

Research Article

Fachri Afif^{1*}, Vidyarini Dwita², Syahrizal³

Democracy, Unemployment, Corruption Control, and Human Development in Africa: A Panel-Data Framework

*Corresponding Author: **Fachri Afif**: Universitas Negeri Padang, Indonesia; fachriafif82@gmail.com

Vidyarini Dwita: Universitas Negeri Padang, Indonesia; Vidyarinidwita@unp.ac.id

Syahrizal: Universitas Negeri Padang, Indonesia; syahrizal@unp.ac.id

Received: Sept 2, 2026; **Accepted:** Sept 15, 2026; **Online:** Oct 23, 2026 | DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47353/ijema.v4i2.257>

Abstract: *This study develops an Africa-focused framework for examining the relationships between liberal democracy, unemployment, corruption control, and human development. Human development is conceptualized through the Human Development Index (HDI), while democracy is measured using the V-Dem Liberal Democracy Index. Unemployment, control of corruption, economic growth, and foreign direct investment (FDI) are drawn from internationally comparable datasets, including the World Bank's World Development Indicators and Worldwide Governance Indicators. The proposed observation period is 2010–2023, subject to data coverage and consistency across countries. The framework distinguishes the direct relationships of institutional and labour-market conditions with HDI from the possibility that democracy moderates the relationships between unemployment, corruption control, and human development. The theoretical argument is grounded in the capability approach and institutional perspectives on accountability and public-service delivery. Because the manuscript does not yet contain a merged country-year dataset or completed regression estimates, it does not claim empirical confirmation of the hypotheses. Its contribution at this stage is the specification of a transparent, testable Africa-specific research design. The manuscript can be presented as a completed empirical article only after the dataset is assembled, the models are estimated, and the abstract is revised to report the actual sample and findings.*

Keywords: *Africa; corruption control; democracy; human development; unemployment.*

Introduction

Human development is not adequately captured by economic growth alone. Improvements in national income may coexist with unequal access to health care, education, secure livelihoods, and other conditions that enable people to lead lives they value. The Human Development Index (HDI) offers a multidimensional indicator of achievement in health, education, and income, making it useful for investigating whether political institutions and labour-market conditions are associated with development outcomes. Across African countries, substantial differences in institutional arrangements, economic structures, conflict exposure, and public-service capacity make a continent-wide comparison informative, provided that country heterogeneity is addressed analytically rather than treated as background context.

Democracy may influence human development through electoral accountability, political participation, civil liberties, and constraints on executive power. These mechanisms can increase incentives for governments to provide public goods and respond to citizens' needs. Nevertheless, the presence of elections does not automatically guarantee effective service delivery. Weak administrative capacity, clientelism, instability, and limited fiscal resources may interrupt the translation of political accountability into improvements in health, education, and living standards. The relationship between democracy and HDI should therefore be tested rather than assumed to be uniformly positive.

Labour-market conditions provide a second pathway. Unemployment can reduce household income and limit access to health, education, and other resources that support human capabilities. However, measured unemployment can be difficult to interpret in economies where informal, subsistence, and

vulnerable employment are widespread. Individuals who cannot afford to remain unemployed may enter low-productivity work, so a relatively low unemployment rate does not necessarily indicate broad-based economic security. This measurement issue is particularly important when comparing countries with different labour-market structures.

Corruption and the capacity to control it constitute a third pathway. Corruption may divert public resources, distort procurement, weaken trust, and reduce the effectiveness of spending on education, health, and social protection. The empirical distinction between corruption and control of corruption must be explicit: the World Bank's Control of Corruption indicator is coded so that higher values indicate stronger control, and its coefficient should be interpreted accordingly. Institutional quality may help explain why countries with similar levels of economic activity achieve different human-development outcomes.

Although prior research has examined democracy and development, corruption and welfare, and foreign investment and human development, the relationships among these factors may depend on institutional context. A central question is not only whether democracy, unemployment, and corruption control are associated with HDI, but also whether democratic institutions change the way labour-market distress and governance quality relate to human development. This conditional perspective moves beyond a model in which institutions are treated as independent predictors and instead considers whether political accountability complements other development-relevant conditions.

The research gap must be framed as an empirical and theoretical question rather than simply as a geographical change from another region. Specifically, evidence is needed on whether the relationships among liberal democracy, unemployment, corruption control, and HDI remain robust when country-specific characteristics and common time shocks are considered, and whether democracy moderates the unemployment–HDI and corruption-control–HDI relationships. The contribution would be strongest if the analysis also evaluates the sensitivity of results to variable definitions, missing-data decisions, and alternative model specifications.

Accordingly, this study proposes an Africa-focused country-year panel covering 2010–2023, subject to verified data availability. It examines the associations of liberal democracy, unemployment, and corruption control with HDI while controlling for economic growth and foreign direct investment (FDI). It also tests two interaction effects: democracy with unemployment and democracy with corruption control. The study is designed to make three contributions: to connect a capability-based understanding of development with institutional and labour-market explanations; to test whether democratic institutions condition the associations of unemployment and corruption control with HDI; and to provide a transparent cross-country analytical framework that can be replicated using documented international datasets. Since the data merge and estimation have not yet been completed in the supplied manuscript, these contributions remain the aims of the empirical study rather than claims of confirmed findings.

Literature Review

Human development and institutional capability

Sen's (1999) capability approach defines development in terms of expanding substantive freedoms rather than increasing income alone. HDI captures selected dimensions of this broader concept through health, education, and income. Yet the conversion of economic resources into human capabilities depends on the quality of institutions, distributional arrangements, public-service delivery, and access to productive work. Countries experiencing similar economic growth may therefore exhibit different HDI outcomes. This perspective supports examining political and governance variables alongside macroeconomic controls.

Democracy and human development

Democratic institutions can promote human development by strengthening accountability, protecting civil liberties, and increasing incentives to provide public goods. However, the developmental consequences of democracy depend on how democracy is conceptualized and measured, as well as on historical and institutional context (Gerring et al., 2012; Gerring et al., 2021). Electoral competition may not produce effective welfare outcomes when administrative capacity is weak or public resources are poorly managed. The present study therefore tests the association between liberal democracy and HDI without presuming that the relationship is necessarily positive.

H1: Liberal democracy is significantly associated with human development in African countries.

Unemployment and human development

Unemployment may reduce human development by lowering income, increasing economic insecurity, and constraining household investment in health and education. The expected relationship is negative, although cross-country measurement can be complicated by informal and subsistence work. Evidence on educated unemployment in West Africa also indicates that labour-market mismatch can persist even among people with educational qualifications (Girsberger & Meango, 2022). The unemployment rate should consequently be interpreted as one indicator of labour-market conditions, not a comprehensive measure of job quality or economic vulnerability.

H2: Unemployment is negatively associated with human development in African countries.

Corruption control and human development

Corruption can weaken the conversion of public and private resources into social outcomes by diverting funds, undermining procurement, and reducing the effectiveness of public institutions. Research on Sub-Saharan Africa and cross-country evidence links corruption and institutional effectiveness to human-development outcomes (Akinbode, 2020; Neme et al., 2024). Since the proposed indicator measures control of corruption rather than corruption itself, higher values are expected to be associated with higher HDI, subject to empirical testing.

H3: Stronger control of corruption is positively associated with human development in African countries.

Economic growth and foreign direct investment

Economic growth may expand household resources and government fiscal capacity, but its developmental effects depend on the distribution of gains and the effectiveness of public spending. FDI may contribute through employment, technology transfer, productivity, and managerial knowledge, although benefits may vary by sector, local linkages, and the level of development (Gameli & Abawiera, 2023; Thi Cam Ha et al., 2024). Growth and FDI are therefore included as controls rather than assumed to translate automatically into higher human development.

H4: Economic growth is significantly associated with human development in African countries.

H5: FDI is positively associated with human development in African countries.

Democracy as a moderator

Democracy may condition the relationship between unemployment and HDI if political accountability encourages governments to respond to labour-market hardship through social protection,

employment policy, or public services. Similarly, democratic constraints and public scrutiny may strengthen the developmental benefits associated with corruption control. These are propositions about institutional complementarity: the effects of unemployment and corruption control may vary with the level of liberal democracy. Interaction effects must be evaluated directly and interpreted using conditional marginal effects rather than inferred from the significance of individual coefficients.

H6: Liberal democracy moderates the relationship between unemployment and human development.

H7: Liberal democracy moderates the relationship between control of corruption and human development.

Method

The study is designed as a quantitative explanatory analysis of country-year observations for sovereign African countries over 2010–2023. The final sample must be determined after verifying comparable coverage for all variables and merging the sources by country and year. The manuscript should report the full list of included countries, the number of country-year observations, the extent of missingness for each variable, and the rules used to include or exclude observations. Missing values must not be replaced with values from other regions or with fabricated estimates.

Table 1. Operational Definitions, Data Sources, and Roles of Study Variables

Variable	Operational definition	Proposed source	Role
HDI	Human Development Index, 0–1	UNDP Human Development Reports / documented OWID series	Dependent
LDI	Liberal Democracy Index	V-Dem dataset	Main predictor / moderator
UE	Unemployment rate (% of labour force)	World Bank, World Development Indicators	Main predictor
COR	Control of Corruption estimate; higher values indicate stronger control	World Bank, Worldwide Governance Indicators	Main predictor
EG	Annual GDP growth (%)	World Bank, World Development Indicators	Control
FDI	FDI inflows; use one consistently defined scale across countries and years	World Bank, World Development Indicators	Control

Before estimation, the authors should document the exact series identifiers, dataset editions, retrieval dates, and any transformations. FDI measurement requires particular care: nominal inflows in currency units are not directly comparable across economies of different sizes. A scale such as net FDI inflows as a percentage of GDP may improve comparability, provided that the selected indicator is available consistently and is justified in the final manuscript. The authors should also state how any missing observations are handled and test whether the final sample is systematically different from the intended population.

The baseline model is specified as:

$$\text{HDI}_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{LDI}_{it} + \beta_2 \text{UE}_{it} + \beta_3 \text{COR}_{it} + \beta_4 \text{EG}_{it} + \beta_5 \text{FDI}_{it} + \mu_i + \tau_t + \varepsilon_{it}$$

where i denotes country, t denotes year, μ_i represents country fixed effects, τ_t represents year fixed effects, and ε_{it} is the error term. The two moderation models add the interaction terms $\text{LDI} \times \text{UE}$ and $\text{LDI} \times \text{COR}$, respectively. Continuous variables used in interaction terms should be mean-centred to facilitate interpretation; centering does not itself resolve endogeneity.

The analysis should compare plausible panel specifications and justify the final estimator based on the research design and diagnostic evidence. Country and year fixed effects are important candidates because stable country characteristics and common shocks may otherwise bias estimates. Standard errors should account for within-country dependence, with country-clustered robust standard errors considered as a minimum. The authors should report tests for heteroskedasticity and serial correlation and discuss cross-sectional dependence where relevant. Potential reverse causality and time-varying omitted variables should be acknowledged; results from a conventional panel model should be interpreted as conditional associations unless a defensible identification strategy supports causal claims.

For each interaction model, the authors should report the interaction coefficient and calculate marginal effects across substantively meaningful values of democracy. Graphs of conditional marginal effects with confidence intervals can make the moderation results easier to interpret. Robustness checks should, where data permit, include alternative variable definitions, alternative estimation specifications, and sensitivity to the country sample and missing-data treatment. All exclusions and analytical decisions should be documented to support reproducibility.

Results and Discussion

Sample coverage and descriptive statistics

Report the number of countries and country-year observations included after merging the HDI, LDI, unemployment, corruption-control, GDP-growth, and FDI series. Present descriptive statistics for each variable, including the mean, standard deviation, minimum, maximum, and number of non-missing observations. Discuss the extent of variation across countries and over time and identify any data-coverage limitations. Any continent-wide or country-specific HDI figures should be checked against the exact cited dataset and year.

Baseline estimates

Present the baseline panel estimates in a table that reports coefficients, robust standard errors, significance levels, sample size, country and year effects, and model-fit information. Interpret the magnitude and direction of each estimate, not statistical significance alone. Explain whether the estimates support H1–H5 and compare the findings with the studies reviewed above. Avoid causal language unless the identification strategy warrants it.

Moderation results

Report the democracy–unemployment and democracy–corruption-control interaction estimates separately. Explain the direction and uncertainty of each interaction and provide marginal effects at meaningful values of democracy. A significant interaction should be interpreted as evidence that the estimated association varies with democracy, not automatically as proof of a causal mechanism. Evaluate H6 and H7 based on the estimates and confidence intervals.

Robustness and policy implications

Summarize the diagnostic tests and robustness checks, explaining whether the substantive conclusions remain stable across reasonable specifications. Policy implications should be tied directly to the observed results. For example, recommendations concerning democratic accountability, employment quality, anti-corruption institutions, or FDI should be included only to the extent that the empirical findings and relevant literature support them. Differences across African subregions should be discussed only if the analysis actually tests them.

Conclusion

This study sets out an Africa-focused framework for examining how liberal democracy, unemployment, and control of corruption are associated with human development, while accounting for economic growth and foreign direct investment. It also proposes tests of whether democracy conditions the relationships between unemployment, corruption control, and HDI. The framework connects the capability approach with institutional accountability and labour-market explanations and emphasizes that the developmental effects of political and economic conditions may depend on context.

At present, however, the supplied manuscript does not contain the completed dataset or empirical estimates required to draw substantive conclusions. It would therefore be inappropriate to claim that any hypothesis is supported or to recommend policies on the basis of unreported coefficients. Before submission, the authors must complete the country-year data merge, estimate and validate the models, report the actual findings, and revise the abstract, discussion, and conclusion accordingly. The final conclusion should state the principal empirical results, theoretical and practical contributions, limitations, and priorities for further research. The current framework provides a basis for that analysis but is not a substitute for it.

References

- Akinbode, S. O. (2020). Corruption, government effectiveness and human development in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal for the Advancement of Developing Economies*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.32873/unl.dc.jade912>
- Alkire, S. (2010). Human development: Definitions, critiques, and related concepts. Human Development Research Paper 2010/01. United Nations Development Programme.
- Anand, S., & Sen, A. (2000). The income component of the human development index. *Journal of Human Development*, 1(1), 83–106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649880050008782>
- Barro, R. J. (1996). Democracy and growth. *Journal of Economic Growth*, 1, 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00163340>
- Boix, C., Miller, M., & Rosato, S. (2013). A complete data set of political regimes, 1800–2007. *Comparative Political Studies*, 46(12), 1523–1554. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414012463905>
- Chong, A., & Calderón, C. (2000). Causality and feedback between institutional measures and economic growth. *Economics & Politics*, 12(1), 69–81. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0343.00068>
- Deacon, R. T. (2009). Public good provision under dictatorship and democracy. *Public Choice*, 139, 241–262. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11127-008-9391-x>
- Gameli, J., & Abawiera, C. (2023). Does the level of development distinguish the impacts of foreign direct investment on the stages of human development? *Sustainable Futures*, 5, 100111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sftr.2023.100111>

- Gerring, J., Knutsen, C. H., Skaaning, S.-E., Teorell, J., & Maguire, M. (2021). Democracy and human development: Issues of conceptualization and measurement. *Democratization*, 28(2), 308–332. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2020.1818721>
- Gerring, J., Thacker, S. C., & Alfaro, R. (2012). Democracy and human development. *The Journal of Politics*, 74(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022381611001113>
- Girsberger, E. M., & Meango, R. (2022). The puzzle of educated unemployment in West Africa. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4281276>
- Iddrisu, I. (2026). The effect of digitalisation and corruption on human development in Sub-Sahara Africa: Are there regional differences? *South African Journal of Economics*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/saje.70032>
- Jetter, M., Agudelo, A. M., & Hassan, A. R. (2015). The effect of democracy on corruption: Income is key. *World Development*, 74, 286–304. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2015.05.016>
- Kaufmann, D., Kraay, A., & Mastruzzi, M. (2010). The worldwide governance indicators: Methodology and analytical issues. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 5430*. <https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-5430>
- Kaufmann, D., Kraay, A., & Mastruzzi, M. (2011). The worldwide governance indicators: Methodology and analytical issues. *Hague Journal on the Rule of Law*, 3, 220–246. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1876404511200046>
- Kinyondo, A., & Byaro, M. (2024). The link between democracy and development in Africa: What does data tell us? *African Journal of Economic Review*, 12(1), 25–38. <https://doi.org/10.4314/ajer.v12i1>
- Lipset, S. M. (1959). Some social requisites of democracy: Economic development and political legitimacy. *American Political Science Review*, 53(1), 69–105. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1951731>
- Meilita, F. Y., & Hasmarini, M. I. (2024). Analysis of factors affecting the Human Development Index (HDI) in 43 Sub-Saharan African countries 2018–2022. *Jurnal Ekonomi Balance*, 20(2). <https://doi.org/10.26618/jeb.v20i2.15474>
- Neme, O., Lilia, A. N. A., Santibáñez, V., & Márquez, H. F. (2024). Effects of corruption on human development: Evidence for developed and developing countries. *Acta Oeconomica*, 74, 507–541. <https://doi.org/10.1556/032.2024.00024>
- Oueghlissi, R., & Derbali, A. (2024). Democracy, corruption and unemployment: Empirical evidence from developing countries. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, 15(2). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-023-01204-0>
- Przeworski, A., Alvarez, M. E., Cheibub, J. A., & Limongi, F. (2000). *Democracy and development: Political institutions and well-being in the world, 1950–1990*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ranis, G., Stewart, F., & Ramirez, A. (2000). Economic growth and human development. *World Development*, 28(2), 197–219. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X\(99\)00131-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(99)00131-X)
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.
- Thi Cam Ha, V., Doan, T., Holmes, M. J., & Tran, T. Q. (2024). Does institutional quality matter for foreign direct investment and human development? *Evaluation Review*, 48(4), 610–635. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193841X231195798>
- United Nations Development Programme. (2025). *Human Development Report 2025: A matter of choice: People and possibilities in the age of AI*. UNDP.
- V-Dem Institute. (2026). *V-Dem dataset, version 16*. Varieties of Democracy Project.
- World Bank. (2026). *Worldwide Governance Indicators: Control of Corruption*. World Bank.