



Research Article

© 2022 Ramzy M. H. Radaideh.

This is an open access article licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

Received: 26 May 2022 / Accepted: 17 August 2022 / Published: 2 September 2022

The Impact of Good Governance on Human Development in Jordan: A Case Study

Ramzy M. H. Radaideh

Assistant Professor,
King Talal School of Business Technology,
Princess Sumaya University for Technology (PSUT),
Jordan

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2022-0124>

Abstract

This study investigates the correlations between indicators of good governance and human development in Jordan during the period (2010-2019). The study relies on the indicators of the World Bank for good governance and the Human Development Index for the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) about Jordan. It analyzes the indicators of the two variables in Jordan by employing statistical analysis. The study found that there are no statistically significant correlations between the indicators of good governance and human development at the significance level (0.05). It also found a weakness in the levels of good governance, and that there is a decline in the growth rates of human development during the studied period which may due to the negative impact of regional conditions related to the Arab Spring and its direct and indirect repercussions on the human development in Jordan. This indicates that human development in Jordan is affected by the consequences of regional conditions rather than just internal factors such as good governance. The study recommends the Jordanian government to build a productive national economy in a manner that reduces vulnerability to regional and international conditions, and provide support for education and health sectors, as well as to control high population growth rates.

Keywords: Education, Good governance, Health, Human development, Income, Jordan

1. Introduction

The concept of good governance first appeared in the 1980's in the publications of the World Bank within the new conditions that were set to help developing countries, considering that weak governance is in charge for poverty and delaying the development process (Goldsmith, 2007; Santiso, 2001). The 1990's witnessed the popularity of the concept of good governance in the literature and programs of international financial institutions within the framework of looking at good governance as a mechanism that could help creating the necessary conditions for achieving development as it includes the interaction between different institutions and sectors, sound management of resources and positive values of development such as transparency, accountability and governance, law and anti-corruption (Dinh & Calabro, 2019; Scherer & Voegtlin, 2020). In the same period, the concept of human development appeared and began to develop and crystallize to a greater extent by focusing development work on human capital and increasing the capabilities and options in front of people by

paying attention to indicators of education, health and income (Sima et al., 2020).

At the level of Jordan, as it is one of the developing countries, and a case study of the present paper, it had begun to adopt the policy of openness and democratic transformation during that period (i.e., 1990's), and it had taken steps towards improving the levels of good governance. Jordan also sought to enhance levels of human development (Dator et al., 2018). Therefore, the present study is an attempt to identify the impact of the reality of good governance with its various indicators on the levels of human development in Jordan during the period from 2010 to 2019.

1.1 *The Significance of the Study*

The importance of the present study lies in its attempt to reveal the correlations between good governance as an independent variable and the reality of human development in Jordan as a dependent variable, and thus identifying the factors affecting the levels of human development in Jordan during the considered period that extends from 2010-2019.

1.2 *The Problem of the Study*

The problem of the study lies in identifying the extent to which the human development in Jordan is affected by the reality of good governance in it, based on the fact that the nature of the quality of governance in the country constitutes the internal environment for achieving development, and that Jordan has made great efforts for several decades to enhance the levels of good governance and human development. The study aims to answer the following questions:

1. What are the factors affecting the reality of human development levels in Jordan?
2. Is the reality of human development in Jordan affected by indicators of good governance in it?
3. Are there statistically significant correlations between indicators of good governance and human development in Jordan?

1.3 *Methods*

In its measurement of the levels of good governance in Jordan, the study depends on the indicators of the World Bank, which are six indicators, that are measured annually. The study also depends on the human development index which is issued by the UNDP to measure the levels of human development in Jordan. The study uses the descriptive analytical method to analyze the reality of the indicators of the study variables in Jordan. Statistical analysis of Pearson's correlation coefficients is used to reveal the extent of correlations between the independent variable and the dependent variable during the studied period that extends from 2010 to 2019.

1.4 *Previous Studies*

Sebudubudu (2010) examined the relationship between good governance and development in Botswana. The findings of the study revealed that Botswana's commitment to standards of good governance has moved it from the level of the poorest countries in Africa to a country with a high middle income. The level of good governance has had a positive impact on its development and this has led to its emergence as a model that provides useful lessons in the development for the rest of African countries.

Sameti et al. (2012) studied the impact of good governance on the human development index in the ASEAN countries during the period 2005-2009. They found that there are four indicators, among the six indicators of good governance, that have a positive impact and statistical significance on the index of human development which are: lack of violence, government efficacy, political stability, regulatory quality, and rule of law.

On the other hand, Nandha and Smyth (2013) studied the relationship between good governance and human development in 186 countries during the period 1995-2011. The findings revealed that good governance and human development reinforce each other, but the impact of good governance on human development deteriorates over time. Also, the study found that human development impact on the quality of governance is greater than the impact of governance on development, which means that the ability of governments to influence development is in decline. This is indicative of increased public unrest, which requires governments to divert resources from development to maintaining law and order. Besides, spending on improving the reality of human development in the country is more feasible than spending on improving the quality of governance.

Ahmad and Saleem (2014) aimed to identify the indicators of good governance that are most important in their impact on human development. The study found that the indicators of good governance that play a dynamic role and influence in human development are government effectiveness, political stability, control of corruption, and regulatory quality. Thus, the governments should focus on them to improve the welfare of their people.

Abu-Ismaïl et al. (2016) attempted to build a modified indicator of human development in the framework of governance and its effects on the Arab countries. The authors examined the significance of the indicators of opinion, accountability and the rule of law for establishing modern development. They pointed out that the relationship between good governance and development depends largely on the conditions of the country as it is the Arab countries, in which external geopolitical factors in addition to the impact of weak internal governance in undermining development play an important role in increasing conflicts in them. The study concluded that cases of achieving higher degrees in the human development index from countries with low levels of good governance may result from the use of means other than governance reforms such as the interventions of international organizations, or sometimes the existence of an authoritarian government which has the will to achieve development.

A Vietnamese study by Thanh (2017), that focused on the effect of good governance on human development, found that governance largely affects aspects of human development, for instance political freedoms and political participation, and to a lesser extent on traditional components of human development including health, income and education.

Keser and Gökmen (2018) examined the relationship between indicators of good governance and the level of human development in 33 member states and candidates for membership in the European Union during the period from 2002 to 2012. The researchers found a positive correlation between the level of good governance and human development, and there is a strong statistical relationship between the three indicators of good governance: regulatory quality, government effectiveness, and rule of law with the level of human development in any of the sample countries. They also found that the first members of the European Union that are relatively higher in the performance of indicators of good governance tend to enjoy relatively a higher evaluation in the human development index.

Gaur and Kant (2020) studied the role of government and governance in human development. It focused on the impact of the role of government spending and the rule of law indicator on various social and economic aspects such as education and health in developing human capital. The study concluded that governance helps to enhance human development through its clear positive impact on easily enforcing contracts and avoiding social chaos, which enhances human development.

Qader (2020) studied the impact of good governance on human development in Iraq during the period (2005-2018). He found a direct relationship between indicators of good governance and human development, and that the indicators of opinion, rule of law and accountability are the most influential indicators of good governance in human development.

2. The Theoretical Framework

2.1 *The Concept of Good Governance*

The World Bank defines good governance as the method of exercising authority in managing the country's economic and social resources for development (The World Bank, 1992). According to Kaufmann et al. (2009), good governance is the set of rules and institutions on the basis of which authority is exercised in a country, including selecting and monitoring process and replacing those in authority, the ability of the government to manage resources and implement thorough policies effectively, and the respect of all citizens and the institutions that govern the economic and social interactions among them. According to the literature of the United Nations, good governance is based on a participatory, transparent and accountable state that includes state institutions and operations, the private sector and civil society organizations (United Nations, 2007). As for the UNDP, it defines good governance from the perspective of human development as governance that enhances, supports and preserves human well-being, and it relies on intensifying human capabilities, choices, chances and social, economic, and political freedoms, especially for the lowliest and most disregarded members of society (UNDP, 2002).

The World Bank states that good governance is based on two overarching public values, which are accountability and inclusiveness (World Bank, 2004). As for the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, it identifies four criteria for good governance, including rule of law, public sector management, monitoring corruption, and decreasing military expenditures (OECD, 1995). The European Commission outlines the criteria for good governance with five measures: openness, participation, accountability, effectiveness, coherence and harmony (Unlukaplan, 2010). As for the UNDP, it presents nine criteria for good governance: transparency, participation, rule of law, strategic vision, efficiency and proficiency, unanimity building, equality, responsiveness, and accountability (UNDP, 2002).

Besides, there are many other definitions that have been put forward by scholars of good governance for this concept, which differ in their view of it, and the nature of the dimensions it includes from their point of view. According to Gregory (2013), the model of good governance is related to the fragmentation of the centralization and authority of the state, and the increase of civil society participation in the delivery of public services, through network cooperation between an extensive range of governmental and non-governmental organizations in order to achieve the public interest.

Sullivan (2004) focuses on the institutional and procedural dimension in defining good governance as that includes the traditions, institutions, and procedures that determine how government decisions are made on a daily basis. This includes key accountable institutions, and the existence of means through which the residents can regularly participate in policy making. At large, the concept of good governance is based on two parts: a value component represented in the system of values that characterize good governance, such as transparency, participation, accountability, rule of law, predictability, and the institutional part which is based on interaction and coordination between the active parties, namely, government, civil society, and the private sector, by establishing collaborative relationships through negotiation rather than management by hierarchy (Rahman, 2016; Simonis, 2004).

The concept of good governance includes three main dimensions: the political dimension, the economic dimension, and the administrative dimension. The political dimension is related to democracy and the existence of a legitimate authority. As for the economic dimension, it relates to the decision-making process that affects the economic activity in the country and the nature of its economic relations with other countries. The administrative dimension is related to the bureaucratic efficiency and accountable civil service (Nzimakwe, 2005; Rahman, 2016).

2.2 *The Concept of Human Development*

The UNDP (1990) defines human development as the process of broadening people's choices, most importantly leading a healthy long life, educating and enjoying an adequate standard of living. Further options include political freedoms, assured human rights and self-worth (UNDP, 1990). Thus, human development is concerned about people, and about growing their choices to live a life they value. What is essential to intensifying human choices is constructing human capacities that lead to a healthy long life and the knowledge acquisition, access to the resources required for an adequate standard of living and the ability to contribute in the life of the community (UNDP, 2002).

Also, the Human Development Report (2018) defines it as the human freedoms and capacity-building, not for a few or many, but for all of them alike (UNDP, 2018). Human development has two aspects. The first relates to the formation of human competencies, for instance improving health or knowledge. The second relates to people's use of the learned abilities for work or leisure (UNDP, 1990). The concept of human development includes a set of elements that are empowerment, equity, cooperation, sustainability, and security (Keser & Gokmen, 2018). Therefore, people's choices are expanded and their capabilities increased and they have the right to access equal opportunities, which may lead to increasing their participation in these opportunities and benefiting from them. It is not only for the current generation, but for future generations (Nayak, 2008) in which people are liberated from threats related to livelihoods, disease or oppression (Keser & Gokmen, 2018).

As seen, the dimensions of human development, as identified by reports issued by the United Nations Development Program since 1990 tend to vary. Although there is some consistency among them, as all reports over the years focus on health, education and living standards, there is no fixed list of human development dimensions that include these dimensions (Health, decent standard of living, education, political freedom, productivity, creativeness and, culture and the arts). Perhaps, this is the flexibility that allows human development to harmonize with national cultural specificities (Alkire, 2010).

The development in the concept of human development has led to questioning the importance of GDP growth as the only measure of development (International Science Council, 2020). Human development views people as the real wealth, and that people are the main goals of development. This is related to Amartya Sen's (1999) Capability Approach, which addresses the problem of inequality to reformulate the concept of well-being, as Amartya Sen argues that the priority in assessing well-being should be human capacity or freedom and not be reduced to the concept of income, because the achievement of certain jobs largely depends on the ability of the person, and therefore it is equality in terms of ability that can be the appropriate basis for assessing human well-being (Maboloc, 2008).

2.3 *The Relationship between Good Governance and Human Development*

The positive impact of good governance on human development theoretically comes from the premise that the requirements for achieving development are met by good governance mechanisms in terms of an efficient market and a state capable of protecting property rights, limiting corruption, committing to democracy and protecting the interests of the majority (Al-Ajlouni, 2019). As the process of exercising power under good governance is not limited to the government, which consists of institutions, actors and those charged with exercising power, but also includes similar elements belonging to the private sector and civil society. All of which include roles and actors in the state, the market, and the social environment that help achieve development, in light of the basic characteristics and values of good governance such as transparency, responsibility, effectiveness, public participation and the rule of law (Al-Jabri, 2001). Development is no longer just about obtaining the correct economic and technical inputs, but also means the institutional environment that supports them, that is, the rules and norms that determine how those inputs are used (World Bank, 1997).

Development also requires conditions that must be met, the most important of which is that there should be real participation between the public and private sectors, the benefits of development be distributed fairly and equitably, the element of continuity and development be available for development, effective administrative bodies be available, and there should be organized scientific planning (Al-Owaimer, 2017). This is what good governance provides with its various mechanisms, features and institutions.

Significantly, the development does not work in a vacuum, but rather in the context and the surrounding environment. Thus, good governance constitutes the conducive environment for achieving human development due to its values and interactions by which people and groups express their interests, exercise their legal rights, fulfill their duties, and settle their variances. Good governance ensures that social, political and economic main concerns are set on the basis of broad consensus in society. It also ensures that the underprivileged and most vulnerable groups' voices be heard in the decision-making process related to the distribution of development resources (UNDP, 1997).

The good governance system normally works to provide the greatest degree of freedoms for citizens to participate in directing public policy and to carry out their creative activities in various fields, increasing individuals' abilities to make choices and enabling them to exercise these choices, unleashing their creative energies, and enabling them to participate in the matters of their lives is considered a means to achieve development (Democracy and Human Rights Program, U.D). Societies in which liability and accountability are existing and where decisions are taken transparently by a large segment of society are better capable to exploit their resources and achieve their development goals than those in which a small unique group is making decisions in an environment of secrecy and lack of accountability (Al-Youssef, 2003).

The economic freedom provided by good governance leads to more ability to attract private investment and thus raise the efficiency of public services, including the field of health and educational services, and the development and rehabilitation of human resources (Ben Chelouieh, 2015). The political stability that is included in good governance also plays a central and important role in achieving development. It is not possible to develop without enjoying security and stability, and preventing the occurrence of conflicts, as these are the main pillars that can reduce poverty and achieve development efforts (Ben Naoum, 2016). The rule of law provided by good governance also leads to the efficient exploitation of resources, the reduction of the spread of corruption, and the improvement of levels of development (Abdel Moneim, 1999).

Normally, good governance includes achieving justice in the distribution of resources and wealth, as one of the most important development issues, which necessarily leads to the inclusion of development for all regions and its coverage for all groups (Al-Asbahi, 2013). The good governance focuses on decentralization in adopting and implementing development policies, and distributing them to the various regions of the country geographically, thus relying on the full participation of community members, bringing the citizens closer to the administration, meeting the public's desires and securing the best services for them (Ben Naoum, 2016). Nevertheless, this does not negate that there are types of development that can take place under improper governance as repressive governments may achieve some development. However, the continuation of development in the true sense of the word certainly requires a better government (Al-Sayed, 2006).

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Indicators of Good Governance in Jordan

Levels of good governance in Jordan are measured based on the World Bank's six indicators. The results of each of the six indicators are presented annually in a range between (-2.5) (that is, the lowest in the levels of good governance) and (+2.5) (that is, the highest in the levels of good governance). These indicators include the following:

1. Voice and accountability: It relates to the insights of a country about the extent to which its citizens are able to partake in choosing their governments, and the extent of freedom of expression, freedom of the media and freedom of association.
2. Political stability and absence of violence: This indicator relates to perceptions about the possibility of political instability in the state, and the possibility of destabilizing the government or overthrowing it by illegal or vehement means. This includes violence of a political nature and acts of terrorism.
3. Government effectiveness: The indicator relates to insights related to the quality of public services, the civil service quality, independence from political pressures, the policy development quality and implementation, and the government's reliability in adhering to these policies.
4. Regulatory quality: The indicator embodies the insights related to the government's ability to verbalize and implement rigorous policies and laws that allow the promotion and development of the private sector.
5. Rule of law: This indicator embodies perceptions of the extent to which dealers are confident in complying with legal rules, especially the quality of contract enforcement, property rights, the police, and the courts, and the possibility of crimes and violence.
6. Control corruption: This indicator relates to perceptions about the extent to which public power is exercised to achieve private gains, including all forms of minor and major corruption, and the extent to which influencers, private interests, and elites control the state (Kaufmann et al., 2010).

As noted, the first and second indicators represent the political dimension of good governance; the third and fourth indicators represent the economic dimension of good governance; and the fifth and sixth indicators represent the administrative/institutional dimension of good governance.

Table 1 shows the values of the indicators of good governance in Jordan during the period 2010-2019.

Table 1: Evaluation of indicators of good governance in Jordan during the period (2010-2019)

Year	Voice and Accountability	Political Stability and Absence of Violence	Government Effectiveness	Regulatory Quality	Rule of Law	Control Corruption
2010	-0.8	-0.3	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.0
2011	-0.8	-0.5	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.1
2012	-0.7	-0.5	0.0	0.2	0.4	0.1
2013	-0.8	-0.6	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.1
2014	-0.8	-0.5	0.1	0.1	0.5	0.1
2015	-0.8	-0.6	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.3
2016	-0.7	-0.5	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.3
2017	-0.7	-0.5	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.2
2018	-0.7	-0.4	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.2
2019	-0.7	-0.3	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1
The overall average of the index	-0.75	-0.47	0.08	0.12	0.3	0.15

Source: The World Bank (2022)

It is clear from Table 1 that the values of the indicators are low in general, which indicates the low level of good governance in the case of Jordan during the studied period. By comparing the indicators of the three dimensions of good governance, it is clear that the indicators of the political dimension are the lowest, as their values were negative in all years of study, which means low levels of participation, freedoms, accountability and political stability while the values of the indicators of the economic dimension were positive despite their decrease, and the indicators of the administrative/institutional dimension were the

best, which means better performance with regard to combating corruption and the rule of law.

The following is an analysis of the reality of the indicators of good governance in Jordan during the studied period:

1. *Voice and accountability*: It is clear from the indicator values in Table 1 that they are the lowest among all indicators, which signposts the low participation of citizens in government selection, monitoring and accountability in Jordan, mainly because of the incompleteness of the parliamentary nature of the political system, as parliamentary elections are not based on competition between political parties, and consequently governments are not formed from political parties that have achieved a majority within the legislative authority. Remarkably, this is closely related to the weakness of civil society institutions, especially political parties, and the weakness of citizens joining them due to their preference to join associations of a family nature (Center for Strategic Studies, 2011) in light of the decline in participation levels in the parliamentary elections, as the level of voting declined in the elections from 53% in 2010 to 36% in 2016 then to 29.9% in 2020 (Independent Election Commission, 2022).

Jordan's weak assessment in this indicator is also due to a set of restrictions on freedom of expression and media freedom that lead to weak media independence, in addition to violations of media and press freedoms, the most important of which is the lack of information provision and the withholding of information or the difficulty of obtaining it (Jordanian Journalists Syndicate, 2014). Within the framework of all of this, Jordan was classified in the first seven years of the studied period as a "Not Free State", and in the last three years of the studied period it began to be classified as a "Partly Free State" (Freedom House, 2022).

2. *Political stability and absence of violence*: The indicator values, as shown in Table 1, indicate the low levels of political stability in Jordan during the studied period, as this indicator came second in terms of weakness after the indicator of opinion and accountability. The values of this indicator were affected by the state of government instability in Jordan, where Jordan witnessed the formation of ten governments during the ten years of study, headed by seven prime ministers, which means short lifespan of governments in Jordan, at the rate of one government per year.

With regard to the government amendment of the ministers in each government, the Jordanian governments during the studied period witnessed 18 government amendments, with approximately two amendments for each government and every year (Prime Ministry of Jordan, 2022). The values of this indicator were also affected by a number of terrorist acts that Jordan was subjected to during the studied period, in addition to the impact of the events of the Arab Spring and the popular movement that Jordan witnessed during that period on the increase in government change to adapt to the new reality.

3. *Government effectiveness*: Although the values of this indicator were positive throughout the studied period, they remained low. This is related to the poor quality of public services and weak levels of civil service independence from political pressures, as the public sector in Jordan suffers from an increase in the number of employees, low levels of efficiency and productivity in light of the inflation of government agencies, the scarcity of financial and administrative resources, and the weak accountability for levels of commitment and achievement in public sector development programs (Ministry of Public Sector Development, 2011).
4. *Regulatory quality*: Jordan's evaluation in this indicator is ranked third in terms of strength after the indicators of rule of law and anti-corruption, although the values of this indicator remained low throughout the studied period, and its values witnessed a decline at the end of the studied period. The values of this indicator in Jordan were affected by the events of the Arab Spring and the state of political instability in the region, which in turn affected the economic, investment and competitive environment of the countries of the region, including Jordan.

Despite the enactment of many legislations encouraging the private sector in Jordan, and giving it more incentives, there is still difficulty in the organizational and bureaucratic procedures needed to

build businesses, and consequently, there are obstacles faced by investment and the private sector in the Jordanian economic environment, where Jordan is ranked 104 out of 190 countries in the ease of doing business index, which is lagging behind international rankings, indicating the presence of obstacles and lack of ease in doing business (World Bank Group, 2019).

5. *Rule of law*: Jordan's evaluation in this indicator is the best among all indicators of good governance, largely due to the independence of the judiciary and the integrity of the judiciary in Jordan. This makes the judiciary in Jordan enjoy high confidence. Nonetheless, there are issues that negatively affect Jordan's assessment in this indicator, the most important of which is the increased incidence of social violence and crime (Shteiwi, 2021).
6. *Control corruption*: The ranking of this indicator in terms of strength came in second place after the rule of law indicator, despite the decrease in its values in general during the studied period. The index values have improved in some years in light of the issuance of the Integrity and Anti-Corruption Law No. (13) of the year 2016. While Jordan's global rank in the corruption perceptions index was 54 in 2010, it has become 60 in 2019 (Transparency International, 2022).

3.2 Indicators of Human Development in Jordan

The current study relies on the human development indicators that the United Nations Development Program measures at the global level. The reality of human development in the country is measured by the "Human Development Index", which is a composite index focusing on the following dimensions:

1. The ability to live a healthy long life: It is measured by the life expectancy index at birth.
2. The ability to gain knowledge: It is often measured by the indicators of average years of study, and the expected number of years of study.
3. The ability to accomplish a decent standard of living: It is normally measured by the Gross National Income (GNI) per capita index (UNDP, 2018)

Starting from 2010, human development reports have begun to measure human development as adjusted by the inequality factor, which modifies the value of the Human Development Index on the basis of inequality, meaning that it is not limited to measuring the average achievements in each country in longevity, income and education, but shows how these achievements are distributed among population measures the actual level of human development after accounting for inequality (UNDP, 2018).

Table 2 shows the indicators of human development in Jordan during the studied period.

Table 2: The values of human development indicators in Jordan during the studied period

	Life expectancy at birth	Mean*	Expected years of schooling	Gross national**	Inequality-adjusted expectancy index	Inequality-adjusted education index	Inequality-adjusted income index	Human Development Index(HDI)	Inequality-adjusted Human Development Index	HDI
2010	73.1	8.6	13.1	5.956	0.729	0.508	0.450	0.681	0.550	82
2011	73.4	8.6	13.1	5300	0.732	0.551	0.449	0.698	0.565	95
2012	73.5	8.6	12.7	5272	0.732	0.541	0.462	0.700	0.568	100
2013	73.9	9.9	13.3	11.337	0.730	0.543	0.564	0.745	0.607	77
2014	74	13.5	9.9	11.365	0.732	0.586	0.568	0.748	0.625	80
2015	74.2	13.1	10.1	10.111	0.734	0.583	0.554	0.741	0.619	86
2016	74.2	11.7	10.4	9.790	0.734	0.583	0.554	0.729	0.619	94
2017	74.5	13.1	10.4	8.288	0.748	0.591	0.531	0.735	0.617	95
2018	74.4	11.9	10.5	8.868	0.748	0.574	0.547	0.723	0.617	102
2019	74.5	11.4	10.5	9.858	0.750	0.564	0.569	0.729	0.622	102

* Mean Years of schooling; ** Gross national income per capita(GNI)

Source: Human Development Reports data during the period (2010-2020) (UNDP, 2022)

It is noted from table 2 that there is a significant decline in Jordan's ranking at the global level. While Jordan was ranked 82 in the Human Development Index in 2010, it declined to 102 in 2019, and the growth rate of the Human Development Index during the studied period from 2010 to 2019) reached (-0.12) (UNDP, 2019). It witnessed a significant decline when compared to previous periods, where the annual average growth rate of the Human Development Index during the period 1980-2010 was (0.97), and the average during the period 2000-2010 was (0.92) (UNDP, 2010).

One of the most prominent manifestations of this decline during the studied period was the high rates of poverty and unemployment, as poverty rates rose from (14.4%) in 2010 to (15.7%) at the end of the studied period, while it was (13%) in 2006 (Beibars, 2021). On the other hand, unemployment rates increased from (12.5%) in 2010 to (19%) in 2019 and became (22.4%) among those holding a bachelor's degree or higher and (39.7%) in the age group (20-24) (Department of Statistics, 2019).

The values of human development indicators in Jordan were affected by the turbulent regional conditions during the school years with the start of the events of the Arab Spring in 2010, especially in light of the burdensome consequences generated by the Syrian crisis and its repercussions on Jordan, as well as the increase in pressure caused by the Syrian refugee crisis on infrastructure services and education sectors and health, where the net cost of the refugee crisis over the period from 2011-2014 was estimated at more than 7 billion US dollars (Esnad Consulting, 2015).

Jordan's needs for the year 2015 to be able to adapt to the Syrian presence were estimated at about 3.9 billion US dollars, in light of that 60% of the humanitarian appeal of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees for the year 2014 was not funded by the international community (Jordan Vision 2025, 2015). The effect of these circumstances on the reality of human development indicators in Jordan is evident by noting the decline in the per capita GDP during the first three years of the Arab Spring.

As Table 2 shows, the per capita share has decreased from 5,956 in 2010 to 5,272 in 2012, affected by the population growth resulting from the Syrian refugee crisis and its economic consequences. Economic estimates indicate that the average per capita income would have multiplied by more than three times if the population growth rates had remained at their pre-2011 levels (Jaradat, 2017). Thus, real growth rates had declined in 2011 compared to 2010 from about (5%) to less than (3%), which means a loss estimated at about 560 million US dollars (Center for Strategic Studies, 2012). The GDP growth rates also decreased from (8.24%) as an average for the period from 2005 to 2007 to (4.96%) for the period 2008-2010 and then to (2.70%) for the period 2011-2013 (Esnad Consulting, 2015). This decline explains Jordan's classification as one of the medium countries in human development in 2011 and 2012, although it was formerly classified as one of the countries with high human development in the rest of the years of study.

At the level of the average life expectancy index, it witnessed an increase over the studied period, as shown in Table 2, where health care indicators in Jordan are characterized by clear progress. The health sector in Jordan has witnessed a remarkable development in the level of health services and geographical coverage. The percentage of what is allocated to the health sector of the GDP has reached (9%), which is considered globally among the high percentages. Per capita spending on health care increased from 171.3 dollars in 2000 to 358.9 dollars in 2014 (The World Bank, 2017).

On the level of education indicators, Jordan is ranked high in the world in providing education for all, as the rate of enrollment in basic education has reached (99.1%). Jordan also witnessed a decrease in the illiteracy rate among the population, as it decreased from about (11%) in 2000 to (6.8%) in 2016, and the literacy rate among adults increased from (89%) in 2000 to (93.2%) in 2016. The percentage of attendance up to the fifth grade of primary school reached (98.5%) as a percentage of the age group (The World Bank, 2017).

It is also noted from the data in Table 2 that the difference (loss) between the original human development index and the human development index, adjusted by the inequality factor, was 19.2%, which indicates a high case of inequality in the distribution of the achievements of the indicators of longevity and education and income on the population in Jordan. However, this difference witnessed

an improvement at the end of the studied period, as it decreased to (14.7%) in 2019. This difference also witnessed an improvement at the level of all sub-indicators between 2010 and 2019, which means an improvement in inequality among the population, where the difference decreased at the level of life expectancy from (13.3%) to (10.6%), and at the level of education from (25.1%) to (15.4%). It decreased on the level of income from (18.7%) to (17.9%), but the disparity resulting from inequality remains large despite its decline (UNDP, 2010 & 2019).

3.3 Correlations between Indicators of Good Governance and Human Development in Jordan

Table 3 underneath shows the results of the statistical analysis and Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient between the indicators of the study variables.

Table 3: Pearson’s correlation coefficient between the independent variable (good governance) and the dependent variable (human development) (n = 10)

Variables		Voice and Accountability	Political Stability and Absence of Violence	Government Effectiveness	Regulatory Quality	Rule of Law	Control Corruption
Human Development Index(HDI)	Pearson correlation coefficient	0.278	-0.474	-0.581	-0.499	0.622	0.292
	statistical significant	0.437	0.166	0.078	0.142	0.055	0.414

It is clear from Table 3 that there is no statistically significant relationship at the significance level (0.05) between all the six indicators of good governance and human development in the case of Jordan, meaning that there is no correlation or influence of the indicators of good governance on the reality of human development in Jordan during the studied period from 2010 to 2019. This result is in agreement with some of the findings of Nandha and Smyth’s (2013) study that the impact of good governance on human development deteriorates over time, and the ability of governments to influence development is in decline.

This is also consistent with the results of Abu-Ismael et al.’s (2016) study that the relationship between good governance and development depends largely on the conditions of the state, as in the case of the Arab countries in which external geopolitical factors play an important role in increasing conflicts. In the case of Jordan, the regional conditions associated with the Arab Spring Revolutions and their fallouts during the years of the study played a major role in influencing the reality of development in Jordan, as it has become among the countries hosting the largest proportion of refugees in the world compared to its population, in which about 1.3 million Syrian refugees in Jordan as a result of the Syrian crisis in which more than 671 thousand among them registered with the United Nations (Jordanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Expatriates, 2022).

Remarkably, the massive population growth has exhausted the capabilities of the Jordanian host community through the impact of refuge on Jordan’s depleted resources, overloading the infrastructure and overburdening social services, such as health care and education (Francis, 2015). This has negatively affected human development in Jordan during the studied period. The Syrian refuge, and consequently the large population growth, constituted a great burden on the health system in Jordan by increasing the occupancy rate of hospitals, increasing pressure on medical devices and shortening their operational life. The costs of the health burden resulting from the Syrian refuge amounted to about 354 million US dollars per year (Ammon News Agency, 2016).

On the other hand, the refugees’ crisis has led to the exhaustion of the educational infrastructure at the school level, the density of student classes, the double-shift work, and increased pressure on school facilities and the cost of maintenance work, and consequently the decline in the performance of the educational system in light of the increasing cost of teaching Syrian students in government schools, which is estimated at 350 million US dollars annually (Mazhar, 2017).

The state of regional instability in light of the Arab Spring during the studied period has affected all indicators and development sectors in Jordan, which constituted additional burdens on human development indicators. Furthermore, the interruption of Egyptian gas with the consequences of the Egyptian Revolution increased the burden of the escalating energy bill. The services sector in Jordan was also negatively affected, including the tourism sector, as the number of tourists decreased from 5,326,501 in 2014 to 1,127,216 in 2015, and then to 1,050,608 in 2016 (Al-Khasawneh, 2017). All of this was accompanied by a decrease in international aid to Jordan, which decreased from 1,736 billion US dollars in 2014 to 1,240 million US dollars in 2015, and then dropped to 1,208 million US dollars in 2016. Significantly, the ratio of public debt to GDP increased to 95.1% (Central Bank of Jordan, 2016), which negatively affected the growth rates of human development indicators in Jordan during the studied period.

4. Conclusions

The results revealed that the studied period witnessed a decline in Jordan's ranking in the Human Development Index, as Jordan's ranking declined from 82 to 102 between 2010 and 2019. The results also showed that the values of the indicators of good governance in Jordan remained low during the studied period, and the values of the indicators of the political dimension (political stability and lack of violence, and accountability) were the lowest, While the indicators of the administrative/institutional dimension (control corruption, and rule of law) were the best, despite their lower values. On the other hand, the results showed that the studied period witnessed a decline in the growth rates of human development compared to its growth rates in previous periods.

With regard to the relationship between the two variables of the study, the results showed that there is no statistically significant correlation between the six indicators of good governance and the rates of human development in Jordan, meaning that the reality of the indicators of good governance in Jordan did not affect the levels of human development during the studied period. The growth rates of human development in Jordan during the studied period were greatly affected by external regional conditions related to the state of regional instability in the context of the Arab Spring Revolutions and their direct and indirect repercussions on Jordan. This includes the refuge crisis and the pressure caused by the large population growth on resources and infrastructure, and the high cost of education and health services, in addition to the significant decline in various economic indicators related to the high energy bill, the impact of the services/tourism sector, and the decline in international aid. This has been reflected negatively on the developmental reality in Jordan, and this has outstandingly become clear with the classification of Jordan within the group of medium countries in human development in the early years of the Arab Spring.

Thus, the results of the current study demonstrate that each country has a certain particularity in the nature of the relationship between good governance and human development. The human development in the country may be greatly affected by the regional reality more than being affected by the reality of good governance in it. Each country has its own circumstances, not only local but also regional and international conditions. Jordan has historically been surrounded by many crises that have negatively affected its development performance to a much greater degree than its development has been affected by internal factors.

5. Recommendations

The study recommends the Jordanian government to play a key role in stimulating and directing the development path through policy planning and implementation, which lead to building a productive national economy far from being affected by regional and international fluctuations, and oscillations in foreign aids. The government has to maintain supporting the education and health sector, enhance public spending in this field, and invest in human capital. It should develop practical policies to control the rising population growth in Jordan, that is compatible with development capabilities, and

reduces pressure on limited resources.

References

- Abdel Moneim, A. (1999). *Democracy and anti-corruption, and development: The political conditions for economic development*. Egypt: Center for Studies and Research of Developing Countries, Cairo, Cairo University.
- Abu-Ismaïl, K., Kuncic, A., & Sarangi, N. (2016). Governance-adjusted human development index. United Nations. http://www.un.org/development/desa/dspd/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2017/04/governance-adjusted-human-development-index-english_o.pdf
- Ahmad, Z., & Saleem, A. (2014). Impact of governance on human development. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS)*, 8(3), 612-628. <http://hdl.handle.net/10419/188159>
- Al-Ajlouni, M. M. (2019). The impact of good governance on sustainable economic development in the Arab countries. *Arab Journal of Administration*, 39(4), 3-20.
- Al-Asbahi, E. (2013). *Citizenship and development as a basis for social justice, in Development, democracy and the development of the Arab regional system*. Egypt: Arab Organization for Human Rights.
- Al-Jabri, M. A. (2001) Is it possible to move to neoliberalism in a backward country? In *Governance, Economic and Social Development and Combating Poverty, Cairo, ESCWA, Series of Studies on Combating Poverty*.
- Al-Khasawneh, M. (2017). The Jordanian economy: Imbalances and challenges. *Al Jazeera Center for Studies website*. <http://studies.aljazeera.net/ar/reports/2017/02/170209131200736.html>
- Alkire, S. (2010). Human development: Definitions, critiques, and related concepts. *UNDP-HDRO Occasional Papers*, (2010/1). <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2351490>
- Al-Owaimer, W. A. (2017). The positive impact of unlocking individual freedoms on human development. *Afkar Magazine, Jordanian Ministry of Culture*, Issue 336, 35-40.
- Al-Sayed, M. K. (2006). *Good governance: The political dimension of sustainable development, in, good governance and development*. Egypt.
- Al-Youssef, Y. K. (2003). Political participation and development in the gulf cooperation council countries. *Arab Future Magazine, Center for Arab Unity Studies*, 290(25), 122-134.
- Ammon News Agency (2016). *Progress in the health system for Syrian refugees in Jordan*, <https://www.ammonnews.net/article/263751>
- Beibars, S. (2021). The World Bank expects the poverty rate in Jordan to rise to 27%. *Al-Ghad newspaper*, 12/2-2021.
- Ben Chelouieh, U. (2015). *The role of the private service sector in achieving economic development in Algeria*. (Unpublished master's thesis, Algeria, Kasdi Merbah University, Ouargla).
- Ben Naoum, A. (2016). *The role of good governance in achieving local economic development (Algeria case study)*. (Unpublished master's thesis, Algeria, Mustafa Istanbouli University).
- Center for Strategic Studies (2011). *The state of democracy in Jordan: A public opinion survey*. University of Jordan, Amman.
- Center for Strategic Studies (2012). *The performance of the Jordanian economy in light of the Arab Spring*. Jordan: University of Jordan.
- Central Bank of Jordan (2016). *Annual report*. Jordan.
- Dator, W., Abunab, H., & Dao-Ayen, N. (2018). Health challenges and access to health care among Syrian refugees in Jordan: a review. *Eastern Mediterranean Health Journal*, 24(7). https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/326793/EMHJ_24_7_2018.pdf?sequence=1#page=76
- Democracy and Human Rights Program (U.D). *Governance literature, faculty of economics and political science*. Egypt: Cairo University. http://mpmar.gov.eg/ar-eg/mop/unity-government/Upload_Main_Entity_Db_AssetMedia_Filename_08bc543b99d31e2f8d06fa4d9oad6133.pdf
- Department of Statistics (2019). *Unemployment rate during the fourth quarter of 2019*. http://dos.gov.jo/dos_home_a/main/archive/unemp/2020/Emp_Q4_2019.pdf
- Dinh, T. Q., & Calabro, A. (2019). Asian family firms through corporate governance and institutions: A systematic review of the literature and agenda for future research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 21(1), 50-75. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12176>
- Esnad Consulting (2015). *Jordan's Economic Prospects 2015: Ingredients for Required Economic Reform*. Jordan.
- Francis, A. (2015) *The refugee crisis in Jordan*. Carnegie Middle East Center, Beirut.
- Freedom House (2022). *Freedom in the world*. <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world>
- Gaur, M., & Kant, R. (2020). The role of government and governance in human development: Astudy of very high development economies. *European Journal of Business and Management Research*, 5(5). <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejbmr.2020.5.5.546>

- Goldsmith, A. A. (2007). Is governance reform a catalyst for development? *Governance*, 20(2), 165-186. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1468-0491.2007.00352.x>
- Jordanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Expatriate Affairs (2022). *The Syrian refugee crisis*. <https://www.mfa.gov.jo/content/%D8%A3%D8%B2%D8%A9>
- Gregory, R. (2013). *Assessing 'good governance and corruption in New Zealand: 'scientific measurement, political discourse, and historical narrative*. <http://hdl.handle.net/10063/8132>
- Independent Election Commission, (2022). *Elections*. <https://www.iec.jo/en/other/independent-election-commission-jordan-o>
- International Science Council (2020). *Conversations on rethinking human development*. France.
- Isnad Consulting (2015). *Jordan's economic prospects 2015: Elements of required economic reform*. Jordan: the specialized economic report.
- Jaradat, H. (2017). The development of the average per capita income during the era of the Fourth Kingdom. *Al-Rai Newspaper*, 24/7/2017, <http://alrai.com/article/10399110/%D8%A5%D8%A9%D8%AA>
- Jordan Vision 2025 (2015). *National vision and strategy*. <http://inform.gov.jo/Portals/o/Report%20PDFs/2.%20Human%20&%20Social%20Development/Jordan%202025.pdf>
- Jordanian Journalists Syndicate (2014). *Report of the press and media freedoms scale in Jordan*. Jordan.
- Kaufmann, D., Kraay, A., & Mastruzzi, M. (June 29, 2009). Governance matters VIII: Aggregate and individual governance indicators, 1996-2008 *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper* No. 4978, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1424591>
- Kaufmann, D., Kraay, A., & Mastruzzi, M.(2010). The worldwide governance Indicators: Methodology and analytical Issues. *Draft Policy Research working paper*, <http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/pdf/wgi.pdf>
- Keser, A., & Gökmen, Y. (2018). Governance and human development: the impacts of governance indicators on human development. *J. Public Adm. Gov*, 8(1). <https://www.academia.edu/download/77208321/pdf.pdf>
- Maboloc, C. R. (2008). The concept of human development: A comparative study of Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum. 2-84. (Unpublished Master's Thesis in Applied Ethics Centre for Applied Ethics Linköpings Universitet, Germany). <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2:18358>
- Mazhar, A. (2017). *The Syrian refugee crisis is stressing the educational infrastructure and exacerbating the lack of resources*. <https://alghad.com>
- Ministry of Public Sector Development (2011). *Government policy document for public sector development: access to results-driven government management*. <http://www.mopds.gov.jo/ar/PDF%20Files/%D8%A5%D8%AB%D9>
- Nandha, M., & Smyth, R. (2013). *Quality of governance and human development*. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2360898> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2360898>
- Nayak, P. (January 7, 2008). Human development: Concept and measurement. *Growth and Human Development in North-East India*, Nayak, P., ed., pp.19-23, Oxford University Press, 2009, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1081274>
- Nzimakwe, T.I. (2005). An Analysis of the theory and practice of governance in the Kwazulu-NATAL Provincial Authority. (Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Kwazulu-Natal).
- OECD. (1995). *Participatory development and good governance, development co-operation guidelines series*.
- Prime Ministry of Jordan (2022). *Government data*, <https://www.pm.gov.jo/ar/CustomPages/SearchGovernment>
- Qader, A. I. (2020). The impact of good governance on human development: A case study of Iraq for the period (2005-2018). *Journal of Political and Security Studies*, 3(6), 37-54.
- Rahman, L. (2016). Governance and good governance: A theoretical framework. *Public Policy and Administration Research*, 6(10), 40-50.
- Thanh, N. Q. (2017). Good governance and human development in Vietnam: Spatial empirical evidence. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 7(5), 93. <https://search.proquest.com/openview/12dd465bfc303da0907de06f4fe244ee/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=816338>
- Sameti, M., Ranjbar, H., & Mohseni, F. (2012). The effect of good governance indicators on human development index: The case of ASEAN countries. *Quarterly Journal of Economic Growth and Development Research*, 1(4), 223-183. http://egdr.journals.pnu.ac.ir/article_64.html?lang=en
- Santiso, C. (2001). Good governance and aid effectiveness: The World Bank and conditionality. *The Georgetown public policy review*, 7(1), 1-22. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Carlos-Santiso/publication/228959367_Good_Governance_and_Aid_Effectiveness
- Sen, Amartya (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Scherer, A. G., & Voegtlin, C. (2020). Corporate governance for responsible innovation: Approaches to corporate governance and their implications for sustainable development. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 34(2), 182-208. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2017.0175>

- Sebudubudu, D. (2010). The impact of good governance on development and poverty in Africa: Botswana-A relatively successful African initiative. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 4(7), 249-262. <https://doi.org/10.5897/AJPSIR.9000112>
- Shteivi, M. (13 August, 2021). Violence and social stability. *Alghad Newspaper*, <https://alghad.com/%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B9%D9%86%D9%81>
- Sima, V., Gheorghe, I. G., Subić, J., & Nancu, D. (2020). Influences of the industry 4.0 revolution on the human capital development and consumer behavior: A systematic review. *Sustainability*, 12(10), 4035. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12104035>
- Simonis, U.E. (2004). Defining good governance: The conceptual competition is on. *Discussion paper*, No. P 2004-005, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung, Berlin.
- Sullivan, J. (2004). *Good democratic governance: The key component of political and economic reform*. <http://www.cipe-arabia.org/files/pdf/art1001.pdf>.
- The World Bank (2017). *World development indicators*. <http://databank.albankaldawli.org/data/reports.aspx?source=2&country=JOR>,
- The World Bank (2022). *Worldwide governance indicators*. <https://databank.worldbank.org/source/worldwide-governance-indicators>
- The World Bank (1992). *Governance and development*. World Bank Publications, Washington D.C.
- Transparency International (2022). *Corruption perceptions index*. <https://www.transparency.org/>
- UNDP (1990). *Human development report*. <https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-1990>
- UNDP (1997). *Governance for sustainable human development, policy document of the united nations development programme*. <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/3831662?ln=en>
- UNDP (2002). *Arab human development report*. <https://www.undp.org/arab-states/publications/arab-human-development-report-2002-0>
- UNDP (2010). *human development report 2010 the real wealth of nations: pathways to human development*. <https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-2010>
- UNDP (2018). *Human development indicators and indices: 2018 statistical update team*. <https://hdr.undp.org/content/statistical-update-2018>
- UNDP (2019). *Human development report 2019: Beyond income, beyond averages, beyond today*. <https://reliefweb.int/report/world/human-development-report-2019-beyond-income-beyond-averages-beyond-today-inequalities>
- UNDP (2022). *Human development reports 1990-2020*. <https://hdr.undp.org/en/global-reports>
- United Nations (2007). *Public governance indicators: A literature review*. https://publicadministration.un.org/publications/content/PDFs/E-Library%20Archives/2007%20Public%20Governance%20Indicators_a%20Literature%20Review.pdf
- Unlukaplan, I. (2010). Policy coherence, effectiveness, openness and participation in European Union. *International Journal of eBusiness and eGovernment Studies*, 2(1), 1-10. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/257143>
- World Bank (1997). *World development report: The state in a changing world. Egypt*: translated by Al-Ahram Center for Translation and Publishing.
- World Bank (2004). *Better governance for development in the Middle East and north Africa: enhancing inclusiveness and accountability*. (Arabic Edition). Lebanon: Dar Al-Saqi.
- World Bank Group (2019). *Doing business 2019*. https://www.worldbank.org/content/dam/doingBusiness/media/Annual-Reports/English/DB2019-report_web-version.pdf