economy of the country (National Centre for Disease Control, 2020). Already, the country's economy has been hit hard by the COVID-19 pandemic (International Monetary Fund, 2021) while the COVID-19 pandemic is predicted to drive up the poverty rate in the country, pushing additional millions of people into poverty by 2022 (World Bank, 2020e). The Bank has already warned that given the effects of the COVID-19 crisis, the national poverty headcount rate is to jump from 40.1 percent to 42.9 percent in 2022, implying that the number of poor people in Nigeria will be about 95.7 million in 2022.

Of course, the effects are many and very traumatizing. For instance, most of the security challenges facing Nigeria in the current democratic dispensation have their root causes in the high level of poverty and inequality in the country and include ethno-religious strife, political violence, kidnapping, militancy and terrorism by the dreaded Islamic sect called Boko Haram. Also, the inability of many homes to make the

ends meet with the family income tends to increase immorality, broken fatherless/motherless homes, divorces and drunkenness, leading again to a large reserve of youths who could be employed for execution of ethno-religious conflicts (Tijani, 2020; & Salawu, 2010). As a result of poverty, Nigeria was classified by the World Bank (2018) as having the highest number of out-of-school children of primary school age in the world with 9 million children out of school. It also holds that there has been little change in vaccination rates over the last 25 years in Nigeria and the country was set to overtake India as the country with most under-five deaths in the world.

Also as a result of poverty, 71 million people lived without access to improved water while 130 million did not meet the Millennium Development Goal standard for sanitation. In the North East and North West regions of the country, only around 25 to 28 percent of households have access to basic services: electricity, water and sanitation (World Bank, 2017). Specifically, the COVID-19 pandemic which has worsened the poverty challenge in Nigeria currently threatens Nigeria's attainment of United Nations Sustainable Development Goal number 1 which is to end poverty in all its forms by 2030. In the light of this, one can conveniently draw the conclusion that the policy framework governing aid inflow into Nigeria was handicapped and unable to save the country from the poverty scourge.

FINDINGS

This study made some findings. There was non-existence of an explicit and implementable policy framework to direct foreign aids use and mobilization in the country. Legislative provision specific to foreign aids management was rather not definitive and lacked robust and procedural details relating to the tracking of aids inflows and utilization, as well as management and coordination of development partners' activities in Nigeria. As a result, the framework was not effectively implemented within the period. This, consequently, had negative impacts on monitoring, evaluation and utilization of foreign aids in the country. It also made productive use of foreign aids impracticable, thus hindering actualization of poverty alleviation in the country. Also, Nigeria, at policy-formulation level, was faced with several challenges which include inadequate involvement of Nigerians, high cost of technical assistance, donor-driven approach to aids delivery, proliferation of aid agencies, uneven spread of donors' activities, institutional weakness, improper coordination between donors and government, lack of coordination between federal and sub-national governments, and problem of counter-funding. Thus, the formulation and implementation of donor-assisted programmes in the country was characterized by the aforementioned challenges and this by implication meant that the entire foreign aids chain in Nigeria was replete with challenges at the framework stratum. These identified

anomalies inevitably restrained the available policy framework governing foreign aids inflow into the country from sustaining her poverty alleviation efforts from 2010 to 2020.

Recommendations

In view of the findings, the study therefore recommended the need to strengthen Nigeria's foreign aids policy framework through appropriate legislation for better mobilization and outcome of aid resources. This will, by extension, ensure involvement of more Nigerian stakeholders in the process for the sake of ownership and sustainability of aid programmes and projects, even spread of donors' activities, recipient-driven approach to aid delivery and proper coordination between donors and government, among others.

REFERENCES

1. Akpan, H., & Udoma, J. (2011). Official development assistance and economic performance in Nigeria, 1970-2010. *Journal of Monetary and Economic Integration*, 12(1), 125-150.
2. Asogwa, F., & Okoli, P. (2008). *Economic crimes and national development*. Enugu: Institute for Development Studies.
3. Ayodele, T., et al. (2005). *African perspectives on aid: Foreign assistance will not pull Africa out of poverty*. Retrieved from <https://www.cato.org/economic-development-bulletin/african-perspectives-aid-foreign-assistance-will-not-pull-africa-out> Retrieved on September 2, 2020 at 3:45pm.
4. Burnside, C., & Dollar, D. (2000). Aid, policies and growth. *American Economic Review*, 90(4), 847-868.
5. Chukwuemeka, E., et al. (2014). Foreign aid to Nigeria and domestic obstacles: A review of Anambra State education sector. *Africa's Public Service Delivery and Performance Review*, 2(2), 52-82.
6. Dangana, J. (2011). *Building a new Nigeria: The right approach* (Vol. 3). Kaduna: First Pyramid Digital Publishing Co Limited.
7. Easterly, W. (2006). *The white man's burden: Why the west's efforts to aid the rest have done so much ill and so little good*. New York: Penguin Press.
8. Federal Government of Nigeria. (2007). *Official development assistance policy 2008*. Abuja: NPC.
9. Federal Government of Nigeria. (2008). *A review of official development assistance to Nigeria 1999-2007*. Abuja: NPC.
10. Federal Government of Nigeria. (2015). *Cooperation report 2015*. Abuja: MBNP.
11. Federal Government of Nigeria. (2020). *First case of coronavirus disease confirmed in Nigeria*. Retrieved from <https://ncdc.gov.ng/news/227/first-case-of-corona-virus-disease-confirmed-in-nigeria#:~:text=The%20Federal%20Ministry%20of%20Health,in%20China%20in%20January%202020> Retrieved on January 30, 2021 at 8:15pm.
12. Forster, G. (2020). *What use is aid and development data? Two examples from Nigeria*. Retrieved from <https://reliefweb.int/report/nigeria/what-use-aid-and-development-data-two-examples-nigeria> Retrieved on February 6, 2021 at 9:03am.
13. Halonen-Akatwijuka, M. (2004). Coordination failure in foreign aid. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*, 3223, 1-50.
14. Hussaini, M. (2014). Poverty alleviation programmes in Nigeria: Issues and challenges. *International Journal of Development Research*, 4(3), 717-720.
15. International Monetary Fund. (2021). *IMF executive board concludes 2020 Article IV consultation with Nigeria*. Retrieved from <https://www.imf.org/en/News/Articles/2021/02/08/pr2135-nigeria-imf-executive-board-concludes-2020-article-iv-consultation>. Retrieved on February 9, 2021 at 11:08am.
16. Kale, Y. (2012). *The review of the Nigerian economy*. Abuja: National Bureau of Statistics.
17. Madhusanka, M. (2021). The effect of foreign aids on economic growth of Sri Lanka. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 6(1), 114-118.
18. Mbah, S., & Amassoma, D. (2014). The linkage between foreign aid and economic growth in Nigeria. *International Journal of Economic Practices and Theories*, 4(6), 1007-1017.
19. Mohammed, H., et al. (2008). *Poverty in Nigeria: Causes, manifestations and alleviation strategies*. London: Adonis and Abbey Publishers Ltd.
20. Monye, S., et al. (2010). Easy to declare, difficult to implement: The disconnect between the aspirations of the Paris Declaration and donor practice in Nigeria. *Development Policy Review*, 28(6), 749-770.
21. Murshed, M., & Khanaum, M. (2014). Impact of foreign aid in the economic development of recipient country. *Journal of the Bangladesh Association of Young Researchers*, 2(1), 33-37.
22. News Agency of Nigeria (2020, October 27). Nigeria receives \$26.9bn foreign support in six years – Minister. *Premium Times Nigeria*. Retrieved from <https://www.premiumtimesng.com/news/top-news/423343-nigeria-receives-26-9bn-foreign-support-in-six-years-minister.html> Retrieved on January 22, 2021 at 11:56am.
23. Obi, B. (2007). Fiscal policy and poverty alleviation: some policy options for Nigeria, *AERC Research Paper*, 164, 1-39.
24. Ojo, O., & Umo, J. (2007). Nigeria: Proposal for improving aid harmonization and coordination in the context of the Paris Declaration. *UNDP Consultancy Paper*, 1-50.
25. Okoye, O. (2002). *Development administration: Theories and applications in Nigeria*. Onitsha: Abbot Books Limited.

26. Omoniyi, B. (2018). An examination of the causes of poverty on economic growth in Nigeria. *Africa's Public Service Delivery and Performance Review*, 6(1), 1-10.
27. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2005). *Paris Declaration*. Paris: OECD.
28. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2008). *Survey on monitoring the Paris Declaration: Making aid more effective by 2010*. Paris: OECD.
29. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). *The well-being of nations: The role of human and social capital*. Paris: OECD.
30. Oxfam. (2017). *Inequality in Nigeria: Exploring the drivers*. Retrieved from <https://www.oxfam.org/en/research/inequality-nigeria-exploring-drivers>. Retrieved on February 12, 2021 at 4:50pm.
31. Ramiarison, H. (2010). Assessing the developmental role of foreign aid in developing countries: A special reference to the role of Japan's aid in far East Asia, *VRF Series*, 462, 1-70.
32. Rodrik, D. (2003). Growth strategies. *NBER Working Paper, 10050*, Cambridge.
33. Salawu, B. (2010). Ethno-religious conflicts in Nigeria: Causal analysis and proposals for new management strategies. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 13(3), 345-353.
34. Taiwo, J., & Agwu, M. (2016). Problems and prospects of poverty alleviation programmes in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Management Review*, 4(6), 18-30.
35. Tijani, Y. (2020). *The impact of poverty on insecurity in Nigeria*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339933612_THE_IMPACT_OF_POVERTY_ON_INSECURITY_IN_NIGERIA/citation/download Retrieved on July 15, 2020 at 2:32pm.
36. World Bank (2018). *In 12 years, 90% extremely poor will live in Nigeria, other sub-saharan countries, May 2018*. New York: World Bank Group.
37. World Bank. (2017). *A wake-up call: Nigeria water supply, sanitation and hygiene poverty diagnostic*. Retrieved from <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/27703>. Retrieved on July 3, 2020 at 5:10pm.
38. World Bank. (2019). *Advancing social protection in a dynamic Nigeria*. New York: World Bank Group.
39. World Bank. (2020e). *Nigeria in times of COVID-19: Laying foundations for a strong recovery*. Washington DC: World Bank Group.