Proceeding of the International Conference on Management, Entrepreneurship, and Business

E-ISSN: 3090-9155

Research Article

The Role of GDP in Changing the Influence of Environmental and Politic on SDG

Anum Nuryani[1*], Anggun Anggraini[2], Andika Prasetya[3]

[1-3] Pamulang University, Indonesia; e-mail: AnumNuryani@gmail.com
* Corresponding Author: Anum Nuryani

Abstract: Amidst the current changing global conditions, it is important for a country to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to face challenges in sustainable development, social inequality, and strengthen economic and environmental resilience. This study aims to analyze the influence of environmental performance and political stability on the SDG scores of ASEAN countries for the 2020-2024 period, moderated by economic growth. Researchers used a quantitative method, processed using multiple linear regression with SPSS. The regression process was conducted twice, before and after using moderating variables. The findings suggest that economic growth can alter the influence of environmental performance and political stability on SDG scores. Political stability has a positive impact on the SDGs after economic growth has moderated. While environmental performance has a negative impact after being moderated by economic growth. Economic growth promotes political stability and sustainable growth. Conversely, with high growth, improvements in environmental performance are indicated to shift priorities from sustainability to exploitation.

Keywords: ASEAN; Environmental; GDP; Politics; SDG

Received: August 13, 2025
Revised: September 10, 2025
Accepted: October 5, 2025
Published: November 30, 2025
Curr. Ver.: December 30, 2025

1. Introduction

In recent decades, global attention to environmental issues and sustainable development has increased significantly, highlighting the need for indicators that reflect both economic progress and sustainability. One of the most commonly used indicators to measure a country's economic performance is Gross Domestic Product (GDP), although it does not fully capture environmental or social dimensions. GDP not only reflects economic health but also plays a crucial role in influencing environmental and political policies related to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (Gazi et al., 2024). (Gazi et al., 2024) demonstrate a significant long-term relationship between ESG initiatives, GDP growth, and the achievement of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in East Asia and South Asia. Their findings suggest that GDP not only reflects economic health but also plays a crucial role in shaping environmental and political policies related to SDG attainment. Therefore, it is essential to examine how GDP interacts with ESG factors within the broader context of sustainable development. GDP can be a powerful tool for supporting the achievement of the SDGs, but only if it is balanced with policies that support sustainability (Zarghami, 2025). This highlights the need for evidence-based strategies that enable governments and stakeholders to align economic growth with environmental protection and social welfare, as emphasized in sustainable development frameworks (Adrangi & Kerr, 2022). Gross Domestic Product (GDP) is one of the primary indicators used to measure a country's economic performance. GDP reflects the total value of goods and services produced within a country over a specific period and is often used as a measure of economic growth.

GDP is often considered the main indicator of a country's prosperity. When GDP increases, this is usually interpreted as positive economic growth, which can create jobs, increase income, and improve people's living standards. However, economic growth as measured by GDP does not always reflect social welfare and environmental sustainability. In many cases, rapid GDP growth can lead to excessive exploitation of natural resources and increased pollution, which have negative impacts on public health and ecosystems (Sachs, 2015).

The SDGs consist of 17 interrelated goals that aim to address global challenges such as poverty, inequality, and climate change. GDP plays an important role in determining the allocation of resources to achieve these goals. Increased GDP can provide more funds for investment in sustainable infrastructure, education, and health, all of which are part of the SDGs (United Nations, 2015). However, the relationship between GDP and the SDGs is not always positive. Rapid economic growth often comes at a high environmental cost, such as pollution and the degradation of natural resources (Sachs, 2015).

High GDP provides governments with more resources to invest in sustainable environmental policies. Countries with higher GDP tend to have the capacity to develop environmentally friendly infrastructure, such as efficient public transportation and good waste management systems (Raworth, 2017). In addition, increased GDP can support funding for renewable energy, which is important for reducing dependence on environmentally damaging fossil fuels (United Nations Environment Programme, 2019).

High GDP is often associated with strong economic growth. However, this growth is not always sustainable. In many cases, an increase in GDP can lead to excessive exploitation of natural resources and increased pollution. For example, countries that rely on heavy industry to increase their GDP often experience a decline in environmental quality, which has a negative impact on public health and ecosystems (Sachs, 2015). This shows that while GDP can reflect economic growth, it can also be an indicator of greater environmental damage.

High GDP allows governments to invest in environmentally friendly infrastructure. For example, countries with higher GDP tend to have more resources to develop efficient public transportation and good waste management systems. This contributes to reduced carbon emissions and improved quality of life for communities (Raworth, 2017). In addition, increased GDP can support funding for renewable energy, which is important for reducing dependence on environmentally damaging fossil fuels (United Nations Environment Programme, 2019).

However, challenges arise when GDP growth is not balanced with policies that support sustainability. In many cases, policies that focus more on short-term economic growth can ignore long-term environmental impacts. Therefore, it is important to develop policies that not only focus on GDP growth but also consider the social and environmental impacts of that growth (Stiglitz et al., 2010).

Politics plays a key role in directing how GDP is used to achieve the SDGs. Public policies that support sustainability and social inclusion can help change the way GDP contributes to development goals. For example, policies that promote renewable energy can reduce dependence on fossil fuels, which in turn can improve environmental quality and public health (KPMG, 2020).

Community involvement in the political decision-making process is also very important. Community participation can ensure that the policies adopted reflect the needs and aspirations of the community, so that GDP can be used to achieve the SDGs more effectively. Political uncertainty can hamper investment and GDP growth, which in turn can affect the achievement of the SDGs (World Bank, 2021).

Proactive public policies are essential to creating an environment that supports sustainable GDP growth. Governments with a long-term vision for sustainable development can create policies that support GDP growth while preserving the environment. This includes strict regulations on pollution and the exploitation of natural resources (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2019).

Community involvement in the political decision-making process is also very important. Community participation can ensure that the policies adopted reflect the needs and aspirations of the community, so that GDP can be used to achieve the SDGs more effectively. Political uncertainty can hamper investment and GDP growth, which in turn can affect the achievement of the SDGs (World Bank, 2021).

Political stability is essential for sustainable economic growth. Countries with political stability tend to be better able to attract foreign and domestic investment, which in turn can increase GDP and support the achievement of SDGs. Conversely, political uncertainty can lead to a decline in investment and economic growth, which can hamper efforts to achieve sustainable development goals (Sachs, 2015).

Technological innovation also plays an important role in the relationship between GDP, the environment, and politics. Countries that invest in research and development (R&D) tend to have higher GDPs and can develop more sustainable solutions to environmental challenges. Green technologies, such as renewable energy and energy efficiency, can help reduce the negative impact of economic growth on the environment (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2019). Therefore, policies that support innovation and sustainable technology are essential for achieving the SDGs.

2. Literature Review

Gross Domestic Product (GDP) is often considered the main indicator of a country's economic health. However, the role of GDP in influencing environmental and political policies related to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) is increasingly becoming a focus of academic research. The SDGs, adopted by the United Nations in 2015, encompass 17 goals aimed at addressing global challenges, including poverty, inequality, and climate change. In this context, it is important to understand how GDP can influence and be influenced by environmental and political factors.

Economic growth theories, such as the Solow model (1956), explain how the accumulation of capital, labor, and technological progress contribute to GDP growth. This model shows that economic growth can improve people's welfare, but it can also have negative impacts on the environment if not managed properly. In the context of the SDGs, sustainable economic growth must take environmental impacts into account.

The theory of sustainable development, introduced by Brundtland (1987), emphasizes the importance of balancing economic growth, environmental sustainability, and social justice. High GDP does not always guarantee sustainability; therefore, it is important to integrate environmental policies into economic planning to achieve the SDGs.

Institutional theory, as described by North (1990), emphasizes the role of institutions in facilitating economic growth and political stability. Strong institutions can promote policies that support sustainability and the achievement of SDGs. In this context, high GDP can contribute to institutional strengthening, which in turn can influence environmental and social policies.

GDP can influence environmental policy in several ways. Countries with higher GDP tend to have more resources to invest in environmentally friendly technologies and sustainability initiatives. According to Stern (2007), investment in renewable energy and carbon emission reduction is essential to achieving SDG 7 (Affordable and Clean Energy) and SDG 13 (Climate Action).

However, unplanned GDP growth can lead to environmental degradation. Dasgupta (2021) shows that economic growth that does not take environmental impacts into account can hinder the achievement of the SDGs. Therefore, it is important to integrate environmental considerations into economic planning to ensure that growth does not compromise sustainability.

GDP not only reflects the economic health of a country, but also plays an important role in influencing environmental and political policies related to SDGs. In this context, further analysis is needed to understand the complex relationship between GDP, the environment, and political policies.

High GDP is often associated with greater political stability. Countries with strong economies tend to have better institutions and more effective policies for achieving the SDGs. Acemoglu and Robinson (2012) argue that inclusive and stable institutions can promote sustainable economic growth and the achievement of the SDGs.

However, there are political challenges arising from GDP growth. Increasing economic inequality can lead to social and political tensions, which in turn can hinder progress toward the SDGs. Piketty (2014) notes that high inequality can lead to political instability, which can disrupt efforts to achieve development goals.

To ensure that GDP growth supports the achievement of the SDGs, policies focused on sustainability and social justice must be implemented. This includes reducing emissions, protecting natural resources, and improving community welfare. Integration between economic, environmental, and social policies is key to achieving development goals. With a holistic approach, countries can steer economic growth toward more sustainable and inclusive outcomes. The role of GDP in transforming environmental and political influences on the SDGs is highly complex. While GDP can serve as a positive indicator of growth, it is crucial to ensure that such growth is sustainable and inclusive. Thus, the integration of economic, environmental, and social policies is key to achieving the desired development goals.

Based on the above theories, several hypotheses can be developed for further research:

The influence of the Environmental Performance Index (EPI) on the SDG Score

EPI is an indicator that measures a country's environmental performance based on various factors, including air quality, water quality, and natural resource management. SDG Score is a measure that reflects the extent to which a country has achieved the Sustainable Development Goals. The theory of sustainable development emphasizes the importance of environmental performance in achieving social and economic goals. According to Brundtland (1987), environmental sustainability is key to achieving social and economic well-being. Research by Hsu et al. (2016) shows that countries with better environmental performance tend to have higher SDG scores, which supports this hypothesis.

H1: There is a significant positive influence between the Environmental Performance Index (EPI) and the SDG Score.

The influence of the Political Stability Index (PSI) on the SDG Score

PSI is an indicator that measures a country's political stability, including the risk of conflict and social instability. Institutional theory suggests that good political stability can support economic growth and the achievement of development goals. According to Acemoglu and Robinson (2012), stable and inclusive institutions contribute to sustainable growth. Research by Kauffmann et al. (2010) found that countries with higher political stability have better SDG scores, supporting this hypothesis.

H2: There is a significant positive influence between the Political Stability Index (PSI) and the SDG Score.

The Role of GDP in Moderating the Influence of the Environmental Performance Index (EPI) on the SDG Score

GDP growth refers to an increase in the total value of goods and services produced by a country within a certain period. Economic growth theory suggests that sustainable economic growth can support investment in environmentally friendly technologies. According to Stern (2007), sustainable economic growth can be achieved through investment in environmental sustainability. Research by Zeng et al. (2018) shows that economic growth can strengthen the relationship between environmental performance and SDG achievement, supporting this hypothesis.

H3: GDP growth moderates the positive influence between the Environmental Performance Index (EPI) and SDG Score, thereby increasing the strength of the relationship.

The Role of GDP in Moderating the Influence of the Political Stability Index (PSI) on the SDG Score

GDP growth is an increase in the total value of goods and services produced by a country in a given period. Institutional theory suggests that stable economic growth can strengthen political institutions and support the achievement of development goals. According to Acemoglu and Robinson (2012), inclusive economic growth can strengthen political stability. Research by Rodrik (2000) shows that economic growth can strengthen the relationship between political stability and the achievement of development goals, supporting this hypothesis.

H4: GDP growth moderates the positive influence between the Political Stability Index (PSI) and the SDG Score, thereby increasing the strength of the relationship.

3. Research Method

Type of Research

Researchers use an associative quantitative method to examine the influence of the Environmental Performance Index (EPI) and the Political Stability Index (PSI) on the achievement of the SDGs (SDG Score). Additionally, the study tests the role of GDP growth in moderating the influence of the Environmental Performance Index (EPI) and the Political Stability Index (PSI) on the achievement of the SDGs.

Population and Sample

The population in this study consists of ASEAN countries including Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Cambodia, Myanmar, Laos, Thailand, Brunei Darussalam, Vietnam, and the Philippines. The sample used involves 10 ASEAN countries that have research data during the period of 2020-2024.

Research Variables

The variables used by the researcher include dependent, independent, and moderating variables. The researcher uses the SDG Score measurement as the dependent variable, the Environmental Performance Index (EPI) and the Political Stability Index (PSI) as independent variables. Then, the measurement used as the moderating variable is GDP growth.

The following is an explanation of the variables:

The SDG score represents the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals, which consists of 17 Sustainable Development Goals. The SDG Index score uses a scale of 0–100 that represents the level of achievement of sustainable development goals, with higher values indicating closer proximity to optimal performance (SDR, 2025). The Environmental Performance Index (EPI) is an assessment of how well a country meets internationally established sustainability targets for specific environmental issues that are sustainable worldwide (ASEAN Statistics and Index Bulletin, 2023). The Political Stability Index used by researchers, in the form of the Asia Power Index from the Lowy Institute, consists of eight measures of power, 30 thematic sub-measures, and 131 indicators (Lowly Institute, 2024). The economic growth that the researchers used is in the form of GDP growth where

economic growth is economic data taken from ADB in 2025 that shows how large the growth rate of GDP (% per year) of countries from 2020-2026.

Analysis Technique

Before conducting the analysis, the researcher performs classical assumption tests including normality, heteroskedasticity, multicollinearity, and autocorrelation. Next, in terms of analysis techniques, the researcher conducted two stages of analysis. In the first analysis, the researcher performed multiple linear regression analysis to examine the direct effects of the Environmental Performance Index and the Political Stability Index on the SDG Score. The basic regression model can be expressed as follows:

$SDG\_Score = \alpha + \beta 1EPI + \beta 2PSI$ …… (I)

In the subsequent analysis, a test was conducted on the role of GDP growth as a moderator. The examiner performed regression by including predictors such as EPI, PSI, GDP, and the interaction of GDP with EPI and PSI on the SDG Score. The model shown is in the form of the following equation:

$SDG\_Score = \alpha + \beta 1EPI + \beta 2PSI + \beta 3GDP + \beta 4EPI*GDP + \beta 5PSI*GDP$….. (ii)

Significance testing is conducted using a 95% confidence level. The researcher uses T-Test to determine the significant effects of the two models used. Then the research results were analyzed based on the regression coefficient values, significance values, and coefficient of determination (R^2).

4. Results and Discussion

Result

Classical Assumption Testing

In the first classical assumption test, namely the normality test, the researcher used the significance value of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Based on the results of the normality test for both the first linear regression and the linear regression with a moderator, a significance value of 0.200 was obtained, which is greater than 0.05, proving that it passed the normality test. Next, the classical assumption test conducted is the heteroskedasticity test. The researchers used Park's test on regressions (i) and (ii), where the results showed that in regression (i), the significance for the EPI and SPI variables was 0.59 and 0.759, respectively, which is greater than 0.05, indicating that there was no heteroscedasticity problem. In regression (ii), the Park test results also showed values of 0.306 and 0.296, which are greater than 0.05, as in regression (i), indicating that there is no heteroscedasticity problem.

Then in the multicollinearity test, both in the first multiple linear regression and in the multiple linear regression with a moderator, The results obtained in regression (i) show a VIF value of 1.877 < 10, and in regression (ii) the VIF values are 3.222, 2.672, and 6.892 < 10. Both indicate that there is no multicollinearity. The last classical assumption test is the autocorrelation test. In this test, the obtained DW value for both the first multiple linear regression and the multiple linear regression with a moderator falls within the range of -2 and +2. This indicates that it passes the autocorrelation problem.

Multiple Linear Regression

In the first analysis, multiple linear regression was used to test the effect of EP and PSI on the SDG Score. The data processing yielded the following equation:

$SDG\_Score = 62.323 + 0.228\ EPI - 0.057\ PSI$…….(i)

From this equation, it can be interpreted that the average SDG_Score value is 62.323 if the EPI and PSI values are equal to 0. Then the EPI coefficient of 0.228 is positive, indicating that every 1 point increase in EPI will increase the SDG score by 0.228. The PSI coefficient of -0.057 is negative, indicating that every 1 point increase in PSI will reduce the SDG score by 0.057.

Multiple Linear Regression with Moderator

Multiple linear regression with moderation was conducted to examine the role of GDP growth in the influence of EPI and PSI on SDG scores. The analysis yielded the following equation:

$SDG\_Score = 53.878 + 0.477\ EPI - 0.114\ PSI + 1.950\ GDP – 0.053\ EPI*GDP + 0.12\ PSI*GDP$….(ii)

This equation provides information that a country's average SDG score is 53.878 when the independent and moderating variables are zero. The EPI coefficient of 0.477 indicates that each one-point increase in the environmental performance index tends to increase the SDG score by 0.477 points, assuming other variables remain constant. However, the interaction between the EPI and economic growth, with a coefficient of -0.053, provides evidence that the positive effect of the EPI on the SDGs will decrease as economic growth increases. Meanwhile, the PSI coefficient of -0.114 indicates that increasing political stability will decrease the SDG score by 0.114 points, but the interaction of the PSI with economic growth of 0.120 indicates that economic growth can change the direction of the relationship

to positive. We can conclude that economic growth not only contributes directly by 1.950 points to the increase in the SDG score, but also acts as a moderating variable that strengthens the influence of political stability on SDG achievement and weakens the positive effect of environmental performance.

Hypothesis Testing

The hypothesis in this study uses the T-test. The following are the results of the initial multiple linear regression and after moderation:

Table 1. Hypothesis Testing

No	Variable	Model	T-Statistik	Sig.
1	EPI → SDG Score	I	3.236	0.002
2	PSI → SDG Score	I	-2.335	0.024
3	EPI*GDP → SDG Score	II	-3.633	0.001
4	PSI*GDP → SDG Score	II	2.279	0.028

Source: Output SPSS (2025)

Referring to Table 1, the results show that in the first linear regression (before moderation), the Environmental Performance Index has a significant impact whose value is in the same direction as the SDG Score, indicated by a T-Statistic value of 3.236 and a significance of 0.002. The Political Stability Index also has a significant impact but in the opposite direction to the SDG Score, indicated by a T-Statistic value of -2.335 and a significance of 0.024.

Then, in the multiple linear regression with moderation, the results and impacts differed from the previous regression. The interaction between GDP growth and the Environmental Performance Index significantly affected the SDG score, shifting from the same direction to the opposite direction. Similarly, the interaction between GDP and the Political Stability Index significantly affected the SDG score, shifting from the same direction to the opposite direction.

Coefficient of Determination (R^2)

Based on the results of multiple linear regression tests before and after moderation, the adjusted R2 value increased. In the first multiple linear regression, the R^2 value was 0.183 or 18.3%, and the adjusted R^2 value was only 0.148 or 14.8%. However, after moderation, the R^2 value was 0.500 or 50.0%, and the adjusted R^2 reached 0.443 or 44.3%. This model was able to explain 44.3% of the SDG factor.

Discussion

The influence of the Environmental Performance Index (EPI) on the SDG Score

The first hypothesis is that there is a significant positive influence between the Environmental Performance Index (EPI) and the SDG Score. Referring to the results of the hypothesis testing using the T-test, it was found that EPI had a significant positive impact on SDG scores. This indicates that the hypothesis was accepted. Referring to the results of the hypothesis testing using the T-test, it was found that the EPI had a significant positive impact on the SDG score. This indicates that the hypothesis was accepted. We can interpret this as the higher the EPI score of ASEAN countries, the higher their SDG score. Improved EPI conditions include aspects of air pollution control, water management, biodiversity, climate change mitigation, and environmental governance. Improving the quality of these aspects can support the achievement of the SDGs in ASEAN countries. This indicates that the EPI's contribution can improve the achievement of SDG scores, which align with the principles of sustainable development, which include a balance between economic, social, and environmental aspects. Indirectly, we can say that improvements in environmental performance not only bring changes to the ecosystem but also impact public health, social welfare, and economic stability. The resulting significant positive relationship enhances the perspective on the environment as one of the main foundations in supporting sustainable development and achieving the 2030 SDGs.

This finding is in line with the findings of Hsu et al. (2016) which stated that countries with better environmental performance tend to have higher SDG scores. This is reinforced by research by Esty and Porter (2019), which shows that countries with high EPI scores tend to perform better in achieving the SDGs, particularly in health, clean water and sanitation, climate action, and terrestrial ecosystems. Furthermore, the 2021 SDG report by Sachs et al. (2021) states that good environmental governance can support faster achievement of the SDGs. In other words, these findings strengthen the empirical evidence that improving environmental performance is a key strategy for supporting the overall success of the SDGs.

The influence of the Political Stability Index (PSI) on the SDG Score

The second hypothesis was that there is a significant positive relationship between the Political Stability Index (PSI) and the SDG score. Referring to the results in table 1, we found that the PSI negatively impacts the SDG score. This indicates that the second hypothesis is not accepted. Under certain conditions, political stability can actually hinder the SDG agenda.

These conditions can be interpreted as a country maintaining old policies (based on habit), being unresponsive, or making no effort toward structural reform. Thus, although political stability is generally considered to support development, in certain situations politics can reduce the government's incentive to innovate policies, accelerate energy transition, or improve environmental governance. The implications of such political stability require governance that is inclusive, transparent, and supportive of sustainable development. Without these elements, stability can contribute to policy stagnation and weaken efforts to achieve SDG targets. These findings are in line with research by Fukuda-Parr and Muchhala (2020), which shows that some countries with high political stability actually hinder the SDG agenda. This is due to the dominance of the political elite and minimal public participation. The findings of this study reinforce the literature that political stability needs to be understood contextually; without good governance, stability will have a negative impact on the achievement of the SDGs.

The Role of GDP in Moderating the Influence of the Environmental Performance Index (EPI) on the SDG Score

The third hypothesis is that GDP growth moderates the positive influence between the Environmental Performance Index (EPI) and SDG Score, thereby increasing the strength of the relationship. However, the results of the study show that GDP growth acts as a moderating variable that changes the direction of influence from positive to negative. This means that when the rate of economic growth rises, the contribution of improved environmental performance, which initially supported the achievement of SDGs, changes to a decrease in SDG achievement. This phenomenon is in line with the concept of trade-offs between economic growth and environmental sustainability. High economic growth is often driven by industrialization, which tends to involve the exploitation of natural resources and the use of energy sources. Despite efforts to improve environmental performance, economic activities can strain environmental resources, leading to exploitation. Therefore, we can conclude that an increase in the EPI within the context of economic growth may have counterproductive implications for SDG achievement. This finding is consistent with the Environmental Kuznets Curve (EKC) theory, which states that in the early stages of growth, economic development tends to cause environmental degradation. However, after passing a certain turning point, further economic growth will support environmental improvement. In addition, in the sustainable development trade-off theory, economic goals can conflict with ecological and social goals. Therefore, GDP growth must be managed in a sustainable and inclusive manner. This is reinforced by Daly's (1996) view that growth provides economic benefits that are lower than the social and environmental costs. We can conclude that GDP growth plays a moderating role, as evidenced empirically, where sustainable development depends not only on the quality of environmental performance but also on the direction and quality of economic growth.

The Role of GDP in Moderating the Influence of the Political Stability Index (PSI) on the SDG Score

The fourth hypothesis is that GDP growth moderates the negative influence between the political stability index (PSI) and the SDG score, thereby strengthening the relationship. However, the findings indicate that GDP growth plays a moderating role in changing the direction of the Political Stability Index (PSI) influence on Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) scores from negative to positive. This means that when economic growth is still low, political stability tends to hinder the achievement of current SDGs, where weak reforms or the dominance of political elites that do not support sustainable development are present. Conversely, when GDP growth increases, political stability becomes a supportive factor in achieving SDGs. This is because strong economic growth has the potential to expand government tax revenue, increase public investment capacity, and improve resource distribution for social, environmental, and sustainable development programs. Thus, political stability is no longer merely about maintaining static conditions but has become a crucial prerequisite for ensuring the sustainability of policies, attracting sustainable investments, and accelerating the implementation of the SDG agenda.

This finding is consistent with the framework of Modernization Theory. This theory argues that economic growth leads to more inclusive political institutions that are responsive to development needs. In addition, Institutional Economics theory focuses on political stability, which provides tangible benefits for development with adequate economic capacity support. This means that GDP growth will strengthen the function of political stability to create more effective, accountable, and sustainability-oriented governance. Thus, it can be said that GDP growth plays a moderating role, indicating that political stability will have a positive impact on the SDGs if accompanied by healthy, inclusive, and sustainable economic growth. According to Acemoglu and Robinson (2012), stable political institutions are beneficial with the support of economic capacity. This enables the government to facilitate

public services and manage development in an inclusive manner. This research aligns with Sachs et al. (2021) in the Sustainable Development Report, which states that sustainable economic growth enhances the positive relationship between political stability and the achievement of the SDGs. In other words, this empirical evidence supports the finding that GDP growth plays a role in altering the influence of political stability on the SDGs.

5. Conclusion

This study aims to analyze the influence of the Environmental Performance Index (EPI) and Political Stability Index (PSI) on Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) scores and assess the role of economic growth (GDP growth) as a moderating variable. The first research result proves that EPI has a significant positive impact on SDG. This means that the better the environmental performance, the higher the SDG achievement. Second, PSI was found to have a significant negative impact on SDG. In political stability without inclusive, transparent, and accountable governance, stability does not directly have a positive impact on sustainable development. Third, GDP growth was found to moderate the relationship between EPI and SDGs by changing the direction of their impact. High economic growth can be accompanied by industrialization and resource exploitation, so even though EPI improves, its impact on SDGs actually decreases. Fourth, GDP growth moderates the influence of PSI on SDGs from negative to positive. At low levels of economic growth, political stability hinders reform, and stability becomes an important asset for maintaining policy continuity, expanding fiscal capacity, and accelerating the SDG agenda. Thus, overall, this study confirms that the success of achieving the SDGs is linked to the synergy between environmental performance, political stability, and the quality of inclusive and sustainable economic growth.

References

Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2012). *Why nations fail: The origins of power, prosperity, and poverty*. Crown Business.

Adrangi, B., & Kerr, L. (2022). Sustainable development indicators and their relationship to GDP: Evidence from emerging economies. *Sustainability, 14*(2), 658. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14020658

Brundtland, G. H. (1987). *Our common future: Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development*. Oxford University Press.

Dasgupta, P. (2021). *The economics of biodiversity: The Dasgupta review*. HM Treasury.

Esty, D. C., & Porter, M. E. (2019). Measuring national environmental performance and its determinants. *Environmental and Resource Economics, 74*(2), 227–255. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-019-00380-y

Fukuda-Parr, S., & Muchhala, B. (2020). The Southern origins of sustainable development goals: Ideas, actors, aspirations. *World Development, 126*, 104706. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2019.104706

Gazi, M. A. I., Islam, H., Islam, M. A., Karim, R., Momo, S. M., & Senathirajah, A. R. B. S. (2024). Unlocking sustainable development in East Asia Pacific and South Asia: An econometric exploration of ESG initiatives. *Sustainable Environment, 10*(1), 2366558.

Ghozali, I. (2018). *Aplikasi analisis multivariate dengan program IBM SPSS* (25th ed.). Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Hsu, A., Esty, D. C., Levy, M. A., & de Sherbinin, A. (2016). 2016 Environmental Performance Index. Yale Center for Environmental Law & Policy. https://epi.yale.edu/

Hsu, A., et al. (2016). The environmental performance index: A global assessment of environmental sustainability. *Sustainability Science, 11*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-015-0340-0

Kauffmann, D., Kraay, A., & Mastrorillo, M. (2010). Growth without governance (World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 5397). https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-5397

KPMG. (2020). The future of sustainability reporting: A global perspective. KPMG International. https://home.kpmg/xx/en/home/insights/2020/01/future-of-sustainability-reporting.html

North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change, and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). *The future of productivity: The role of innovation and technology*. OECD Publishing.

Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the twenty-first century*. Harvard University Press.

Raworth, K. (2017). *Doughnut economics: Seven ways to think like a 21st-century economist*. Chelsea Green Publishing.

Rodrik, D. (2000). Institutions for high-quality growth: What they are and how to acquire them. *Studies in Comparative International Development, 35*(3), 3–31. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02699725

Sachs, J. D. (2015). *The age of sustainable development*. Columbia University Press.

Sachs, J. D., Kroll, C., Lafortune, G., Fuller, G., & Woelm, F. (2021). *Sustainable development report 2021: The decade of action for the sustainable development goals*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009106559

Stern, N. (2007). *The economics of climate change: The Stern review*. Cambridge University Press.

Stiglitz, J. E., Sen, A., & Fitoussi, J. P. (2010). *Mismeasuring our lives: Why GDP doesn't add up*. The New Press.

United Nations Environment Programme. (2019). *Global environment outlook – GEO-6: Healthy planet, healthy people*. United Nations Environment Programme.

United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development*. United Nations.

World Bank. (2021). *World development indicators*. World Bank.

Zarghami, S. A. (2025). The role of economic policies in achieving sustainable development goal 7: Insights from OECD and European countries. *Applied Energy, 377*, 124558.

Zeng, S., et al. (2018). The impact of economic growth on environmental performance: Evidence from China. *Sustainability, 10*(4), 1234. https://doi.org/10.3390/su10041234