

The Role of Global Governance in Managing International Conflict

Mohammed Kawosha

Department of Management Science, Benue State University, Makurdi, Nigeria

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.90300027>

Received: 17 February 2025; Accepted: 22 February 2025; Published: 26 March 2025

ABSTRACT

This study examines the role of global governance in managing international conflict, focusing on the effectiveness of global and regional organizations. A descriptive survey research design was employed to assess the perceptions and attitudes of employees at the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) headquarters in Abuja, Nigeria. Due to access restrictions, employees of the United Nations (UN), African Union (AU), and European Union (EU) were excluded. The study's population comprised 1,191 ECOWAS employees, with a sample size of 299 determined using Taro Yamane's formula. Data were collected through a structured questionnaire utilizing a Likert scale and analyzed using Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) via SmartPLS 4. Findings indicate that regional organizations, particularly ECOWAS, play a more effective role in conflict resolution compared to global institutions. While the UN's role remains present, its impact was found to be statistically insignificant, suggesting bureaucratic and geopolitical constraints limit its efficiency. In contrast, the AU and EU demonstrated moderate significance, reflecting their growing but constrained roles in conflict management. ECOWAS emerged as the most effective institution due to its proximity and contextual understanding, enabling swift crisis response. The study recommends that the UN adopt a decentralized conflict resolution strategy that strengthens regional organizations through capacity-building, logistical support, and diplomatic mediation. Additionally, ECOWAS, AU, and EU should enhance their operational frameworks, intelligence-sharing, and rapid response capabilities. Strengthening regional institutions while ensuring global collaboration is essential for improving international conflict management and sustaining global peace and security.

Keywords: Global governance, international conflict, peacebuilding, multilateralism, international law.

INTRODUCTION

Global governance plays a fundamental role in managing international conflict by providing a framework for cooperation and collaboration among states, international organizations, and other global actors. As the complexity of international relations increases, the management of conflicts becomes a critical task that transcends national boundaries. In the post-Cold War era, the world has witnessed a significant shift towards multilateralism, with institutions such as the United Nations (UN), World Trade Organization (WTO), and the International Criminal Court (ICC) at the forefront of efforts to resolve disputes and maintain international peace (Hurd, 2020). These institutions act as mediators and facilitators, offering platforms for dialogue, conflict resolution, and the enforcement of international norms. The importance of global governance in conflict management lies in its ability to address both the immediate and underlying causes of conflicts, promoting peacebuilding and stability across nations.

The role of global governance is further underscored by the increasing prevalence of non-state actors, including multinational corporations, civil society organizations, and transnational advocacy networks, in shaping global conflict dynamics. Their involvement highlights the need for a comprehensive approach that integrates various stakeholders in conflict resolution processes (Keohane, 2021). Recent studies have shown that conflicts today are no longer solely driven by state-centric issues but also by economic disparities, environmental concerns, and human rights violations, which require broader, more inclusive governance mechanisms (Simmons & Dorsey, 2021). For instance, in regions affected by climate-induced migration, global governance frameworks have been pivotal in addressing the security implications of resource scarcity and displacement (Biermann, 2022). This

reflects a growing recognition that international conflict management requires holistic strategies that consider diverse factors, including environmental, economic, and social dimensions.

Empirically, several case studies demonstrate the effectiveness of global governance in mitigating international conflicts. For example, the European Union (EU) has played a crucial role in the peaceful integration of former Eastern Bloc countries, fostering cooperation through economic and political incentives. Similarly, peacekeeping missions by the United Nations have been instrumental in regions such as sub-Saharan Africa and the Middle East, where local conflicts have had far-reaching implications for global security (Chesterman, 2020). Additionally, the emergence of global governance initiatives like the Paris Climate Agreement exemplifies how international collaboration can address complex global challenges that, if left unaddressed, could lead to conflict. These empirical examples highlight the potential of global governance mechanisms in preventing and resolving international conflicts by promoting diplomacy, facilitating dialogue, and ensuring compliance with international norms and agreements.

Despite its successes, global governance faces significant challenges in managing international conflict, particularly when it comes to balancing the interests of powerful states with those of smaller, less influential nations. Critics argue that the dominance of certain states, especially in institutions like the UN Security Council, undermines the legitimacy and effectiveness of global governance in conflict resolution (Buzan & Little, 2020). Furthermore, the growing influence of global capitalism and the erosion of state sovereignty in certain regions have made it difficult for global governance systems to adapt to emerging forms of conflict, such as cyber warfare and transnational terrorism. These challenges call for ongoing reforms in global governance structures to enhance their inclusivity and responsiveness in addressing the evolving nature of international conflict (Doyle & Sambanis, 2021). This study seeks to investigate the role of global governance in managing international conflict, with a particular focus on the empirical evidence that demonstrates both the strengths and limitations of current governance frameworks in fostering peace and stability worldwide.

Statement of the Problem

The recent withdrawal of Mali, Burkina Faso, and Niger from the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) underscores significant challenges in global governance's role in managing international conflict. These nations, each led by military juntas following coups, have expressed dissatisfaction with ECOWAS's response to their internal political changes. They accuse the bloc of imposing sanctions they deem "inhumane" and failing to support their efforts against terrorism and insecurity (Al Jazeera, 2024). This collective exit not only highlights the tension between national sovereignty and regional oversight but also raises questions about the effectiveness of regional organizations in conflict resolution.

The departure of these three countries from ECOWAS has significant implications for regional stability and security. ECOWAS has been instrumental in facilitating economic integration and ensuring collective security among West African nations. The withdrawal of Mali, Burkina Faso, and Niger threatens to undermine coordination in combating terrorism, human trafficking, and transnational organized crime in the region (Musah, 2024). This move could potentially embolden insurgent groups, exacerbate security challenges, and destabilize the broader West African region.

Furthermore, the formation of the Alliance of Sahel States (AES) by these nations signifies a shift in regional alliances and a potential challenge to ECOWAS's authority. The AES aimed to strengthen cooperation in foreign and security policies among its members, ensuring the free movement of people and goods, and establishing a joint investment bank (Welt, 2024). This development reflects a broader trend of countries seeking alternative alliances when existing regional bodies are perceived as ineffective or misaligned with their national interests. It underscores the need for global governance structures to be adaptable and responsive to the evolving political dynamics within regions to effectively manage international conflicts.

Objective of the Study

The main objective of this study is to examine the role of global governance in managing international conflict while others are:

- i. Investigate the impact of United Nations (UN) governance in managing international conflict.
- ii. Explore the effect African Union (AU) governance in managing international conflict.
- iii. Examine the effect European Union (EU) governance in managing international conflict.
- iv. Investigate the impact Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) governance in managing international conflict.

Research Hypotheses

- H_{0:1} there is no significant effect from United Nations (UN) governance in managing international conflict.
- H_{0:2} there is no significant effect from African Union (AU) governance in managing international conflict.
- H_{0:3} there is no significant effect from European Union (EU) governance in managing international conflict.
- H_{0:4} there is no significant effect from Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) governance in managing international conflict.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The concept of global governance has undergone substantial evolution over the decades. Rosenau (1995) conceptualizes global governance as the "sum of the many ways individuals and institutions, public and private, manage their common affairs." Keohane (2001) accentuates the role of international institutions in facilitating cooperation among states, particularly in the context of systemic anarchy as posited by realist theorists. Global governance is analysed through multifaceted theoretical perspectives. Liberal theorists contend that international organizations, such as the United Nations and the European Union, are indispensable for fostering dialogue and cooperation (Abbott & Snidal, 1998). Constructivists emphasize the normative dimensions, focusing on how shared values and identities shape global governance mechanisms (Wendt, 1999). In contrast, critical theorists critique the inherent inequities in global governance structures, asserting that they often entrench power asymmetries and privilege hegemonic states (Cox, 1987).

Global governance and conflict management are multifaceted concepts interpreted diversely by scholars. Zartman (1997) posits that governance inherently involves conflict management, emphasizing that governments must handle societal conflicts to prevent escalation into violence. He examines how countries like Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, and Nigeria have managed internal conflicts, highlighting the role of effective governance structures. Similarly, Miall (2003) argues that conflict prevention is intrinsic to good governance, suggesting that legitimate institutions and accepted procedures allow disputes to be settled politically rather than through violence. He emphasizes the need for sound global governance to anticipate and address conflicts arising from globalization.

Miller (2007) defines global governance as "the resolution of conflicts over divergent interpretations of evidence constraining the exercise of power and authority," highlighting its role in managing disputes arising from differing perspectives. Castells (2005) succinctly describes global governance as "the ability to manage the problems and issues of a world in turmoil," emphasizing its role in addressing global challenges that could lead to conflict. Ikenberry (2014) views global governance as a collective effort to manage the benefits and drawbacks of an open global system, effectively describing it as "the management of liberal internationalism."

Rittberger (2002) distinguishes between international and global governance, noting that the latter involves decreased state dominance and increased participation of non-state actors in establishing norms and rules, which is crucial for conflict management. Weiss and Wilkinson (2014) identify global governance as collective efforts to address worldwide problems that transcend individual states' capacities, reflecting the international system's ability to provide government-like services in the absence of a world government. Latto (2002) emphasizes that good governance makes conflict more likely to be managed peacefully, arguing that political arrangements can help resolve conflicts without violence. He suggests that aspects like constitutional design and political systems

play a part in conflict management. These perspectives collectively highlight that effective governance structures, both at national and global levels, are essential for managing and preventing conflicts. They emphasize the importance of legitimate institutions, inclusive political processes, and collaborative efforts in addressing disputes and maintaining global stability.

The United Nations (UN) in Conflict Management

The United Nations (UN) plays a pivotal role in global governance, particularly in conflict management, by leveraging its unique position to maintain international peace and security. Established in 1945, the UN provides a platform for dialogue, negotiation, and cooperation among its 193 member states, addressing issues that transcend national boundaries (TutorChase, n.d.). The UN Security Council, one of its six main organs, holds the authority to take collective security measures to prevent and remove threats to peace, including the deployment of peacekeeping operations. These missions involve monitoring ceasefires, facilitating the implementation of peace agreements, and protecting civilians in conflict zones. For instance, the United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) has been instrumental in supporting the peace process and providing humanitarian assistance in a region plagued by civil war (World Jurisprudence, 2024).

Beyond peacekeeping, the UN engages in preventive diplomacy and preventive disarmament to address potential conflicts before they escalate. Preventive diplomacy involves actions such as mediation and negotiation to prevent disputes from arising or escalating, while preventive disarmament focuses on reducing the number of small arms in conflict-prone regions (United Nations, n.d.). The UN also promotes human rights and fundamental freedoms, with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights serving as a cornerstone of international human rights law. The UN Human Rights Council monitors human rights situations in member states and addresses violations, ensuring that human dignity remains a central concern amidst turmoil (TutorChase, n.d.). Through these multifaceted efforts, the UN exemplifies its commitment to fostering stability and security, underscoring its indispensable role in the realm of international conflict management.

The African Union (AU) in Conflict Management

The African Union (AU) has established itself as a central institution in global governance, particularly in conflict management across the African continent. Through the African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA), the AU has developed a comprehensive framework encompassing conflict prevention, management, and post-conflict reconstruction. The APSA includes key components such as the Peace and Security Council (PSC), the Panel of the Wise, the Continental Early Warning System (CEWS), the African Standby Force (ASF), and the Peace Fund, all designed to address various facets of conflict and promote peace and security in Africa (African Union, n.d.).

In practice, the AU has actively engaged in conflict management through both diplomatic and military interventions. For instance, the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM) has been instrumental in supporting the Somali government against the militant group al-Shabaab, contributing to the stabilization of the region (United Nations, 2024). Additionally, the AU has facilitated peace agreements and provided mediation in conflicts such as those in Darfur, Sudan, and the Democratic Republic of Congo, demonstrating its commitment to resolving disputes through peaceful means (Dung et al., 2024). However, challenges remain, including resource constraints and the need for enhanced coordination among member states, which can impact the effectiveness of the AU's conflict management efforts (African Union, n.d.).

The European Union (EU) in Conflict Management

The European Union (EU) has increasingly positioned itself as a key actor in global governance, particularly in conflict management, through its diplomatic, economic, and security efforts. As part of its commitment to fostering global peace and stability, the EU has developed extensive frameworks such as the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP), which allow it to take both civilian and military actions in crisis regions (European External Action Service [EEAS], n.d.). The EU's diplomatic influence is also visible in its active mediation roles in global conflicts, with its member states serving as key negotiators in peace talks. A notable example is the EU's involvement in the Iran nuclear deal, formally

known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), where the EU played a central role in facilitating diplomatic dialogue between Iran and the international community (Council of the European Union, 2023). Additionally, the EU supports conflict prevention through initiatives such as the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR), which helps promote human rights and democracy in conflict-prone areas (European Commission, 2024). These measures illustrate how the EU's comprehensive approach integrates diplomacy, development, and security tools in conflict management.

In terms of conflict resolution and management, the EU has expanded its role globally through peacebuilding missions and post-conflict reconstruction initiatives. The EU has led multiple missions in Africa, such as the EU Training Mission in Mali (EUTM Mali), which focuses on training and mentoring the Malian Armed Forces to ensure long-term peace and stability in the region (European External Action Service [EEAS], 2024). Furthermore, the EU's Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy outlines an integrated approach that combines diplomatic, military, and development instruments to address the root causes of conflicts, such as governance issues, poverty, and instability (European Union External Action, 2022). The EU also emphasizes multilateralism and a rules-based international order in managing global conflicts, with a strong commitment to upholding international law, including support for the International Criminal Court (ICC) in ensuring accountability for international crimes (Reuters, 2025). Through these multifaceted strategies, the EU continues to play a significant role in conflict management by promoting peacebuilding, supporting the rule of law, and fostering international cooperation for long-term stability.

The Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) in Conflict Management

The Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) has long been a pivotal institution in regional governance, particularly in conflict management within West Africa. Established in 1975, ECOWAS has developed comprehensive frameworks to address conflicts, notably the ECOWAS Conflict Prevention Framework (ECPF), which serves as a strategic guide for preventing violence and supporting peacebuilding efforts. The ECPF encompasses various components, including early warning systems, preventive diplomacy, and mechanisms for political governance, all aimed at enhancing human security and stability in the region (ECOWAS, n.d.). Through these initiatives, ECOWAS has undertaken numerous peacekeeping and mediation missions, such as interventions in Liberia and Sierra Leone during their civil wars, demonstrating its commitment to maintaining regional peace and security.

However, recent developments have posed significant challenges to ECOWAS's role in conflict management. In 2024, three member states—Mali, Burkina Faso, and Niger—announced their departure from ECOWAS to form the Alliance of Sahel States (AES), citing dissatisfaction with ECOWAS's responses to their internal political changes and security concerns (Associated Press, 2024). This secession has raised concerns about the potential fragmentation of regional efforts to manage conflicts and maintain stability. ECOWAS has expressed apprehension over the possible "disintegration" of regional unity and the implications for its capacity to address security crises effectively (The Guardian, 2024). The departure of these nations underscores the challenges ECOWAS faces in balancing respect for national sovereignty with the enforcement of collective democratic principles and security protocols. As the region navigates these complexities, ECOWAS's ability to adapt its conflict management strategies will be crucial in sustaining its role as a central figure in West African governance and security.

Theoretical Review

Liberal Institutionalism provides a compelling framework for understanding the role of global governance in managing international conflict. Rooted in the broader liberal tradition of international relations, this theory posits that international institutions play a crucial role in mitigating anarchy and fostering cooperation among states (Keohane, 1984). Unlike realism, which assumes that states act solely in pursuit of power, liberal institutionalism emphasizes the importance of institutions in reducing uncertainty and transaction costs in international politics (Axelrod & Keohane, 1985). Organizations such as the United Nations (UN), the World Trade Organization (WTO), and the International Criminal Court (ICC) exemplify how international institutions promote peace and security by establishing rules and norms that encourage cooperation and conflict resolution (Abbott & Snidal, 1998). The United Nations Security Council (UNSC), for instance, plays a pivotal role in

global conflict management by deploying peacekeeping missions, mediating disputes, and imposing sanctions on aggressor states (Hurd, 2007). The European Union (EU) also demonstrates how regional institutions can facilitate peaceful conflict resolution by creating economic and political interdependencies that discourage war (Moravcsik, 1997). The effectiveness of global governance institutions in conflict resolution is further reinforced by mechanisms such as diplomatic negotiations, multilateral agreements, and international legal frameworks that hold states accountable for violations of international norms (Ruggie, 1998). Given that conflicts are increasingly transnational and involve non-state actors, institutions provide platforms for inclusive dialogue and collective action, making them indispensable in contemporary global governance (Ikenberry, 2011).

Liberal Institutionalism is well-suited for this study because it explains how institutions mediate conflicts by fostering trust, transparency, and rule-based interactions among states. This theoretical perspective underscores the necessity of global governance in maintaining international peace and security by demonstrating that states are not solely driven by self-interest but can also act cooperatively when institutional mechanisms are in place (Keohane & Martin, 1995). Moreover, institutions like the International Court of Justice (ICJ) and the International Criminal Court (ICC) offer legal avenues for conflict resolution, reducing the reliance on military interventions (Slaughter, 2004). Liberal Institutionalism also aligns with the study's objectives by highlighting the role of economic interdependence in preventing conflicts, as trade agreements and economic partnerships encourage peaceful coexistence (Russett & Oneal, 2001). Additionally, international institutions facilitate humanitarian interventions and post-conflict reconstruction efforts, ensuring long-term stability in conflict-prone regions (Paris, 2004). The adoption of this theory in this study is further justified by the increasing relevance of multilateralism in addressing global conflicts, particularly in an era of complex security threats such as terrorism, cyber warfare, and climate-induced conflicts (Barnett & Duvall, 2005). As globalization continues to erode traditional state boundaries, institutional cooperation remains critical in addressing conflicts that extend beyond national jurisdictions (Rosenau, 1995). By integrating Liberal Institutionalism into this study, a deeper understanding of how global governance mechanisms shape conflict management strategies will be achieved, ultimately reinforcing the argument that institutions are indispensable for fostering international peace and stability.

Empirical Review

Akande and Ojo (2024) critically examine the intersection of global governance and state capacity, highlighting how Africa's development crisis is shaped by both internal governance failures and external pressures from Western-dominated institutions. The study effectively critiques the Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs), Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), arguing that these frameworks are ineffective without strong internal governance. However, while the authors rightly emphasize corruption, weak rule of law, and external manipulation as major impediments, their argument risks portraying African states as passive victims rather than active participants in global governance. Additionally, the recommendation for an "indigenous African vision" lacks concrete policy proposals for harmonizing local priorities with global standards. While the call for internal reforms is valid, the study underestimates the potential benefits of strategic engagement with global institutions rather than outright resistance. A more balanced approach would acknowledge Africa's agency in navigating global governance structures.

Bottici (2024) explores war and conflict through the lenses of governance and empire, arguing that mainstream governance theories fail to fully explain modern conflict dynamics. The paper effectively critiques the limitations of traditional governance models, emphasizing how globalization and networked power structures have reshaped conflict. The analysis of empire as a more fitting explanatory tool is compelling, particularly in its ability to capture power asymmetries post. However, Bottici's assertion that biopolitical interpretations of governance align with empire overlooks the fundamental difference between decentralized regulatory mechanisms and centralized imperial control. Additionally, the discussion on globalization's dual role in fostering both order and conflict is insightful but lacks empirical depth in connecting specific geopolitical events beyond. While the paper presents a nuanced theoretical comparison, it would benefit from a clearer distinction between governance as a framework of distributed authority and empire as a structure of hegemonic dominance.

Purvis (2022) challenges the conventional notion of global governance by asserting the existence of a global government, focusing on the hierarchical nature of international relations and the role of Western dominance.

The study effectively critiques the power structures within institutions like the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and the United Nations (UN), using Power Transition Theory to highlight the disproportionate influence of Western nations, particularly the United States. However, the argument that hierarchy equates to governance rather than governance systems oversimplifies the complexities of global politics. The existence of powerful states does not necessarily imply a centralized global authority, as sovereignty remains intact. Furthermore, the discussion on global society, while insightful, lacks empirical evidence to substantiate claims of an overarching global citizenship. While Purvis provides a compelling perspective, the study would benefit from a more nuanced differentiation between influence, cooperation, and legitimate governmental authority at the global level.

Chidozie and Aje (2017) analyzed the role of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in advancing global governance, emphasizing collaboration between public and private stakeholders. They argue that the SDGs provide a transformative framework to combat poverty and conflict, aligning with the broader objectives of international organizations. However, their reliance on secondary data and content analysis limits the study's empirical depth, as it lacks primary evidence to support claims about the SDGs' effectiveness. Additionally, while the paper highlights the importance of global cooperation, it does not critically engage with the structural inequalities within international organizations that may hinder SDG implementation. The authors' optimism about defeating poverty and war underestimates the geopolitical and economic interests that often dictate global governance outcomes. A more nuanced analysis incorporating empirical case studies would strengthen their argument and provide a more balanced assessment of the SDGs as a governance model.

Salim (2017) provides a comprehensive examination of international security challenges and the role of global governance in addressing them, particularly through the United Nations (UN). The study highlights critical security threats such as nuclear proliferation, terrorism, and climate change, emphasizing their global nature and the necessity for collective action. However, while the research is grounded in Liberalism theory, which assumes the inherent goodness of human nature and the effectiveness of institutions, it fails to critically address the structural power imbalances that hinder equitable global governance. Additionally, the hypothesis testing, which oscillates between asserting significance and insignificance, lacks a nuanced approach to measuring governance effectiveness. The study rightly underscores the complexity of modern security dynamics but overestimates the capacity of partnerships to resolve these challenges without addressing the geopolitical interests that shape international decision-making. A deeper exploration of power asymmetries and state-centric limitations would have strengthened its conclusions.

METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a descriptive survey research design, which is suitable for investigating perceptions, attitudes, and opinions of a population regarding a specific phenomenon (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). This approach enables researchers to systematically collect and analyze data to understand trends and relationships in real-world settings (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2019). The study focused exclusively on employees of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) headquarters in Abuja, Nigeria, as access was not granted to employees of the United Nations (UN), African Union (AU), and European Union (EU). The rationale for this sampling choice aligns with convenience and feasibility sampling techniques, which are commonly employed in organizational research when access restrictions limit broader participation (Etikan, Musa, & Alkassim, 2016). The population of the study comprised 1,191 ECOWAS employees, and the sample size was determined using Taro Yamane's formula, resulting in 299 respondents, ensuring statistical representativeness while maintaining a manageable data collection process (Yamane, 1967). Primary data collection was employed using a structured questionnaire based on a Likert scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." The Likert scale is a widely used method for measuring attitudes and perceptions in social science research, providing ordinal data for statistical analysis (Likert, 1932). The collected data were analyzed using Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) through SmartPLS 4, a robust analytical tool suitable for exploring complex relationships between variables while addressing measurement errors and improving predictive accuracy (Hair et al., 2021). The choice of SEM aligns with its capability to test direct, indirect, and mediating effects in structural models, making it ideal for understanding the intricate dynamics of global governance in managing international conflict (Henseler, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2015).

Table 1 Reliability and Validity of Constructs

	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability (rho_a)	Composite reliability (rho_c)	Average variance extracted (AVE)
UN	0.9598	0.9114	0.9599	0.8276
AU	0.9151	0.9116	0.9151	0.6859
EU	0.9317	0.9002	0.9318	0.7322
ECOWAS	0.9418	0.9003	0.9515	0.7973

Source: SmartPLS4 Output, (2025)

The table presents reliability and validity measures for four entities—United Nations (UN), African Union (AU), European Union (EU), and Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)—using Cronbach’s alpha, composite reliability (rho_a and rho_c), and average variance extracted (AVE). Cronbach’s alpha values for all entities exceed the 0.7 threshold, indicating high internal consistency, with the UN (0.9598) demonstrating the strongest reliability. Composite reliability (rho_c) follows a similar trend, reinforcing the robustness of the constructs, with ECOWAS (0.9515) and the UN (0.9599) showing the highest scores. The AVE values, which assess convergent validity, indicate that all constructs surpass the acceptable 0.5 threshold, confirming that the variables explain a significant proportion of variance in their respective constructs. The UN (0.8276) and ECOWAS (0.7973) exhibit the highest AVE values, suggesting stronger construct validity compared to the AU (0.6859) and EU (0.7322). Overall, the data indicates strong reliability and validity across all entities.

Table 2 Structural Equation Modeling

	Original sample (O)	Sample mean (M)	Standard deviation (STDEV)	T statistics (O/STDEV)	P values
UN	0.1765	0.1824	0.1227	1.431	0.2122
AU	0.2438	0.3368	0.0892	2.5474	0.0132
EU	0.2444	0.2448	0.1005	2.5424	0.0151
ECOWAS	0.4358	0.4320	0.0792	3.8773	0.0011

Source: SmartPLS4 Output, (2025)

The table presents statistical results for four entities—United Nations (UN), African Union (AU), European Union (EU), and Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)—based on original sample values (O), sample means (M), standard deviations (STDEV), T-statistics, and P-values. The UN has the lowest original sample value (0.1765) and a high standard deviation (0.1227), resulting in a T-statistic of 1.431 and an insignificant P-value (0.2122), indicating weak statistical significance. Conversely, ECOWAS exhibits the highest original sample value (0.4358) with a low standard deviation (0.0792), leading to a strong T-statistic (3.8773) and a highly significant P-value (0.0011), suggesting a strong relationship. The AU (0.2438) and EU (0.2444) display moderate effects with T-statistics above 2.5 and P-values (0.0132 and 0.0151, respectively) indicating statistical significance at the 5% level. Overall, ECOWAS demonstrates the strongest significance, while the UN’s results suggest a weak or non-significant effect.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The findings indicate varying levels of statistical significance in the impact of global governance institutions—UN, AU, EU, and ECOWAS—on conflict management. The United Nations (UN) exhibits the lowest original sample value (0.1765) and a high standard deviation (0.1227), resulting in a T-statistic of 1.431 and an

insignificant P-value (0.2122). This suggests that the UN's role in conflict management, while present, is not statistically significant in this model, aligning with critiques of its effectiveness in peacekeeping due to bureaucratic inefficiencies and geopolitical constraints (Weiss, 2023). On the other hand, the African Union (AU) and the European Union (EU) demonstrate moderate statistical significance with original sample values of 0.2438 and 0.2444, respectively. Their T-statistics exceed 2.5, and P-values (0.0132 for AU and 0.0151 for EU) indicate significance at the 5% level, supporting findings by Adeoye (2022), who argued that regional organizations have increasingly played crucial roles in conflict resolution, albeit with limitations in enforcement mechanisms.

Among the four organizations, ECOWAS exhibits the highest original sample value (0.4358) and the lowest standard deviation (0.0792), leading to a strong T-statistic (3.8773) and a highly significant P-value (0.0011). This suggests a robust and statistically significant impact of ECOWAS in conflict resolution, reinforcing previous studies highlighting its decisive interventions in West African conflicts, such as in Liberia, Sierra Leone, and The Gambia (Adebayo, 2023). The findings align with existing literature that positions ECOWAS as an effective regional organization due to its proactive stance in deploying peacekeeping forces and enforcing democratic transitions (Mbah & Anyanwu, 2023). The strong statistical significance of ECOWAS contrasts with the UN's lower significance, supporting arguments that regional organizations may be more effective in addressing local conflicts due to proximity, contextual understanding, and quicker response mechanisms (Olonisakin, 2024). Overall, while the UN's global framework faces challenges in conflict resolution, regional bodies like ECOWAS, AU, and EU exhibit stronger localized effectiveness, with ECOWAS leading in statistical impact.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the findings highlight the varying effectiveness of global governance institutions in conflict management, with regional organizations demonstrating greater localized impact. While the UN's role remains present, its statistically insignificant effect suggests that bureaucratic constraints and geopolitical influences limit its peacekeeping efficacy. In contrast, the AU and EU exhibit moderate significance, affirming their growing roles in regional conflict resolution despite enforcement challenges. ECOWAS emerges as the most effective organization, showing a strong and statistically significant impact, reinforcing existing studies on its decisive interventions in West African conflicts. These results support the argument that regional organizations, due to their proximity and contextual understanding, are better positioned to respond swiftly to crises. The study underscores the need for a more decentralized approach to conflict management, where regional institutions play a leading role, complemented by global organizations, to enhance peace and stability in their respective domains.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, it is recommended that the United Nations (UN) re-evaluate its conflict resolution strategies by adopting a more decentralized approach that empowers regional organizations. Given its statistically insignificant impact, the UN should focus on capacity-building initiatives, logistical support, and diplomatic mediation while allowing regional bodies to lead interventions in their respective areas. This can be achieved through increased collaboration between the UN and regional organizations, ensuring that peacekeeping efforts are tailored to local contexts. Additionally, reforms within the UN's peacekeeping structure should address bureaucratic inefficiencies and geopolitical constraints, allowing for more agile and responsive interventions in conflict-prone regions.

Furthermore, regional organizations, particularly ECOWAS, AU, and EU, should strengthen their operational frameworks to enhance conflict resolution effectiveness. ECOWAS, which demonstrated the highest statistical significance, should be further supported in its peacekeeping and mediation efforts through sustainable funding mechanisms, capacity development, and strengthened enforcement of democratic governance. The AU and EU should also invest in better coordination mechanisms, intelligence-sharing, and rapid response units to address emerging security threats more efficiently. Policymakers should recognize the role of regional proximity and contextual expertise in conflict management and allocate resources accordingly, ensuring that local institutions are well-equipped to lead peacekeeping efforts with minimal external interference.

REFERENCES

1. Abbott, K. W., & Snidal, D. (1998). Why States Act Through Formal International Organizations. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 42(1), 3-32.
2. Abbott, K. W., & Snidal, D. (1998). Why states act through formal international organizations. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 42(1), 3-32.
3. Adebajo, A. (2002). *Liberia's Civil War: Nigeria, ECOMOG, and Regional Security in West Africa*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
4. Adebayo, A. G. (2023). ECOWAS interventions in West African conflicts: A critical analysis. *African Security Review*, 32(1), 15-32.
5. Adeoye, S. A. (2022). Regional organizations and conflict resolution: The role of the African Union and the European Union. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 25(3), 456-478.
6. African Union. (n.d.). African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA). Retrieved from <https://au.int/en/apsa>
7. Akande, S. A., & Ojo, O. M. (2024). Global governance, state capacity, and the development crisis in Africa. *Sociology Mind*, 14(1), 54–68. <https://doi.org/10.4236/sm.2024.141004>
8. Al Jazeera. (2024, January 28). Niger, Mali, Burkina Faso announce withdrawal from ECOWAS. Al Jazeera. <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2024/1/28/niger-mali-burkina-faso-announce-withdrawal-from-ecowas/>
9. Associated Press. (2024, July 8). Ecowas warns of 'disintegration' as juntas split from west African bloc. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/article/2024/jul/08/ecowas-warns-disintegration-juntas-split-west-african-bloc>
10. Axelrod, R., & Keohane, R. O. (1985). Achieving cooperation under anarchy: Strategies and institutions. *World Politics*, 38(1), 226-254.
11. Barnett, M. (2016). Paternalism in Humanitarian Governance. *Global Constitutionalism*, 5(3), 391-421.
12. Barnett, M., & Duvall, R. (2005). *Power in global governance*. Cambridge University Press.
13. Biermann, F. (2022). Global environmental governance: A place for conflict resolution?. *Global Environmental Politics*, 22(1), 1-20.
14. Bottici, C. (2024) War and conflict in a globalising world: Governance or empire? Retrieved from <https://red.pucp.edu.pe/wp-content/uploads/biblioteca/110514.doc.pdf>
15. Boutros-Ghali, B. (1992). *An Agenda for Peace*. New York: United Nations.
16. Buzan, B., & Little, R. (2020). *International systems in world history: A global socio-political and economic perspective*. Oxford University Press.
17. Castells, M. (2005). *The network society: A cross-cultural perspective*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
18. Chesterman, S. (2020). *The United Nations and the maintenance of international peace and security*. Cambridge University Press.
19. Chidozie, F., & Aje, O. O. (2017). International organizations and global governance agenda: SDGs as a paragon. *Relaciones Internacionales*, 10(1), 43–60.
20. Council of the European Union. (2023, July 27). The European Union and Iran: A story of successful diplomacy. Retrieved from <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/>
21. Cox, R. W. (1987). *Production, Power, and World Order: Social Forces in the Making of History*. New York: Columbia University Press.
22. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
23. Doyle, M. W., & Sambanis, N. (2021). *Making war and building peace: The United Nations and the struggle for peace*. Princeton University Press.
24. Dung, K. L., Umar, M. N., & Adamu, A. (2024). An assessment of the African union conflict management mechanisms in Darfur region of Sudan. *International Journal of Intellectual Discourse*, 7(3). Retrieved from <https://ijidjournal.org/index.php/ijid/article/view/601>
25. ECOWAS. (n.d.). ECOWAS Conflict Prevention Framework (ECPF). Retrieved from <https://ecpf.ecowas.int/all-about-ecpf/ecpf/>
26. Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11>

27. European Commission. (2024). European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR). Retrieved from <https://ec.europa.eu/international-partnerships/>
28. European External Action Service [EEAS]. (2024, January 30). EU Training Mission in Mali: Supporting the country's security forces. Retrieved from <https://eeas.europa.eu/>
29. European External Action Service [EEAS]. (n.d.). The European Union as a global partner. Retrieved from https://www.eeas.europa.eu/eeas/european-union-global-partner_en
30. European Union External Action. (2022). Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy. Retrieved from <https://www.eeas.europa.eu/>
31. Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2021). A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
32. Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43(1), 115-135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8>
33. Hurd, I. (2007). *After anarchy: Legitimacy and power in the United Nations Security Council*. Princeton University Press.
34. Hurd, I. (2020). *The United Nations and the politics of international law*. Cambridge University Press.
35. Hurrell, A. (2007). *On Global Order: Power, Values, and the Constitution of International Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
36. Ikenberry, G. J. (2011). *Liberal leviathan: The origins, crisis, and transformation of the American world order*. Princeton University Press.
37. Ikenberry, G. J. (2014). The logic of order: Westphalia, liberalism, and the evolution of international order in the modern era. In G. Hellmann, A. Fahrmeir, & M. Vec (Eds.), *The transformation of foreign policy: Drawing and managing boundaries from antiquity to the present* (pp. 53–79). Oxford University Press.
38. Keohane, R. O. (1984). *After hegemony: Cooperation and discord in the world political economy*. Princeton University Press.
39. Keohane, R. O. (2001). Governance in a Partially Globalized World. *American Political Science Review*, 95(1), 1-13.
40. Keohane, R. O. (2021). *After hegemony: Cooperation and discord in the world political economy*. Princeton University Press.
41. Keohane, R. O., & Martin, L. L. (1995). The promise of institutionalist theory. *International Security*, 20(1), 39-51.
42. Latta, J. (2002). *Good governance and conflict management*. Governance and Social Development Resource Centre.
43. Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 140, 1-55.
44. Mbah, P., & Anyanwu, U. (2023). Regional organizations and peacekeeping operations in Africa: The case of ECOWAS. *African Journal of Political Science*, 29(2), 89-107.
45. Miall, H. (2003). Global governance and conflict prevention. In F. Cochrane, R. Duffy, & J. Selby (Eds.), *Global governance, conflict and resistance* (pp. 59–77). Palgrave Macmillan.
46. Miller, D. (2007). *National responsibility and global justice*. Oxford University Press.
47. Moravcsik, A. (1997). Taking preferences seriously: A liberal theory of international politics. *International Organization*, 51(4), 513-553.
48. Musah, A.-F. (2024, August 7). Withdrawal of Mali, Niger, Burkina Faso from ECOWAS threatens regional security — Commissioner. *Punch Newspapers*. <https://punchng.com/withdrawal-of-mali-niger-burkina-faso-from-ecowas-threatens-regional-security-commissioner/>
49. Olonisakin, F. (2024). The effectiveness of regional organizations in conflict management: A comparative study of ECOWAS and the African Union. *Conflict, Security & Development*, 24(1), 45-67.
50. Paris, R. (2004). *At war's end: Building peace after civil conflict*. Cambridge University Press.
51. Purvis, G. R. (2022). *Global governance or global government? An examination of anarchy vs. hierarchy, global civil society, and international governmental organizations* (Undergraduate honors thesis). Portland State University. Retrieved from <https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/honorstheses>
52. Reuters. (2025, February 7). EU's Von der Leyen: ICC must be able to pursue fight against global impunity. Retrieved from <https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/eus-von-der-leyen-icc-must-be-able-pursue-fight-against-global-impunity-2025-02-07/>

53. Rittberger, V. (2002). Approaches to the study of global governance. In V. Rittberger (Ed.), *Global governance and the United Nations system* (pp. 21–44). United Nations University Press.
54. Rosenau, J. N. (1995). Governance in the Twenty-First Century. *Global Governance*, 1(1), 13-43.
55. Rosenau, J. N. (1995). Governance in the twenty-first century. *Global Governance*, 1(1), 13-43.
56. Ruggie, J. G. (1998). *Constructing the world polity: Essays on international institutionalization*. Routledge.
57. Russett, B., & Oneal, J. (2001). *Triangulating peace: Democracy, interdependence, and international organizations*. Norton.
58. Salim, M. S. (2017). *Global governance in the promotion of international security: A case study of the United Nations* (Master's research project). Institute of Diplomacy and International Studies, University of Nairobi.
59. Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2019). *Research methods for business students* (8th ed.). Pearson Education.
60. Schabas, W. A. (2011). *An Introduction to the International Criminal Court*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
61. Simmons, B. A., & Dorsey, E. (2021). *International conflict resolution: The role of international institutions*. Cambridge University Press.
62. Slaughter, A. M. (2004). *A new world order*. Princeton University Press.
63. The Guardian. (2024, July 8). *Ecowas warns of 'disintegration' as juntas split from west African bloc*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/article/2024/jul/08/ecowas-warns-disintegration-juntas-split-west-african-bloc>
64. Tutor Chase. (n.d.). *What is the role of the UN in global governance?* Retrieved from <https://www.tutorchase.com/answers/ib/politics/what-is-the-role-of-the-un-in-global-governance>
65. United Nations. (2024, December 28). *UN authorizes new mission against al-Shabaab in Somalia*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2024/dec/28/un-authorises-new-mission-against-al-shabaab-in-somalia>
66. United Nations. (n.d.). *Peace and Security*. Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/en/global-issues/peace-and-security>
67. Weiss, T. G. (2023). The United Nations and conflict management: Assessing the challenges and opportunities. *Global Governance*, 29(4), 389-407.
68. Weiss, T. G., & Wilkinson, R. (2014). Rethinking global governance? Complexity, authority, power, change. *International Studies Quarterly*, 58(1), 207–215.
69. Welt. (2024, July 8). *Militärjuntas von Mali, Burkina Faso und Niger gründen Staatenbund*. Welt. <https://www.welt.de/252392146>
70. Wendt, A. (1999). *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
71. Williams, P. D. (2017). *The African Union's Peace Operations: Principles and Practices*. London: Routledge.
72. World Jurisprudence. (2024, May 22). *The Role of the United Nations in Conflict Resolution Strategies*. Retrieved from <https://worldjurisprudence.com/role-of-the-united-nations-in-conflict/>
73. Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: An introductory analysis* (2nd ed.). Harper and Row.
74. Zartman, I. W. (1997). *Governance as conflict management: Politics and violence in West Africa*. Brookings Institution Press.
75. Zartman, I. W. (2001). *Preventive Negotiation: Avoiding Conflict Escalation*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.