



Eric Neumayer

What factors determine the allocation of aid by Arab countries and multilateral agencies?

Originally published in The journal of development studies, 39 (4). pp. 134-147 © 2003 Routledge, part of the Taylor & Francis Group.

You may cite this version as:

Neumayer, Eric (2003). What factors determine the allocation of aid by Arab countries and multilateral agencies? [online] London: LSE Research Online.

Available at: <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/archive/00000615>

Available online: February 2006

LSE has developed LSE Research Online so that users may access research output of the School. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LSE Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain. You may freely distribute the URL (<http://eprints.lse.ac.uk>) of the LSE Research Online website.

This document is the author's final manuscript version of the journal article, incorporating any revisions agreed during the peer review process. Some differences between this version and the publisher's version remain. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<http://eprints.lse.ac.uk>

Contact LSE Research Online at: [Library.Researchonline@lse.ac.uk](mailto:Library.Researchonline@lse.ac.uk)

**What factors determine the allocation of aid by Arab  
countries and multilateral agencies?**

**FINAL VERSION**

**Dr Eric Neumayer**

Lecturer in Environment and Development

Department of Geography and Environment, London School of Economics and  
Political Science, Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE, UK

Phone: 0207-955-7598. Fax: 0207-955-7412. Email: e.neumayer@lse.ac.uk

Word count (everything included): 5766

# **What factors determine the allocation of aid by Arab countries and multilateral agencies?**

*This article provides a statistical analysis of the determinants of Arab aid allocation using Heckman's two-step estimator. It is found that poorer, Arab, Islamic and Sub-Saharan African countries are more likely to receive some positive amount of Arab aid (gate-keeping stage). The same is true for countries not maintaining diplomatic relations with Israel as well as those with voting patterns in the United Nations General Assembly similar to Saudi Arabia. Arab and more populous countries also receive a higher share of the total aid allocated (level stage). The same is true for Islamic countries in the case of bilateral aid and countries with voting similarity in the case of multilateral aid. Donor interest, in particular Arab solidarity, plays a clear role at both stages, whereas recipient need as measured by a country's level of income only affects the gate-keeping stage, not the level stage.*

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

Whilst the determinants of aid allocation by OECD-countries, regional development banks and United Nations (UN) agencies have been examined extensively over many years (see, for example, McKinlay and Little [1977]; Maizels and Nissanke [1984]; more recently, Alesina and Dollar [2000]; Neumayer, [2001a, 2001b]), to the best of my knowledge no systematic statistical analysis of Arab aid allocation has ever been undertaken. What does exist are rather descriptive studies that provide rich and detailed information, but cannot give an answer to

which factors determine with which importance the allocation of Arab aid (see, for example, Imady [1984]; Porter [1986]; Van den Boogaerde [1991]; Raffer and Singer [1996]). This lack of a systematic statistical analysis presents an astonishing gap in the relevant literature that deserves being filled for at least two reasons. One is the importance of Arab aid: Arab countries have on average provided around 13.5% of total aid by all donors in the time period 1974 to 1994.<sup>1</sup> The other reason stems from the fact that it is often suggested that Arab aid is different from other aid in being heavily influenced by such factors as, amongst others, Arab and Islamic solidarity.

Recently, there has been a heated debate concerning the effectiveness of aid — see, for example, the World Bank's [1998] Assessing Aid: What Works, What Doesn't, and Why report as well as a series of papers published in a special issue of this journal [Hermes and Lensink, 2001]. This paper does not add anything to this debate, but in order to better understand the consequences of aid provision it might be helpful to know which factors can explain the allocation of aid in the first place. Hopefully, this article therefore contributes to a better and more comprehensive understanding of the determinants of aid allocation that goes beyond a mere analysis of aid flows from Western countries.

Before examining the factors determining the pattern of aid allocation by Arab countries and multilateral agencies, it is worth while noting two important and peculiar features of Arab aid. The first feature has to do with the extraordinary amount of aid given relative to the gross national product (GNP) of donor countries. Between 1974 and 1994, Arab countries have provided on average about 1.5% of their GNP as net ODA to developing countries (net ODA data taken from OECD (1999), GNP data taken from World Bank (2001)).<sup>2</sup> This is well above the 0.7% of GNP recommended by the United Nations, which most Western donors do not reach anyway. It is the more astonishing given that the GNP of Arab aid donors mainly derives from the extraction of non-renewable resources. Since such extraction leads to inflated

income figures given that the partial liquidation of capital (the resource stock) is erroneously counted as true income [Neumayer, 1999, 2000], actual GNP is lower and the aid provision to GNP ratio therefore higher than the published figures would suggest (see also Raffer and Singer [1996: 124ff.]).

Second, it is often pointed out that, contrary to much of aid provision from Western donors, Arab aid tends to be provided untied, with the exception of relatively unimportant specific loans and grants for oil purchases [Raffer and Singer, 1996: 124; Khaldi, 1984: 9]. Of course, the absence of such ties does not come as great surprise since Arab aid donors do not tend to produce a wide range of goods to tie procurement to.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, that Arab aid tends to be untied provides an important distinctive feature as recipient countries can buy the goods they want wherever they want at the lowest price.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW: WHAT FACTORS MIGHT INFLUENCE ARAB AID ALLOCATION?

The relevant literature, which has studied Arab aid allocation, albeit not in a systematic statistical sense, suggests a number of factors which might influence the allocation of aid by Arab countries and Arab agencies.

Starting with what one might call Arab solidarity, there is very little doubt that at least in the beginning years of Arab aid allocation, Arab countries were the main beneficiaries of such aid [Van den Boogaerde, 1991]. The most striking examples for this are multilateral agencies such as the Gulf Organization for the Development of Egypt (GODE), but a certain favourable bias towards Arab countries is apparent in other multilateral and bilateral programmes as well. Indeed, in the very early years often only Arab countries were eligible for these programmes. For example, only Arab countries were eligible for the receipt of aid

from the Kuwait and the Abu Dhabi Fund for Arab Economic Development until 1974. Still today the Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development's Agreement states that the purpose of the Fund is give 'preference to projects which are vital to the Arab world and to inter-Arab projects' [AFESD, 1999: 5]. However, generally speaking, eligibility and the range of recipient countries widened substantially after the very early periods of Arab aid allocation. Already in 1984, Khaldi [1984: 13], claimed that 'Arab aid is geographically balanced out' and is not heavily biased towards Arab countries.

In addition to Arab countries, many observers also suggest that Sub-Saharan African countries might have been favoured due to the pursuit of Afro-Arab unity and the traditionally strong links between these countries and Arab countries [Simmons, 1981: 16]. Again, such potential preference is suggested by the existence of such organisations as the Arab Fund for Technical Assistance to African and Arab Countries (AFTAAAC) or the Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa (BADEA), established in the wake of the commitments made at the Afro-Arab summit meeting in Cairo in March 1977 [Porter, 1986: 53f.].

Besides Arab and African solidarity, another potential preference suggested by, for example, Mertz and Mertz [1983] is with respect to Islamic countries. Khaldi [1984: 13] rejects the suggestion that Islamic countries might be favoured by Arab aid in claiming that 'Arab aid does not have any religious character'. However, suggestive of such potential preference might again be the existence of such multilateral agencies as the Islamic Development Bank, which only funds projects in member countries of the Organization of Islamic Conference.<sup>4</sup> A middle position is taken by Porter [1986: 63] who believes that the 'Islamic connection', whilst existent, 'appears to be of relatively small significance among the motivations underlying the Arab aid effort and its distribution'.

Turning towards more directly political factors potentially influencing Arab aid allocation, Mertz and Mertz [1983] suggest that the traditionally conservative major Arab aid donors

such as Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates might be biased against Socialist countries in their aid provision. Furthermore, Mertz and Mertz [1983: 21] claim that ‘political interests dictate the distribution of Arab aid’ such that aid allocation might be biased towards countries that are similar in their foreign policy positions, in particular with respect to issues concerning the Israel-Arab conflict (similarly, Simmons [1981]). However, the claim that political interests heavily influence the distribution of Arab aid is again rejected by Al-Ani [1984: 42] who states that many of the recipient countries do not have diplomatic relations with OPEC (and therefore Arab) countries.

Finally, Arab like many other aid donors might take the need of potential recipient countries into account in favouring poorer countries. For example, Al-Humaidi [1984: 60] claims that it has been the general policy of the already mentioned Kuwait Fund to favour ‘those countries of the developing world which are more in need of assistance than others’. Similarly, Humaidan [1984: 69] claims that the Saudi Fund for Development ‘has tried to focus the benefits of its assistance predominantly on the poorest countries, those having very low per capita income’. A booklet by the OPEC Fund for International Development states that whilst all developing countries are in principle eligible for Fund assistance ‘the least developed and most seriously affected countries (...) are accorded higher priority’ [OFID 1987: 11].

The problem with all these claims about what determines Arab aid allocation is that their validity can only be tested in a multivariate statistical framework. Controlling for other variables, one can analyse whether a factor has a statistically significant influence on the allocation and one can estimate the strength of the effect. Such a statistical analysis is the objective of the rest of this paper.

### III. RESEARCH DESIGN

#### The dependent variables

OECD [1999] provides aggregate aid data for Arab countries as well as Arab multilateral agencies.<sup>5</sup> Aid refers here to net official development assistance (ODA). It measures the disbursement of grants and highly concessional loans (that is, loans with a grant element of at least 25%) minus amortisation. In principle, aid commitments rather than actual disbursements might have been a better candidate to take as the dependent variable since donors have better control over their commitments than over the actual disbursements, which depends on whether the recipients actually draw upon all the commitment [White and McGillivray, 1995]. However, OECD [1999] does not provide commitment data for many years for which it provides net ODA data. Given the generally very high correlation between the two, it was therefore decided to take net ODA as the dependent variable in order to avoid substantial loss of information.

Since the aid data are in current US\$ they have been transformed into real units with 1995 as the base year using the unit value of the world import price index, taken from IMF [2000]. The idea behind this is to express aid in terms of its purchasing power for a representative bundle of imports [Burnside and Dollar, 2000]. The dependent variable is then the (natural log) of the amount of net ODA in constant US\$1995 that a country receives as a share of the total amount allocated. Such a dependent variable probably represents the actual decision-making process best. There is a fixed aid allocation budget and it is decided upon, which recipient country receives which share of the total cake, if anything.

We look at aid allocation in three year averages covering the period from 1974 to 1997 for Arab countries. Until 1992, the Arab country data comprise the combined total for Algeria, Iraq, Kuwait, Libya, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates (UEA). From 1993 to 1996 the data cover Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and the UEA only, by far the most important



donors. No data for the UEA are available for 1997. The reader should note that whilst these data are the best available, they are also somewhat incomplete because Saudi Arabia keeps the geographic allocation of a large part of its aid flows from the Saudi Ministry of Finance secret [Van den Boogaerde, 1991: 27].

As concerns the Arab multilateral agencies, the data comprise the combined total for the Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa (BADEA), the Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development (AFEDS), the Islamic Development Bank and the OPEC Fund for International Development (OFID). Of course, strictly speaking neither the Islamic Development Bank nor the OFID are exclusively Arab financed institutions, but the Arab countries are by far the major financiers [Meenai, 1989; Porter, 1986]. Due to lack of data the period covered extends to 1994 only for Arab multilateral agencies.

#### The independent variables

Following McKinlay and Little [1977], it has become common in the aid allocation literature to distinguish between variables that control for donor interest versus recipient need. As concerns donor interest, in order to check for potential bias towards Arab, Sub-Saharan African and Islamic countries dummy variables were used. An Arab dummy variable was set to 1 for Bahrain, Djibouti, Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia and Yemen. This dummy covers all countries with a majority Arab population, apart from those Arab countries with major oil or gas reserves, which are aid donors themselves (Algeria, Iraq, Kuwait, Libya, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates). An African dummy was set to 1 for all Sub-Saharan African countries except those that are Arab. An Islamic dummy was set to 1 for all countries other than Arab countries coded as belonging to the Islamic civilization in Henderson and Tucker [2001: 335] and based on the conceptual framework of Huntington [1996]. A further proxy variable for donor

interest that is often employed in the aid allocation literature is some trade-related measure. We use here the natural log of the value of imports in constant US\$1995 from Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates (data taken from Gleditsch [2001]). The idea for using such a variable is that donors might be more willing to give aid to countries that are major recipients of their exports. However, as mentioned already above, given that Arab countries do not export a diversified basket of goods and are known for not tying their aid to the purchase of specified exports from the donor country, we would expect this variable not to test statistically significant.

To test the importance of considerations of donor interest that are more directly political, we introduce three control variables. One is a Socialist dummy, which was set to 1 if a country was considered as Socialist in Kornai [1992: table 1.1] with further information taken from CIA [2001]. The second control variable tries to measure the similarity of policy positions. Signorino and Ritter [1999] have developed a measure of policy similarity. This measure conceptualises two policy positions as falling within a policy space defined by all the possible policy positions. The measure falls in the interval  $-1$  to  $1$ , where  $-1$  means that two policy positions are as far apart in the policy space as possible (complete dissimilarity) and  $1$  means that the two policy positions are identical (complete similarity). Gartzke, Jo and Tucker [1999] use this measure to provide estimates of the similarity of policy positions as revealed by the voting behaviour in the UN General Assembly. We take the similarity of policy positions between potential aid recipient countries and Saudi Arabia, the major Arab aid donor, as a proxy variable for the non-observable similarity of positions with Arab countries as a whole. The third control variable is a dummy, which was set to 1 for any period a country has had diplomatic relations with Israel, with information taken from Ministry of Foreign Affairs [2000] and complemented by New York Times [various years].

To test the importance of recipient need, gross domestic product (GDP) per capita data in purchasing power parity and constant US\$1995 were taken from World Bank [2001]. Other need variables used in the literature such as life expectancy, infant mortality and literacy rates are very highly correlated with income per capita and are therefore not used here in addition to income.

A further control variable is population size. We would expect more populous countries to be regarded more eligible for the receipt of aid due to their greater importance in comparison to countries with a smaller population size. We would also expect more populous countries to receive a greater share of total aid given their bigger size. Lastly, the total amount of aid available for allocation should have an influence on the probability that any country is regarded eligible for the receipt of aid. With a bigger pie available the likelihood of receiving any cake should increase. Period specific dummies are also included to control for aggregate time effects.

### Methodology

Analysing the determinants of Arab aid allocation also has to deal with the fact that not only do countries receive different amounts of aid, but many countries do not receive any aid at all. There are basically two methods for dealing with this fact. One is follow the lead of Cingranelli and Pasquarello [1985] and many others and distinguish between two independent stages in the process of aid allocation (so-called two-part model). The first stage is the so-called gate-keeping stage where it is determined which countries receive aid. The appropriate estimation technique for this kind of analysis is probit or logit. The second stage is the so-called level stage, which can be estimated via ordinary least squares (OLS). At this stage, it is determined how much aid is allocated to a country, which has been selected as an aid recipient in the first stage. One of the problems with this two-part method is that it assumes

that the errors in both stages are uncorrelated. In other words, it assumes that decisions at the gate-keeping stage are taken independently from the decisions at the level stage, which might be unrealistic.

The second method is Heckman's [1979] two-step estimator, which explicitly allows the error terms from both stages of aid allocation to be correlated. It has been used by, for example, McGillivray and Oczkowski [1992] in the aid allocation literature.<sup>6</sup> One of the disadvantages of the two-step estimator is that it requires an exclusionary variable that has a significant impact upon the first step (gate-keeping stage), but not upon the second step (level stage).<sup>7</sup> For Arab aid allocation, the total amount of aid provided in any one year can function as such an exclusionary variable. This is because a higher value of the total amount allocated raises the chance of being included at the gate-keeping stage, but has no influence on the percentage of total aid allocated to any one country. It is not an ideal exclusionary variable since it does not vary across donors, but no better exclusionary variable could be found.

To mitigate potential problems with distributional skewedness, all variables that are not dummy variables entered the estimations as their natural log. Heteroscedasticity robust standard errors were used. The population, income and export variables enter all estimations with a one year lag since their contemporaneous values are not available to decision-makers at the time aid is allocated. The models were pre-tested for non-linear effects of the independent variables. No evidence for non-linear effects were found with the exception of the population variable at the gate-keeping stage of Arab agency aid allocation. In this case only, a squared population term was included in the estimations.

#### IV. RESULTS

Column I of table 1 provides the Heckman estimations for the gate-keeping stage for the allocation of aid by Arab countries. Countries that are poor, Arab, Sub-Saharan African,

Islamic as well as countries that vote similar to Saudi Arabia in the UN General Assembly are statistically significantly more likely to receive aid. Maintaining diplomatic relations with Israel decreases the chances of a country to receive aid. Socialist countries are not less likely to receive some aid, however. Population size, income and the value of imports from Arab countries are insignificant for eligibility of aid. As expected, the total amount of aid allocated has a positive effect on the likelihood that any country is deemed eligible for aid receipt.

< Insert Table 1 about here >

Column II looks at the level stage. It reveals that more populous, Arab and Islamic countries receive a greater share of total aid from Arab countries. A one per cent increase in population size leads to an aid share that is about 0.18 per cent higher. Islamic countries are estimated to receive a share of aid that is about 118 per cent higher than for non-Islamic countries. For Arab countries, the difference is more than 2200 per cent, which clearly underlines the importance of being Arab for receiving a higher share of bilateral aid from Arab donors. Poorer countries, Sub-Saharan African countries, those that maintain diplomatic relations with Israel, vote similar to Saudi Arabia or have higher imports from Arab countries do not receive more aid.

Column I of table 2 provides the Heckman estimations for the gate-keeping stage for the allocation of aid by Arab multilateral agencies. Again, countries that are poor, Arab, Sub-Saharan African, Islamic as well as countries that vote similar to Saudi Arabia in the UN General Assembly are statistically significantly more likely to receive aid as was the case in bilateral aid allocation. However, maintaining diplomatic relations with Israel is not a statistically significant factor. Socialist countries are again not less likely to receive some aid. However, the value of imports from Arab countries is estimated significantly, but with a

negative sign. Also, contrary to bilateral aid allocation, the population variables are statistically significant. More populous countries have first a higher chance and then, with further increases in population size, possibly a lower chance of being eligible for receiving aid from Arab agencies.<sup>8</sup> As expected, the total amount of aid allocated again has a positive effect on the likelihood that any country is deemed eligible for aid receipt.

< Insert Table 2 about here >

Column II of table 2 provides the Heckman estimates for the level stage. The results are generally rather similar to the level stage of bilateral Arab aid allocation. More populous and Arab countries receive a greater share of total aid as was the case with aid allocation from Arab donor countries. A one per cent increase in population size is associated with an aid share that is about 0.29 per cent higher. Being Arab is estimated as leading to a share that is about 632 per cent higher than for non-Arab countries, which, whilst substantially smaller than in the case of bilateral aid, still clearly underlines the importance of being Arab for receiving a higher share of multilateral Arab aid as well. Contrary to bilateral aid allocation, however, Islamic countries do not receive more aid, whilst countries voting similar to Saudi Arabia in the UN General Assembly do. The way this variable is constructed renders it more difficult to provide a useful interpretation of its coefficient. However, one can say that a country that voted identical to Saudi Arabia is estimated to receive a share of aid that is about 68 per cent higher than a country whose voting similarity value is equal to the sample mean. As before, none of the other control variables tests significant.

Note that Likelihood Ratio (LR) tests for both the bilateral and the multilateral aid allocation model fail to reject the hypothesis of independent equations. What this means is that the sample selection bias is very small, that the error terms of the equations for the gate-

keeping and for the level stage are basically uncorrelated and that we therefore could have used equally well the two-part estimation technique instead of Heckman's two-step estimator. Non-reported sensitivity analysis shows that this is indeed the case.

## V. CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

The results reported above quite strongly support the importance of being Arab for receiving aid from Arab countries and multilateral agencies. Arab countries are statistically significantly more likely to receive aid and if they do receive some amount of aid, they also receive significantly more aid. Thus clear evidence for the existence of preferential treatment based on Arab solidarity was found. The picture is more complex for the other determining factors tested. Countries belonging to the Islamic civilization without being Arab are more likely to receive some aid, but once selected only receive more aid in the case of Arab donor countries, not multilateral agencies. Similarly, countries with voting patterns similar to Saudi Arabia in the UN General Assembly are more likely to be eligible for bilateral and multilateral aid receipt, but once selected receive more aid only in the case of Arab multilateral agencies.

Poorer and Sub-Saharan African countries are more likely to receive some positive amount of bilateral and multilateral aid. The same is true for countries that do not maintain diplomatic relations with Israel, but for bilateral aid allocation only. Interestingly, however, these three variables have no influence on the level stage. The hypothesis that Arab donors might be biased against Socialist countries was not confirmed by the results. Neither at the gate-keeping nor at the level stage is the relevant dummy tested as statistically significant. The import variable tested insignificant, with one exception, as expected. Population size matters when it comes to the level stage, but more populous countries are more likely to be eligible for aid recipient for the case of multilateral aid only and even then is the effect non-linear.

In conclusion, this article has shown the important role that ethnic and religious similarity (being Arab and Islamic) as well as voting similarity in the UN General Assembly has on the allocation of aid by Arab donors.<sup>9</sup> As concerns ethnic and religious similarity, Arab aid allocation is quite different from the allocation of aid by Western donors. For example, Alesina and Dollar [2000] do not find evidence that religion plays a major role in their allocation of aid. There is also some evidence that the idea of Arab-African solidarity, political factors such as not maintaining diplomatic relations with Israel as well as a country's level of income play some role in the decision on whether a country is deemed eligible for the receipt of aid. None of these variables plays any role with regard to how much aid a country is given, once it is selected as eligible for aid. These variables therefore truly play the role of 'gate-keepers' only. Some aspects of donor interest thus clearly plays an important role in Arab aid allocation at both stages, but recipient need does so only at the gate-keeping stage.



## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Figures refer to net official development assistance (ODA) and are taken from OECD [1999]. Note that Arab aid originates from before 1974, in the case of Kuwait dating back even before the formal establishment of the Kuwait Fund for Arab Economic Development in 1961.

<sup>2</sup> Not surprisingly, the amount of aid provided is heavily dependent on the volatility of oil and gas revenues to Arab countries. It ranges from as high as 3.6% of GNP in 1975 to as low as 0.55% of GNP in 1989. I tested a simple model with the natural log of the total amount of aid allocated as the dependent variable and the natural log of the combined oil and natural gas revenue of Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates as well as a time trend as the independent variable with serial correlation and heteroscedasticity robust standard errors. The estimated elasticity is 1.34 for aid allocation from Arab countries and 0.85 for aid allocation from Arab agencies. Bilateral aid allocation is therefore more sensitive towards changes in the energy revenue available to donors. (Energy revenue data are taken from World Bank [2000]).

<sup>3</sup> Perhaps equally non-surprisingly, there have also always been calls to modify the process of Arab aid allocation in order to make it work more in the Arab economic interests (see, for example, Khader [1984]).

<sup>4</sup> Arab countries are the major, but not the only, providers of money for the Islamic Development Bank.

<sup>5</sup> Note that only aggregate data are available, no individual data for each donor country or each multilateral agency exists.

<sup>6</sup> Note that they call their model somewhat misleadingly a two-part model.

<sup>7</sup> Strictly speaking, no exclusionary variable is required, but in its absence the validity of estimations depends on restrictive distributional assumptions only.

<sup>8</sup> The estimated coefficient for the squared population term is at the margin between statistical significance and insignificance.

<sup>9</sup> Of course, such similarity does not automatically imply that a country is supported, especially not if for political reasons it falls out of grace. For example, Egypt basically lost all Arab aid in the 1980s due to the Camp David treaty with Israel, but regained it in the 1990s. Yemen temporarily lost aid in the early 1990s due to its support of Iraq in the Second Gulf War.

## REFERENCES

- Achilli, Michele and Mohamed Khaldi (eds.), 1984, The Role of the Arab Development Funds in the World Economy, London and Sydney: Croom Helm.
- AFESD, 1999, Annual Report, Kuwait: Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development.
- Al-Ani, Awni, 1984, 'OPEC Aid to Developing Countries', in Achilli and Khaldi [1984: 40-45].
- Alesina, Alesina and David Dollar, 2000, 'Who Gives Foreign Aid to Whom and Why?', Journal of Economic Growth, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 33–63.
- Al-Humaidi, Bader, 1984, 'The Kuwait Fund for Arab Economic Development', in Achilli and Khaldi [1984: 46-58].
- Breen, Richard, 1996, Regression Models: Censored, Sample-Selected, or Truncated Data, London: SAGE.
- Burnside, C. and D. Dollar, 2000, 'Aid, Policies, and Growth', American Economic Review, Vol. 90, No. 4, pp. 847-868.
- CIA, 2001, World Fact Book, Washington, DC: Central Intelligence Agency.
- Cingranelli, D.L. and T.E. Pasquarello, 1985, 'Human Rights Practices and the Distribution of U.S. Foreign Aid to Latin American Countries', American Journal of Political Science, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 539–563.
- Dowling, John Malcolm and Ulrich Hiemenz, 1985, 'Biases in the Allocation of Foreign Aid: Some New Evidence', World Development, Vol. 13, No. 4, pp. 535–541.
- Gartzke, Erik, Dong-Joon Jo and Richard Tucker, 1999, The Similarity of UN Policy Positions, 1946-96, [Hwww.vanderbilt.edu/~rtucker/data/affinity/un/similar](http://www.vanderbilt.edu/~rtucker/data/affinity/un/similar).
- Gleditsch, Kristian, 2001, Expanded Trade and GDP Data. San Diego: University of California at San Diego.

- Heckman, J., 1979, 'Sample Selection Bias as a Specification Error', Econometrica, Vol. 47, No. 1, pp. 153-161.
- Henderson, Errol A. and Richard Tucker, 2001, 'Clear and Present Strangers: The Clash of Civilizations and International Conflict', International Studies Quarterly, Vol. 45, No. 2, pp. 317-338.
- Hermes, Niels and Robert Lensink (eds.), 2001, Changing the Conditions for Development Aid: A New Paradigm?, Special issue of Journal of Development Studies, Vol. 37, No. 6.
- Huntington, Samuel Paul, 1996, The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order, New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Humaidan, Saleh H., 1984, 'The Activities of the Saudi Fund for Development', in Achilli and Khaldi [1984: 59-66].
- Imady, Mohammed, 1984, 'Patterns of Arab Economic Aid to Third World Countries', Arab Studies Quarterly, Vol. 6, No. 1&2, pp. 70-123.
- IMF, 2000, World Financial Statistics on CD-Rom, Washington, DC: International Monetary Fund.
- Khader, Bichara, 1984, 'The Afro-Arab Alliance: an Economic Strategy for the 1980s', in Achilli and Khaldi [1984: 155-193].
- Khaldi, Mohamed, 1984, 'Arab Aid in the World Economy', in Achilli and Khaldi [1984: 7-39].
- Kornai, Janos, 1992, The Socialist System: The Political Economy of Communism, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Maizels, A. and M.K. Nissanke, 1984, 'Motivations for Aid to Developing Countries', World Development, Vol. 12, No. 9, pp. 879-900.
- McGillivray, M. and E. Oczkowski, 1992, 'A Two-part Sample Selection Model of British Bilateral Aid Allocation', Applied Economics, Vol. 24, No. 12, pp. 1311-1319.

- McKinlay, R.D. and R. Little, 1977, 'A Foreign Policy Model of U.S. Bilateral Aid Allocation', World Politics, Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. 58-86.
- Meenai, S.A., 1989, The Islamic Development Bank – a Case Study of Islamic Co-operation, London and New York: Kegan Paul.
- Mertz, Robert Anton and Pamela MacDonald Mertz, 1983, Arab Aid to Sub-Saharan Africa, Boulder: Westview.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2000, Israel's Diplomatic Missions Abroad, Jerusalem: Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- Neumayer, Eric, 1999, Weak Versus Strong Sustainability: Exploring the Limits of Two Opposing Paradigms, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Neumayer, Eric, 2000, 'Resource Accounting in Measures of Unsustainability: Challenging the World Bank's Conclusions', Environmental and Resource Economics, Vol. 15, No. 3, pp. 257-278.
- Neumayer, Eric, 2001a, 'Do human rights matter in bilateral aid allocation? A quantitative analysis of 21 donor countries', mimeo, London: London School of Economics.
- Neumayer, Eric, 2001b, 'The determinants of aid allocation by regional development banks and United Nations Agencies', mimeo, London: London School of Economics.
- New York Times, various years, Searchable database in Lexis-Nexis, www.lexis-nexis.co.uk.
- OECD, 1999, Statistical Compendium on CD-Rom, Paris: Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development.
- OFID, 1987, Questions and Answers, Vienna: OPEC Fund for International Development.
- Porter, R.S., 1986, 'Arab Economic Aid', Development Policy Review, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 44-68.
- Raffer, Kunibert and H.W. Singer, 1996, The Foreign Aid Business – Economic Assistance and Development Co-operation, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

- Signorino, Curtis S. and Jeffrey M. Ritter, 1999, 'Tau-b or Not Tau-b: Measuring the Similarity of Foreign Policy Positions', International Studies Quarterly, Vol. 43, No. 1, pp. 115-144.
- Simmons, Andre, 1981, Arab Foreign Aid, London and Toronto: Associated University Press.
- Van den Boogaerde, Pierre, 1991, Financial Assistance from Arab Countries and Arab Regional Institutions, Washington, DC: International Monetary Fund.
- White, Howard and Mark McGillivray, 1995, 'How Well is Aid Allocated? Descriptive Measures of Aid Allocation: A Survey of Methodology and Results', Development and Change, Vol. 26, No. 1, pp. 163-183.
- World Bank, 1998, Assessing Aid: What Works, What Doesn't, and Why, Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- World Bank, 2000, Genuine Savings Data Set, Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- World Bank, 2001, World Development Indicators on CD-Rom, Washington, DC: The World Bank.

TABLE 1. HECKMAN ESTIMATIONS FOR AID BY ARAB COUNTRIES.

	I (gate-keeping stage)	II (level stage)
ln (POPULATION)	.04 (1.25)	.18** (2.88)
ln (GDP)	-.16* (2.51)	-.05 (.40)
ARAB	1.67*** (6.27)	3.15*** (12.21)
S-S AFRICA	.78*** (5.99)	-.10 (.46)
ISLAM	.85*** (5.14)	.78*** (3.51)
RELATIONS ISRAEL	-.49*** (4.01)	-.25 (.85)
VOTE-SIMILARITY	.92*** (3.57)	.85 (1.04)
SOCIALIST	-.24 (1.44)	.07 (.26)
ln (IMPORTS)	.01 (.25)	.02 (.66)
TOTAL AID	.0002** (2.71)	

N = 855, of which uncensored: 370. LR test of independent eqs.: p = .3363

Note: Pooled regressions with three-year averages. Absolute z-values in parentheses with heteroscedasticity robust standard errors. Coefficients of constant and period specific dummies not reported.

\* statistically significant at 95% level \*\* at 99% level \*\*\* at 99.9% level

TABLE 2. HECKMAN ESTIMATIONS FOR AID BY ARAB MULTILATERAL AGENCIES.

	I (gate-keeping stage)	II (level stage)
ln (POPULATION)	.70* (1.91)	.29*** (5.97)
ln (POPULATION) sq.	-.02 (1.76)	
ln (GDP)	-.22** (3.07)	-.12 (1.20)
ARAB	1.83*** (6.78)	1.99*** (7.25)
S-S AFRICA	.54*** (3.69)	-.25 (1.36)
ISLAM	.46** (2.53)	-.02 (.10)
RELATIONS ISRAEL	-.18 (1.36)	-.22 (1.03)
VOTE-SIMILARITY	1.63*** (4.36)	2.27*** (3.24)
SOCIALIST	-.22 (1.27)	-.13 (.67)
ln (IMPORTS)	-.05** (2.87)	-.02 (.93)
TOTAL AID	.0014** (2.62)	

N = 719, of which uncensored: 299. LR test of independent eqs.: p = .3508

Note: Pooled regressions with three-year averages. Absolute z-values in parentheses with heteroscedasticity robust standard errors. Coefficients of constant and period specific dummies not reported.

\* statistically significant at 95% level \*\* at 99% level \*\*\* at 99.9% level