American Journal of Business Practice, Vol.3, No.09 (September, 2026),
E-ISSN: 2997-934X
American Journal of Business Practice
https://semantjournals.org/index.php/AJBP

| Research Article

Check for updates

The Impact of Investment and Capital Accumulation on Economic Growth: A Review of Theory and Empirical Evidence

Sodikova Dilafruz Zokhid kizi
PhD, Senior Lecturer, The University of World Economy and Diplomacy
Email: dsodiqova@uwed.uz

Abstract: Investment and the accumulation of physical capital have occupied a central place in growth economics since the earliest formal growth models of the 1930s and 1940s. Yet the precise nature of the relationship between investment and long-run growth - its magnitude, its direction of causation, and the conditions under which it holds - remains a matter of active debate. This paper conducts a systematic, narrative review of the theoretical and empirical literature on the impact of investment and capital accumulation on economic growth. It traces the evolution of the analysis from the Harrod-Domar model, in which growth is mechanically tied to the savings rate and the capital-output ratio, through the neoclassical Solow framework, in which diminishing returns to capital limit the long-run growth effect of investment to transitional dynamics, to more recent empirical work that examines the composition of investment, the direction of causality between investment and growth, and the mediating roles of financial development and institutional quality. The review finds that the investment share of GDP is among the most robust correlates of growth in cross-country data, but that the strength of this relationship depends heavily on the type of capital being accumulated, the efficiency with which savings are intermediated into productive investment, and the quality of the institutions that govern property rights and contract enforcement. The paper concludes with implications for policies aimed at mobilizing investment as a driver of growth, particularly in developing and transition economies.

Keywords: Investment, Capital Accumulation, Economic Growth, Harrod-Domar Model, Solow Growth Model, Capital-Output Ratio, Financial Development

This is an open-access article under the CC-BY 4.0 license

1. Introduction

Few relationships in economics appear, at first sight, as intuitive as the link between investment and economic growth: a country that sets aside a larger share of its output for the accumulation of machinery, buildings, and infrastructure should, other things equal, be able to produce more in the future. This intuition underlay the earliest attempts at formal growth theory and has continued to inform development planning, from the investment-driven strategies of the mid-twentieth century to contemporary debates over infrastructure spending and capital-market development. Yet the intuition conceals substantial theoretical and empirical complexity. Growth theory since the 1950s has repeatedly qualified the simple view that more investment mechanically produces more growth, pointing instead to diminishing returns, the composition and quality of capital, the direction of causality between investment and output, and the institutional and financial conditions under which savings are converted into productive capital.[1]

This paper reviews that body of theory and evidence in order to clarify what is, and is not, well established about the impact of investment and capital accumulation on economic growth. The review is organized around a central historical and analytical progression: from the early Harrod-Domar growth models, which treat the capital-output ratio as fixed and growth as proportional to the savings rate, to the neoclassical model of Solow, in which diminishing returns to capital limit the growth effect of investment to the transition toward a steady state, to a more recent empirical literature that disaggregates investment by type, tests the direction of causality between investment and growth, and examines the financial and institutional channels that determine how efficiently savings are transformed into productive capital.[2]

Three research questions guide the review: (i) What do successive generations of growth theory imply about the channel through which investment affects growth, and about the limits of that channel? (ii) What does the empirical cross-country literature show about the strength, robustness, and direction of the investment-growth relationship? (iii) What conditions - relating to the composition of investment, financial development, and institutional quality - determine whether a given rate of capital accumulation translates into higher long-run growth?[3]

The remainder of the paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 outlines the review methodology. Section 3 presents the results, tracing the theoretical evolution of the investment-growth relationship and reviewing the empirical evidence on its magnitude, composition, causal direction, and conditioning factors. Section 4 discusses the synthesis and its policy implications, together with the limitations of the review. Section 5 concludes.

2. Materials and Method

This study follows a systematic, narrative literature-review design, appropriate to a body of work that spans formal growth models, cross-country growth regressions, and country-level case evidence not readily reducible to a single quantitative effect size. The review proceeded in three stages: systematic search, screening against explicit inclusion and exclusion criteria, and thematic synthesis.[4]

Search strategy. Relevant literature was identified through the principal economics bibliographic databases - Scopus, Web of Science, EconLit, and IDEAS/RePEc - using combinations of the terms "investment", "capital accumulation", "capital formation", "savings", "capital-output ratio", and "economic growth". The search prioritized the foundational theoretical contributions that established the dominant analytical frameworks together with the subsequent empirical literature that has tested, refined, and qualified these frameworks from the early 1990s onward, a period during which cross-country growth data of adequate quality first became widely available.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria. Studies were included if they (a) appeared in peer-reviewed economics journals, or as widely cited working papers subsequently published in such journals, (b) modelled or empirically tested the relationship between investment, capital formation, or savings and aggregate output growth, and (c) were available in English. Studies confined to firm-level investment decisions in isolation from aggregate growth outcomes, or falling outside the discipline of economics, were excluded.[5]

Analytical framework. The reviewed literature was organized along the historical progression of the investment-growth relationship: (1) the Harrod-Domar tradition, in which the capital-output ratio is fixed; (2) the neoclassical Solow tradition, in which capital is subject to diminishing returns; (3) the empirical literature on the composition of investment; (4) the literature on the direction of causality between investment and growth; and (5) the literature on the financial and institutional conditions that mediate the translation of savings into productive capital. This structure is used to organize the presentation of results in Section 3.

Limitations of the method. As a narrative rather than a statistical meta-analysis, the review does not

compute a pooled elasticity of growth with respect to investment, and the selection of representative studies, while systematic, retains an element of interpretive judgment. These limitations are revisited in Section 4.[6]

3. Results

The reviewed literature converges on a layered account of the investment-growth relationship, summarized in Table 1 and discussed by strand below.

3.1. Early growth models: the Harrod-Domar tradition

The formal analysis of the relationship between investment and growth begins with the independently developed models of Harrod and Domar, commonly combined under the label of the Harrod-Domar model. In this framework, output is produced with capital under a fixed capital-output ratio, so that the growth rate of the economy is determined mechanically as the savings rate divided by the capital-output ratio, net of depreciation. The model's central and much-discussed implication is that there is, in general, no automatic tendency for an economy's actual growth rate to converge to the "warranted" rate consistent with full utilization of the growing capital stock; Solow later summarized this as the "knife-edge" property of the Harrod-Domar system. Despite this instability result, the model's simple mechanical link between the savings/investment rate and the growth rate made it highly influential in the development-planning literature of the 1950s through the 1970s, where it provided the basis for calculating the investment requirements—the so-called "financing gap"—associated with a target growth rate.[7]

3.2. The neoclassical model: diminishing returns and conditional convergence

Solow relaxed the fixed capital-output ratio assumption of the Harrod-Domar model by allowing capital and labour to substitute for one another under a neoclassical production function exhibiting diminishing marginal returns to capital. In this framework, a higher investment rate raises the steady-state capital-labour ratio and the associated level of output per worker, and temporarily raises the growth rate along the transition path, but because of diminishing returns it cannot sustain a permanently higher growth rate once the new steady state is reached; long-run growth in the model is instead driven by exogenous technological progress. An important corollary is conditional convergence: holding the determinants of the steady state constant, economies further below their steady-state capital stock should grow faster. Despite the model's prediction that the growth effect of investment is ultimately transitional, Levine and Renelt, in a systematic sensitivity analysis of cross-country growth regressions, found the investment share of GDP to be among the very small number of variables whose positive association with growth was robust across a wide range of alternative model specifications—a result that has anchored the empirical growth literature's treatment of investment as a central, if not sufficient, growth determinant.[8]

3.3. The composition of investment: not all capital is equal

A further refinement of the literature disaggregates investment by type. De Long and Summers, using data from the Penn World Table and the United Nations International Comparison Project, found that machinery and equipment investment carried a substantially stronger association with subsequent growth than investment in structures: each additional percentage point of GDP invested in equipment was associated with an increase in the growth rate of roughly one third of a percentage point per year, a far larger coefficient than that estimated for other components of investment. The authors argued that this pattern was consistent with a causal interpretation in which equipment investment embodies new technology and carries an unusually high social rate of return in market economies. This finding qualifies the aggregate investment-share results of the cross-country growth literature by suggesting that the composition, and not merely the volume, of capital formation is central to its growth impact—a conclusion with direct relevance for investment-promotion policy, which the aggregate Harrod-Domar-style

framework does not distinguish.

3.4. The direction of causality between investment and growth

A recurring methodological concern in this literature is that the correlation between investment and growth does not, by itself, establish the direction of causation. Blomstrom, Lipsey and Zejan examined the shares of fixed capital formation in GDP and growth rates for more than one hundred countries over successive five-year periods and found more evidence that increases in growth precede subsequent increases in the rate of capital formation than that increases in capital formation precede subsequent growth. This result is consistent with an interpretation in which optimistic expectations of future growth induce firms to invest, rather than investment mechanically generating growth, and it complicates any straightforward reading of the Harrod-Domar or neoclassical models as identifying a one-directional causal channel running from investment to growth. The finding does not imply that investment is unimportant—capital accumulation remains a necessary concomitant of growth in virtually every empirical specification—but it cautions against development strategies that treat raising the investment rate as a sufficient condition for accelerating growth, independent of the broader conditions that make investment profitable in the first place.

3.5. Financial development as a channel for capital accumulation

Because investment must typically be financed, either through domestic savings intermediated by the financial system or through capital inflows, a distinct strand of the literature examines the role of financial development in converting savings into productive capital. King and Levine, testing Schumpeter's hypothesis that financial intermediaries—by mobilizing savings, evaluating investment projects, and monitoring the use of funds—promote economic development, examined a cross-section of roughly eighty countries over the period 1960–1989 and found that measures of financial development were strongly associated not only with the rate of per-capita GDP growth but also with the rate of physical capital accumulation and with improvements in the efficiency with which economies employed physical capital. Moreover, the predetermined component of financial development was found to be a robust predictor of subsequent capital accumulation and growth, suggesting that financial-sector depth functions as a channel, distinct from the investment rate itself, through which an economy's capacity to translate savings into productive capital formation is determined.[9]

3.6. Human capital complementarities and the robustness of the investment channel

The investment-growth relationship has also been examined jointly with human capital accumulation. Mankiw, Romer and Weil augmented the neoclassical Solow model with human capital and found that physical capital investment and human capital accumulation together provide a substantially better account of cross-country variation in output per worker than physical investment alone, implying that the productivity of physical capital investment is itself partly conditional on the stock of human capital available to operate and complement it. This complementarity is broadly consistent with the sensitivity-analysis findings of Levine and Renelt, who found that although the investment share of GDP was robustly correlated with growth, many of the specific policy and human-capital variables examined in the literature were not independently robust once the investment share was included, suggesting that part of the growth effect attributed to human capital and other variables operates indirectly through their influence on the volume and productivity of physical investment.[10]

3.7. Institutional quality and the productivity of investment

Finally, a body of work associated with the new institutional economics argues that the growth effect of a given rate of investment is conditional on the security of property rights and the credibility of contract enforcement. North argued that institutions which reduce the transaction costs of economic exchange raise the expected return to investment and thereby encourage capital accumulation, while insecure property

rights discourage long-horizon investment regardless of the resources nominally available for it. Acemoglu, Johnson and Robinson, using differences in the mortality rates faced by European colonizers as a source of exogenous variation in the institutions established in different colonies, found that countries that inherited institutions protecting property rights from expropriation subsequently achieved substantially higher income levels, a pattern consistent with an institutional channel operating, at least in part, through the volume and productivity of capital accumulation. Taken together with the financial-development evidence discussed above, this literature implies that the translation of savings into growth-enhancing investment depends on institutional and financial conditions that lie outside the investment rate itself.[11]

Table 1. Summary of the theoretical and empirical literature on investment, capital accumulation, and economic growth

Strand of literature	Core claim	Representative studies	Implication for the investment-growth link
Harrod-Domar model	Growth is proportional to the savings rate and inversely proportional to the capital-output ratio	Harrod (1939); Domar (1946)	Investment is the binding constraint on growth; no self-correcting mechanism ("knife-edge")
Neoclassical (Solow) model	Capital is subject to diminishing returns; investment raises the level, not the long-run rate, of output per worker	Solow (1956); Levine & Renelt (1992)	Investment share of GDP is a robust correlate of growth, mainly through transitional dynamics and conditional convergence
Composition of investment	Not all investment is equally productive; equipment investment shows the strongest growth association	De Long & Summers (1991)	The composition and quality of capital formation matter as much as its aggregate volume
Direction of causality	Growth often precedes and induces subsequent capital formation, not only the reverse	Blomstrom, Lipsey & Zejan (1996)	Simple investment-led growth strategies may overstate the causal role of capital formation
Financial development	Financial depth is associated with both the rate and efficiency of physical capital accumulation	King & Levine (1993)	Financial-sector development is a channel through which savings are converted into productive investment
Institutional quality	Secure property rights raise the expected return to investment and encourage capital formation	North (1990); Acemoglu, Johnson & Robinson (2001)	The growth effect of a given investment rate is conditional on institutional quality

Source: compiled by the author on the basis of the reviewed literature.

4. Discussion

The results of this review suggest that the relationship between investment and economic growth, while empirically robust at the level of simple cross-country correlation, is considerably more conditional than the early Harrod-Domar formulation implied. Three qualifications stand out. First, the neoclassical model's

diminishing-returns property means that, absent complementary technological progress, the growth effect of a higher investment rate is transitional rather than permanent - a caution against expecting sustained acceleration in growth from investment campaigns that are not accompanied by improvements in total factor productivity. Second, the evidence on the composition of investment reviewed in Section 3.3 indicates that policies aimed at raising the aggregate investment rate may achieve substantially different growth outcomes depending on whether the additional capital takes the form of productivity-embodying equipment or other, less growth-intensive forms of capital formation. Third, the causality evidence reviewed in Section 3.4 warns against a simple reading in which raising investment is treated as a sufficient trigger for growth: if growth expectations themselves partly drive investment decisions, then policies that improve the underlying determinants of growth - including macroeconomic stability, human capital, and institutional quality - may be a precondition for, rather than merely a consequence of, higher investment.[12]

The financial-development and institutional-quality findings reviewed in Sections 3.5 and 3.7 point toward a common policy implication: raising the domestic savings or investment rate is unlikely, by itself, to be sufficient for sustained growth unless it is accompanied by a financial system capable of efficiently allocating capital to its most productive uses, and by institutions that protect the returns to long-horizon investment. This has particular relevance for developing and transition economies, where investment campaigns pursued without complementary financial-sector and institutional reform have, in a number of documented cases, produced disappointing growth outcomes despite substantial increases in the investment share of GDP. The review's synthesis therefore favors a policy approach that treats capital accumulation as one component of a broader, mutually reinforcing set of reforms - encompassing financial deepening, human-capital investment, and institutional strengthening - rather than as an independent lever capable of generating growth in isolation.[13]

Several limitations qualify these conclusions. As a narrative rather than a quantitative meta-analysis, the review does not provide a pooled statistical estimate of the investment-growth elasticity, and the selection and interpretation of studies retains an element of judgment.[14] The cross-country growth-regression literature that underpins much of the empirical synthesis is itself subject to well-known econometric concerns, including measurement error in investment and capital-stock data, omitted-variable bias, and - as the causality evidence discussed in Section 3.4 illustrates - genuine ambiguity regarding the direction of causation between investment and growth. Finally, the review concentrates on macro-level, cross-country evidence and does not fully engage with more recent firm- and sector-level studies of investment efficiency, nor with emerging determinants of capital productivity such as digital infrastructure and automation, which represent promising directions for future research.[15]

5. Conclusion

This paper has reviewed the theoretical and empirical literature on the impact of investment and capital accumulation on economic growth, tracing its development from the mechanical savings-driven growth of the Harrod-Domar model, through the neoclassical Solow model's diminishing-returns qualification, to a more recent empirical literature that disaggregates investment by composition, tests the direction of causality between investment and growth, and identifies financial development and institutional quality as key conditioning factors. The balance of evidence indicates that the investment share of GDP remains among the most robust correlates of growth in cross-country data, but that its translation into sustained growth depends on the type of capital accumulated, the efficiency of financial intermediation, and the security of the institutional environment in which investment decisions are made. For policymakers, the central implication is that capital accumulation should be pursued as part of a coherent package of

financial-sector and institutional reform rather than as a stand-alone growth strategy. Future research would benefit from firm-level evidence on investment efficiency, improved measurement of capital quality, and closer attention to the growth effects of investment in digital and knowledge-based capital.

REFERENCES

[1] D. Acemoglu, S. Johnson, and J. A. Robinson, "The colonial origins of comparative development: An empirical investigation," *American Economic Review*, vol. 91, no. 5, pp. 1369–1401, 2001.

[2] M. Blomstrom, R. E. Lipsey, and M. Zejan, "Is fixed investment the key to economic growth?," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 111, no. 1, pp. 269–276, 1996.

[3] J. B. De Long and L. H. Summers, "Equipment investment and economic growth," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 106, no. 2, pp. 445–502, 1991.

[4] D. Sodikova, "The main features of e-commerce dynamics in world countries," *Innovation Science and Technology*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 105–112, 2025.

[5] E. D. Domar, "Capital expansion, rate of growth, and employment," *Econometrica*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 137–147, 1946.

[6] R. F. Harrod, "An essay in dynamic theory," *Economic Journal*, vol. 49, no. 193, pp. 14–33, 1939.

[7] R. G. King and R. Levine, "Finance and growth: Schumpeter might be right," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 108, no. 3, pp. 717–737, 1993.

[8] R. Levine and D. Renelt, "A sensitivity analysis of cross-country growth regressions," *American Economic Review*, vol. 82, no. 4, pp. 942–963, 1992.

[9] M. O. Sodikov, "The operationalization of green tourism in Uzbekistan: Strategic frameworks and case studies from Nuratau and Zaamin," *Вестник ассоциации вузов туризма и сервиса*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 66–71, 2026.

[10] N. G. Mankiw, D. Romer, and D. N. Weil, "A contribution to the empirics of economic growth," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 107, no. 2, pp. 407–437, 1992.

[11] D. C. North, *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

[12] D. Sodikova, "Пути и проблемы использования опыта развивающихся стран в развитии электронной коммерции," *Экономическое развитие и анализ*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 49–53, 2023.

[13] R. M. Solow, "A contribution to the theory of economic growth," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 65–94, 1956.

[14] P. M. Romer, "Increasing returns and long-run growth," *Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 94, no. 5, pp. 1002–1037, 1986.

[15] P. M. Romer, "Endogenous technological change," *Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 98, no. 5, pp. S71–S102, 1990