

# Governance and Human Development: A Cross-Country Analysis of Southern Africa

Elvis Munyaradzi Ganyaupfu

Maxima Research Analytics; South Africa

E-mail of corresponding author: elvisganyaupfu@gmail.com

## ABSTRACT

*This study empirically analysed the influence of governance quality on human development in Southern Africa using a set of cross country panel data from 11 countries during 2005–2012. The methodological approach applied followed the Breusch-Pagan Lagrangian Multiplier test and Hausman test procedures. Based on the Random Effects (RE) model, empirical results reveal that only political stability; and voice and accountability from the six indicators of governance demonstrate statistically significant positive impacts on human development; with political stability indicating a more pronounced significant impact on human development in the region. The estimated R-squared shows that nearly 25.97 percent total variation in development was accounted for by political stability and voice and accountability. The Wald chi2 (2) statistic (=29.75;  $p < 0.05$ ) reveals significance of the model; while the interclass correlation value indicates that approximately 97.65 percent of the variance was due to differences across panels.*

**KEYWORDS:** governance quality, human development, political stability, voice and accountability

## INTRODUCTION

Human beings are the real wealth of a nation other than just being the beneficiaries of economic and social progress (Human Development Report, 1990). With the sustained existence of malfunctioning of most governments across the globe remaining a widespread turmoil, absence of good governance systems substantially poses serious detrimental socioeconomic consequences on the welfare and development of ordinary citizens (Adsera, Boix & Payne, 2000). According to Akpan & Effiong (2012), good governance is an important instrument for poverty eradication. Virtually, improved governance systems strongly enhance the quality of human life through poverty eradication, reliable and affordable health care and access to sound education. Generally, governance comprises of institutional mechanisms through which political and administrative authority is exercised in managing the country's economic, social and political

affairs; thus determining the processes through which citizens exercise their rights.

Dodgson, Lee & Drager (2002) regard governance as a process that broadly concerns socially approved means and actions that promote mutual participation in pursuit of common goals. According to the World Bank (2013), governance consist of of traditions and institutions by which authority in a country is exercised with regards to the process by which governments are selected, monitored and replaced; the capacity of the government to effectively formulate and implement sound policies; and the respect of citizens and the state for the institutions that govern economic and social interactions among them. Previous studies that have examined the effect of governance on development provide evidence that the quality of governance indeed influences development. Such studies include Mauro (1995), Hall & Jones (1997), Knack & Keefer (1995), Kaufman, Kraay & Zoido-Lobaton (1999a), Rodrik, Subramanian & Trebbia (2004), Meon & Weill (2005), Acemoglu & Johnson (2005), Barro (2007), Akpan & Effiong (2012) and Baek & Oh (2013). While other studies have used diverse variables as development indicators, this study uses changes in the quality of human life as the ideal indicator of development.

The objective of this study was to analyse the impact of governance quality on human development in Southern Africa. The paper proceeds as follows: Section 2 reviews literature

on governance and development. Section 3 specifies the methodology and estimation procedure; while Section 4 presents and discusses the findings. Section 5 provides conclusion and policy implications.

## 1. LITERATURE REVIEW

The concept of governance recently emerges to dominate the center stage in the realm of public policy debates on human development (Vadlamannati, 2008). Following Adsera, Boix & Payne (2000), although substantial constitutional mechanisms have been adopted to make public officials accountable to citizens, the sustained existence of malfunctioning governing institutions has generated detrimental socioeconomic effects on the welfare of citizens. From a governance perspective, the ways in which governance and administration are practiced in a country directly translate into the quality of human lives. Mauro (1995), Easterly & Levine (1997) and Kaufman, Kraay & Zoido-Lobaton (1999b) indicate that countries within which governments can be held accountable for their actions provide evidence that good governance is an effective instrument for enhancing human welfare. Borrowing from Barro (2007), Tridico (2007) highlights that improved human life generates a better skilled and productive labour force that further enhances economic growth.

Following Kaufmann, Kraay & Mastruzzi (2010), the quality of governance is best measured based on six indicators; namely Political Stability, Voice and Accountability, Government Effectiveness, Regulatory Quality, Rule of Law and Control of Corruption. The ranking of these indicators follows a normal distribution of scores ranging between -2.5 to +2.5; with high scores reflecting better quality of governance and vice versa. Succeeding Kaufmann et al (1999a), the first dimension of governance comprises of two indicators; namely political stability; and voice and accountability. In broad terms, the respective two indicators measure the processes through which governments are selected, monitored and replaced. Individually, the political stability and absence of violence measures the perceived likelihood of destabilizing the government through unconstitutional violent actions; while voice and accountability estimates the extent to which a country's citizens participate in the selection of government, exercise freedom of expression, association and press. Findings from the study by Tridico (2007) indicate that voice and accountability has a substantial effect on human development; while political stability remains insignificant. From an economic development perspective based on income per capita, Akpan & Effiong (2012) find political stability as having a significant and positive effect on development sub-Saharan Africa. As

such, it can be inferred that political stability and absence of violence are necessary conditions for stimulating economic development.

Proceeding further, the second dimension of governance captures government effectiveness; and regulatory quality. This dimension measures the capacity of government to effectively formulate and implement sound policies. Discretely, government effectiveness reflects the quality of public services, the quality of civil service and the degree of government independence from political pressures; as well as credibility of government's commitment. Regulatory quality reflects the perceptions of the ability of the government to formulate and implement sound policies and regulations that are conducive to private sector development. While Tridico (2007) finds regulatory quality as having no significant impact on human development, government effectiveness, however demonstrates a statistically significant positive effect on human development; indicating an efficient provision of social infrastructure public goods and services such as road networks, safe and clean water, energy and power supply, education and health facilities. Using the per capita income as a development indicator, Akpan & Effiong (2012) find that regulatory quality has a significant positive impact on development; signifying that the adoption of non-distortionary policies stimulate business confidence; market competition and sustainable development.

The last dimension of governance comprises of two indicators; namely the rule of law and control of corruption. These indicators collectively measure the respect for citizens and state of the institutions that govern citizens' economic and social interactions. While the rule of law reflects the extent to which agents have confidence in and abide by the rules of the society, the quality of contract enforcement, property rights, the police, the courts as well as the possibility of crime and violence; control of corruption measures the extent to which public power is exercised for private gain, including petty and grand corruption, as well as the state by elites and private interests. Based on the empirical findings by Tridico (2007) on emerging economies, both the rule of law and the regulatory quality have no significant effects on human development. The results suggest that the respective two indicators of governance were perceived to be weak to the extent that they are not significant enough to enhance human development. Measuring development based on the income per capita, Akpan & Effiong (2012) find control of corruption as having no significant positive effect on development; while the rule of law demonstrates a statistically significant and positive impact on development. From a governance perspective, these results signify that respecting and abiding by the rule of law is an effective instrument towards achieving economic development. Based on the recent literature,

efforts to enhance development through improvement of governance quality should observe all the governance indicators as complements to each other rather than as substitutes (Campos & Nugent, 1999).

## 2. ECONOMETRIC METHODOLOGY

### 3.1 Data

The study uses cross-country panel data on human development and governance indicators for a set of 11 countries in Southern Africa during the period 2005-2012. Data on countries' human development indices was collected from the UNDP's Human Development Report 2013 online database. Similarly, the data on political stability; voice and accountability; government effectiveness, regulatory quality; rule of law and control of corruption was obtained from the World Bank's Worldwide Governance Indicators 2013 online database.

The human development index was used as the ideal proxy for human development; while the six governance indicators were used as determinants of development. While the human development index measures the average achievement in three basic dimensions of human development; namely a long and healthy life, knowledge and decent standard of living; governance indicators measure perceived quality of governance based

on views of large numbers of survey respondents and expert assessments worldwide.

### 3.2 Empirical Estimation

The econometric procedure followed in selecting the appropriate estimation model was based on appraisal of three panel data models; namely

$$\text{Pooled OLS regression model: } Y_{it} = \alpha + X'_{it} \beta (\alpha_i - \alpha + e_{it}) \quad \text{----- (1)}$$

$$\text{Random Effects (RE) model: } Y_{it} = \alpha + X'_{it} \beta + (u_i + v_{it}); v_{it} \sim IID(0, \sigma_v^2) \quad \text{----- (2)}$$

$$\text{Fixed Effects (FE) model: } Y_{it} = \alpha_i + X'_{it} \beta + u_i + e_{it} \quad \text{----- (3)}$$

The Breusch and Pagan Lagrangian Multiplier test was run on the RE model to appropriately choose between the Pooled OLS and RE model.

Pooled OLS regression, GLS Random Effects (RE) and Fixed Effects (FE) models (Ganyaupfu, 2014). The Breusch-Pagan Lagrangian Multiplier and Hausman test techniques were used to select the suitable models.

The respective LM test was run based on the specification:

$$LM_u = \frac{nT}{2(T-1)} \left[ \frac{\sum (\sum e_{it})^2}{\sum \sum e_{it}^2} - 1 \right]^2 = \frac{nT}{n(T-1)} \left[ \frac{\sum (T) \bar{e}_i}{\sum \sum e_{it}^2} - 1 \right] \sim \chi^2(1) \quad \text{----- (4)}$$

Following rejection of the hypothesis that the Pooled OLS regression was appropriate (Table 2), the Hausman test was run to choose between

the RE model and FE model based on the formulation:

$$H = \left( \hat{\beta}_{FE} - \hat{\beta}_{RE} \right)' \left[ \left( V \left( \hat{\beta}_{FE} \right) - V \left( \hat{\beta}_{RE} \right) \right) (-1) \right] \left( \hat{\beta}_{FE} - \hat{\beta}_{RE} \right) \quad \text{----- (5)}$$

The Hausman test results were used to select the appropriate model between RE and FE at 5% level of significance. Differences across panels

were measured by the interclass correlation ( $\rho$ ); which approaches 1 if the respective individual effects dominates the idiosyncratic error.

### 3.3 Econometric Model

The econometric estimation method used was a single equation model formulated as below:

$$HDI = \alpha + \beta_1 (PolStab) + \beta_2 (VoiceAcc) + \beta_3 (GvtEff) + \beta_4 (Re gQual) + \beta_5 (RulLaw) + \beta_6 (CntrlCorr) + u_{it} \quad \text{-- (6)}$$

where: HDI symbolizes Human Development Index; PolStab represents Political stability; VoiceAcc denotes Voice and accountability; GvtEff signifies Government effectiveness;

RegQual symbolizes Regulatory quality; RuLaw represents Rule of law; and CntrlCorr denotes Control of corruption.

#### 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Breusch and Pagan LM test was applied on the estimates of the RE model (Table 1) to evaluate whether the Pooled OLS regression was appropriate model to apply for analysis.

##### 4.1 Breusch and Pagan Lagrangian Multiplier (LM) Test

**Table 1: GLS Random Effects**

R-squared: within = 0.2594		obs per group	:	min = 8		
between = 0.2597			:	avg = 8.0		
overall = 0.2597			:	max = 8		
		Wald chi2(2)	=	29.75		
corr(u_i,x) = 0 (assumed)		Prob > chi2	=	0.0000		
Human Development	Coeff.	Std. Err.	z	P >  z	95% Conf. Interval	
Political Stability	.0432169	.0098269	4.40	0.000	.0239566	.0624772
Voice and Accountability	.0513120	.0223143	2.30	0.021	.0075767	.0950473
_cons	.4824625	.0316755	15.23	0.000	.4203796	.5445454
sigma_u	.10355371					
sigma_e	.01607852					
rho	.9764593	(fraction of variance due to u_i)				

The Breusch and Pagan Lagrangian Multiplier test for random effects results (Table 2) rejected the null hypothesis that the Pooled OLS regression was appropriate. All the other governance indicators were dropped out of the model as they remained statistically insignificant in influencing human development.

**Table 2: Breusch and Pagan Lagrangian Multiplier test for Random Effects results**

HDI [Country, t] = Xb + u [Country] + e [Country, t]		
	Var	sd = sqrt(Var)
Human Development	.0109957	.1048606
e	.0002585	.0160785
u	.0107233	.1035532
Test: Var (u) = 0	Chibar2(01) = 288.97	Prob > chibar2 = 0.0000

The FE model was further run (Table 3) to make appropriately selection between the RE and FE models based on the Hausman test results.

**Table 3: Fixed Effects results**

R-squared: within = 0.2594	obs per group: min = 8				
between = 0.2596	: avg = 8.0				
overall = 0.2595	: max = 8				
	F (2, 75)	= 13.14			
corr(u_i, Xb) = -0.0574	Prob > F	= 0.0000			
Human Development	Coeff.	Std. Err.	t	P>  t	95% Conf. Interval
Political Stability	.0432599	.010011	4.32	0.000	.0233160 .0632037
Voice and Accountability	.0532143	.025577	2.08	0.041	.0022608 .1041678
_cons	.4830355	.008083	59.75	0.000	.4669319 .4991390
sigma_u	.0929549				
sigma_e	.0160785				
rho	.9709501				
F test that all u_i = 0:	F (10, 75) = 266.29		Prob > F = 0.0000		

The Hausman test (Table 4) was run to select the appropriate model between RE and FE models.

**Table 4: Hausman test results**

	Coefficients			
	(b)	(B)	(b-B)	sqrt(diag(V_b-V_B))
	FE1	RE1	Difference	
Political Stability	.0432599	.0432169	.0000430	.0011551
Voice and Accountability	.0532143	.0513120	.0019023	.0118786
Test H <sub>0</sub> : difference in coefficients not systematic:				
chi2(2) = 0.03			Prob > chi2 = 0.9867	

The Hausman test was run to determine whether the individual effects are random. Given the null hypothesis that both the FE and RE models are consistent, and the alternative hypothesis that the RE is not consistent, results from the Hausman

Based on the results of the RE model, both political stability; and voice and accountability demonstrated substantial positive effects on human development in the Southern African region. In comparative terms, political stability had a more remarkable positive impact on human development than voice and accountability. Results reveal that 1 percent improvement in political stability leads to approximately 4.32 percent improvement in human development in respect of healthy life, knowledge acquisition and decent standard of living. Correspondingly, a 1 percent improvement in the quality of voice and accountability leads to nearly 5.13 percent improvement in the quality of citizens' health care, knowledge and standard of living. Overall, the R-squared statistic of the random effect model indicates that approximately 25.97 percent total variation in human development in the respective region was accounted for by political stability; and voice and accountability during the period under review. Furthermore, the Wald chi2 (=29.75;  $p < 0.05$ ) revealed significance of the estimated model; while the interclass correlation revealed that approximately 97.65 percent of the

test performed implied non-rejection of the null hypothesis that the RE model was appropriate. The coefficient estimates of the Random Effect model were therefore consistent.

variance computed from the model was due to differences across panels.

## 5. CONCLUSION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

### 5.1 Conclusion

This paper estimated the individual impacts of distinct governance indicators on human development in Southern African region during the period 2005–2012. From the six world governance indicators, government effectiveness, regulatory quality, rule of law and control of corruption remained statistically insignificant towards influencing human development. Only political stability; and voice and accountability demonstrated substantial positive impacts on human development in the region. From the human development perspective, the results yielded by political stability; and voice and accountability indicators provide evidence that improvements in processes through which governments are selected, monitored and replaced undoubtedly enhances the quality of human life. Although the direction of causality remains unclear, the notion by Campos & Nugent



(1999) that the dimensions of governance are complimentary in nature conforms to the findings of this study. Based on the results, it can therefore be inferred that improvement in voice and accountability positively translates into political stability; while the presence of political stability provides an environment conducive for citizens to live with dignity, exercise their rights of freedom of expression; and hold the government responsible for formulation and implementation of policies that are responsive to people's socioeconomic needs and aspirations.

## 5.2 Policy Implications

The strive to achieve human development at country, regional and global levels requires commitment by parties vested with constitutional authority to creating conditions that citizens can develop a sense of self-worth, security and dignity. Given the conformity of the current results to development literature that governance quality plays an essential role in stimulating human development, governments in the region need to observe that improvement in governance quality remains an effective instrument for achieving regional integration across social, political and economic dimensions. Governance reforms also need to be made at both regional and country levels; especially towards promoting legitimate inclusive participation in finding solutions development challenges. Given that the overall goodness of the model was not high, future research on the subject of governance and

human development nexus should integrate a large number of countries over a longer sample period in order to yield better results.

## REFERENCES

- Acemoglu, D. and Johnson, S. (2005). Unbundling Institutions. *American Economic Review*, 113(5): 949-995.
- Adsera, A., Boix, C. and Payne, M. (2000). Are You Being Served?: Political Accountability and Quality of Government. Inter-American Development Bank Working Paper No. 438.
- Akpan, G. E. and Effiong, E. L. (2012). Governance and Development Performance: A Cross-Country Analysis of Sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of Economics & Sustainable Development*, 3(14):54-65.
- Baek, S. G. and Oh, Y. (2013). Governance, Institutional Quality and the Euro Area Crisis: What Lessons to East Asia Integration?. *Journal of East Asia Economic Integration*, 17(4):361-383.
- Barro, R. J. (2007). Determinants of Economic Growth: A Cross-Country Empirical Study. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- Campos, N. F. and Nugent, J. B. (1999). Development performance and the institutions of

governance: evidence from East Asia and Latin America”, *World Development*, 27(3): 439-452.

Dodgson, R., Lee, K. and Drager, N. (2002). Global Health Governance: A Conceptual Review. Department of Health and Development, World Health Organisation. Available at: [http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2002/a85727\\_eng.pdf](http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2002/a85727_eng.pdf)

Easterly, W. and Levine, R. (1997). Africa’s Growth Tragedy: Politics and Ethnic Divisions. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112:1203-1250.

Ganyaupfu, E. M. (2014). Estimating the Relative Impacts of Health and Education on Economic Development in Southern Africa. *Asian Journal of Economic Modelling*, 2(2):85-92.

Hall, R. and Jones, C. (1997). Why Do Some Countries Produce So Much More Output per Worker than Others. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 114:83-116.

Human Development Report (1990). United Nations Development Programme, New York, USA.

Kaufmann, D., Kraay, A. and Zoido-Lobaton, P. 1999a. Aggregating Governance Indicators. World Bank Working Paper 2195. Washington, DC.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1999b. Governance Matters. World Bank Working Paper 2196. Washington, DC.

Kaufmann, D., Kraay, A. and Mastruzzi, M. (2010). The Worldwide Governance Indicators: A Summary of Methodology, Data and Analytical Issues. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 5430. Available at: [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=1682130](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1682130).

Knack, S. and Keefer, P. 1995. Institutions and Economic Performance: Cross-Country Tests Using Alternative Institutional Measures. *Economics and Politics*, 7:207-27.

Mauro, P. (1995). Corruption and Growth. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 110(3):681-712.

Meon, P. G. and Weill, L. (2005). Does Better Governance Foster Efficiency? An Aggregate Frontier Analysis. *Economics of Governance*, 6:75-90.

Rodrik, D., Subramanian, A. and Trebbi, F. (2004). Institutions Rule: The Primacy of Institutions over Geography and Integration in Economic Development. *Journal of Economic Growth*, 9(2):131-165.

Tridico, P. (2007). The Determinants of Economic Growth in Emerging Economies: A

Comparative Analysis. University of Roma Tre,  
Department of Economics.

UNDP's Human Development Report (2013).  
UNDP Human Development Indicators and  
Thematic Statistical Tables from the 2013 Human  
Development Report. Available at:  
[https://data.undp.org/api/views/8ruz-  
shxu/rows.xlsx?accessType=DOWNLOAD](https://data.undp.org/api/views/8ruz-shxu/rows.xlsx?accessType=DOWNLOAD).

Vadlamannati, K. C. (2008). Socioeconomic,  
Institutional and Political Determination of  
Human Rights Abuses: A Subnational Study of  
India, 1993-2002. William Davidson Institute,  
Working Paper No. 926.

World Bank, (2013). Worldwide Governance  
Indicators, Available at:  
[http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.  
aspx#home](http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.aspx#home).