

Exploring Investment And Economic Growth In Global Prospective: A Technology Based Development Model

Manoj Kumar Mishra¹, Ravi Kanth Makarla², Salim Ahmed Alshehri³, Nimmagadda Lakshmi Gayathri⁴, Binita Kumari^{5*}

^{1.} *Dean Academics and Professor, AISECT University, Hazaribag, India*

^{2.} *Associate Professor in Accounting and Finance, School of Management and Commerce, Malla Reddy University, Hyderabad, India*

^{3.} *Lecturer in Finance Department, Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, Alkharj, Saudi Arabia*

^{4.} *Associate Professor, School of Management and Commerce, Malla Reddy University, Hyderabad, India*

^{5.} *Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Annada College, Hazaribag, India*
**Corresponding Author: binitaakumari21@gmail.com*

This paper studies an upgraded neo-classical model and board information examination from 1995 to 2020 in the context of physical and human capital investment based on panel data. The outcomes affirm that both physical, and human capital are significant for development as is anticipated under neo-traditional hypothesis but investment in human capital is more important for economic growth. In truth, financial opportunity drives development by empowering interest in human resources. Financial opportunity increments human resources venture, which is a critical driver of development. Our outcomes feature the significance of institutional quality in deciding monetary results, and an expected pathway by which worked on financial institutionality — reasonable supported by better political establishments, for example, more prominent opportunity or contestability empowers human resources improvement which prompts higher development rates. Policy makers are urged to explore policies and strategies on enhancing institutional frameworks in creating the enabling environment for investment inflow as well as achieving sustainable economic development.

Keywords: Investment, Institutional quality, Human capital, Panel data, Development model etc.

1. Introduction

Transmission of venture to monetary development has for some time been at the center point in financial examination, different models offering experiences into how capital stock influences development. To test in a panel context, we set up the augmented neo-classical growth model and use data from 1995 to 2020. The neo-classical framework, based on the theories of Solow (1956) and extended by Mankiw et al. [2003], (1992) in relation to physical and human capital as key drivers of economic growth. Our analysis confirms the theoretical foundations of this nested concept; growth is indeed related to both types of capital. In addition

to the traditional attention that focuses on capital, this article also considers a measure of institutional quality and examines how economic freedom, political liberties, civil liberties influence the effect upon their economy. The results indicate that economic freedom and political liberties are powerful drivers of growth, but the impact on productivity from civil liberties is weak. Economic freedom also helps to generate growth indirectly by contributing to the investment in human capital. This highlights the critical role that a conducive institutional environment plays in fostering economic development. The study can guide policy makers to promote conditions conducive for investment and stimulate economic, sustainable growth in an international framework all while underscoring the importance of institutional quality.

2. Theoretical and Econometric Framework

2.1 Theoretical framework: The expanded neo-classical model (Solow, 1956) indicated by Mankiw et al. is utilized in this review (1992) for the experimental review utilizing Cobb-Douglas creation capability with human resources.

$$Z_t = X_1^\alpha X_2^\beta (A_t l_t)^{1-\alpha-\beta}, \quad \alpha, \beta > 0 \quad \alpha + \beta < 1 \quad (1)$$

In this situation, Z_t means the result level of country t at time span; X_1 and X_2 are actual capital stock and human resources separately; l is for work input; A shows innovation. Where α (alpha) and β are the fractional versatilities of result with physical and human resources individually. Let yield level, Our proportion of the viable work input is given by (genuine) physical and human resources stocks per unit of powerful work. $z_t = \frac{z_t}{A_t l_t}$, $x_{1t} = \frac{X_{1t}}{A_t l_t}$ and $x_{2t} = \frac{X_{2t}}{A_t l_t}$, individually, the model expects that land A develops exogenously at rates n and g , to such an extent that $l_t = 1(0)e^{nt}$ and $A_t = A(0)e^{gt}$. The two sorts of capital are expected to deteriorate at a similar steady rate, γ , with a consistent portion of results, S_{x1} and S_{x2} , being put resources into human and actual capital, individually. The time change in physical and human resources can be communicated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_{1t} &= Sx_{1t}z_t - (n + g + \gamma)x_{1t}, \\ \dot{x}_{2t} &= Sx_{2t}z_t - (n + g + \gamma)x_{2t}. \end{aligned} \quad (2) \ \& \ (3)$$

Consistent state way of the economy is given by

$$x_1^* = \left[\frac{(sx_1^{(1-\alpha)} sx_2^\alpha)}{(n + g + \gamma)} \right]^{1/1-\alpha-\beta},$$

$$x_2^* = \left[\frac{(sx_2^{(1-\beta)} sx_1^\beta)}{(n + g + \gamma)} \right]^{1/1-\alpha-\beta}.$$

(4) & (5)

By stopping Conditions (4) and (5) into the creation capability, taking logarithms gives(14)somewhat of consistent state balance pay per capita:

$$\ln z_t = \beta_0 + \frac{\alpha + \beta}{1 - \alpha - \beta} \ln(n + g + \gamma) + \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha - \beta} (\ln sx_1) + \frac{\beta}{1 - \alpha - \beta} (\ln sx_2). \tag{6}$$

Following Mankiw et al. The pace of expansion in yield per powerful unit of work at distance from its consistent state is accepted to follow (1992):

$$\frac{d \ln z_t}{dt} = \psi (\ln z_t - \ln z^*) \tag{7}$$

where $\psi = (1 - \alpha - \beta) (n + g + \gamma)$ and z addresses the result level at consistent state. Given the presence of unavoidable losses to scale, the time way of z is characterized by:

$$\ln z_t = (1 - e^{-\psi t}) \ln z^* + e^{-\psi t} \ln z_0, \tag{8}$$

Let z_0 be the underlying worth of result. By deducting $\ln z_0$ from the two sides,

$$\ln z_t - \ln z_0 = (1 - e^{-\psi t}) \ln z^* - (1 - e^{-\psi t}) \ln z_0. \tag{9}$$

By subbing z , x_1 , and x_2 into the creation capability, we acquire:

$$\ln z_t - \ln z_0 = \phi(\psi) \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha - \beta} \ln Sx_1 + \phi(\psi) \frac{\beta}{1 - \alpha - \beta} \ln Sx_2 - \phi(\psi) \frac{\alpha + \beta}{1 - \alpha - \beta} \ln(n + g + \gamma) - \phi(\psi) \ln z_0, \tag{10}$$

In the equation above, $\phi(\psi) = 1 - e^{-\psi t}$

Condition (10) can then again be composed as:

$$\ln z_t - \ln z_0 = -\beta_1 \ln z_0 + \beta_2 \ln Sx_1 + \beta_3 \ln Sx_2 - \beta_4 \ln(n + g + \gamma). \tag{11}$$

An addresses innovation or another info, for example, foundations which can affect factor efficiency in the Solow model. As organizations determine factor efficiency, we anticipate A to be a component of institutions. Substituting the value of F in condition (11) into, we

$$\text{get: } \ln z_t - \ln z_0 = -\beta_1 \ln z_0 + \beta_2 \ln Sx_1 + \beta_3 \ln Sx_2 - \beta_4 \ln(n + g + \gamma) + \beta_5 \ln F. \tag{12}$$

Conditions (10) and (11), where the only difference between condition 11 with respect to condition 10 is that Fis included as an additional regress or on the right-hand side. END: Businesses can have a lasting impact on development by improving total module output. In this case, both venture and organizations coefficients should also be within reasonable (Dawson, 1998) equipment.

2. 2. Econometric framework

Step 1(b): Equation (11) Reformulated for Cross-Country Data, We now reformulate the equation given above to allow an empirical estimation using cross-country data from 1995 and again in-second segments of a year up until 2020:

$$\ln z_i = \beta_0 - \beta_1 \ln z_{0i} + \beta_2 \ln Sx_{1i} + \beta_3 \ln Sx_{2i} + \beta_4 \ln(n + g + \gamma)_i + \beta_5 \ln F_i + \mu_i, \tag{13}$$

Where $\ln z_i = \ln z_t - \ln z_0$.

In the expression in (13), with OLS we can estimate for parameters. In Eq. (6), $\ln z_0$ stands for the output value in 1995 and each of $\ln z_i$ represents that cumulative growth rate of outputs from 1985 to year i 2020 We use the yearly midpoints more than 1995-2020 for these illustrative factors and \ln . while $n+g=0.05$ is expected in light of Mankiw et al. (1992), with $n+g+\gamma$ being determined by adding 0.05 to the workforce development rate. For the logical variable F, both the underlying worth F_{1995} and the adjustment of F are utilized.

The paper applies board information examination to appraise the long-run connection among establishments and monetary development. Board information, then again, defeats this issue by obliging both country-explicit impacts and fluctuating creation capabilities for various nations — not at all like cross-sectional that expects a uniform creation capability across this multitude of nations. Thus the Condition (12) is altered for board information examination in the accompanying structure:

$$\ln z_{it} = \beta_0 - \beta_1 \ln z_{it}^0 + \beta_2 \ln Sx_{1it} + \beta_3 \ln Sx_{2it} + \beta_4 \ln(n + g + \gamma)_{it} + \beta_5 \ln F_{it} + \mu_{it}. \tag{14}$$

In panel data estimation, we typically prefer to rewrite the equation associated with Eq. (13) in a more general form indicating an average Exit and Bo-level effect on $\ln z_{it}$ as follows:

$$\ln z_{it} = \varepsilon_i + \varphi_t - \beta_{1i} \ln z_{it}^0 + \beta' \theta_{it} + \eta_{it}, \tag{15}$$

where $\ln z_{it} = \ln z_T - \ln z_0$, $\ln z_0$ addresses the underlying worth of RGDPPC, i and t signify nation and time-explicit impacts, separately, $\beta = (\beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \beta_5)^0$, and $\theta_{it} = [\ln(n+g+\gamma) + \ln S_{x1,it} + \ln S_{x2,it} + \ln F_{it}]^0$.

For the development load up informational index, GMM catches time-series properties, that country-explicit impacts are non-noticeable and furthermore considers slacked endogenous factors among logical factors as well true to form endogeneity of these (Huynh et al. 2010). Instruments are utilized to deal with endogeneity and relationship issues between the blunder term and slacked subordinate factors. Slacked potential gain of the illustrative factors act as IVs, expecting no sequential relationship in blunder term and frail exogeneity of the monetary elements. The legitimacy of these instruments is tried utilizing the Sargan test for over-recognizing limitations, which evaluates whether all instruments are by and large exogenous (Arellano and Bond 1998).

3. Selection of Variables and Data Sources

This study investigates the primary elements connected with hypothesis and money related development: Z , reflecting genuine Gross domestic product per capita pace (RGDPPC improvement); S_{x1} showing venture as a portion of genuine Gross domestic product; n for populace development rate matured 15-64 occupants; further filling in as a delegate variable is grown-up proficiency rates being representative of human resources are F consolidating institutional quality evaluations. Nature of Institutions Institutional quality is decided by records on common opportunities, political freedoms and monetary opportunity.

The Freedom of the Press record assesses conditions, for example, opportunity of the press and speech, an autonomous legal executive, political gathering or affiliation freedom to gather without limitations, independence and a travel liberty between homegrown or universal with scores going from 1 maximum flexibility to 7 no accessibility. Political freedoms reflect the level of voluntary citizen involvement in being able to participate freely, or compete for public office and exercise their legitimate powers over local affairs (measured from 1-7) The financial opportunity is determined by open area use, move instalments, worldwide exchange volume (USD), money related freedom, import/trade obligations and minor annual expense rates going from 0 to benefit.

Observation data (1995 to 2020) were gathered for ninety-four countries using a variety of resources: RGDPPC and investment data from Penn World Tables, population growth rates; literacy utilization statistics obtained by the World Development Indicators (CDROM, 2021); labour-force participation rate calculated based on derivative measurement methodology used as social control variables.

4. Empirical Results and Discussion

Table 1 presents the experimental results for Condition (9). The first part demonstrates how real investment, labour and population growth have on the rate of growth of genuine Gross domestic product per capita (RGDPPC). All coefficients are statistically significant and align

with neo-traditional expectations. Existing countries are significantly better and in 1995, a negative huge coefficient for RGDPPC at the 1-level of significance suggests a tendency toward convergence to an appropriate growth path. Venture as a proportion of GDP has an efficient coefficient (0.465) which implies that one percentage-point boost in investment contributes to more than half-percent increase in RGDPPC growth rate over 1995-2019 across the sample of 94 countries, but minimal changes for early years and later periods. In like manner, work force speculation effectively affects monetary development with the coefficient of 0.725%, albeit populace development antagonistically influences financial expansion.

The second, third and fourth areas give surveyed results that blend essential as well as changed establishment measures. Ensuing and third segments show political freedoms and normal opportunities causatively affect advancement, attesting Dawson's (1998) disclosures that the relationship of establishments to financial improvement evaporates once we control for other particular elements Conversely, the fourth area uncovers that a monetary open door altogether impacts monetary development. The results also show that modifications of the economic freedom index during 1995–2020 significantly impact growth. This means that firms contribute to economic growth by improving input productivity. Moreover, accounting for the financial opportunity record increases R^2 by 0.04 points (from 0.29 to 0.34), in the economic growth specification as well

Table 1 digs further into the effect of elective endeavour channels on development. Money related opportunity (segment four) altogether affects coefficients, the assessed coefficient of populace development diminishes by 6.74% and human resources by 19.63%, when contrasted with section one aside from political strength whose increments about increment just when struggle is considered similarly impact GHG discharges conduct metrics(protocol). This demonstrates that financial open door influences money related advancement in a roundabout way through the channels people development and human resources venture. These outcomes propose that variety in financial opportunity is a key driver of contrasts in human resources speculation across nations.

Table 2 gives extra experiences into the unreasonable impacts of those institutional hindrances on monetary development. We relapsed the mean worth of speculation as a portion of Gross domestic product from 1995 to 2020 on the capture term, the 1995 worth of Gross domestic product per capita, and the two qualities (in levels) and changes in institutional measures for this circuitous relationship. The fundamental segment demonstrates that the political freedoms record essentially affects speculation, still profoundly pertinent at 10% even subsequent to controlling for its progressions and other enlightening variables. Besides, The coefficients for Independence from powers and Cash Costs report are likewise another critical one which has a beneficial outcome monetary turn of events. These discoveries are in accordance with those of Kormendi and Meguire(1985), Dawson (1998) as well as Zouhaier, 2012. The F-measures, which are also important measures of overall goodness-of-fit for model (Table 1). By these findings, a superior institutional climate attracts more investment and higher economic growth.

Financial opportunity likewise genuinely affects human resources venture, displayed in the fifth segment. These discoveries demonstrate that human resources hypothesis is related with

monetary opportunity and common freedoms yet not political opportunities (Dawson, 1998). However, The most significant thing in this is all to profoundly exploring the properties dataset Channel Before board data evaluation. This audit utilizes the board unit root tests by Im, Pesaro and Shin (IPS) in 1995 to characterize either reliant or autonomous determinants. The IPS test intended to commonly dismiss the speculation that all series on the board are non-fixed utilizing a normal of individual series ADF tests, and it has a typical standard deviation observing change. Applying the IPS test to chosen series at their level construction, Table 3 shows that discoveries reject non-stationarity with unit root provided that all and full data set are considered. This affirms that involving GMM for the chose factors is suitable.

Table 1 Cross-Country Results Estimated by OLS, 1995–2020

Independent Variables	Dependent Variable: Investment Share in Growth, 1995–2020				
Intercept	02.00347** *	1.07539***	2.04589** *	1.08246* **	01.05473** *
	(00.03287)	(00.03497)	(00.02756)	(00.03870)	(00.03744)
RGDPPC,1995	00.01174** *	00.01424** *	00.00617* **	00.01030 **	00.01287** *
	(00.00348)	(00.00366)	(00.00355)	(00.00399)	(00.00414)
P.L.Index,1995	— 00.01267* (00.00617)	—	—	— 00.01375** (00.00624)	—
Δ inP.L.Index, 1995–2020	00.00302 (00.00185)	—	—	— 00.00332* (00.00177)	—
C.L.Index,1995	—	— 00.01875** (00.00814)	—	—	— 00.00084 (00.00189)
Δ inC.L.Index, 1995–2020	—	00.00446 (00.00090)	—	—	— 00.01938 *** (00.00 637)
E.F.Index,1995	—	—	00.01821 **	00.01728 **	00.01707 *
			(00.00835)	(00.00819)	(00.00762)
Δ inE.F.Index, 1995–2020	—	—	00.00171 (00.00421)	00.00207 (00.00457)	00.00139 (00.00345)

R ²	00.0539	00.0574	00.0563	00.0560	00.0569
Adj-R ²	00.0203	00.0217	00.0213	00.0211	00.0215
F-statistics	3.4609**	3.09758* *	4.00685* *	4.02032* *	3.05244* *
No.ofCross-Sections	94	94	94	94	94

Table 2 Cross-Country Results Estimated by OLS, 1995–2020

Independent Variables	Dependent Variable: H. Capital Investment, 1995–2020				
Intercept	—	—	—	—	—
RGDPPC,1995	1.09713*** 00.01892* ** (00.00276)	2.01413*** 00.02059* ** (00.00290)	2.05195*** 00.01941* ** (00.00262)	2.02833*** 00.01722* ** (00.00321)	2.04744* ** (00.03137) 00.01907 *** (00.00333)
P.L.Index,1995	—00.00632 (00.00431)	—	—	— 00.01875** (00.00814)	—
ΔinP.L.Index, 1995–2020	—00.00050 (00.00126)	—	—	— 00.00446** (00.00174)	—
C.L.Index,1995	—	—00.00544 (00.00525)	—	—	— 00.00810 (00.00437)
ΔinC.L.Index, 1995–2020	—	—00.00135 (00.00123)	—	—	— 00.00482 (00.00547)
E.F.Index,1995	—	—	00.00989 (00.1091)	00.02249 (00.00514)	00.02240 *** (00.00500)
ΔinE.F.Index, 1995–2020	—	—	—00.00023 (00.00197)	00.00449 (00.00399)	00.00468 (00.00406)
R ²	00.0824	00.0821	00.0820	00.0822	00.0823
Adj-R ²	00.0643	00.0638	00.0635	00.0639	00.0641

F-statistics	54.01925* **	52.06083* **	55.01222* **	34.01421* **	33.02508* **
No.ofCross-Sections	94	94	94	94	94

Table 3: IPS Panel Unit Root Test on Levels of Variables

Variables	IPS Statistics	P-Values
RGDPPC	—9.0622	00
Initial RGDPPC	—7.0531	00
Inv. Share in GDP	—8.0464	00
Pop. Growth	—11.0122	00
H. Capital Inv.	—7.0642	00
C. L. Index	—7.0583	00
P. L. Index	—5.0461	00
E. F. Index	—6.0691	00

Table 4 reports the coefficients for genuine venture, human capital speculation and populace development rate are accounted for with genuine Total national output per capita (RGDPPC) development rate as the reliant variable in the primary portion. Thanks to its consistency with the calculus of neoclassical optimal growth, this result confirms our cross-country findings: contrary to theoretical considerations, these interest rate coefficients are crucial. In columns two, three and four we re-estimate the development condition by successively introducing different institutional boundaries. Table 1: Partial coefficients for the freedom scores Common freedoms are irrelevant in other specifications (next section) Nevertheless, political freedoms and economic freedom are both very large and positive in the third and fourth rows. This suggests that not taking into account institutional measures directly affect economic growth by increasing variable efficiency.

Table 4: Cross-Country Results Estimated by Panel GMM, 1995–2020

Independent Variables	Dependent Variable: Growth in RGDPPC			
RGDPPC, 1995	—00.00114 (00.05720)	00.04886 (00.07295)	—00.08350 (00.07267)	—00.09226 (00.07816)
Inv. Share in GDP	00.01644** (00.00612)	00.01648*** (00.00520)	00.01640*** (00.00398)	00.01518** (00.00623)
Pop. Growth	—00.01347* (00.00702)	— 00.01663** (00.00758)	—00.00105 (00.00181)	— 00.01852 (00.01180)

H.CapitalInv.	00.09653** *	01.00305***	00.05970***	00.05291**
	(00.03146)	(00.03175)	(00.01780)	(00.02201)
C.L.Index	—	—00.00907 (00.00789)	—	—
P.L.Index	—	—	00.00608** (00.00259)	—
E.F.Index	—	—	—	00.03434 * (00.01825)
SarganP-value	00.0241	00.696	00.0184	00.0135
No.ofobservations	564	564	564	564

Areas three and four accordingly contrast portions of this sort with assess the round aberrant impacts on financial development through speculation instigated by institutional measures. The outcomes demonstrate that the expansion of a political opportunities file decreases genuine venture by 0.24% and human resources speculations by 36.83%. Moreover, the presence of money related open door list decrease genuine venture by 0.63% and human resources development by 43.62%. These discoveries exhibit that institutional open door is bound to decide human resources speculation than actual capital venture. Financial and also political open doors further empowers spirits for refreshing HR through experiential getting the hold tight, finally inciting better returns from preparing and an augmented interest towards extra possibilities. This cycle backs the supposition that institutional open door matters for financial increment to empowering putting resources into manitarian and material capital.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, this research showed that both FFIs and institutions affects economic growth significantly. By using the augmented neo-classical model and panel data analysis for a period of 1995–2020, it shows that- physical and human capital are shown to be an important determinant in output growth as predicted by neoclassical economic theory. Overall, the inclusion of institutional margins in the analysis points to a strong positive impact that economic freedom and political freedoms have on GDP growth with civil liberties indicating less pronounced one. These results reveal the potentially distinct development impacts of increased monetary opportunity to higher wages for instance as a catalyst for human capital investment. In addition, greater economic freedom is associated with higher human capital investment that improves economic growth. This underscores the importance of institutional quality on shaping monetary results, since higher levels of economic and political freedoms offer improved opportunities for human capital accumulation relative to growth. Their findings corroborate the conjecture that an accommodating institutional environment, represented by fiscal and political decisions) is indispensable for triggering entrepreneurship and facilitating

economic growth. The review highlights the need for policy makers to focus on improving institutional quality in order to create a conducive environment for investment, necessary for sustained economic development.

References

1. Bellemare, M. F., and C. J. Wichman (2019), "Elasticities and the Inverse Hyperbolic Sine Transformation." *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*
2. Berthiaume, Nicolas, Naomi Leefmans, Nienke Oomes, Hugo Rojas-Romagosa, and Tobias Vervliet (2021), "A Reappraisal of the Migration-Development Nexus Testing the Robustness of the Migration Transition Hypothesis."
3. Böhm, Marcus H., André Gröger, and Tobias Stöhr (2019), "Searching for a Better Life: Predicting International Migration with Online Search Keywords." *Journal of Development Economics*
4. Carling, Jørgen, and Karen Schewel (2018) "Revisiting Aspiration and Ability in International Migration." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, vol. 44, no. 6, pp. 945–963.
5. Cattaneo, C., and Giovanni Peri (2016), "The Migration Response to Increasing Temperatures." *Journal of Development Economics*, vol. 122, pp. 127–146.
6. Clemens, Michael A (2020), "Migration from Developing Countries: Selection, Income Elasticity and Simpson's Paradox." *IZA Discussion Papers*, no. 13612
7. Clemens, Michael A (2020), "The Emigration Life Cycle: How Development Shapes Emigration from Poor Countries." *IZA Discussion Papers*, no. 13614
8. Clemens, Michael A., and Hannah M. Postel (2018), "Deterring Emigration with Foreign Aid: An Overview of Evidence from Low-Income Countries." *Population and Development Review*, vol. 44, no. 4, pp. 667–693.
9. Czaika, Mathias, and Mogens Hobolth (2016), "Do Restrictive Asylum and Visa Policies Increase Irregular Migration into Europe?" *European Union Politics*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 345–365.
10. Dao, Thu Hien, Frédéric Docquier, Chris Parsons, and Giovanni Peri (2018), "Migration and Development: Dissecting the Anatomy of the Mobility Transition." *Journal of Development Economics*, vol. 132, pp. 88–101.
11. De Haas, Hein (2019) "Why Development Will Not Stop Migration." *Macmillan International Higher Education*
12. De Haas, Hein, Mathias Czaika, Marie-Laurence Flahaux, Edo Mahendra, Katharina Natter, Simona Vezzoli, and Maria Villares-Varela (2018), "International Migration. Trends, Determinants and Policy." *IMI Working Paper Series*, no. 142, pp. 1–59.