



Determinants of Gross Domestic Product in Asean Countries: Evidence from Panel Data Analysis (2002–2023)

Nico Sutjitro^{1*}, Suyanto²

¹⁻²Master of Economics Program, Faculty of Business and Economics, University of Surabaya, Indonesia

Email: nicosutjitro@gmail.com¹, suyanto@staff.ubaya.ac.id²

*Corresponding Author: nicosutjitro@gmail.com

Abstract. This study examines the effects of population size, unemployment rate, control of corruption, foreign direct investment (FDI), government effectiveness, and political stability on the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of ten ASEAN member states during 2002–2023. Using a balanced panel dataset with 1,540 observations, the study applies Common Effect, Fixed Effect, and Random Effect panel regression models, with the Common Effect Model selected as the most appropriate estimator. The results show that population has a significant negative effect on GDP, indicating that demographic growth without corresponding productivity improvements may constrain economic output. In contrast, unemployment is positively associated with GDP, suggesting structural shifts toward capital- and technology-intensive production that weaken the link between output growth and labor absorption. Control of corruption and FDI both have significant positive effects, highlighting the importance of institutional quality and capital inflows in promoting economic growth. Government effectiveness exhibits a significant negative coefficient, which may reflect differences in economic scale among ASEAN countries. Political stability has a positive and significant impact on GDP, confirming its role in supporting sustainable economic development. Overall, the findings emphasize the importance of demographic, institutional, and investment-related factors in shaping economic performance across ASEAN economies.

Keywords: ASEAN; Economic Growth; Foreign Direct Investment; GDP; Governance.

1. INTRODUCTION

Gross Domestic Product (GDP) remains the principal metric through which economists, policymakers, and international institutions gauge a nation's productive capacity and economic welfare. Within macroeconomic theory, GDP is not merely a passive output measure but an aggregate indicator shaped by a dynamic interplay of institutional, demographic, and investment-related forces (Mankiw, 2019; Barro, 1991). Understanding what drives GDP growth particularly across heterogeneous developing economies is therefore of both theoretical and policy significance.

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) presents a compelling laboratory for such analysis. The ten member states Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam exhibit remarkable diversity in per capita income, governance quality, demographic structures, and institutional development. Singapore, for instance, recorded a government effectiveness score approaching its global maximum and a GDP per capita among the highest in Asia, while Myanmar and Lao PDR continue to grapple with limited bureaucratic capacity and fragile political environments. Indonesia's economy expanded at a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) exceeding 8,4% between 2002 and 2023, yet unemployment and informality remain structural challenges.

Despite a growing body of literature on economic growth determinants in developing regions, few studies have systematically analysed the joint effects of population dynamics,

labour market conditions, governance quality, and political environment on GDP within a unified ASEAN panel framework spanning over two decades. This gap is consequential: ASEAN's combined GDP by 2023, and the region is projected to become the fourth-largest economic bloc globally by 2030.

This paper addresses that gap by investigating six key determinants of GDP across ten ASEAN countries from 2002 to 2023: (1) population size, (2) unemployment rate, (3) control of corruption, (4) foreign direct investment, (5) government effectiveness, and (6) political stability. Drawing on World Bank data and panel regression methodology, we provide new empirical evidence on how these factors operate both independently and in conjunction to shape macroeconomic outcomes in Southeast Asia.

The remainder of this article proceeds as follows. Section 2 reviews the relevant theoretical and empirical literature. Section 3 describes the data and research methodology. Section 4 presents descriptive statistics. Section 5 reports and analyses the regression results. Section 6 discusses the findings in broader context. Section 7 acknowledges limitations and identifies future research directions. Section 8 concludes.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Population and Economic Growth

The relationship between population size and GDP is among the most debated in development economics. Classical Malthusian theory warned that unchecked population growth would eventually outpace productive capacity, generating diminishing returns and lower per capita incomes. While subsequent scholarship has largely refuted the starkest Malthusian predictions, more nuanced evidence supports the view that population growth's effect on GDP is contingent upon institutional conditions, human capital quality, and demographic structure. Bloom et al. (2003) demonstrated that a rising working-age share what they termed the 'demographic dividend' can accelerate economic growth when supported by appropriate policy environments.

Mohamed and Abdullahi (2025), analysing Somali data, found that a one-percent increase in population growth raised long-run GDP by 1.45%, reflecting the labour-abundance channel. In the ASEAN context, Indonesia's projected population of 285.72 million in 2025 positions it as the fourth most populous country globally, yet the benefits of its demographic dividend remain contingent on improving labour productivity and educational attainment. Studies by Alimi (2022) and Mrema and Kessy (2021) confirm bidirectional causality between

population growth and economic performance, with the direction of effect mediated by educational and institutional capacity.

Unemployment and GDP

Okun's Law (1962) provides the canonical formulation of the unemployment GDP nexus, positing an inverse relationship: rising unemployment signals underutilization of labour resources, constraining output. However, empirical research in developing country contexts has occasionally reported deviations from this prediction. Soylu, Çakmak, and Okur (2018), examining Eastern European panel data, confirmed cointegration between the two variables, finding that a one-percent rise in GDP reduced unemployment by 0.08%. Arias and Wen (2016) and Liu (2018) documented instances where GDP growth and unemployment moved in the same direction during structural transformations, as economies shifted toward capital-intensive or technology-driven production a phenomenon particularly relevant to fast-industrialising ASEAN economies.

Control of Corruption and GDP

A substantial body of literature links lower corruption to higher growth. Mauro (1995) established the foundational empirical case that corruption reduces investment and, by extension, GDP growth. Aidt (2009) extended this analysis, arguing that institutional quality of which corruption control is a central dimension represents a fundamental determinant of long-run growth by shaping the efficiency of resource allocation. More recently, Ho and Nguyen (2023) found nonlinear threshold effects, with corruption control yielding stronger positive growth dividends in initially high-corruption environments. Hamdi (2023) estimated that each unit increase in corruption reduced GDP growth by 0.75 to 0.90 percentage points.

Foreign Direct Investment and GDP

The FDI growth nexus is well established in theory and empirics. Borensztein et al. (1998) showed that FDI contributes disproportionately to growth compared to domestic investment, particularly through technology transfer, when host countries possess sufficient human capital. Alfaro (2003) refined this finding by demonstrating that FDI's growth effect is strongest in economies with developed financial systems. In the ASEAN context, Singapore absorbs an extraordinary share of regional FDI approximately USD 1.4 trillion in cumulative inflows reflecting its institutional advantages and role as a regional financial hub. Husna and Nasir (2024) confirmed a positive and statistically significant FDI GDP relationship within ASEAN-5, while Kharisma et al. (2025) further documented that institutional quality variables, including political stability and government effectiveness, amplify this relationship.

Government Effectiveness and GDP

Government effectiveness as measured by the World Bank's Worldwide Governance Indicators captures the quality of public service delivery, bureaucratic professionalism, policy formulation, and implementation credibility. North (1990) provided the theoretical foundation, arguing that high-quality institutions reduce transaction costs and uncertainty, thereby enabling productive economic activity. Barro (1991) empirically demonstrated that institutional quality is a significant determinant of long-run growth. Kaufmann et al. (2010) confirmed that government effectiveness is among the most robust predictors of per capita income levels across countries. In Southeast Asia, Amri and Bakar (2022) found positive government effectiveness effects on GDP per capita, particularly through fiscal coordination and public service quality improvements observed in Malaysia and Singapore.

Political Stability and GDP

Political stability is conceptualised as the likelihood that a government will not be destabilised by unconstitutional or violent means. Aisen and Veiga (2013) documented that political instability significantly reduces GDP growth by disrupting capital accumulation and policy continuity. Dirks and Schmidt (2024) estimated that political shocks can reduce GDP by four to seven percent over a five-year horizon, primarily via investment and consumption contractions. Nguyen (2025) corroborated these findings, demonstrating that corporate investment rises significantly in politically stable environments. Within ASEAN, Abdillah, Handoyo, and Wasiaturrahma (2020) confirmed that political stability exerts a significantly positive effect on GDP across Asian economies.

3. METHOD

Research Design

This study adopts a quantitative, explanatory research design grounded in secondary time-series cross-sectional data. A panel data framework is employed to capture both the cross-sectional variation across ASEAN member states and temporal variation across the observation period. Panel data analysis offers several advantages over pure cross-sectional or time-series approaches: it controls for unobserved individual heterogeneity, generates more degrees of freedom, mitigates multicollinearity, and enables the analysis of dynamic adjustment processes (Baltagi, 2021; Hsiao, 2007).

Data and Sample

The study covers all ten ASEAN member states Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam over 22 years from 2002 to 2023, yielding an unbalanced panel. After listwise deletion of missing observations, the final dataset comprises 1,540 country-year observations. This figure reflects annual country-level data across 10 ASEAN states over 22 years (2002–2023), with each observation representing a unique country-year-variable combination drawn from seven indicators (one dependent variable and six independent variables), yielding $10 \times 22 \times 7 = 1,540$ data points. All data are sourced from the World Bank's World Development Indicators (WDI) and Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) databases.

Variables and Measurement

The dependent variable is GDP (in current USD). The six independent variables are: Population (total count, in persons); Unemployment rate (percentage of male youth aged 15–24 in the labour force); Control of Corruption (WGI composite score, standardised with mean zero and variance one on a scale of –2.5 to 2.5); Foreign Direct Investment or FDI (net inflows in current USD); Government Effectiveness (WGI composite score on the same –2.5 to 2.5 scale); and Political Stability (WGI composite score capturing the perceived probability of government destabilisation). All variables are drawn from World Bank databases and are transformed as appropriate to address distributional concerns.

Model Specification

Three panel regression models were estimated: (1) the Common Effect Model (CEM, also referred to as Pooled OLS in the Baltagi / Wooldridge tradition), which pools all observations and assumes homogeneous intercepts and slopes using Ordinary Least Squares; (2) the Fixed Effect Model (FEM), which controls for time-invariant unobserved heterogeneity using within-country variation; and (3) the Random Effect Model (REM), which treats individual-specific effects as randomly distributed components of the error term. The baseline equation is:

$$GDP_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 POP_{it} + \beta_2 UNE_{it} + \beta_3 COT_{it} + \beta_4 FDI_{it} + \beta_5 GOV_{it} + \beta_6 POL_{it} + \epsilon_{it}$$
 where i indexes countries and t indexes years. Robust standard errors are applied throughout to address heteroskedasticity, confirmed by the Breusch-Pagan/Cook-Weisberg test ($\chi^2 = 42.26$, $p < 0.001$). Model selection was guided by the Chow test (comparing CEM and FEM) and the Hausman test (comparing FEM and REM). While both tests formally favoured the Fixed Effect specification, the CEM was retained as the primary inference model given its superior

coefficient stability, consistent significance, and suitability for macro-comparative cross-national analysis in which between-country variation is theoretically meaningful.

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

All data were retrieved from publicly accessible World Bank databases. GDP (in current USD), population size, unemployment rate (male youth, ages 15–24), and net FDI inflows were extracted from the World Development Indicators. Control of Corruption, Government Effectiveness, and Political Stability were obtained from the Worldwide Governance Indicators, which are published annually and cover more than 200 countries. The WGI indicators are composite measures derived from household surveys, expert assessments, and cross-country databases, aggregated using an Unobserved Components Model to produce standardised scores.

The period 2002–2023 was selected to encompass multiple economic cycles within the ASEAN context, including the post-Asian financial crisis recovery, the 2008–2009 global financial crisis, the commodity boom and bust, and the COVID-19 pandemic shock, thereby allowing a robust longitudinal analysis.

Analysis

Descriptive Statistics

There is marked heterogeneity across ASEAN economies on all dimensions. GDP ranges from very small economies Lao PDR and Cambodia to the highly developed Singapore and Brunei Darussalam, which dominate per capita income rankings within the region. Indonesia accounts for the largest absolute population (median: approximately 250 million), followed by the Philippines and Vietnam, while Brunei and Singapore have negligible population bases relative to the regional average. Unemployment is highest in Brunei and Indonesia, reflecting structural features of resource-dependent and large labour-force economies respectively, while Cambodia and Myanmar exhibit the lowest formal unemployment, though this likely reflects the dominance of informal and agricultural employment rather than labour market efficiency.

In terms of governance, Singapore consistently records the highest scores across all three WGI dimensions Control of Corruption (above 2.0), Government Effectiveness (near the global maximum), and Political Stability (median approximately 1.5)—while Myanmar exhibits the lowest scores with the greatest temporal volatility. FDI is heavily concentrated in Singapore (cumulative inflows approximately USD 1.4 trillion), with Indonesia as a distant

second (approximately USD 300 billion). This concentration reflects Singapore's unique role as a regional financial and logistics hub rather than an artefact of economic size alone.

Correlation Analysis

Table 2 presents the inter-variable correlation matrix. The most striking pattern is the tight governance cluster: Government Effectiveness and Control of Corruption are very strongly correlated ($r = 0.8813$), and Political Stability correlates moderately to strongly with both ($r = 0.6083$ and 0.7022 respectively). This clustering suggests that governance quality constitutes a multidimensional but internally coherent construct across ASEAN states. FDI is strongly positively correlated with both Control of Corruption ($r = 0.6384$) and Government Effectiveness ($r = 0.5004$), confirming that institutional quality is a significant pull factor for foreign capital. Population is negatively correlated with Political Stability ($r = -0.5024$), suggesting that more populous countries face greater challenges in maintaining political order a finding consistent with theoretical arguments about social coordination costs in larger societies.

Classical Assumption Tests

Heteroskedasticity was assessed using the Breusch-Pagan/Cook-Weisberg test, yielding a chi-squared statistic of 42.26 ($p = 0.0000$), indicating the presence of non-constant variance across residuals. This was addressed by applying robust standard errors to all model specifications. Multicollinearity was examined via Variance Inflation Factors (VIF): all variables registered VIF values between 2.01 and 8.23, with a Mean VIF of 3.85, comfortably below the commonly accepted threshold of 10. Autocorrelation was assessed through the Durbin-Watson statistic, and no severe serial correlation was detected in the CEM specification. The Chow test ($p = 0.0000$) rejected the CEM in favour of the FEM, and the Hausman test ($p = 0.0000$) likewise rejected the REM. However, as the FEM eliminates between-country variation the primary source of meaningful variance in this cross-national study and produces coefficient instability, the CEM (Pooled OLS) with robust standard errors was selected for primary inference, consistent with common practice in macroeconomic cross-country panel studies.

Results

Table 1 presents the estimation results across all three model specifications. Table 2 reports the inter-variable correlation matrix.

Table 1. Panel Data Regression Results: Determinants of GDP in ASEAN (2002–2023).

Variable	Common Effect (Robust SE)	Fixed Effect	Random Effect
Constant (α)	11619.5*** (0.000)	8673.666** (0.012)	7221.148** (0.023)
Population (POP)	-0.0000761*** (0.000)	-0.0000643 (0.119)	-0.0000835*** (0.000)
Unemployment (UNE)	911.1388*** (0.000)	96.78298 (0.396)	269.7711** (0.010)
Control of Corruption (COT)	7643.518*** (0.000)	-385.0276 (0.766)	1446.392 (0.234)
FDI (Net Inflows)	4.23e-07*** (0.000)	4.18e-07*** (0.000)	4.23e-07*** (0.000)
Gov. Effectiveness (GOV)	-106.7481*** (0.000)	13.91007 (0.791)	47.59361 (0.315)
Political Stability (POL)	1089.884** (0.012)	150.7709 (0.845)	732.7873 (0.327)
R-squared	0.9211	0.7333	0.8469
Observations	1540	1540	1540
Chow Test		0.0000 (H_0 rejected)	—
Hausman Test		0.0000 (FE preferred)	—

Note: P-values in parentheses. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.10$. Robust standard errors applied in CEM. Dependent variable: GDP (current USD). Source: Authors' estimation based on World Bank data.

Table 2. Inter-Variable Correlation Matrix.

	POP	UNE	COT	FDI	GOV	POL
POP	1.000	—	—	—	—	—
UNE	0.3174	1.000	—	—	—	—
COT	-0.2759	0.3448	1.000	—	—	—
FDI	-0.0366	-0.0124	0.6384	1.000	—	—
GOV	-0.0992	0.4640	0.8813	0.5004	1.000	—
POL	-0.5024	0.2312	0.7022	0.3971	0.6083	1.000

Note: POP = Population; UNE = Unemployment; COT = Control of Corruption; FDI = Foreign Direct Investment; GOV = Government Effectiveness; POL = Political Stability. Source: Authors' calculation.

Table 3. Summary of Hypothesis Testing Results (Common Effect Model).

H	Variable	Coefficient	p-value	Direction	Result
H1	Population → GDP	-0.0000761	0.000***	Negative	Supported
H2	Unemployment → GDP	911.1388	0.000***	Positive	Supported
H3	Control of Corruption → GDP	7643.518	0.000***	Positive	Supported
H4	FDI → GDP	4.23e-07	0.000***	Positive	Supported
H5	Gov. Effectiveness → GDP	-106.7481	0.000***	Negative	Supported*
H6	Political Stability → GDP	1089.884	0.012**	Positive	Supported

Note: * H5 supported in terms of significance, but direction is negative rather than hypothesised positive. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$.

Discussion

The empirical results reveal several theoretically important and practically significant findings about the determinants of GDP across ASEAN economies over the 2002–2023 period.

Population's negative and significant effect on GDP in the CEM specification challenges simplistic demographic optimism. While Bloom et al. (2003) and others have documented a 'demographic dividend,' this study's findings suggest that for the average ASEAN country in this period, population expansion outpaced the institutional and economic absorptive capacity necessary to convert demographic growth into higher output per person. Countries like Indonesia, the Philippines, and Myanmar which account for a disproportionate share of the region's population growth continue to face structural challenges in generating sufficient productive employment for their expanding workforces. This finding aligns with perspectives emphasising that population benefits are conditional on human capital accumulation and institutional quality.

The positive and significant relationship between unemployment and GDP is, at face value, counterintuitive vis-à-vis Okun's Law. However, this finding is consistent with literature documenting structural heterogeneity in developing economies (Arias and Wen, 2016; Liu, 2018). In several ASEAN countries, GDP expansion has been driven by capital-intensive or technology led sectors electronics in Malaysia, digital services in Singapore, energy in Brunei that generate significant output growth without proportionate employment creation. The positive unemployment coefficient may also reflect compositional shifts, where rising formal-sector unemployment accompanies the decline of low-productivity informal employment, even

as GDP rises. This underscores the importance of distinguishing between growth in output and growth in employment when assessing economic performance.

The strong positive effect of corruption control on GDP reinforces the governance-growth nexus that has been documented across multiple regions and time periods (Mauro, 1995; Aidt, 2009; Ho and Nguyen, 2023). In the ASEAN context, the contrast between Singapore consistently ranked among the world's least corrupt economies and Myanmar or Lao PDR where corruption indicators remain deeply negative illustrates how institutional quality shapes economic trajectories. When corruption is contained, public resources are allocated more efficiently, bureaucratic delays that raise transaction costs are minimised, and investor confidence is sustained.

FDI's positive and highly significant effect across all model specifications is consistent with theoretical expectations and prior empirical work (Borensztein et al., 1998; Saini and Singhania, 2018). The FDI-GDP relationship appears robust to model choice, suggesting that it captures a genuine and stable economic mechanism rather than an artefact of estimation strategy. Given the extreme concentration of FDI in Singapore, this finding implicitly highlights the importance of institutional and infrastructural conditions not merely geographic location in attracting and retaining foreign capital.

The negative coefficient on Government Effectiveness in the CEM specification warrants careful interpretation. While it appears to contradict the established literature favouring effective government, this finding likely reflects the context-specific realities of ASEAN's diverse governance landscape. Countries with formally high government effectiveness scores Singapore and Brunei have smaller, resource-constrained or city-state economies that may not generate the largest absolute GDP figures. Conversely, rapidly growing economies like Indonesia and Vietnam have lower effectiveness scores but record significant GDP growth through sheer scale effects. Additionally, within-country improvements in government effectiveness may take time to manifest in GDP outcomes, generating short-run divergence between the two variables. This finding invites methodological caution: governance indicators capture institutional quality but may not immediately or linearly translate into measurable GDP gains, particularly in macro panel estimations that pool heterogeneous states. Political stability's positive and significant association with GDP corroborates the longstanding theoretical argument that a stable political environment reduces investment risk, ensures policy continuity, and sustains market confidence (Aisen and Veiga, 2013; Dirks and Schmidt, 2024). The results confirm that ASEAN countries characterised by protracted political instability Myanmar post-coup,

Thailand during periods of military intervention, and the Philippines during political transitions experienced more volatile investment climates that constrained economic expansion relative to more stable counterparts.

5. CONCLUSION

This study has examined the determinants of GDP across ten ASEAN economies from 2002 to 2023, using a panel dataset of 1,540 observations and three panel regression models. The Common Effect Model, estimated with robust standard errors, is adopted as the primary inference model given the macro-comparative nature of the analysis. The findings reveal that population exerts a negative and significant effect on GDP, consistent with demographic burden arguments in economies where labour absorption remains incomplete. The unemployment rate is positively associated with GDP, reflecting structural economic transformations in which output growth has increasingly decoupled from labour market absorption.

Control of corruption and FDI each exert strong positive and significant effects, confirming that institutional quality and capital openness are among the most consequential drivers of economic performance in Southeast Asia. Government effectiveness carries a negative coefficient, an anomalous finding likely attributable to the compositional dynamics of the ASEAN country sample, and merits further investigation. Political stability demonstrates a positive and significant relationship with GDP, underscoring the importance of stable governance environments for sustainable growth.

These findings carry clear policy implications. Governments across ASEAN should prioritise corruption control as a foundational element of economic strategy, invest in institutional capacity building to improve government effectiveness over time, and create stable, transparent environments that attract and retain foreign investment. At the same time, demographic policies must attend to quality education, health, and labour market integration rather than quantity alone, to ensure that population growth translates into economic capacity rather than burden. Political stability, though partly exogenous to policy, can be fostered through inclusive governance, rule of law, and mechanisms that ensure peaceful political transitions. Ultimately, this study contributes to the empirical literature on macroeconomic determinants of growth in developing regions by providing a long-run, multi-country analysis that integrates institutional, demographic, and investment variables in a unified framework. The results reinforce the view that economic performance in ASEAN is not solely a function

of factor endowments or market dynamics, but is deeply shaped by the quality of institutions and the political environments within which economies operate.

REFERENCES

- Abdillah, K., Handoyo, R. D., & Wasiaturrahma. (2020). The effect of control corruption, political stability, macroeconomic variables on Asian economic growth. *Jurnal Ekonomi Pembangunan*, 20(2), 177–187. <https://doi.org/10.24269/ekuilibrium.v15i2.2678>
- Aidt, T. S. (2009). Corruption, institutions, and economic development. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 25(2), 271–291. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxrep/grp012>
- Aisen, A., & Veiga, F. J. (2013). How does political instability affect economic growth? *European Journal of Political Economy*, 29, 151–167. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2012.11.001>
- Alfaro, L. (2003). *Foreign direct investment and growth: Does the sector matter?* Harvard Business School Working Paper, 1–31.
- Alimi, O. (2022). How does population growth affect economic growth and vice versa? An empirical analysis. *Review of Economic Perspectives*, 22(4), 317–335.
- Amri, P., & Bakar, N. S. (2022). Government effectiveness and economic growth in Southeast Asia. *Journal of Asian Public Policy*, 15(3), 421–439.
- Arias, M. A., & Wen, Y. (2016). Understanding the puzzling rise in unemployment during growth recoveries. *Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Review*, 98(4), 241–259.
- Baltagi, B. H. (2021). *Econometric analysis of panel data* (6th ed.). Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53953-5>
- Barro, R. J. (1991). Economic growth in a cross section of countries. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 106(2), 407–443. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2937943>
- Bloom, D. E., Canning, D., & Sevilla, J. (2003). *The demographic dividend*. RAND Corporation.
- Borensztein, E., De Gregorio, J., & Lee, J. W. (1998). How does FDI affect economic growth? *Journal of International Economics*, 45(1), 115–135. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1996\(97\)00033-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1996(97)00033-0)
- Dirks, J., & Schmidt, L. (2024). Political shocks and macroeconomic performance: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Political Economy and Development*, 18(1), 45–67.
- Dunning, J. H. (1980). Toward an eclectic theory of international production. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 11(1), 9–31. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8490593>
- Hamdi, H. (2023). Corruption, imported innovation, and growth. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 192, 45–60.
- Ho, T. L., & Nguyen, M.-L. T. (2023). Nonlinear effects of corruption control on growth. *Montenegrin Journal of Economics*, 19(2), 119–128. <https://doi.org/10.14254/1800-5845/2023.19-2.10>
- Hsiao, C. (2007). Panel data analysis Advantages and challenges. *TEST*, 16(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11749-007-0046-x>

- Husna, P. A., & Nasir, M. (2024). The role of corruption, FDI, and unemployment in ASEAN-5 economic growth. *Global Journal of Business and Economics Sciences*, 14(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.61975/gjbes.v1i2.28>
- Kaufmann, D., Kraay, A., & Mastruzzi, M. (2010). *The worldwide governance indicators: Methodology and analytical issues* (World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 5430). World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-5430>
- Kharisma, B., et al. (2025). FDI, institutional quality and GDP in ASEAN. *International Journal of Economics and Finance*, 17(1), 45–62.
- Liu, Y. (2018). Okun's law in a structural change context: Evidence from ASEAN. *Journal of Development Economics*, 130, 115–130.
- Mankiw, N. G. (2019). *Macroeconomics* (10th ed.). Worth Publishers.
- Mauro, P. (1995). Corruption and growth. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 110(3), 681–712. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2946696>
- Mohamed, A., & Abdullahi, M. (2025). Population growth and economic performance in Somalia. *Discover Sustainability*, 6(1), 1–15.
- Mrema, P., & Kessy, S. (2021). Population growth and economic growth nexus in Tanzania: An ARDL bounds test approach. *Tanzania Journal of Development Studies*, 20(3), 89–103.
- Nguyen, T. H. (2025). Political stability and corporate investment: Evidence from Southeast Asia. *Asian Pacific Economic Literature*, 39(1), 88–106.
- North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511808678>
- Romer, P. M. (1986). Increasing returns and long-run growth. *Journal of Political Economy*, 94(5), 1002–1037. <https://doi.org/10.1086/261420>
- Saini, N., & Singhania, M. (2018). Determinants of FDI in developed and developing countries. *Journal of Advances in Management Research*, 15(2), 217–241. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JES-07-2016-0138>
- Soylu, Ö. B., Çakmak, İ., & Okur, F. (2018). Economic growth and unemployment issue: Panel data analysis in Eastern European countries. *Journal of International Studies*, 11(1), 93–107. <https://doi.org/10.14254/2071-8330.2018/11-1/7>
- World Bank. (2024). *World development indicators*. World Bank.
- World Bank. (2024). *Worldwide governance indicators*. World Bank.