Journal of Yerevan University. Economy
2025, Vol. 16, No. 1(45), June, 21-34
https://doi.org/10.46991/BYSU.G/2025.16.1.021

# ASSESSMENT AND ANALYSIS OF THE SECURITY LEVEL OF COUNTRIES

**SAMSON DAVOYAN, VAHE ASATRYAN** *
*Yerevan State University*

**Abstract.** The security of the country is the mutually supported and balanced capabilities of its multi-institutional systems to resist internal and external threats, which can ensure the territorial integrity of the country, the stable and effective functioning of all its most important systems, economic, political, etc.
The purpose of the article is to study the individual components and directions of the country's security, to carry out a calculation and comparative analysis of the economic security of different countries using an integral index. Within the framework of the research, the foundation of the economic development of the country and the possibility of ensuring it at different levels of the country's security were also considered.

**Key words:** *economy, safety, economic development, partial indexes, national security, global indexes.*

## Introduction

The security of countries has been a vital necessity for the existence of nations and their long-term development at almost all times. Fortunately, humanity has now reached a level of development in which there are many opportunities to quantitatively assess the non-measurable indicators characteristic of humanity and to conduct comparative analysis in the context of different countries.

For centuries, the term economic development has been interpreted differently by different authors, however, the fact that economic development is significantly determined by the level of security of a country and the natural, sustainable development of various institutions of the country is indisputable. The economic development and security of countries are significantly interconnected, and a high level of security provides a great opportunity for implementing effective economic policies and ensuring economic development.

However, economic development is a complex and multidimensional concept, due to which there is no common definition of this term in the economic literature. Many economists, including Schultz (Theodore W. Schultz, 1978, pp. 3-23), Lewis (W. A. Lewis, 1954), and others, have studied economic development. Summarizing definitions

* **Samson Davoyan –** Doctor in Economics, Professor at the Chair of Economics and International Economic Relations of YSU Faculty of Economics and Management
E-mail: samsondavoyan2014@gmail.com ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0003-3100-002X
**Vahe Asatryan –** Graduate Student of YSU Faculty of Economics and Management
Email: vahe.asatryan@edu.ysu.am ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0009-8992-6080



Received: 03.02.2025
Revised: 17.05.2025
Accepted: 06.06.2025

of economic development in the professional literature, we propose the following definition of economic development.

*The economic development of countries, according to time and space, is the qualitative-quantitative changes of all the main institutions of the economic system, which are aimed at ensuring the expanded reproduction of the entire economy, thus achieving a positive, synergistic result.*

Considering the importance of economic development to the long-term success of countries, and based on the role of security in ensuring the continuous growth of economic development, we have addressed the concept of security of countries and its assessment.

The term "Security of Countries" has been widely studied in broad academic circles. In the paper “Assessment of Passive Economic Security of the Socioeconomic System of the Region” by Agarkov and Tarasyeva (2020), the authors discuss the concept of “national security” in relation to regional economic security, specifically focusing on passive economic security. They argue that national security includes safeguarding the socioeconomic stability of regions by evaluating the vulnerabilities in economic systems, thereby protecting against potential risks and threats that could destabilize the broader economic environment. In his 2010 paper “National Security Strategy in an Era of Growing Challenges and Resource Constraints”, Andrew F. Krepinevich Jr. discusses “national security” as being increasingly influenced by both traditional military threats and emerging challenges such as economic instability, technological advancements, and geopolitical shifts. He argues that national security strategy must adapt to a more complex global landscape, where resource constraints and non-traditional threats require a more comprehensive and strategic approach to safeguarding national interests. Other authors (Kravchenko, Kudryavtseva, & Kuporov, 2021) discuss national security in the context of economic threats to a region. They emphasize that national security involves safeguarding a region's economic stability, particularly through mechanisms like public procurement. The authors propose a method to assess and mitigate risks that could undermine economic security, highlighting the need for effective management and oversight of economic systems to ensure national stability and resilience. Molchan and Saenko emphasize that economic security is vital for protecting the state's overall stability and ensuring timely interventions when risks exceed acceptable levels (Molchan & Saenko, 2016). Hudson (2021) argues that “economic security” is essential for ending poverty in the United States. He emphasizes the need for policies that ensure everyone has access to basic economic resources, including stable employment, healthcare, and housing, to protect individuals from financial insecurity. Hudson suggests that achieving economic security for all is a critical step toward eliminating poverty and promoting overall societal well-being. According to Kremer-Matyškevič and Černius (2019), ensuring economic security involves protecting key sectors of the economy from risks that could jeopardize the country’s overall security and development.

Taking into account the studies of the above-mentioned authors on the security of countries, based on their definitions of this category and the results of their research, we propose the following definition of the term "security of countries", which, in our opinion, fully reflects the content of this concept.

*The institutional system of the country's security includes the magnitude of the synergistic result formed as an outcome of the application of the required level of political,*

*economic, social, military, legal, diplomatic, informational, cultural, educational, environmental and other institutional components, which can ensure a normal and balanced activity of the population of the country. The country's security is the state's level of defense, its ability to neutralize multiple internal and external threats and challenges and to resist them.*

Given the critical importance of the "security of countries" category, there is a need to quantitatively assess the security level of countries and classify countries according to that level, which will make it possible to easily explain the mechanisms for ensuring security, based on the policies pursued by leading countries in terms of security level. Thus, within the framework of the research, we have tried to calculate the levels of the country's security. As the concept of "country security" is very complex, variable and probable, and the assessment of its level using classical applied mathematics methods is very problematic, we employed one of the econometric methods previously used in our research (Davoyan S., 2016), the panel analysis method, and the calculations were performed through the SPSS software package.

**Methodology**

In order to assess the security level of countries in a comprehensive and systematic way, we developed a general (integral) security index by aggregating several internationally recognized partial indexes. Given the multidimensional nature of national security—which spans economic, military, environmental, and social dimensions—a composite index provides a practical framework for cross-country comparisons. Below we outline the methodological steps taken to construct the integral index, including the rationale behind the selected indicators and the specific weighting methodology used.

**1. Rationale for Method Selection**

The assessment of national security levels across countries and over time requires a methodology capable of handling both temporal and cross-sectional data. For this reason, we used panel data analysis, which combines data from multiple countries (cross-sectional dimension) and multiple years (time-series dimension). This approach provides several advantages:

- Increases the degrees of freedom and reduces collinearity among variables;
- Allows for the identification of country-specific and time-specific effects;
- Enables tracking of dynamic trends in security levels across countries.

The panel data analysis was performed using the SPSS statistical software package, which allowed for the efficient estimation of composite index scores and the verification of internal consistency.

**2. Selection of Partial Indexes**

The selection of partial indexes was guided by the following criteria:

- The indicators must be quantitative and standardized, ensuring comparability across countries.
- They must be published by authoritative international organizations (e.g., UN, World Bank, World Economic Forum).
- The data must be available for a sufficiently large sample of countries (at least 100) for the years 2020–2023.

- Each indicator must reflect a distinct and relevant dimension of national security (economic vitality, political stability, societal welfare, environmental sustainability, technological infrastructure, etc.).

These partial indexes are:

**1) Global Competitiveness Index (GCI)**

The index has been published annually by the World Economic Forum since 2004. It evaluates indicators affecting the long-term growth and development of the world's economies, and also provides an opportunity to identify the positive and negative aspects of these economies in order to develop a long-term development strategy.

The results of the assessment of the World Economic Forum, databases of international organizations (World Bank, UN structural bodies, World Health Organization, etc.) are used as a source of information.

The index is calculated for 140 countries and includes more than 120 indicators (such as higher education and training, product market efficiency, innovation, technological readiness, etc.) grouped into 3 sub-indices that make up the 12 pillars[1].

**2) Human Development Index (HDI)**

The index has been developed by the United Nations and considers the human potential of 188 countries as a driving force of the country's economic development.

The Human Development Index represents a composite assessment of three dimensions of human development[2]:

- a long and healthy life, as measured by life expectancy at birth;
- knowledge, as measured by mean years of schooling and expected years of schooling;
- a decent standard of living, as measured by GNI per capita in PPP terms in US$.

The human development index is estimated in the range of 0-1[3].

**3) GDP (expressed in purchasing power parity) (GDP PPP)**

The indicators of gross domestic product (GDP), expressed in terms of purchasing power parity, are quite applicable when conducting comparative analyses of living standards and quality of life between different countries, as they take into account the relative cost of living, inflation rates. Calculated and published by various international organizations.

**4) Human capital index (Hcap)**

The report behind the index is published by the World Bank; the index assesses the ability of different countries to mobilize the economic and professional potential of their citizens.

The Human Capital Index estimates how much capital each country is losing due to lack of education and health. The index was first published in 2008 for 157 countries. The human capital index ranges from (0-1), with 1 being the highest ranking score for the index[4].

---

[1] The Global Competitiveness Report 2015-2016, http://www3.weforum.org/docs/gcr/2015-2016/ Global_ Competitiveness_Report_2015-2016.pdf

[2] World health Organization, https://www.who.int/data/nutrition/nlis/info/human-development-index/Entry date: 10.12.2024.

[3] United Nations Development Programme, https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-2023-24/Entry date: 10.12.2024.

[4] https://datacatalog.worldbank.org/search/dataset/0038030 /Entry date: 10.12.2024.

**5) The Quality of Life Index (QLI)**

The rating score of the index is calculated for 177 countries, using 30 indicators, which are combined in 7 pillars, and each of the pillars is included in the index with its own weighting factor:

1. Stability: 14%
2. Civil Rights: 16%
3. Health and medical services: 16%
4. Security: 16%
5. Climate: 14%
6. Values: 16%
7. Popularity: 8%

The index change range is (0-100). The database of indicators included in the quality of life index is collected from the databases of the World Bank, OECD, the United Nations and other international organizations[5].

**6) Economic Freedom Index (EFI)**

The Economic Freedom Index was developed by the Heritage Foundation and The Wall Street Journal in 1995. The index evaluates the level of economic freedom in 186 countries of the world in the following four main sections:

1. supremacy of law,
2. dimension of state,
3. efficiency of regulation,
4. openness of the market.

The index is calculated every year on the basis of 10 pillars characterizing economic freedom (property rights, corruption freedom, tax freedom, government spending, business freedom, etc.). The rating points of the countries are evaluated in the range of 0-100, and as a result of their averaging; the rating point of the index of economic freedom is calculated. The higher the rating scores of the component, the greater the degree of economic freedom in that country[6].

**7) Social Progress Index (SPI)**

The index was initially published in 2011 by the initiative of Oxford University. The methodology behind the calculation was developed by Michael Porter at Harvard Business School. The Rockefeller Foundation, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and a number of other reputable organizations also participated in the creation of the Social Progress Index. The Social Progress Index was first published in 2014 based on a methodology developed in 2013. The Social Progress Index is built on the basis of 12 main components and contains 52 indicators, calculated for 120 countries[7].

**8) Global Peace Index (GPI)**

In assessing peace, the Global Peace Index examines the extent to which countries are involved in current domestic and international conflicts, and attempts to assess the level of harmony or discord within a nation. The indicators that are part of the statistics broadly assess safety in society. According to these indicators, a low crime rate, minimal

[5] https://www.worlddata.info/quality-of-life.php /Entry date: 11.12.2024.
[6] Heritage Foundation, Economic Freedom Index, http://www.heritage.org/index/ /Entry date: 12.12.2024.
[7] Social Progress Imperative, https://www.socialprogress.org/social-progress-index /Entry date: 12.12.2024.

incidents of terrorist acts and violent demonstrations, harmonious relations with neighboring countries, a stable political environment and a small number of internally displaced or refugee populations testify to peace.

In 2017, 23 indicators were used to determine peace scores for each country. The indicators were initially selected with the support of an expert panel in 2007 and are reviewed by the expert panel on an annual basis. The scores of each index are normalized on a scale of 1-5[8].

**9) Unemployment rate**

The US Bureau of Labor Statistics measures the employment and unemployment rates for persons 16 and older. The unemployment rate is measured by two different labor force surveys:

Current Population Survey (CPS): also known as a "household survey", it is conducted based on a sample of 60,000 households. The survey measures the unemployment rate based on the ILO definition. The Current Employment Statistics Survey (CES): also known as the "wage survey," is conducted based on a sample of 160,000 businesses and government agencies representing 400,000 individual workers. The unemployment rate is also calculated using weekly unemployment insurance claims reports. The unemployment rate is updated monthly.

The US Bureau of Labor Statistics uses six measures when calculating the unemployment rate. The measures range from U1 to U6 and were introduced between 1950 and 2010. They calculate different aspects of unemployment.

The measures are:

- U1. Percentage of labor force unemployed for 15 weeks or more.
- U2. The percentage of the workforce that has lost their jobs, or has completed a temporary job.
- U3. The official unemployment rate, which is when people are out of work and actively looking for work in the past four weeks.
- U4. Persons described in U3 plus "discouraged workers" who stop looking for work because economic conditions make them think there is no work for them.
- U5. Individuals described in U4 plus other "lightly attached workers," "weakly attached workers," or those who are "willing" and able to work but have not recently looked for work.
- U6. Persons described in U5 plus part-time workers who wish to work full-time but cannot for economic reasons, mainly underemployment.

**10) Global Food Security Index (GFSI)**

The Global Food Security Index (GFSI) looks at issues related to food availability, quality and safety in 113 countries. This indicator is a dynamic, quantitative and qualitative pillar model built on 58 indicators. These indicators measure the drivers of food security in both developing and developed countries[9].

The GFSI methodology was developed by the EUF in consultation with a group of peer experts. The group met in February 2012 in Washington, D.C., to review the index's scope, indicator selection, weighting, and overall structure.

[8] https://www.visionofhumanity.org/maps/#/ Entry date: 12.12.2024.
[9] https://impact.economist.com/sustainability/project/food-security-index/about, /Entry date: 13.12.2024.

Food security varies around the world, with some regions being much more prone to food insecurity due to both lack of fertile land and capital. A lot of research is being done to increase the productivity of crops and therefore grow more food.

**11) The Environmental Performance Index (EPI)**

The environmental performance index is intended to measure and number the environmental indicators of the state's policy. This index was developed with the help of the Pilot Environmental Performance Index, which was first published in 2002 and is intended to meet the environmental goals set by the United Nations under the Millennium Development Framework.

The index was developed in 2006 by Yale University (Yale Center for Environmental Law and Policy) and Columbia University (Center for International Earth Science Information Network), in cooperation with the World Economic Forum and the Joint Research Center of the European Commission.

EPI calculation indicators change frequently. This should be taken into account when looking at a country's performance through several reports, as this may lead to score and ranking changes based purely on a change in methodology.[10]

**12) Global Cybersecurity Index (GCI)**

The Global Cybersecurity Index is designed to track the activities of companies operating in the cybersecurity industry. According to the data of the International Telecommunication Union, about one billion people in the world became Internet users for the first time from 2015 (when the first GCI was issued) to 2019. As global losses from cybercrime reach enormous proportions, citizens expect governments to improve cybersecurity standards and protect personal and financial data more effectively.

Each country's level of development or engagement is assessed against the five pillars of ITU's Global Cybersecurity Agenda: legal measures, technical measures, organizational measures, capacity building and cooperation.

Based on a multi-stakeholder approach and initiative, the GCI leverages the capacities and expertise of various organizations with the aim of improving the quality of research, promoting international collaboration and knowledge sharing on the subject[11].

**13) Military Power Index**

The ranking of the leading military powers of the world is made taking into account a number of factors: it uses a clear formula to rank countries according to their fighting capabilities[12]. More than 50 different factors are taken into account to determine the position of each country. The number of weapons, while important, is not the only factor determining a country's military capabilities or ranking. Training, combat readiness, overseas military bases, defense infrastructure and fortifications are factors that are considered and can often be decisive in the outcome of a war.

Strategic and tactical nuclear capabilities must be deployed with extreme caution, and states must refrain from using such weapons; they are considered a limited asset and do not have a decisive role; they would be decisive if they were used freely. Because of their top-secret nature, biological warfare capabilities are not considered.

---

[10] https://epi.yale.edu/, Entry date: 14.12.2024.

[11] https://unric.org/en/itu-releases-fourth-edition-of-the-global-cybersecurity-index/ Entry date: 14.12.2024.

[12] https://www.globalfirepower.com/countries-listing.php, Entry date: 14.12.2024.

Military forces are also divided into six tiers based on the league where their military capabilities are. Countries at the same level can be considered close rivals, while countries at lower levels struggle to wage war against those at higher levels.

Then, the specific weight of each partial coefficient in the range of 0-1 in the structure of the general (integral) coefficient of security of the countries was determined. According to our calculations, the partial coefficients in the formation of the general security index of the countries for 2020-2023 have the following weights:

***Table 1***

**The relative weights of the partial indexes in the general index of the security of the countries**

| | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Human Development Index (HDI) | 0.078 | 0.069 | 0.075 | 0.0718 |
| GDP (expressed in purchasing power parity) (PPP) | 0.079 | 0.072 | 0.07 | 0.0822 |
| Human capital index (Hcap) | 0.077 | 0.086 | 0.087 | 0.0836 |
| The Quality of Life Index (QLI) | 0.066 | 0.074 | 0.075 | 0.0744 |
| Global Cybersecurity Index (GCI) | 0.095 | 0.092 | 0.09 | 0.0934 |
| Economic Freedom Index (EFI) | 0.059 | 0.061 | 0.061 | 0.0697 |
| Global Peace Index (GPI) | 0.079 | 0.082 | 0.08 | 0.0671 |
| Unemployment rate | 0.046 | 0.047 | 0.046 | 0.0537 |
| Social Progress Index (SPI) | 0.053 | 0.049 | 0.051 | 0.0668 |
| Military Power Index | 0.112 | 0.115 | 0.117 | 0.1046 |
| Global Food Security Index (GFSI) | 0.106 | 0.108 | 0.105 | 0.1032 |
| The Environmental Performance Index (EPI) | 0.096 | 0.097 | 0.095 | 0.0762 |
| Global Competitiveness Index (GCI) | 0.054 | 0.048 | 0.048 | 0.0534 |

***Source:*** Developed by the authors.

The specific weights of each partial index in the overall security index were not assigned arbitrarily. Instead, we employed a **two-stage hybrid methodology** combining:

a) **Principal Component Analysis (PCA)**

PCA was applied to the panel dataset to identify the proportion of variance each partial index contributed to the total variation in national security levels. Indicators that explained more variance in the underlying data were assigned higher weights. For instance, the Military Power Index and the Global Food Security Index consistently exhibited strong explanatory power in differentiating the security levels of countries.

b) **Expert Judgment and Theoretical Relevance**

To supplement the empirical component, we incorporated **expert judgment** based on literature review and domain-specific understanding. This step was necessary to ensure that conceptually significant factors—such as cybersecurity, human development,

or environmental performance—were not underrepresented due to statistical limitations alone. This step follows the precedent established in our earlier research (Davoyan, 2016), where we found that mixed-method weighting strategies offer a more robust and interpretable index.

The final weights (presented in Table 1) represent an **average of both empirical significance and theoretical importance**, adjusted each year to account for small shifts in relative importance while maintaining overall methodological consistency.

The integral security index of countries' security is determined by the following formula:

$$H^t_{i\,security} = \sum_{j=1}^{13} a^t_{i\,j}\, L^t_{i\,j}$$

$H^t_{i\,security}$ - is the value of the general (integral) security index of the i-th country in the t-th year,

$a^t_{i\,j}$ - is the specific weight of the j-th partial coefficient of the i-th country in the general security index of the country in the t-th year,

$L^t_{i\,j}$ - is the magnitude of the j-th coefficient of the i-th country in the t-th year,

i - is the number of countries, (i=1,2...102)

j - is the number of the partial coefficients forming the general security index of the countries, (j=1,2...13)

According to our calculations, the general security index of countries for 2020-2023 has the following composition:

***Table 2***

***The levels of security in the countries observed, 2020-2023***

| **Country:** | **2020** | | **2021** | | **2022** | | **2023** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Score** | **Rank** | **Score** | **Rank** | **Score** | **Rank** | **Score** | **Rank** |
| **Ireland** | 0.725 | 1 | 0.685 | 1 | 0.711 | 1 | 0.748 | 1 |
| **Portugal** | 0.690 | 3 | 0.653 | 3 | 0.711 | 2 | 0.724 | 2 |
| **Finland** | 0.697 | 2 | 0.656 | 2 | 0.681 | 3 | 0.717 | 3 |
| **Austria** | 0.685 | 4 | 0.650 | 4 | 0.679 | 4 | 0.711 | 4 |
| **Denmark** | 0.683 | 5 | 0.643 | 7 | 0.679 | 5 | 0.707 | 5 |
| **New Zealand** | 0.682 | 6 | 0.644 | 6 | 0.669 | 6 | 0.704 | 6 |
| **Slovakia** | 0.673 | 8 | 0.644 | 5 | 0.665 | 7 | 0.699 | 7 |
| **Belgium** | 0.676 | 7 | 0.641 | 8 | 0.660 | 8 | 0.697 | 8 |
| **Germany** | 0.672 | 9 | 0.638 | 9 | 0.658 | 9 | 0.694 | 9 |
| **France** | 0.661 | 13 | 0.630 | 12 | 0.647 | 10 | 0.683 | 10 |
| **Canada** | 0.662 | 12 | 0.637 | 10 | 0.637 | 11 | 0.682 | 11 |
| **Australia** | 0.662 | 11 | 0.632 | 11 | 0.633 | 12 | 0.679 | 12 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Switzerland** | 0.664 | 10 | 0.624 | 15 | 0.636 | 13 | 0.678 | 13 |
| **Japan** | 0.657 | 14 | 0.626 | 14 | 0.627 | 14 | 0.673 | 14 |
| **USA** | 0.656 | 16 | 0.628 | 13 | 0.620 | 15 | 0.671 | 15 |
| **Spain** | 0.646 | 18 | 0.622 | 16 | 0.619 | 16 | 0.665 | 16 |
| **Sweden** | 0.647 | 17 | 0.614 | 17 | 0.617 | 17 | 0.662 | 17 |
| **Italy** | 0.632 | 19 | 0.607 | 18 | 0.612 | 18 | 0.653 | 18 |
| **Great Britain** | 0.627 | 21 | 0.598 | 19 | 0.605 | 19 | 0.646 | 19 |
| **Netherlands** | 0.628 | 20 | 0.589 | 22 | 0.605 | 20 | 0.643 | 20 |
| **Israel** | 0.656 | 15 | 0.581 | 27 | 0.580 | 27 | 0.641 | 21 |
| **Czech** | 0.622 | 22 | 0.589 | 21 | 0.599 | 21 | 0.639 | 22 |
| **UAE** | 0.609 | 27 | 0.588 | 23 | 0.597 | 23 | 0.632 | 23 |
| **Greece** | 0.611 | 26 | 0.590 | 20 | 0.590 | 22 | 0.631 | 24 |
| **Estonia** | 0.621 | 23 | 0.583 | 26 | 0.583 | 26 | 0.630 | 25 |
| **Kuwait** | 0.614 | 24 | 0.585 | 24 | 0.583 | 25 | 0.629 | 26 |
| **Singapore** | 0.612 | 25 | 0.585 | 25 | 0.585 | 24 | 0.629 | 27 |
| **Malaysia** | 0.595 | 29 | 0.573 | 29 | 0.575 | 30 | 0.615 | 28 |
| **Chile** | 0.590 | 32 | 0.572 | 30 | 0.575 | 29 | 0.613 | 29 |
| **Norway** | 0.607 | 28 | 0.564 | 34 | 0.566 | 34 | 0.612 | 30 |
| **Mexico** | 0.589 | 33 | 0.568 | 31 | 0.573 | 31 | 0.610 | 31 |
| **Saudi Arabia** | 0.586 | 36 | 0.565 | 32 | 0.570 | 32 | 0.607 | 32 |
| **Romania** | 0.594 | 30 | 0.563 | 35 | 0.554 | 36 | 0.603 | 33 |
| **Luxembourg** | 0.593 | 31 | 0.550 | 39 | 0.565 | 35 | 0.602 | 34 |
| **Kazakhstan** | 0.588 | 35 | 0.563 | 36 | 0.549 | 38 | 0.599 | 35 |
| **Republic of South Africa** | 0.565 | 45 | 0.564 | 33 | 0.568 | 33 | 0.598 | 36 |
| **Thailand** | 0.582 | 37 | 0.560 | 38 | 0.550 | 37 | 0.597 | 37 |
| **Russia** | 0.580 | 38 | 0.561 | 37 | 0.547 | 39 | 0.595 | 38 |
| **Hungary** | 0.529 | 56 | 0.575 | 28 | 0.580 | 28 | 0.594 | 39 |
| **Poland** | 0.576 | 40 | 0.548 | 40 | 0.545 | 40 | 0.588 | 40 |
| **Lithuania** | 0.576 | 39 | 0.547 | 41 | 0.544 | 41 | 0.588 | 41 |
| **Panama** | 0.570 | 41 | 0.536 | 42 | 0.543 | 42 | 0.581 | 42 |
| **Azerbaijan** | 0.560 | 47 | 0.535 | 43 | 0.540 | 43 | 0.576 | 43 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Uruguay** | 0.565 | 43 | 0.531 | 45 | 0.538 | 45 | 0.576 | 44 |
| **Latvia** | 0.566 | 42 | 0.530 | 46 | 0.536 | 46 | 0.575 | 45 |
| **South Korea** | 0.588 | 34 | 0.516 | 54 | 0.518 | 54 | 0.572 | 46 |
| **Turkey** | 0.549 | 49 | 0.531 | 44 | 0.539 | 44 | 0.571 | 47 |
| **Sri Lanka** | 0.549 | 48 | 0.524 | 49 | 0.533 | 49 | 0.567 | 48 |
| **China** | 0.540 | 52 | 0.528 | 48 | 0.534 | 47 | 0.565 | 49 |
| **Costa Rica** | 0.538 | 53 | 0.523 | 50 | 0.530 | 50 | 0.561 | 50 |
| **Ireland** | 0.546 | 50 | 0.517 | 53 | 0.520 | 53 | 0.558 | 51 |
| **Bulgaria** | 0.565 | 44 | 0.505 | 56 | 0.505 | 56 | 0.556 | 52 |
| **Morocco** | 0.534 | 54 | 0.519 | 52 | 0.523 | 52 | 0.556 | 53 |
| **Botswana** | 0.526 | 57 | 0.507 | 55 | 0.516 | 55 | 0.546 | 54 |
| **Jordan** | 0.482 | 74 | 0.530 | 47 | 0.534 | 48 | 0.545 | 55 |
| **Croatia** | 0.533 | 55 | 0.503 | 58 | 0.503 | 58 | 0.543 | 56 |
| **Slovenia** | 0.561 | 46 | 0.478 | 68 | 0.497 | 66 | 0.542 | 57 |
| **Cyprus** | 0.525 | 58 | 0.501 | 60 | 0.502 | 60 | 0.539 | 58 |
| **Georgia** | 0.518 | 60 | 0.503 | 57 | 0.504 | 57 | 0.538 | 59 |
| **Philippines** | 0.518 | 61 | 0.501 | 59 | 0.503 | 59 | 0.537 | 60 |
| **Argentina** | 0.516 | 62 | 0.500 | 61 | 0.502 | 61 | 0.535 | 61 |
| **Indonesia** | 0.513 | 63 | 0.494 | 63 | 0.501 | 63 | 0.532 | 62 |
| **Peru** | 0.512 | 64 | 0.492 | 64 | 0.500 | 64 | 0.530 | 63 |
| **Qatar** | 0.494 | 71 | 0.495 | 62 | 0.501 | 62 | 0.525 | 64 |
| **Albania** | 0.511 | 65 | 0.483 | 66 | 0.496 | 67 | 0.525 | 65 |
| **Egypt** | 0.501 | 67 | 0.487 | 65 | 0.498 | 65 | 0.524 | 66 |
| **El Salvador** | 0.510 | 66 | 0.473 | 72 | 0.483 | 72 | 0.517 | 67 |
| **Uganda** | 0.497 | 69 | 0.477 | 69 | 0.490 | 69 | 0.516 | 68 |
| **Kenya** | 0.495 | 70 | 0.474 | 70 | 0.488 | 70 | 0.514 | 69 |
| **Tanzania** | 0.482 | 75 | 0.481 | 67 | 0.493 | 68 | 0.514 | 70 |
| **Pakistan** | 0.501 | 68 | 0.466 | 74 | 0.478 | 74 | 0.509 | 71 |
| **Paraguay** | 0.544 | 51 | 0 5189 | 51 | 0.527 | 51 | 0.510 | 72 |
| **India** | 0.480 | 76 | 0.474 | 71 | 0.487 | 71 | 0.508 | 73 |
| **Vietnam** | 0.487 | 73 | 0.473 | 73 | 0.480 | 73 | 0.508 | 74 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Malta** | 0.477 | 77 | 0.445 | 77 | 0.477 | 75 | 0.493 | 75 |
| **Nicaragua** | 0.520 | 59 | 0.441 | 79 | 0.431 | 79 | 0.491 | 76 |
| **Belarus** | 0.493 | 72 | 0.454 | 75 | 0.439 | 77 | 0.489 | 77 |
| **Nigeria** | 0.453 | 81 | 0.442 | 78 | 0.433 | 78 | 0.469 | 78 |
| **Bangladesh** | 0.453 | 82 | 0.438 | 80 | 0.430 | 80 | 0.466 | 79 |
| **Algeria** | 0.395 | 92 | 0.448 | 76 | 0.470 | 76 | 0.463 | 80 |
| **Zambia** | 0.454 | 80 | 0.436 | 81 | 0.420 | 82 | 0.462 | 81 |
| **Brazil** | 0.449 | 83 | 0.435 | 82 | 0.423 | 81 | 0.461 | 82 |
| **Honduras** | 0.456 | 78 | 0.433 | 84 | 0.418 | 84 | 0.461 | 83 |
| **Côte d'Ivoire** | 0.437 | 87 | 0.435 | 83 | 0.419 | 83 | 0.455 | 84 |
| **Namibia** | 0.446 | 85 | 0.422 | 85 | 0.417 | 85 | 0.453 | 85 |
| **Kyrgyzstan** | 0.443 | 86 | 0.417 | 86 | 0.416 | 86 | 0.450 | 86 |
| **Senegal** | 0.420 | 89 | 0.411 | 87 | 0.414 | 87 | 0.439 | 87 |
| **Cambodia** | 0.446 | 84 | 0.385 | 89 | 0.410 | 89 | 0.438 | 88 |
| **Mongolia** | 0.423 | 88 | 0.404 | 88 | 0.410 | 88 | 0.436 | 89 |
| **Guatemala** | 0.456 | 79 | 0.367 | 93 | 0.384 | 93 | 0.426 | 90 |
| **Venezuela** | 0.410 | 90 | 0.382 | 91 | 0.398 | 91 | 0.420 | 91 |
| **Jamaica** | 0.398 | 91 | 0.378 | 92 | 0.397 | 92 | 0.414 | 92 |
| **Bolivia** | 0.393 | 93 | 0.366 | 94 | 0.383 | 94 | 0.403 | 93 |
| **Zimbabwe** | 0.341 | 97 | 0.382 | 90 | 0.408 | 90 | 0.399 | 94 |
| **Togo** | 0.341 | 96 | 0.350 | 95 | 0.377 | 95 | 0.377 | 95 |
| **Armenia:** | 0.386 | 94 | 0.323 | 98 | 0.353 | 98 | 0.375 | 96 |
| **Ethiopia** | 0.341 | 95 | 0.338 | 96 | 0.375 | 96 | 0.372 | 97 |
| **Iran** | 0.329 | 98 | 0.323 | 97 | 0.362 | 97 | 0.358 | 98 |
| **Tajikistan** | 0.329 | 99 | 0.320 | 99 | 0.348 | 99 | 0.352 | 99 |
| **Taiwan** | 0.298 | 101 | 0.290 | 100 | 0.337 | 100 | 0.326 | 100 |
| **Ukraine** | 0.306 | 100 | 0.232 | 101 | 0.330 | 101 | 0.306 | 101 |
| **Syria** | 0.197 | 102 | 0.231 | 102 | 0.328 | 102 | 0.267 | 102 |
| **Lebanon** | 0.185 | 103 | 0.223 | 103 | 0.319 | 103 | 0.256 | 103 |

| |
|---|
| High |
| Above average |
| Medium |
| Below average |
| Dangerous |

***Source:*** Developed by the authors.

***Conclusions***

1) For the years 2020-2023, using the panel analysis method, a general index of the security level assessment of 103 countries was formed using 13 partial indexes (Table N2).

2) The different levels of security of 103 countries have been divided into 5 groups. Countries 1-20 in Table 2 are countries with a high level of security, among which are Denmark, Austria, New Zealand, etc. (countries in the green layer).

In the 2nd group, the countries in the 21st-40th places, those with a higher than average security level, among which are the Netherlands, Singapore, Norway, etc. (the countries in the orange layer).

In the 3rd group, the countries in the 41st-60th places are those with an average level of security, among which are Poland, Bulgaria, Azerbaijan, etc. (the countries in the blue layer).

In the 4th group, the countries in the 61st-80th places are those with a lower than average level of security, among which are Indonesia, Egypt, India, etc. (the countries in the red band).

In the 5th group, the countries in the 81st-103rd places are those with a low level of security, among which are Taiwan, Armenia, Ukraine, Syria, etc. (the countries in the white layer).

3) The low level of security of the Republic of Armenia in 2020-2023 is mainly due to the low levels of these partial indexes: military power, food security, human capital, social progress, GDP expressed in terms of purchasing power parity.

4) In order to improve the video-methodological provisions for the formation of the general index of the security level of the countries, in our further research, such partial indexes will be included, which are in a greater degree of interdependence with the term "security of the countries".

5) We believe that the presented research work is not free from a number of theoretical-methodological shortcomings, including:

1. It is necessary to carry out the evaluation of the security levels of the countries with the largest possible number of partial indexes.

2. To present the participation of such partial indexes in the process of assessing the security levels of the countries, which are most correlated with the quantitative magnitude of the security levels of the countries.

3. To use other quantitative evaluation tools, which will enable us to present the above partial indexes according to the degree of importance.

**References**

Davoyan S. (2016), “Analysis of the comparative efficiency of the multifaceted transformations of the countries”, Gyumri. "Dpir" publishing house, 415 pages

Theodore W. Schultz. (1978), “On Economics and Politics of Agriculture.” In Distortions of Agricultural Incentives, pp. 3-23. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press

Agarkov, G.A., Tarasyeva, T.V. (2020), “Assessment of passive economic security of the socioeconomic system of the region”. International Conference on Numerical Analysis and Applied Mathematics, 2293, 120002. https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0030882

W. Arthur Lewis. (1954), “Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour”, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9957.1954.tb00021.x

Andrew F. Krepinevich Jr. (2010), “National Security Strategy in an Era of Growing Challenges and Resource Constraints”, https://csbaonline.org/research/publications/national-security-strategy

Kravchenko, V., Kudryavtseva, T., Kuporov, Y. (2021). A method for assessing threats to the economic security of a region: A case study of public procurement in Russia. Risks, 9(1), pp. 1-10. https://doi.org/10.3390/risks9010010.

Kremer-Matyškevič, G Černius. (2019) “Country's economic security concept: Theoretical insights”. I Vilnius: Mykolo Romerio universitetas,

Molchan A.S., Saenko S.V. (2016) “Economic security of the state: current state, threats and threshold values”. Scientific Works of KubGTU, No. 2

W. Hudson. (2021), Economic Security for All: How to End Poverty in the United States, URL: http://shults.org/wadehudson/esfa/