International Business. 2025. 4 (14). P. 23–47
JEL O17, O43, D73, I15, F21
https://doi.org/10.24833/2949-639X-2025-4-14-23-47

Received 20 December 2025
Accepted 28 December 2025

STRENGTHENING GOVERNANCE FOR SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS FROM FRAGILE STATES

Tryson Yangailo
PhD, Independent Researcher, Lusaka, Zambia, ytryson@yahoo.com, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0690-9747

Abstract. This study examines the complex relationships that exist between socioeconomic outcomes and governance indicators — particularly political stability, rule of law and control of corruption — in different regions of the world, with a focus on fragile and conflict-affected governments. By providing a thorough analysis of the governance-socioeconomic nexus through the integration of quantitative World Bank data, this study sheds light on critical patterns and trends. The study reveals that strong governance significantly improves economic performance and literacy rates, with stark contrasts observed in regions such as sub-Saharan Africa and the Middle East and North Africa (MENA). In these regions, pervasive governance deficits characterised by political instability and weak rule of law exacerbate socioeconomic challenges, resulting in low levels of foreign direct investment and limited access to education and healthcare. Conversely, regions with more robust governance frameworks, such as Southeast Asia, experience improved socioeconomic conditions characterised by higher literacy rates and economic growth. The study also highlights the critical role of health and education, illustrating how investments in these sectors can amplify the benefits of good governance and promote long-term economic development. The results of the mediation analysis show that government effectiveness fully mediates the relationship between unemployment and political stability, suggesting that most of the effect is indirect.

Keywords: governance, socioeconomic development, political stability, fragile and conflict-affected states

For citation: Yangailo T. 2025. Strengthening Governance for Sustainable Development: Insights from Fragile and Conflict-Affected States. *International Business.* 4 (14). P. 23–47. https://doi.org/10.24833/2949-639X-2025-4-14-23-47

Disclosure statement: no conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Introduction

Globally, socioeconomic and governance problems are widespread and have a significant impact on political stability, the rule of law and economic growth. Sub Saharan Africa, for example, faces serious challenges related to political instability and violence, which exacerbate existing security problems and hamper investment prospects. The ongoing conflicts in Sudan and Somalia have created a vicious cycle of instability and underdevelopment, complicating governance and reconstruction efforts (Fagbemi et al. 2021; Ojo et al. 2014). Similar difficulties can be found in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region, where countries such as Yemen and Iraq struggle with widespread poverty and post-conflict governance that exacerbates civil unrest and hinders long-term recovery (Saleh & Fouad 2022; Zoellick 2008).

Poor governance in Afghanistan exacerbates economic fragility in the region, and instability in Pakistan undermines public trust in institutions and discourages foreign investment — all of which are detrimental to development efforts (Dalyop 2019; Jamil Shah et al. 2019). These problems are further entrenched by corruption, inadequate educational institutions and unequal economic development, which hinder progress in a number of ways. For example, low literacy rates are caused by a lack of educational resources, which hinders the development of human capital — a critical component of economic growth (Agborsangaya-Fiteu 2009; Woolcock 2014).

Despite a growing body of scholarship in this area, there remain gaps in our understanding of how governance and socioeconomic issues interact to affect political stability, the rule of law and overall development in many parts of the world. By examining the complex interactions between these components — particularly in unstable and conflict-affected states — this study aims to fill this gap. Through analysis of these dynamics, the research seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of the fundamental mechanisms that perpetuate instability and impede progress.

Research Objectives

The primary objectives of this study are:

1) to examine the relationship between governance indicators and socioeconomic outcomes across different regions;
2) to analyse regional disparities in governance quality and their impact on development;
3) to investigate the role of government effectiveness in mediating the relationship between unemployment and political stability;
4) to highlight the importance of education and health in governance and socioeconomic development.

Significance of the Study

This study is important because it will inform policies aimed at promoting political stability, improving governance and accelerating economic growth. Understanding these interrelationships is essential to formulating effective policies that are tailored to the unique obstacles faced by fragile states. By providing empirical data and theoretical insights, this research aims to support the formulation of policies that strengthen governance frameworks and, ultimately, improve socioeconomic conditions.

Literature Review

Theoretical Framework

Theories of governance provide a basis for understanding political stability, legality and the suppression of corruption. According to scholars, ineffective governance threatens both social stability and economic progress, which is why effective governance is essential for sustainable development (Ball 2005; Taylor 2014). In particular, ideas of democratic governance emphasise the importance of transparency and accountability in building citizen participation and trust. Socioeconomic development theories also suggest that improved governance enhances educational outcomes and attracts investment by linking education, foreign direct investment and economic growth to the quality of governance (Andrijevic et al. 2020; Jamil Shah et al. 2019).

Moreover, research has highlighted the relationship between social capital and governance, noting that robust governance institutions often promote higher levels of civic participation and community resilience. This interdependence implies that, in addition to economic indicators, good governance influences sociocultural conditions, which in turn influence shape development trajectories.

Empirical Review

The idea that socioeconomic outcomes are largely influenced by governance indicators is supported by a number of empirical studies. According to Yildiz et al. (2023), there is a correlation between lower crime rates and economic growth, urbanisation and democratic governance. This highlights the complex role that governance plays in determining socioeconomic conditions. According to Fagbemi et al. (2021), low socioeconomic conditions in sub-Saharan Africa are directly caused by poor governance, suggesting that strengthening governance institutions is crucial for development. Similarly, Rizvi (2022) emphasises the importance of addressing institutional weaknesses to reduce conflict and promote economic stability in fragile states.

The study by Levitt et al. (2010) examines the governance issues that arise throughout the lifecycle of infrastructure projects, from project planning to implementation. It draws attention to how decisions made at one stage can constrain alternatives and affect sustainability in later stages. To address these issues, the study analyses the weaknesses of conventional financing and governance strategies and proposes socioeconomic alternatives that may better meet the governance needs of future infrastructure projects. In addition, a number of studies have highlighted how international organisations can support effective governance practices. For example, Ganson and Wennmann (2015) illustrate the global interconnection between governance and development by discussing how foreign investment increasingly depends on a country's governance system.

The study by Banik et al. (2023) examines the impact of health spending on human development, using governance quality as a moderating factor. Employing panel data analysis, they find that improving human development requires more than simply increasing health expenditure. The effectiveness of health spending in enhancing human welfare depends on the quality of governance — specifically political stability and the absence of terrorism. The study also shows that the relationship between governance quality and health spending varies by income level and geographic location, suggesting that the impact of health spending on human development is context-specific.

The study by Pigozzi et al. (2014) focuses on the difficulties experienced by children living in unstable or conflict-affected areas. It highlights how their schooling is disrupted by fear, trauma, loss, grief and financial hardship. The study examines common challenges affecting learning opportunities across three key age groups: early childhood, primary school and adolescence. It concludes that, while a body of relevant knowledge is growing, it remains insufficient, and identifies knowledge gaps and research needs. The study also emphasises the importance of understanding how culture and crisis affect children's learning in such contexts.

Regional Comparisons

Regional comparisons reveal different socioeconomic and governance problems. Ojo et al. (2014) argue that weak governance in sub-Saharan Africa hinders socioeconomic growth and call for robust institutions to ensure accountability and transparency. As a result, there are several calls for capacity building and governance reforms to promote economic resilience. Saleh and Fouad (2022) explore how political instability affects health systems in the MENA region, emphasising the relationship between governance and public health outcomes. Socioeconomic problems are exacerbated by the deterioration of health services caused by governance failures, which feeds a vicious cycle of poverty and instability.

Much has been learned about the devastating socioeconomic impacts of violence and war from decades of research and observation (Mallett & Slater 2012). Dalyop (2019) finds that political instability negatively affects economic growth in South Asia, highlighting the cyclical nature of socioeconomic situations and governance. According to the research, volatility not only hinders economic performance in the short term but also creates long-term obstacles to sustainable development.

Mallett and Slater (2012) provide a thorough analysis of research on growth and livelihoods in insecure and conflict-affected environments. Their review draws attention to the dire socioeconomic consequences of mass violence and war, and highlights the need for a deeper understanding of these complex situations. The review identifies four primary types of evidence: programmatic evidence, micro-level case studies, enabling contexts, and quantitative assessments. It further examines how conflict affects economic activity, growth, and livelihoods, with particular attention to markets, perceptions, coping mechanisms, human and physical capital, and overall economic activity. The evaluation also assesses the effectiveness of programming, highlighting the need for more context-specific techniques and better-quality evidence. It discusses the importance of creating conditions conducive to successful economic recovery, underscoring the role of laws, informal institutions, and external economic participation. Finally, the review identifies important information gaps and methodological issues in the current evidence base and outlines possible alternatives to existing measures of economic activity. Overall, the study provides insightful information on the difficulties and opportunities associated with promoting livelihoods and development in insecure and conflict-affected environments.

Gaps Addressed in the Literature

While existing research has highlighted the importance of governance for socioeconomic development, significant gaps remain. Previous studies often fail to comprehensively integrate the interplay between governance quality and socioeconomic variables. Moreover, many analyses lack a regional focus and neglect the unique challenges faced by fragile states. This study aims to fill these gaps by providing a detailed examination of the dynamics between governance and socioeconomic factors within specific regional contexts, offering insights that are both context-specific and applicable to broader governance discussions.

Methodology

This study employs a quantitative approach to analyse the socioeconomic and governance characteristics of different regions, focusing on how these factors contribute to fragility and political instability. The analysis uses Jamovi software for statistical calculations and data visualisation, enabling for a comprehensive examination of the relationships between the selected variables.

Data were obtained from the World Bank database for the period 2000-2022. The study includes several key variables: urban population (% of total population); rule of law estimates; political stability and absence of violence/terrorism estimates; control of corruption estimates; net inflows of foreign direct investment (FDI) as a percentage of GDP; population density (people per square kilometre of land area); current health expenditure as a percentage of GDP; adolescent literacy rates; government effectiveness estimates; government expenditure on education as a percentage of total government expenditure; GDP growth (annual %); GDP in current US dollars; primary school enrolment (gross %); and unemployment rate as a percentage of the total labour force. These variables provide a comprehensive framework for understanding the interplay between governance, socioeconomic conditions and political stability.

The study's comparative analysis includes several regional contexts. In sub Saharan Africa, countries face severe instability and economic challenges. Nigeria experiences significant political instability and violence from insurgent groups such as Boko Haram, alongside marked economic inequality. Somalia remains highly fragile, with ongoing conflict and persistent governance challenges. South Sudan exemplifies fragility and recovery, having recently endured a civil war that underscores its struggle with reconstruction and stability. Similarly, the Central African Republic suffers from deep-rooted poverty and governance problems that reflect its fragile state.

In the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region, Iraq is grappling with post-conflict reconstruction and governance issues following years of instability. Yemen is facing a severe humanitarian crisis characterised by massive political instability and widespread poverty. Syria, another post-conflict society, confronts the critical task of rebuilding its institutions amid ongoing challenges. South Asia includes countries with notable political and economic difficulties. For instance, Afghanistan is plagued by political instability and governance failures, making it a focal point for issues of reconstruction and stability. Pakistan faces challenges of insurgency and political instability, particularly in certain regions, which complicate its path to stability.

In Latin America, Venezuela is experiencing economic collapse that has led to significant political instability and widespread social unrest. The Northern Triangle countries — Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala — are characterised by high levels of gang-related violence, high unemployment rates and pervasive economic inequality. Finally, in Southeast Asia, Myanmar is characterised by ongoing political instability and conflict between the military and ethnic groups. The Philippines also faces challenges with political violence, insurgency and persistent governance issues that reflect broader regional struggles.

Using Jamovi, the study conducts statistical analyses such as correlation matrices and regression models to assess the relationships between governance indicators and socioeconomic variables. It also employs mediation analysis to examine how governance quality affects the relationship between socioeconomic variables and political stability. This analytical framework aims to uncover how these dynamics contribute to the fragility and political instability observed in the aforementioned regions. By understanding the moderating effects, the study seeks to clarify the conditions under which socioeconomic factors have the most significant impact on governance and stability.

Ultimately, this comparative study seeks to shed light on the complex interactions between economic, governance and social factors that shape the current state of fragility and political instability across different regions. By examining these elements, the study aims to inform policymakers and stakeholders about the multifaceted challenges facing these regions.

Results

Descriptive Analysis

The descriptive statistics for different parts of the world provide information on key socioeconomic and governance metrics. In Latin America, the average urban population is 64% of the total. Estimates for political stability, rule of law, and absence of terrorism and violence are all relatively low, at –0.569, –1.08, and –0.569, respectively. Control of corruption remains challenging, with an estimate of –0.808. Population density of the region is 129 persons per square kilometre, and the region receives moderate levels of foreign direct investment (FDI), averaging 2.33% of GDP. Health expenditure as a percentage of GDP is 5.51%, while youth literacy stands at 66.5%. Government effectiveness is rated at –0.703, although the government spends 5.35% of its budget on education. With a GDP growth rate of 2.84%, the economy is growing moderately, and the unemployment rate remains moderate at 4.34%.

The Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region has an urbanisation rate of 52%. The estimated scores for political instability and rule of law are –1.96 and –1.37, respectively, indicating more severe governance problems. Control of corruption is also lacking, with a score of –1.25. Average FDI inflow is 0.337% of GDP, while population density is low at 74.1 people per square kilometre. The region's youth literacy rate is low, at 13.1%, and health spending is low, at 2.94% of GDP. Government effectiveness, with a score of –1.28, points to further difficulties. The government spends 3.20% of its expenditure on education, and GDP growth averages only 1.33%, reflecting a sluggish pace of economic progress.

With 29.6% of the population in urban areas, South Asia has the lowest urbanisation rate and the most pronounced governance and stability challenges (rule of law: –1.22; political stability and absence of violence/terrorism; –2.23). Control of corruption is also poor at –1.13. FDI inflows, on the other hand, are stronger at 0.953% of GDP, and population density is high at 142 people per square kilometre. The region's adolescent literacy rate is high at 23.6%, while health spending accounts for 6.08% of GDP. Government effectiveness is rated at –1.01, and government spending on education stands at 6.95%. With an annual GDP growth rate of 4.34%, South Asia is one of the regions with stronger economic growth.

South Asia has stronger governance indicators compared to other regions, with 37.7% of its population living in urban areas. The estimate for political stability and absence of violence/terrorism is –1.19, while the estimate for rule of law is –0.907. A score of –0.865 indicates a fairly modest level of corruption control. Population density is high at 190 people per square kilometre, and FDI inflows account for 2.44% of GDP. Health spending represents 3.52% of GDP, and 20.8% of young people are literate. Government effectiveness is rated –0.645, while the share of government spending on education is 7.90%. Southeast Asia's GDP is growing at a solid pace of 6.33%.

Finally, with 35.6% of its population living in cities, sub-Saharan Africa faces significant governance challenges. The estimates for political stability and absence of violence or terrorism, and for rule of law, are –1.43 and –1.83, respectively. Control of corruption is also lacking, with an estimate of –1.18. Foreign direct investment inflows are modest at 1.39% of GDP, and population density is 51.7 people per square kilometre. Only 2.7% of GDP is spent on healthcare, and youth literacy stands at 7.8%. Governance efficiency is very low at –1.41, while 3.05% of government spending goes to education. The GDP growth rate in sub-Saharan Africa is 2.63%, although there is considerable variation across countries.

The Correlation Matrix for Socio-Economic and Governance Indicators Across Different Regions

A comprehensive correlation matrix assessing numerous socioeconomic and governance variables is presented bellow. For a large number of variables, the matrix includes Pearson's r and Spearman's rho coefficients, along with the corresponding p-values, indicating the direction and strength of the associations between them.

The first variable is urban population as a percentage of the total population. Its Pearson's r and Spearman's rho values are typically low and insignificant, indicating weak correlations with the other variables. In particular, with p-values above the traditional cut-off of 0.05, there is no statistically significant correlation between urban population and political stability, rule of law, or control of corruption.

The rule of law has stronger positive correlations with political stability and absence of violence/terrorism (Pearson's $r = 0.698$, $p < 0.001$), and with control of corruption (Pearson's $r = 0.766$, $p < 0.001$), and weaker negative correlations with urban population (Pearson's $r = -0.067$, $p = 0.217$). This suggests that higher levels of political stability and lower levels of corruption are closely linked to progress in the rule of law.

Strong positive correlations were found between political stability and the absence of violence/terrorism and both control of corruption (Pearson's $r = 0.899$, $p < 0.001$) and government effectiveness (Pearson's $r = 0.879$, $p < 0.001$). These robust correlations suggest that better governance and less corruption are strongly associated with higher levels of political stability and lower levels of violence.

While control of corruption has somewhat positive correlations with political stability and the absence of terrorism and violence, it also has a significant correlation with foreign direct investment (FDI), suggesting that reduced levels of corruption may promote increased foreign investment (Pearson's $r = 0.117$, $p = 0.030$).

The results reveal a positive correlation between FDI and a number of other variables, including GDP growth (Pearson's $r = 0.142$, $p = 0.008$) and literacy rates (Pearson's $r = 0.132$, $p = 0.014$). This suggests that increased investment inflows are associated with improved economic performance and higher levels of education.

A number of factors, such as GDP (Pearson's $r = 0.452$, $p < 0.001$) and rule of law (Pearson's $r = 0.496$, $p < 0.001$), show significant positive associations with population density. This suggests that areas with higher population density tend to have better governance practices and stronger economies.

Health expenditure is now somewhat positively associated with a number of measures, including government effectiveness and literacy rates. The relationships suggest that higher health spending is associated with better governance and educational performance.

Adolescent literacy rates have a strong positive correlation with most other variables, including GDP (Pearson's $r = 0.452$, $p < 0.001$) and government effectiveness (Pearson's $r = 0.587$, $p < 0.001$). This suggests that higher literacy rates are associated with better economic performance and governance.

The notion that effective governance is essential for reducing corruption and promoting political stability is supported by the high correlations between government effectiveness and political stability (Pearson's $r = 0.715$, $p < 0.001$) and control of corruption (Pearson's $r = 0.879$, $p < 0.001$).

Higher educational attainment and better governance may result from increased government spending on education, as evidenced by the positive relationships observed between education spending and variables such as school enrolment and literacy rates.

There are contrasting relationships between GDP levels and growth and other variables. While there is a limited correlation between GDP growth and foreign direct investment and control of corruption, there is a positive correlation between GDP levels and measures related to education, and a negative correlation with unemployment.

Primary and secondary school enrolment is strongly positively correlated with a number of socioeconomic measures, such as GDP and literacy rates, underscoring the role of education in economic development.

Finally, the complicated relationship between unemployment and other socioeconomic factors is reflected in the positive correlations that unemployment rates have with a variety of variables, albeit at different levels of significance.

Regression Analysis on Rule of Law

The ability of the model to predict the rule of law as an outcome variable is strongly explained by the model fit metrics (Table 1). The independent variables in the model account for 91.4% of the variance in the rule of law, according to the R-squared value of 0.914. This estimate is further improved by the adjusted R2 (0.903), which takes into account the number of predictors in the model. The model is statistically significant and fits the data well, as evidenced by the F-statistic of 79.5 and a p-value of less than 0.001.

Table 1

Model Fit Measures

				Overall Model Test			
Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	F	df1	df2	p
1	0.956	0.914	0.903	79.5	38	283	< 0.001

Source: calculated and compiled by the author.

The variables that contribute significantly to the prediction of the rule of law are highlighted by the omnibus ANOVA test (Table 2). Important predictors include GDP (current US dollars), government effectiveness, primary school enrolment, population density, urban population, control of corruption, and regional disparities (with p-values < 0.05). The factors that have the greatest impact on the rule of law are control of corruption ($F = 89.624$, $p < 0.001$), government effectiveness ($F = 82.462$, $p < 0.001$), and urban population ($F = 56.188$, $p < 0.001$). However, a number of other variables did not show a significant effect, including GDP growth ($p = 0.089$), total youth literacy rate ($p = 0.373$), unemployment ($p = 0.218$), and several others.

Table 2

Omnibus ANOVA Test

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
GDP growth (annual %)	0.1121	1	0.1121	2.912	0.089
GDP (current US$)	0.3286	1	0.3286	8.538	0.004
Literacy rate, youth total (% of people ages 15–24)	0.0306	1	0.0306	0.795	0.373
Unemployment, total (% of total labour force, national estimate)	0.0588	1	0.0588	1.527	0.218
Control of Corruption: Estimate	3.4492	1	3.4492	89.624	< 0.001
Current health expenditure (% of GDP)	0.2354	1	0.2354	6.116	0.014
Government Effectiveness: Estimate	3.1736	1	3.1736	82.462	< 0.001
Government expenditure on education, total (% of government expenditure)	0.0381	1	0.0381	0.990	0.321
School enrolment, primary (% gross)	0.5500	1	0.5500	14.292	< 0.001
Urban population (% of total population)	2.1624	1	2.1624	56.188	< 0.001
Foreign direct investment, net inflows (% of GDP)	0.0397	1	0.0397	1.030	0.311
Population density (people per sq. km of land area)	0.3115	1	0.3115	8.093	0.005
Region	1.7784	4	0.4446	11.553	< 0.001
Year	0.8619	22	0.0392	1.018	0.442
Residuals	10.8914	283	0.0385		
Note. Type 3 sum of squares					

Source: calculated and compiled by the author.

The model coefficients for the rule of law are presented in Table 3. The most robust positive correlations between the rule of law and governance indicators are found for government effectiveness and control of corruption, with standardised estimates of 0.4573 and 0.4496, respectively, both highly significant ($p < 0.001$). The rule of law is also significantly and negatively affected by urban population (estimate = –0.00889, $p < 0.001$), while GDP (current US dollars) significantly and positively predicts the rule of law (estimate = 3.99e-7, p = 0.004). On the other hand, there is a negative correlation between health expenditure as a percentage of GDP and the rule of law (estimate = –0.01056, p = 0.014). Comparing regions, the rule of law estimate is much higher in the Middle East and North Africa than in Latin America (estimate = 0.17818, $p < 0.001$). However, there is no statistically significant difference between South Asia, Southeast Asia, sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America.

Table 3

Model Coefficients — Rule of Law: Estimate

Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p	Stand. Estimate
Intercept [a]	0.13362	0.09597	1.392	0.165	
GDP growth (annual %)	–0.00281	0.00165	–1.706	0.089	–0.0336
GDP (current US$)	3.99e-7	1.37e-7	2.922	0.004	0.0806
Literacy rate, youth total (% of people ages 15–24)	3.10e-4	3.47e-4	0.892	0.373	0.0210
Unemployment, total (% of total labour force, national estimate)	0.00379	0.00307	1.236	0.218	0.0247
Control of Corruption: Estimate	0.57990	0.06126	9.467	< 0.001	0.4496
Current health expenditure (% of GDP)	–0.01056	0.00427	–2.473	0.014	-0.0591
Government Effectiveness: Estimate	0.42381	0.04667	9.081	< 0.001	0.4573
Government expenditure on education, total (% of government expenditure)	–0.00202	0.00203	–0.995	0.321	–0.0226
School enrolment, primary (% gross)	0.00120	3.18e-4	3.780	< 0.001	0.0910
Urban population (% of total population)	–0.00889	0.00119	–7.496	< 0.001	–0.2634
Foreign direct investment, net inflows (% of GDP)	0.00621	0.00612	1.015	0.311	0.0210
Population density (people per sq. km of land area)	4.99e-4	1.76e-4	2.845	0.005	0.0811
Region:					
Middle East and North Africa — Latin America	0.17818	0.04610	3.865	< 0.001	0.2831
South Asia — Latin America	–0.09825	0.06256	–1.571	0.117	–0.1561
Southeast Asia — Latin America	–0.08365	0.05726	–1.461	0.145	–0.1329
Sub-Saharan Africa — Latin America	–0.01392	0.06177	–0.225	0.822	–0.0221
Year:					
2000–2001	0.12226	0.08220	1.487	0.138	0.1943
2000–2002	–0.04437	0.07461	–0.595	0.552	–0.0705

End of table 3

Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p	Stand. Estimate
2000–2003	–0.07403	0.07513	–0.985	0.325	–0.1176
2000–2004	–0.03721	0.07511	–0.495	0.621	–0.0591
2000–2005	–0.02693	0.07500	–0.359	0.720	–0.0428
2000–2006	–0.06520	0.07515	–0.868	0.386	–0.1036
2000–2007	–0.11203	0.07613	–1.472	0.142	–0.1780
2000–2008	–0.12533	0.07594	–1.650	0.100	–0.1992
2000–2009	–0.07470	0.07543	–0.990	0.323	–0.1187
2000–2010	–0.03025	0.07592	–0.398	0.691	–0.0481
2000–2011	–0.09892	0.07592	–1.303	0.194	–0.1572
2000–2012	–0.12239	0.07673	–1.595	0.112	–0.1945
2000–2013	–0.10503	0.07673	–1.373	0.171	–0.1669
2000–2014	–0.00844	0.07789	–0.108	0.914	–0.0134
2000–2015	–0.01290	0.07753	–0.166	0.868	–0.0205
2000–2016	–0.09830	0.07663	–1.283	0.201	–0.1562
2000–2017	–0.08726	0.07832	–1.114	0.266	–0.1387
2000–2018	–0.07408	0.07803	–0.949	0.343	–0.1177
2000–2019	–0.03726	0.07901	–0.472	0.638	–0.0592
2000–2020	–0.02178	0.08225	–0.265	0.791	–0.0346
2000–2021	–0.03594	0.08062	–0.446	0.656	–0.0571
2000–2022	0.06373	0.07919	0.805	0.422	0.1013
[a] Represents reference level					

Source: calculated and compiled by the author.

Assumption Checks

No serious violations of the regression assumptions are detected by the diagnostic tests. Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) were used to measure multicollinearity. The results show that none of the predictors exhibit excessive collinearity, with VIF values ranging from 1.04 to 2.89. Furthermore, the Shapiro-Wilk test ($p = 0.183$) indicates that the residuals have an approximately normal distribution (Table 4).

Table 4

Collinearity Statistics

	VIF	Tolerance
GDP growth (annual %)	1.13	0.883
GDP (current US$)	1.59	0.631
Literacy rate, youth total (% of people ages 15–24)	1.35	0.739
Unemployment, total (% of total labour force, national estimate)	1.15	0.870
Control of Corruption: Estimate	2.73	0.366
Current health expenditure (% of GDP)	1.37	0.728
Government Effectiveness: Estimate	2.89	0.346
Government expenditure on education, total (% of government expenditure)	1.31	0.766

End of table 4

	VIF	Tolerance
School enrolment, primary (% gross)	1.38	0.722
Urban population (% of total population)	2.02	0.495
Foreign direct investment, net inflows (% of GDP)	1.19	0.843
Population density (people per sq. km of land area)	1.64	0.610
Region	1.36	0.736
Year	1.04	0.963
Normality Test (Shapiro-Wilk)		
Statistic	**p**	
0.994	0.183	

Source: calculated and compiled by the author.

In a nutshell, the model presents important predictors of the rule of law. Variables related to governance, such as government effectiveness and control of corruption, have the largest effects, but other important variables include urbanisation and health spending. Regional differences further highlight how the effects of these predictors vary across situations.

Regression Analysis on Political Stability and Absence of Violence or Terrorism

The results of the linear regression analysis indicate a good model fit, as presented in Table 5. With an adjusted R^2 of 0.816 and an overall model test result of 0.837, the independent variables in the model can account for approximately 83.7% of the variance in the dependent variable. With a p-value of less than 0.001 and an F-statistic of 38.4, with degrees of freedom (df1 = 38, df2 = 283), the model appears to be statistically significant and to fit the data well.

Table 5

Model Fit Measures

				Overall Model Test			
Model	**R**	**R^2**	**Adjusted R^2**	**F**	**df1**	**df2**	**p**
1	0.915	0.837	0.816	38.4	38	283	< 0.001

Source: calculated and compiled by the author.

The results of the omnibus ANOVA test, as presented in Table 6, indicate that the relevance of the different predictors varies. With p-values less than 0.05, it is noteworthy that the estimates for population density, government effectiveness, government expenditure on education, GDP (current US dollars), and primary enrolment as a percentage of gross enrolment are all significant. In contrast, p-values above 0.1 indicate that the following variables are not statistically significant predictors in this model: unemployment, literacy rate, foreign direct investment, urban population, and current health expenditure. While the year variable does not show significant results (p = 0.287), the region variable does (p < 0.001). With a mean square of 0.17454, the residual sum of squares is 49.39549.

Table 6

Omnibus ANOVA Test

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Urban population (% of total population)	0.10569	1	0.10569	0.6055	0.437
Control of Corruption: Estimate	4.56698	1	4.56698	26.1655	< 0.001
Foreign direct investment, net inflows (% of GDP)	0.43244	1	0.43244	2.4776	0.117
Population density (people per sq. km of land area)	3.18010	1	3.18010	18.2196	< 0.001
Current health expenditure (% of GDP)	0.00350	1	0.00350	0.0201	0.887
Literacy rate, youth total (% of people ages 15–24)	0.00847	1	0.00847	0.0485	0.826
Government Effectiveness: Estimate	4.70493	1	4.70493	26.9558	< 0.001
Government expenditure on education, total (% of government expenditure)	1.56088	1	1.56088	8.9427	0.003
GDP growth (annual %)	0.13709	1	0.13709	0.7854	0.376
GDP (current US$)	1.68395	1	1.68395	9.6478	0.002
School enrolment, primary (% gross)	1.74566	1	1.74566	10.0014	0.002
Unemployment, total (% of total labour force, national estimate)	0.03639	1	0.03639	0.2085	0.648
Region	22.38209	4	5.59552	32.0583	< 0.001
Year	4.44257	22	0.20193	1.1569	0.287
Residuals	49.39549	283	0.17454		
Note. Type 3 sum of squares					

Source: calculated and compiled by the author.

The coefficients of the predictors, as presented in Table 7 show, that there are different effects on political stability and the absence of violence or terrorism. With a significant p-value of 0.001, the predicted intercept is 0.66409. Significant predictors include government effectiveness (β = 0.51602, p < 0.001), control of corruption (β= 0.66728, p < 0.001), population density (β = –0.00160, p < 0.001), government expenditure on education (β = 0.01296, p < 0.003), GDP (current US dollars) (β = –9.04e-7, p < 0.002), and school enrolment (β = 0.00214, p = 0.002). Region-specific variables have significant coefficients with varying consequences, particularly when compared to Latin America. The year variables show varying degrees of significance, with some years having a notable impact on political stability.

Table 7

Model Coefficients — Political Stability and Absence of Violence or Terrorism: Estimate

Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p	Stand. Estimate
Intercept [a]	0.66409	0.20437	3.249	0.001	
Urban population (% of total population)	–0.00196	0.00253	–0.778	0.437	–0.03766
Control of Corruption: Estimate	0.66728	0.13045	5.115	< 0.001	0.33461
Foreign direct investment, net inflows (% of GDP)	0.02050	0.01302	1.574	0.117	0.04474
Population density (people per sq. km of land area)	–0.00160	3.74e-4	–4.268	< 0.001	–0.16769
Current health expenditure (% of GDP)	–0.00129	0.00909	–0.142	0.887	–0.00466
Literacy rate, youth total (% of people ages 15–24)	–1.63e–4	7.40e-4	–0.220	0.826	–0.00715
Government Effectiveness: Estimate	0.51602	0.09939	5.192	< 0.001	0.36010
Government expenditure on education, total (% of government expenditure)	0.01296	0.00433	2.990	0.003	0.09358
GDP growth (annual %)	0.00311	0.00351	0.886	0.376	0.02405
GDP (current US$)	–9.04e-7	2.91e-7	–3.106	0.002	–0.11799
School enrolment, primary (% gross)	0.00214	6.78e-4	3.162	0.002	0.10490
Unemployment, total (% of total labour force) (national estimate)	0.00298	0.00653	0.457	0.648	0.01258
Region:					
Middle East and North Africa — Latin America	–0.74965	0.09817	–7.636	< 0.001	–0.77038
South Asia — Latin America	–1.24332	0.13323	–9.332	< 0.001	–1.27770
Southeast Asia — Latin America	–0.52465	0.12194	–4.302	< 0.001	–0.53916
Sub-Saharan Africa — Latin America	–0.57325	0.13155	–4.358	< 0.001	–0.58910
Year:					
2000–2001	–0.07189	0.17506	–0.411	0.682	–0.07388
2000–2002	–0.01889	0.15889	–0.119	0.905	–0.01941
2000–2003	–0.20043	0.16001	–1.253	0.211	–0.20597
2000–2004	–0.30761	0.15995	–1.923	0.055	–0.31612
2000–2005	–0.21853	0.15972	–1.368	0.172	–0.22458
2000–2006	–0.30386	0.16003	–1.899	0.059	–0.31226
2000–2007	–0.42418	0.16213	–2.616	0.009	–0.43591
2000–2008	–0.42172	0.16171	–2.608	0.010	–0.43338
2000–2009	–0.42138	0.16063	–2.623	0.009	–0.43303
2000–2010	–0.34574	0.16169	–2.138	0.033	–0.35530
2000–2011	–0.33430	0.16168	–2.068	0.040	–0.34354
2000–2012	–0.25063	0.16340	–1.534	0.126	–0.25756
2000–2013	–0.31552	0.16287	–1.937	0.054	–0.32425
2000–2014	–0.34370	0.16588	–2.072	0.039	–0.35320
2000–2015	–0.33462	0.16511	–2.027	0.044	–0.34388

End of table 7

Predictor	Estimate	SE	t	p	Stand. Estimate
2000–2016	–0.32957	0.16318	–2.020	0.044	–0.33869
2000–2017	–0.36527	0.16679	–2.190	0.029	–0.37537
2000–2018	–0.33932	0.16618	–2.042	0.042	–0.34870
2000–2019	–0.22111	0.16827	–1.314	0.190	–0.22722
2000–2020	–0.06867	0.17517	–0.392	0.695	–0.07057
2000–2021	–0.12303	0.17168	–0.717	0.474	–0.12643
2000–2022	–0.17656	0.16864	–1.047	0.296	–0.18145
[a] **Represents reference level**					

Cook's Distance			**Range**	
Mean	**Median**	**SD**	**Min**	
0.00376	0.00105	0.00717	8.16e-9	0.0698

Source: calculated and compiled by the author.

According to Cook's distance data, the standard deviation is 0.00717 and the mean distance is 0.00376. The range of Cook's distance values, from 8.16e-9 to 0.0698, indicates that no data point significantly affects the regression model (Table 8).

Table 8

Assumption Checks

Collinearity Statistics	VIF	Tolerance
Urban population (% of total population)	2.02	0.495
Control of Corruption: Estimate	2.73	0.366
Foreign direct investment, net inflows (% of GDP)	1.19	0.843
Population density (people per sq. km of land area)	1.64	0.610
Current health expenditure (% of GDP)	1.37	0.728
Literacy rate, youth total (% of people ages 15–24)	1.35	0.739
Government Effectiveness: Estimate	2.89	0.346
Government expenditure on education, total (% of government expenditure)	1.31	0.766
GDP growth (annual %)	1.13	0.883
GDP (current US$)	1.59	0.631
School enrolment, primary (% gross)	1.38	0.722
Unemployment, total (% of total labour force, national estimate)	1.15	0.870
Region	1.36	0.736
Year	1.04	0.963

Source: calculated and compiled by the author.

Mediation Analysis of Unemployment on Political Stability through Government Effectiveness

Using government effectiveness as a mediator, the results in Table 9 show that there is a full mediation effect. With an estimate of 0.04239 (SE = 0.00929, Z = 4.562, $p < 0.001$), the indirect effect of unemployment on political stability through government effectiveness (denoted by the product of paths a and b) is substantial. This indirect effect, which accounts for about 84.2% of the total effect, highlights the fact that government effectiveness plays a significant role in the impact of unemployment on political stability. This emphasises the importance of government effectiveness in determining the course of political stability.

On the other hand, with an estimate of 0.00795 (SE = 0.00961, Z = 0.827, p = 0.408), the direct effect (c) of unemployment on political stability is not significant, regardless of government effectiveness. This direct effect accounts for only 15.8% of the total effect. Combining the direct and mediated effects, the total effect of unemployment on political stability is substantial, with an estimate of 0.05035 (SE = 0.01291, Z = 3.899, $p < 0.001$). This suggests that the relationship between political stability and unemployment is primarily indirect, mediated by government effectiveness.

Table 9

Mediation Estimates

Effect	Label	Estimate	SE	Z	p	% Mediation
Indirect	a × b	0.04239	0.00929	4.562	< 0.001	84.2
Direct	c	0.00795	0.00961	0.827	0.408	15.8
Total	c + a × b	0.05035	0.01291	0.827	< 0.001	100.0

Source: calculated and compiled by the author.

The full mediation finding is supported by additional examination of the path estimates. Government effectiveness is significantly affected by unemployment (path a), with an estimate of 0.04217 (SE = 0.00892, Z = 4.729, $p < 0.001$). This implies that lower levels of government effectiveness are associated with higher unemployment rates. With an estimate of 1.00529 (SE = 0.05809, Z = 17.306, $p < 0.001$), government effectiveness in turn has a large and highly significant impact on political stability and the absence of violence or terrorism (path b). This suggests that increased political stability and increased government effectiveness are closely related.

It is further evidence that government effectiveness fully mediates the relationship between political stability and unemployment, as the direct path (path c) from unemployment to political stability is not statistically significant (Table 10).

Table 10

Path Estimates

			Label	Estimate	SE	Z	p
Unemployment, total (% of total labour force, national estimate)	→	Government Effectiveness: Estimate	a	0.04217	0.00892	4.729	< 0.001
Government Effectiveness: Estimate	→	Political Stability and Absence of Violence/ Terrorism: Estimate	b	1.00529	0.05809	17.306	< 0.001
Unemployment, total (% of total labour force, national estimate)	→	Political Stability and Absence of Violence/ Terrorism: Estimate	c	0.00795	0.00961	0.827	0.408

Source: calculated and compiled by the author.

Discussion

The descriptive statistics provide essential insights into socioeconomic and governance conditions across regions, highlighting disparities in urbanisation, governance quality, economic growth and investment flows. The quality of governance is a critical determinant of development outcomes, particularly evident in the contrasting scenarios across regions. For example, Latin America exhibits moderate economic growth (2.84%) and urbanisation (64%), but faces significant governance challenges, including low political stability (–0.569), weak rule of law (–1.08) and poor control of corruption (–0.808). These findings are consistent with Mallett and Slater (2012), who highlight the persistent governance challenges that hinder sustainable development despite economic progress.

In the Middle East and North Africa (MENA), governance challenges are more pronounced, as reflected in deep political instability (–1.96), weak rule of law (–1.37) and high levels of corruption (–1.25). This is consistent with the findings of Saleh and Fouad (2022), who highlight how poor governance undermines economic performance, as evidenced by sluggish economic growth (1.33%) and low foreign direct investment (FDI) inflows (0.337% of GDP). The region's low youth literacy rate (13.1%) further exacerbates these socioeconomic challenges and stifles potential human capital development.

In contrast, South Asia shows stronger economic growth (4.34%) despite severe governance problems, including political instability (–2.23) and poor control of corruption (–1.13). The mediation analysis shows that government effectiveness plays a crucial role in the relationship between unemployment and political stability, with a full mediation effect identified (estimate = 0.04239, $p < 0.001$). This indicates that improvements in government effectiveness can mitigate the negative impact of unemployment on political stability, suggesting that targeted governance reforms are essential for promoting stability. Improvements in literacy rates (23.6%) signal promise for future development, supporting the idea that education can be a lever for socioeconomic advancement.

Southeast Asia presents a more balanced picture, with robust GDP growth (6.33%) and moderate urbanisation (37.7%). While political stability (–1.19) and the rule of law (–0.907) are concerns, the region's better control of corruption (–0.865) and governance effectiveness (–0.645) compared to MENA highlights the effectiveness of governance reforms in driving economic growth. High FDI inflows (2.44% of GDP) and significant government spending on education (7.9%) underscore a development model that prioritises governance and human capital development, consistent with the findings of Yildiz et al. (2023).

Finally, sub-Saharan Africa faces serious governance challenges, particularly in political stability (–1.43), rule of law (–1.83) and control of corruption (–1.18). Despite modest economic growth (2.63%) and FDI inflows (1.39% of GDP), low health spending (2.7% of GDP) and youth literacy (7.8%) pose significant obstacles to long-term development. Governance inefficiency (–1.41) exacerbates these problems, echoing the conclusions of Justino (2017) on the interplay between governance deficits and socioeconomic stagnation.

The correlation matrix highlights the central role of governance indicators such as rule of law, political stability and control of corruption in shaping socioeconomic outcomes. The strong positive correlations between rule of law and political stability ($r = 0.698$, $p < 0.001$), and between control of corruption ($r = 0.766$, $p < 0.001$) and rule of law, reinforce the notion that better governance is closely associated with increased political stability and reduced violence. In particular, the mediation analysis shows that government effectiveness fully mediates the relationship between unemployment and political stability, confirming that improving governance can mitigate the negative effects of unemployment on stability. This relationship is critical for fostering a conducive environment for economic activity, especially in regions such as Latin America and MENA where governance challenges are prevalent.

Corruption control shows strong positive associations with political stability ($r = 0.899$, $p < 0.001$) and government effectiveness ($r = 0.879$, $p < 0.001$), confirming that effective governance mechanisms are essential for mitigating corruption and fostering a stable political environment. Moreover, the positive relationship between corruption control and FDI inflows ($r = 0.117$, $p = 0.030$) underscores the need to reduce corruption in order to attract foreign investment — a finding that is particularly relevant for regions such as sub-Saharan Africa, where poor governance deters potential investors.

GDP growth is also significantly correlated with FDI inflows ($r = 0.142$, $p = 0.008$) and literacy rates ($r = 0.132$, $p = 0.014$), suggesting that human capital development and investment inflows are key drivers of economic growth. These findings are consistent with the experience of Southeast and South Asia, where investments in education and improved governance have facilitated stronger economic performance.

Regression analysis shows that the model predicting rule of law explains a substantial amount of the variance ($R^2 = 0.914$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.903$). Key predictors include control of corruption ($F = 89.624$, $p < 0.001$), government effectiveness ($F = 82.462$, $p < 0.001$), and urban population ($F = 56.188$, $p < 0.001$). These findings are consistent with the literature on the critical role of effective governance and anti-corruption policies in promoting rule of law, and confirm the importance of contextualised governance strategies. The negative correlation between urban population and the rule of law suggests that urbanisation without adequate governance structures can exacerbate challenges related to crime, inequality and political instability.

Regional differences in rule of law estimates suggest that MENA faces significantly greater governance challenges than Latin America (estimate = 0.17818, $p < 0.001$). In contrast, no significant differences were observed between South Asia, Southeast Asia, sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America. This finding underscores the complexity of governance issues across regions and suggests that solutions must be context-specific — a notion supported by previous studies such as Agborsangaya-Fiteu[1].

The regression analysis also shows that the model predicting political stability and the absence of violence or terrorism accounts for an impressive 83.7% of the variance, with an adjusted R^2 of 0.816. This strong explanatory power underscores the importance of several key variables: population density, government effectiveness, education spending, GDP and primary school enrolment. Together, these factors create a stable political environment in which economic opportunity and access to education can effectively reduce social unrest and violence. These findings are consistent with the discussions presented in the introduction, which emphasised the critical links between governance and stability. The analysis suggests that a well-governed society, characterised by high levels of education and effective government, fosters an environment conducive to peace and stability.

Interestingly, the study also found that unemployment, foreign direct investment (FDI) and urban population did not serve as significant predictors of political stability. This observation suggests that while economic factors are undoubtedly important, they are not sufficient on their own. Instead, a robust governance framework is essential to support these economic variables and promote lasting political stability. Thus, policymakers should focus not only on economic development but also on improving governance structures to create a more resilient political landscape.

Gaps Covered by This Study

While the existing literature provides a foundation for understanding the relationship between governance and socioeconomic factors, several gaps remain that this study addresses. First, many previous studies tend to generalise findings

[1] Governance, Fragility, and Conflict: Reviewing International governance Reform Experiences in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Countries. *World Bank Group*. URL: https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/entities/publication/56afb22d-cdb1-59e0-81e4-fa7ef090a4ab (accessed 27 December 2025).

across regions without adequately considering local contexts. This study shows how governance effectiveness varies significantly depending on specific socioeconomic and cultural conditions, providing a nuanced perspective that can inform targeted policy interventions. Second, although previous research has examined the impact of governance on economic growth, fewer studies have integrated the critical role of health and education in this relationship. By highlighting these sectors, this study contributes to a more holistic understanding of socioeconomic development in fragile states.

Policy Implications and Recommendations

The findings of this study underscore the critical need for targeted policy interventions that address the intertwined challenges of governance and socioeconomic development, particularly in fragile and conflict-affected regions. To foster political stability and economic growth, it is essential to improve the effectiveness of governance by implementing robust anti-corruption measures, strengthening the rule of law, and ensuring greater accountability within institutions. Policymakers should prioritise the establishment of transparent governance frameworks that facilitate citizen engagement and trust, as these elements are critical for sustainable development.

Investing in education and health is critical to improving socioeconomic outcomes in fragile states. Given the important role these sectors play in human capital development, governments should allocate more resources to education systems and ensure access to quality education at all levels. This investment will not only improve literacy rates but also empower individuals to make positive contributions to their communities and economies. Similarly, health spending must be prioritised to build resilient health systems capable of addressing the specific needs of vulnerable populations. Policies that encourage public-private partnerships in health and education can also improve service delivery and efficiency.

It is also important to recognise the evolving role of new state actors in governance. Policymakers should engage with these actors, including non-governmental and community-based organisations, to leverage their expertise and resources in promoting good governance practices. Collaborative approaches that foster multi-stakeholder partnerships can strengthen local governance capacities and improve service delivery in conflict-affected areas.

To attract foreign direct investment (FDI) and stimulate economic growth, governance reforms must be complemented by policies that create a favourable business environment. This includes simplifying the regulatory framework, strengthening property rights, and reducing barriers to entry for investors.

Conclusion

This study provides a comprehensive analysis of the intricate relationships between governance indicators, socioeconomic factors and their collective impact on political stability and economic development in different regions of the world. By focusing on fragile and conflict-affected states, this research underscores the urgent need to address the multiple challenges facing these regions, particularly with regard to the effectiveness of governance, the control of corruption, and the provision of basic services such as education and health care.

The results show that the quality of governance is an important determinant of socioeconomic outcomes, affecting both economic performance and literacy rates. Regions characterised by political instability and weak governance, such as sub-Saharan Africa and parts of the MENA region, demonstrate the detrimental effects of governance deficits on overall development. In contrast, areas with stronger governance frameworks, such as Southeast Asia, show positive correlations between effective governance, investment flows and human capital development. This underscores the critical importance of context-specific approaches to governance reform, recognising that solutions must be tailored to the unique socioeconomic and cultural conditions of each region.

The study also highlights the critical role that health and education play in improving governance outcomes and promoting long-term stability. By integrating these sectors into the governance discourse, this research contributes to a more holistic understanding of socioeconomic development. The focus on new state actors further enriches the analysis, illustrating the evolving landscape of governance in which non-governmental organisations and community-based actors play a crucial role in promoting accountability and effective service delivery.

In light of these findings, the study calls for targeted policy interventions aimed at strengthening governance frameworks, investing in human capital, and fostering collaborative partnerships across sectors. By addressing the linkages between governance, socioeconomic factors and political stability, policymakers can lay the foundation for sustainable development and resilience in fragile contexts.

Limitations and Future Study Recommendations

While this study provides valuable insights, it is not without limitations. A primary limitation is the reliance on secondary data sources, which may not capture the full complexity of governance and socioeconomic dynamics in each context. Future research could benefit from using primary data collection methods, such as interviews and surveys, to gain deeper qualitative insights into the experiences of individuals and communities affected by governance challenges. In addition, the study's focus on specific countries in some regions may limit the generalisability of its findings. Future research could broaden the scope to include comparative analyses across more diverse countries and regions, or examine specific countries within these contexts to identify unique patterns and solutions. This broader approach would allow for a richer understanding of the interplay between governance and socioeconomic factors in different cultural and political landscapes.

Another avenue for future research could be longitudinal studies that track changes in governance indicators and socioeconomic outcomes over time. Such studies would provide valuable insights into the long-term effects of governance reforms and their potential to promote stability and development. Finally, there is a need to further explore the role of new state actors, such as international organisations and civil society groups, in governance and development. Examining their influence and effectiveness in promoting good governance practices could provide critical insights into the evolving governance landscape, particularly in fragile states.

REFERENCES

Andrijevic M., Crespo Cuaresma J., Muttarak R. & Schleussner C.F. 2020. Governance in Socioeconomic Pathways and Its Role for Future Adaptive Capacity. *Nature Sustainability.* 3 (1). P. 35–41. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0405-0

Ball N. 2005. Strengthening Democratic Governance of the Security Sector in Conflict–Affected Countries. *Public Administration and Development: The International Journal of Management Research and Practice.* 25 (1). P. 25–38. https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.345

Banik B., Roy C.K. and Hossain R. 2023. Healthcare Expenditure, Good Governance and Human Development. *EconomiA.* 24 (1). P. 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1108/ECON-06-2022-0072

Dalyop G.T. 2019. Political Instability and Economic Growth in Africa. *International Journal of Economic Policy Studies.* 13 (1). P. 217–257. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42495-018-0008-1

Fagbemi F., Nzeribe G.E., Osinubi T.T. & Asongu S. 2021. Interconnections Between Governance and Socioeconomic Conditions: Understanding the Challenges in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Regional Sustainability.* 2 (4). P. 337–348. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.regsus.2022.01.004

Ganson B., Wennmann A. 2015. Business and Conflict in Fragile States. *Adelphi Series.* 55 (475–458). P. 11–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/19445571.2015.1189153

Jamil Shah M., Mehmood T. & Hayat A. 2019. Governance, Economic Growth and Socioeconomic Development in Pakistan. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences: Proceedings.* 8 (4). P. 20.

Justino P. 2017. *Governance Interventions in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Countries.* Brighton: The Institute of Development Studies. 32 p.

Levitt R.E., Henisz W., Scott W.R. & Settel D. 2010. Governance Challenges of Infrastructure Delivery: The Case for Socio-Economic Governance Approaches. *Construction Research Congress 2010: Innovation for Reshaping Construction Practice.* P. 757–767. https://doi.org/10.1061/41109(373)76

Mallett R., Slater R. 2012. *Growth and Livelihoods in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations.* London: Overseas Development Institute. 120 p.

Ojo P.O., Aworawo F. & Elizabeth I. 2014. Governance and the Challenge of Socio-Economic Development in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development Law and Policy (The)*. 3 (1). P. 132–148.

Pigozzi M.J., Carrol B., Hayden J. & Ndaruhutse S. 2014. Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations. *Learning and Education in Developing Countries: Research and Policy for the Post-2015 UN Development Goals.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan US. 162 p.

Rizvi S.M.A.R. 2022. *Three Essays on Conflict and Economic Performance in Fragile Countries.* Clermont-Ferrand: Université Clermont Auvergne. 234 p.

Saleh S., Fouad F.M. 2022. Political Economy of Health in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Regions in the Middle East and North Africa Region. *Journal of Global Health*. Vol. 12. https://doi.org/10.7189/jogh.12.01003

Taylor S.A.J. 2014. Fragile and Conflict-Affected States: Exploring the Relationship Between Governance, Instability and Violence. *Stability: International Journal of Security and Development*. 3 (1). https://doi.org/10.5334/sta.dy

Woolcock M. 2014. *Engaging with Fragile and Conflict-Affected States*. Cambridge: Center for International Development at Harvard University. 19 p.

Yildiz B.F., Alola A.A. & Wong W.K. 2023. Socioeconomic Development Aspects of Democratic Governance Across Selected Countries. *Democracy and Security*. 21 (4). P. 376–391. https://doi.org/10.1080/17419166.2023.2178422

Zoellick R.B. 2008. Fragile States: Securing Development. *Survival*. 50 (6). P. 67–84. https://doi.org/10.1080/00396330802601859

Международный бизнес. 2025. 4 (14). С. 23–47
УДК 338.1:342.5
https://doi.org/10.24833/2949-639X-2025-4-14-23-47

Поступила в редакцию 20.12.2025
Принята к публикации 28.12.2025

УКРЕПЛЕНИЕ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОГО УПРАВЛЕНИЯ КАК ФАКТОР УСТОЙЧИВОГО ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКОГО РАЗВИТИЯ: СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ ГОСУДАРСТВ С ВЫСОКОЙ СТЕПЕНЬЮ УЯЗВИМОСТИ

Трайсон Янгайло
PhD, независимый исследователь, Лусака, Замбия, ytryson@yahoo.com, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0690-9747

Аннотация. В настоящем исследовании анализируются сложные взаимосвязи между социально-экономическими показателями и индикаторами качества государственного управления (в частности, политической стабильностью, верховенством права и контролем над коррупцией) в различных регионах мира с акцентом на уязвимые экономики и государства, затронутые конфликтами. На основе количественного анализа данных Всемирного банка автором проводится комплексное исследование взаимосвязи между управлением и социально-экономическим развитием, что позволяет выявить ключевые закономерности и тенденции. Результаты показывают, что высокое качество государственного управления способствует значительному повышению экономических показателей и уровня грамотности. При этом наиболее выраженные различия наблюдается в таких регионах, как Африка к югу от Сахары, а также Ближний Восток и Северная Африка.

В данных регионах системные недостатки государственного управления, проявляющиеся в политической нестабильности и слабости верховенства права, усугубляют социально-экономические проблемы, что приводит к низким объемам прямых иностранных инвестиций и ограниченному доступу населения к образованию и здравоохранению. Напротив, регионы с более стабильными системами государственного управления, например Юго-Восточная Азия, демонстрируют более высокие социально-экономические показатели, что выражается в росте уровня грамотности и экономического развития. В исследовании также подчеркивается ключевая роль здравоохранения и образования. Продемонстрировано, что инвестиции в данные секторы способны усиливать положительные эффекты надлежащего управления и тем самым способствовать долгосрочному экономическому росту. Результаты медиационного анализа показывают, что эффективность государственного управления полностью опосредует связь между безработицей и политической стабильностью, что свидетельствует о косвенном характере данного влияния.

Ключевые слова: государственное управление, социально-экономическое развитие, политическая стабильность, уязвимые экономики и государства, затронутые конфликтами

Для цитирования: Янгайло Т. Укрепление государственного управления как фактор устойчивого экономического развития: сравнительный анализ государств с высокой степенью уязвимости. *Международный бизнес*. 2025. 4 (14). С. 23–47. https://doi.org/10.24833/2949-639X-2025-4-14-23-47

Конфликт интересов: автор заявляет об отсутствии конфликта интересов.