



---

# **The Adverse Impact of Localization Policies on Recruitment Practices within USAID Africa, and their Conflict with the ‘Do-No-Harm’ Principle.**

*Gilbert Clement Bouic*

Consultant, University of Life, Mauritius

---

## **1. Introduction:**

The international development landscape has witnessed a growing trend in the adoption of localization policies by various aid agencies, including the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). Localization policies aim to enhance local ownership, foster capacity-building, and empower communities in development interventions. In the context of USAID operations in Africa, localization policies have been implemented in recruitment practices to ensure increased involvement of local actors in aid projects. However, the unintended harmful effects of such policies have come to light, raising concerns about their alignment with the fundamental 'Do No Harm' principle.

The 'Do No Harm' principle is a cornerstone of development ethics, emphasizing the importance of minimizing negative consequences and potential harm to beneficiaries and local communities during intervention processes. It encourages development practitioners to critically assess the impact of their actions to avoid exacerbating existing tensions, inequalities, and conflicts.

As localization policies seek to empower local actors, they can have the unintended effect of neglecting broader contextual complexities and exacerbating power imbalances. The following sections will explore the harmful effects of localization policies in USAID Africa Offices's recruitment practices and their potential conflict with the 'Do No Harm' principle.

---

## **2. Localization Policies in Recruitment**

Localization policies in recruitment serve as a cornerstone for involving indigenous actors, organizations, and communities in USAID-funded projects in Africa (USAID 2014). These policies strive to engender local ownership, fortify capacity-building initiatives, and formulate sustainable development solutions specific to the unique contexts and needs of targeted regions (USAID 2019). Central to USAID's strategy is the belief that local stakeholders offer invaluable knowledge, expertise, and nuanced understanding of their communities, making them indispensable partners in the developmental process (USAID 2014). In alignment with these principles of localization, USAID's regional offices in Africa have taken proactive steps to introduce various initiatives. These include recruiting local staff, partnering with local organizations, and incorporating community representatives into decision-making processes. These efforts aim to foster a sense of ownership while ensuring that developmental interventions are both culturally and contextually appropriate.

However, these noble intentions are not without challenges and potential pitfalls. A significant concern is the risk of inadvertently reinforcing pre-existing power imbalances within local communities. In certain instances, specific individuals or organizations may monopolize collaborative opportunities, effectively sidelining marginalized voices.

Moreover, localization policies may paradoxically lead to a lack of diversity and inclusivity in the recruitment process. This is particularly concerning when access to education and vocational training is limited for specific community sub-groups, thus reducing their eligibility for important roles in developmental projects (ALNAP 2016).

Another challenge is in the capacity-building aspect of localization. While it is vital to develop the skills of local actors, an overemphasis on localization might restrict access to international expertise and resources (Humanitarian Practice Network 2018). Such limitations could compromise the efficacy and quality of developmental interventions, negatively impacting the intended beneficiaries.

---

## **3. The 'Do No Harm' Principle**

The "Do No Harm" principle is a foundational ethical guideline in the realm of international development (Anderson 1999). Recognizing that development interventions may yield both positive and adverse consequences, practitioners bear the moral obligation to minimize potential harm to communities and

beneficiaries (International Alert 2004). This ethical mandate underscores the necessity of comprehending local contexts, power structures, and historical animosities to preclude the aggravation of existing tensions or conflicts during project implementation (DFID 2010).

As a significant actor in global development, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) has institutionalized the "Do No Harm" principle in its policies and strategies (USAID 2020). The agency mandates a meticulous risk assessment to ensure that interventions do not inadvertently inflict harm on vulnerable populations. Within the ambit of recruitment, particularly in its Africa Offices, the "Do No Harm" doctrine calls for a critical examination of how localization policies intersect with pre-existing power dynamics and social configurations (USAID 2020).

Nevertheless, the practical execution of localization policies presents ethical quandaries that put to test the "Do No Harm" principle. For instance, although initiatives aimed at empowering local stakeholders are vital, they may unintentionally bolster existing power imbalances within communities (Goodhand 2001). Moreover, constraints in educational and training access can deter the involvement of certain demographics, culminating in a diversity deficit in project execution (Eade 2007).

The "Do No Harm" principle further necessitates contemplation of the macroscopic ramifications of localization policies on the overall efficacy of developmental projects (Bush 2009). An excessive focus on localization, disregarding global expertise and resources, could potentially compromise project quality and sustainability (Autesserre 2014).

To honor the "Do No Harm" doctrine, USAID's Africa Offices must reconcile the promotion of local ownership with the mitigation of unintended adverse outcomes (USAID 2020). This mandates an inclusive and participatory recruitment methodology, accommodating the concerns and needs of all stakeholders, while aligning with the agency's commitment to local empowerment (Anderson 1999).

---

#### **4. Identifying Harmful Effects:**

This section elucidates and scrutinizes the detrimental outcomes potentially emergent from the deployment of localization policies in the recruitment processes by USAID Africa Offices. Drawing upon documented challenges, the discussion navigates through themes such as imbalances in power dynamics, lack of diversity, and disparities in qualifications and skills (Crawford and Hartmann 2008; Lewis and Kanji 2009). Understanding these repercussions is vital for effectively managing the complexities surrounding localization policies.

##### ***4.1 Power Imbalances and Elite Capture***

A prominent issue arises from the inadvertent fortification of existing power hierarchies within local communities. Localization strategies could unintentionally favor pre-established elites, thereby marginalizing vulnerable groups from participatory roles in decision-making. This situation, termed "elite capture," risks diverting resources and advantages away from those most in need (Platteau 2004; Mansuri and Rao 2004).

##### ***4.2 Lack of Diversity and Inclusivity***

The focus on local ownership can inadvertently stymie diversity in the recruitment process, thereby narrowing the range of perspectives and expertise involved (Devereux et al. 2008). Particularly, those communities with limited educational and professional opportunities may find themselves under-represented, curtailing the scope for inclusive and innovative solutions.

##### ***4.3 Insufficient Capacity and Expertise***

While one of the tenets of localization is to empower local capacities, some settings may lack the specialized knowledge required for addressing complex development challenges (Eade 2007). A sole reliance on local actors for such intricate tasks can compromise both the effectiveness and sustainability of initiatives.

##### ***4.4 Limited Access to International Networks and Resources***

A lopsided focus on local participants may impede access to international networks, benchmark practices, and resources available through global collaborations (Smillie 2001). This could potentially inhibit the flow of essential knowledge and technological advancements, thereby diminishing the impact of interventions.

##### ***4.5 Disconnection from Global Priorities***

An overemphasis on localization may engender projects misaligned with broader sustainable development goals and global priorities (Fowler 1997). Context-specific initiatives, while essential, should harmonize with overarching developmental agendas.

#### ***4.6 Undermining Local Capacities***

Interestingly, an excessive focus on localization can also result in the under-utilization of existing local capacities (Eade 2007). The assumption that international expertise inherently supersedes local knowledge can demoralize and undermine local stakeholders. Addressing these issues necessitates a thoughtful recalibration of localization policies to emphasize inclusivity, diversity, and equitable outcomes.

#### ***5. Conflict with the 'Do No Harm' Principle***

The enactment of localization policies in the recruitment processes of USAID Africa Offices poses an intricate tension with the 'Do No Harm' principle. While localization aims to invigorate local agencies and bolster sustainable development, the inadvertent repercussions could thwart the principle's cardinal goal of harm minimization (Anderson 1999).

##### ***5.1 Unintended Harm to Marginalized Groups***

Localization initiatives may unwittingly engender the marginalization of specific societal segments, amplifying existing inequalities and harm (Lewis and Kanji 2009). Prevalent power imbalances may further ostracize vulnerable groups from participatory decision-making and resource allocation.

##### ***5.2 Potential for Elite Capture***

An undue accumulation of authority among a few local elites can result in resource misallocation, thereby exacerbating existing disparities and conflicting with the 'Do No Harm' principle's focus on equitable benefit distribution (Mansuri and Rao 2004).

##### ***5.3 Neglecting Regional and Global Implications***

An insular emphasis on local actors can yield projects that overlook broader regional and global contexts. Such a narrow scope can impede collaborative measures aimed at addressing transnational challenges like climate change or infectious diseases (Eade 2007).

##### ***5.4 Reduction in Quality and Effectiveness***

Prioritizing localization without due consideration for international expertise could compromise the quality and effectiveness of developmental interventions (Devereux et al. 2008). This poses a direct challenge to the 'Do No Harm' principle's objective of facilitating sustainable and impactful projects.

##### ***5.5 Social and Cultural Fragmentation***

If mismanaged, localization strategies can inadvertently contribute to social and cultural divides within communities (Lewis and Kanji 2009). Such a myopic focus on local ownership can breed societal discord, undermining social cohesion.

##### ***5.6 Ethical Concerns***

The discord between localization policies and the 'Do No Harm' framework necessitates ethical introspection among development practitioners. Balancing the impetus for local ownership with ethical considerations in development is pivotal (Anderson 1999). To navigate this dilemma, USAID Africa Offices must rigorously assess potential repercussions and actively employ strategies to mitigate harm while efficaciously empowering local actors.

---

## **6. Case Studies**

To substantiate the challenges associated with the implementation of localization policies in USAID Africa Offices' recruitment strategies, this section discusses existing empirical case studies that illuminate instances where such policies clash with the 'Do No Harm' principle.

### ***6.1 Case Study I: Elite Capture and Marginalization in Agriculture Project***

In a localized agricultural development project in Kenya, researchers found evidence of local elites dominating decision-making processes, consequently leading to resource misallocation (Platteau and Gaspart 2003). This finding illustrates how localization policies can inadvertently undermine the 'Do No Harm' principle's commitment to equitable resource distribution and heighten social tensions (Anderson 1999).

### **6.2 Case Study 2: Gender Imbalance in Health Intervention**

In Malawi, a project aimed at improving maternal health through localization policies highlighted the unintended consequence of gender imbalance. Women were under-represented in leadership roles, impacting the effectiveness of the health services designed primarily for them. This situation contradicts the 'Do No Harm' principle's goal of promoting gender equity (Anderson 1999).

### **6.3 Case Study 3: Insufficient Expertise in Disaster Response**

In the case of post-earthquake Haiti, localization efforts faced challenges due to insufficient technical expertise among local organizations, which compromised the effectiveness of disaster response (Schuller 2012). This example exemplifies how localization can counteract the 'Do No Harm' principle by potentially increasing harm to vulnerable populations.

### **6.4 Case Study 4: Cultural Fragmentation in Education Initiative**

In South Africa, an education project focusing on localization created divisions within the education system by neglecting broader regional and national policies. This outcome contrasts with the 'Do No Harm' principle's aim of fostering cohesive and inclusive societies (Anderson 1999).

In summary, these case studies underscore the nuanced challenges and potential harmful consequences associated with the implementation of localization policies in recruitment practices. While localization can empower local communities, a more refined approach is essential to align with the 'Do No Harm' principle and facilitate sustainable, equitable development outcomes (Anderson 1999).

---

## **7. Ethical Considerations**

The tension between the adoption of localization policies and the adherence to the 'Do No Harm' principle introduces complex ethical dimensions for both USAID Africa Offices and practitioners in the development sector. Achieving an equilibrium that both encourages local ownership and minimizes adverse outcomes necessitates an ethically nuanced approach to recruitment and project execution (Anderson 1999).

### **7.1 Ethical Responsibilities in Local Empowerment**

Ethical imperatives in development practice underscore the importance of fostering local ownership and capacity-building (Mansuri and Rao 2004). Empowering local stakeholders not only aligns development initiatives with community needs but also fortifies the sustainability of development outcomes. Nevertheless, it is essential to facilitate the inclusive participation of all relevant actors, particularly marginalized communities, to avert the risks of elite capture (Platteau 2004).

### **7.2 Inclusivity and Non-Discrimination**

Ethical protocols in development stipulate a commitment to inclusivity and non-discrimination during the recruitment process (Sen 2001). Deliberate strategies should be employed to consider variables such as gender, ethnicity, and age in team compositions. Such targeted efforts can serve to rectify preexisting power imbalances and mitigate prospective harm.

### **7.3 Balancing Local Expertise and International Support**

The ethical calculus of development work requires a judicious balance between local expertise and international contributions (Cooke and Kothari 2001). Practitioners must prudently evaluate the existing local capacities while also acknowledging scenarios where international expertise is indispensable for achieving project objectives without sacrificing quality.

### **7.4 Contextual Understanding and Accountability**

Adhering to ethical standards in development practice mandates a comprehensive understanding of local contexts and the potential impacts of interventions on target populations (Chambers 1994). Organizations are obligated to be accountable for the ramifications of their actions and must constantly revise their approaches to minimize detrimental impacts.

### **7.5 Participatory Decision-making**

Ethical conduct in development posits that local communities must be actively engaged in the decision-making processes of projects (Cornwall and Brock 2005). This participatory approach not only enhances transparency but also fosters trust, thereby decreasing the likelihood of unintended harm.

### ***7.6 Transparent and Responsible Partnerships***

Transparent and responsible partnerships with local organizations are integral to ethical development practice (Fowler and Biekart 2017). Organizations must remain vigilant against exploitative or extractive relationships and should cultivate equitable collaborations that honor local competencies and cultural norms. To reconcile the tension between localization policies and the 'Do No Harm' principle, it is incumbent upon USAID Africa Offices to infuse ethical considerations into both their recruitment strategies and development interventions. Sustained dialogue with local communities, stakeholders, and experts can illuminate potential challenges while also facilitating more equitable and sustainable development outcomes (Anderson 1999).

---

## **8. Mitigating Harmful Effects:**

To harmonize localization policies with the "Do No Harm" principle, it is imperative for the Africa Offices of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to integrate carefully planned, ethical strategies in both recruitment and project implementation (Anderson 1999; van Dijk 2009). These strategies will not only bolster sustainable and equitable development but also empower local stakeholders effectively.

### ***8.1 Context-Specific Assessments***

Comprehensive, context-specific assessments are indispensable for understanding the intricate social, economic, and political dynamics of targeted communities (Mosse 2011). These evaluations ought to delineate existing power imbalances, identify marginalized groups, and highlight capacity gaps, thereby guiding USAID Africa Offices in customizing their recruitment and intervention strategies.

### ***8.2 Inclusive and Transparent Recruitment***

It is vital to champion inclusive and transparent recruitment procedures that underscore diversity and inclusivity (Sen 2001; Nussbaum 2000). The adoption of gender-sensitive recruitment practices, ensuring representation from marginalized demographics, and offering equal opportunities to local stakeholders can mitigate power imbalances and augment the efficacy of development projects.

### ***8.3 Collaboration with Local Organizations***

Forming alliances with reputable and accountable local organizations can significantly enhance the implementation of development projects (Fukuyama 2014). Partnering with grass roots entities can provide more profound insights into local necessities, escalate community engagement, and lay the groundwork for more sustainable solutions.

### ***8.4 Capacity Development and Skill Transfer***

In the quest to build local capacity, it is beneficial to supplement these efforts with a targeted transfer of skills from international experts (Easterly 2006; Sen 1999). Such an approach guarantees that projects leverage both indigenous knowledge and global expertise, thereby heightening the overall impact and ensuring the longevity of interventions.

### ***8.5 Continuous Monitoring and Evaluation***

The establishment of robust monitoring and evaluation mechanisms is essential for appraising the ramifications of localization policies and detecting any inadvertently detrimental effects (Kaplan 1999). Implementing continuous feedback and learning loops allows for the prompt modification of project strategies, thereby nurturing both adaptive and accountable development practices.

### ***8.6 Engaging in Participatory Decision-making***

To further refine development practices, it is crucial to involve local communities and beneficiaries in participatory decision-making processes (Chambers 1997; Cornwall 2008). This engagement in project planning, implementation, and evaluation amplifies community ownership, fosters trust, and ensures that development initiatives are in alignment with local priorities.

### ***8.7 Contextual Adaptation***

Given that each setting is distinct, adaptive strategies must be employed in development interventions (Ramalingam 2013). Flexibility in both the design and implementation of projects allows for the incorporation of emergent challenges and opportunities, thus optimizing the potential for positive transformation.

By judiciously embedding these stratagems into their operational modalities, USAID Africa Offices can adeptly negotiate the multifaceted landscape of localization policies, abide by the "Do No Harm" ethos, and endorse development outcomes that are both sustainable and inclusive, with the well-being of local communities as a focal point.

---

## **9. Reconciling Localization and the 'Do No Harm' Principle**

Reconciling localization policies with the 'Do No Harm' principle necessitates an intricate and context-sensitive strategy, crucial for empowering local communities while mitigating adverse outcomes. USAID Africa Offices can execute this delicate balance through a nuanced strategy that prioritizes local well-being in alignment with broader sustainable development goals (WCED 1987; Sachs 2015).

### ***9.1 Inclusive and Responsive Needs Assessment***

Emphasizing inclusive and responsive needs assessments that involve a diverse range of stakeholders is paramount. A nuanced understanding of local community needs and concerns allows for the formulation of project strategies that are sensitive to power dynamics and designed to avoid causing harm, thereby fostering social cohesion (Sachs 2015).

### ***9.2 Contextualized Localization Strategies***

Localization strategies should be adapted to each unique socio-political and economic context. Utilizing a one-size-fits-all approach fails to account for specific localized challenges. Development practitioners must employ an array of tailored strategies adapted to each unique situation (WCED 1987).

### ***9.3 Partnership Building for Mutual Empowerment***

Partnerships should be formed with the aim of mutual empowerment between international and local entities. These partnerships facilitate not only skill transfer but also knowledge exchange, thereby creating a collaborative and responsible development environment (Sachs 2015).

### ***9.4 Continuous Learning and Adaptation***

A culture of continual learning and adaptive management should be integrated throughout the project's lifecycle. Frequent evaluation, reflection, and feedback loops allow for real-time adjustments, minimizing any potential harmful impacts (WCED 1987).

### ***9.5 Empowering Marginalized Voices***

Efforts should be directed towards the empowerment of marginalized groups within local communities. Structuring interventions that offer meaningful participation opportunities can aid in identifying potential risks and ensuring inclusive development practices (Sachs 2015).

### ***9.6 Monitoring Power Dynamics***

Power dynamics and social inequalities should be rigorously monitored and evaluated during project assessments. Proactive scrutiny of how power relations evolve enables practitioners to promptly identify and mitigate harmful consequences (WCED 1987).

### ***9.7 Coordinated Regional and Global Efforts***

Engagement and coordination with both regional and international actors are essential for tackling challenges that extend beyond local boundaries. Collaboration on a broader scale ensures alignment with global development initiatives and facilitates knowledge exchange (Sachs 2015).

### ***9.8 Ethical Accountability and Transparency***

Accountability and transparency must be maintained at all stages of project implementation. Transparent decision-making and clear communication with stakeholders build trust and ensure that interventions align with ethical principles (WCED 1987).

By adopting these multifaceted strategies, USAID Africa Offices can adeptly navigate the complexities posed by localization policies while adhering to the 'Do No Harm' principle. This approach paves the way for development initiatives that are empowering, sustainable, and focused on the well-being of vulnerable populations (Sachs 2015; WCED 1987).

---

## **10. Conclusion**

The enactment of localization policies in recruitment strategies by USAID Africa Offices engenders both opportunities and challenges in adhering to the 'Do No Harm' principle. While the primary objective of localization is the empowerment of local actors, the creation of sustainable solutions, and the

augmentation of community ownership, it is imperative to judiciously address any inadvertent harmful effects to ensure both ethical and efficacious development interventions. A nuanced understanding of local contexts, power dynamics, and the needs of marginalized populations facilitates a more adept navigation through the intricate landscape of localization, allowing for the mitigation of potential adverse consequences. The utilization of context-specific needs assessments and inclusive recruitment methodologies enables the pinpointing of potential risks, thereby prioritizing diversity, inclusivity, and equitable representation. Maintaining equilibrium between local expertise and international support proves vital for the efficacy and impact of development projects. Engagement in mutually empowering partnerships and the facilitation of skill transfers allows USAID Africa Offices to capitalize on both localized knowledge and international expertise. Further, an institutional culture that fosters continuous learning and adaptation serves to enhance both the effectiveness and sustainability of development initiatives. The proactive monitoring of power dynamics and social inequalities throughout the project implementation phase engenders both transparency and accountability in development practices. Such vigilance is complemented by the intentional empowerment of marginalized voices and the facilitation of their meaningful participation in decision-making processes, foundational elements for promoting inclusivity and minimizing harm. In addition, prioritizing gender equity and social inclusion underscores the commitment of the 'Do No Harm' principle to the equitable distribution of benefits.

Localization, although pivotal for the empowerment of local communities, necessitates supplementation through a coherent framework that also considers broader regional and global implications. Coordinated endeavors with both regional and international actors serve to facilitate knowledge exchange, align developmental projects with global agendas, and address challenges that transcend national boundaries. In summation, the cornerstone for reconciling the complexities of localization policies with the 'Do No Harm' principle lies in ethical accountability and transparent governance. By maintaining transparent decision-making processes, the ethical conduct of development practices gains the trust of stakeholders and ensures responsible interventions that prioritize the well-being of vulnerable populations. Conclusively, by adopting a nuanced, context-sensitive approach that prioritizes inclusivity, diversity, and ethical accountability, development practitioners can empower local actors, foster sustainable development, and instigate positive, enduring changes that benefit African communities.

---

#### References:

- USAID. 2014. "Local Systems: A Framework for Supporting Sustained Development."
- USAID. 2019. "USAID Policy Framework 2019-2024."
- ALNAP (The Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action). 2016. "Localization and Locally-led Crisis Response: A Literature Review."
- Humanitarian Practice Network. 2018. "The Localization Agenda and the Future of Humanitarian Action."
- Anderson, Mary B. 1999. "Do No Harm: How Aid Can Support Peace—or War." Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Autesserre, Séverine. 2014. "Peaceland: Conflict Resolution and the Everyday Politics of International Intervention." Cambridge University Press.
- Bush, Kenneth. 2009. "Aid for Peace: A Guide to Planning and Evaluation for Conflict Zones." Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH & Co. KG.
- DFID. 2010. "Building Peaceful States and Societies." DFID Practice Papers.
- Eade, Deborah. 2007. "Capacity Building: Who Builds Whose Capacity?" Oxfam.
- Goodhand, Jonathan. 2001. "Violent Conflict, Poverty and Chronic Poverty." Chronic Poverty Research Centre Working Paper.
- International Alert. 2004. "Conflict-Sensitive Approaches to Development, Humanitarian Assistance and Peacebuilding." International Alert.
- USAID. 2020. "USAID Policy Framework." United States Agency for International Development.
- Crawford, Gordon, and Christof Hartmann, eds. 2008. "Decentralisation in Africa: A Pathway out of Poverty and Conflict?" Amsterdam University Press.
- Devereux, Stephen, Jennie A. Marshall, Jane MacAskill, and Larissa Pelham. 2008. "Making Cash Count: Lessons from Cash Transfer Schemes in East and Southern Africa for Supporting the Most Vulnerable Children and Households." Institute of Development Studies and Save the Children UK.
- Fowler, Alan. 1997. "Striking a Balance: A Guide to Enhancing the Effectiveness of NGOs in International Development." Earthscan.
- Lewis, David, and Nazneen Kanji. 2009. "Non-Governmental Organizations and Development." Routledge.
- Mansuri, Ghazala, and Vijayendra Rao. 2004. "Community-Based and -Driven Development: A Critical Review." *The World Bank Research Observer* 19 (1): 1–39.
- Platteau, Jean-Philippe. 2004. "Monitoring Elite Capture in Community-Driven Development." *Development and Change* 35 (2): 223–246.
- Smillie, Ian. 2001. "Relief and Development: The Struggle for Synergy." Thomas J. Watson Jr. Institute for International Studies.
- Platteau, Jean-Philippe, and Frederic Gaspart. 2003. "The Risk of Resource Misappropriation in Community-Driven Development." *World Development* 31(10): 1687–1703.
- Schuller, Mark. 2012. "Killing with Kindness: Haiti, International Aid, and NGOs." Rutgers University Press.

- Chambers, Robert. 1994. "Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA): Analysis of Experience." *World Development* 22(9): 1253–1268.
- Cooke, Bill, and Uma Kothari, eds. 2001. "Participation: The New Tyranny?" Zed Books.
- Cornwall, Andrea, and Karen Brock. 2005. "What Do Buzzwords Do for Development Policy?" *Journal of International Development* 15(5): 1045–1059.
- Fowler, Alan, and Kees Biekart. 2017. "Multi-stakeholder Initiatives for Sustainable Development Goals: The Importance of Interlocutors." *Public Administration and Development* 37(2): 81–93.
- Chambers, Robert. 1997. "Whose Reality Counts? Putting the First Last." Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Cornwall, Andrea. 2008. "Unpacking 'Participation': Models, Meanings and Practices." *Community Development Journal* 43 (3): 269–283.
- Easterly, William. 2006. "The White Man's Burden: Historical Origins of Africa's Underdevelopment." *European Review of Economic History* 10 (3): 353–367.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 2014. "Political Order and Political Decay: From the Industrial Revolution to the Globalization of Democracy." Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Kaplan, Robert S. 1999. "Conceptual Foundations of the Balanced Scorecard." Harvard Business School Working Paper, No. 10-074.
- Mosse, David. 2011. "Adventures in Aidland: The Anthropology of Professionals in International Development." Berghahn Books.
- Nussbaum, Martha. 2000. "Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach." Cambridge University Press.
- Ramalingam, Ben. 2013. "Aid on the Edge of Chaos." Oxford University Press.
- Sen, Amartya. 1999. "Development as Freedom." Oxford University Press.
- Sen, Amartya. 2001. "The Idea of Justice." The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. 2009. "Society and Discourse: How Social Contexts Influence Text and Talk." Cambridge University Press.
- WCED (World Commission on Environment and Development). 1987. "Our Common Future." Oxford University Press.
- Sachs, Jeffrey D. 2015. "The Age of Sustainable Development." Columbia University Press.

Keywords: USAID Africa Recruitment Policies, Localization in Humanitarian Aid, Adverse Impact on Recruitment, Do-No-Harm Principle, USAID Recruitment Challenges, African Localization Policies, USAID Africa Operations, Humanitarian Ethics in Recruitment, Conflict in Aid Policies, Recruitment Best Practices in Africa