European Journal of Economics, Finance and Business Development
ISSN (E): 2938-3633
Volume 3, Issue 11, November - 2025

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF NEOCLASSICAL THEORIES IN ECONOMIC GROWTH

Dilshod Qurbanov
Kashkadarya Region, Karshi State Technics University
E-mail: baxtiyorh457@gmail.com

Abstract
This article analyzes the theoretical foundations of neoclassical growth theories, particularly the Solow–Swan and Ramsey–Cass–Koopmans models, and their significance for economic policy. The article examines the impact of capital accumulation, labor force growth, and technological progress on long-term economic growth from a neoclassical perspective. It also compares the limitations of neoclassical growth theories with endogenous growth models and provides general conclusions on neoclassical model parameters in the context of Uzbekistan.

Keywords: Economic growth, neoclassical theory, Solow model, capital accumulation, technological progress, economic policy, Ramsey–Cass–Koopmans model.

Introduction

Relevance of the topic. The issue of sustainable growth in the world economy, the role of neoclassical theories in economic analysis, as well as the aims and objectives of the article, are of particular importance. The main purpose of this paper is to provide a systematic analysis of neoclassical growth theories and to demonstrate their practical significance. The specific objectives are: to elaborate the theoretical foundations of neoclassical growth theories; to compare the Solow–Swan and Ramsey–Cass–Koopmans models; to identify the main limitations of the neoclassical framework; and, if desired, to draw general conclusions regarding their applicability to Uzbekistan's economic growth.

In the context of deepening market relations, ongoing globalization processes and rapid technological progress, the issue of sustainable economic growth has become one of the most important areas of research in modern macroeconomics. Theoretical approaches play a crucial role in identifying the sources, determinants and mechanisms of economic growth, explaining cross-country differences, and shaping effective economic policy. From this perspective, neoclassical economic growth theories are regarded in the global academic literature as one of the core conceptual platforms.

In neoclassical growth theories, particularly in the Solow–Swan and Ramsey–Cass–Koopmans models, the process of economic growth is explained through capital accumulation, labour force growth and technological progress. Within this framework, perfectly competitive markets, efficient allocation of resources, a neoclassical production function, and the predominantly exogenous nature of technological progress are taken as key assumptions. The results of these models make it possible to analyse the long-run steady state, the level of per capita income, and the dependence of growth rates on technological factors.

At the same time, neoclassical growth theories yield important implications for practical economic policy. In particular, they suggest that raising the saving rate, improving the investment climate, ensuring efficient use of capital, adopting advanced technologies and enhancing the quality of the labour force can increase the rate of economic growth and per capita income. However, the treatment of technological progress mainly as an external (exogenous) factor also gives rise to important limitations, as it prevents the model from fully revealing the internal drivers of economic growth. The purpose of this article is to provide a systematic analysis of the content of neoclassical theories of economic growth, their theoretical foundations, and their main models – in particular, the Solow–Swan and Ramsey–Cass–Koopmans frameworks – and to highlight their relevance for economic policy. To achieve this aim, the following tasks are set: to examine the emergence and evolution of neoclassical growth theories; to analyse the main assumptions, mathematical formulation and steady-state implications of the Solow–Swan model; to present the optimization-based approach of the Ramsey–Cass–Koopmans model; to compare the limitations of neoclassical growth theories with the insights of endogenous growth approaches; and, to the extent possible, to provide a general assessment of Uzbekistan's economic growth processes from the perspective of neoclassical model parameters.

Theoretical foundations: neoclassical ideas of economic growth

The general conception of the neoclassical approach.

Neoclassical theories of economic growth took shape in the mid-twentieth century, in particular against the background of the need to overcome the instability problems inherent in the Harrod–Domar model. In the Harrod–Domar framework, the economy is tied to a very "knife-edge" equilibrium, where even small deviations in the growth rates of savings and capital are assumed to lead to large long-run instabilities. Neoclassical economists approached this problem differently, seeking to explain the growth process through market mechanisms, scarce resources and diminishing marginal returns.

At the core of the neoclassical growth idea lies the following set of propositions: factors of production (capital and labour) in competitive markets are paid their marginal products; the production process is represented by a smooth, continuous and differentiable production function; the marginal product of capital is positive but diminishing; and, in the long run, the rate of economic growth is determined primarily by technological progress. As a result, neoclassical theory makes it possible to analyse the interdependence between savings, capital, labour and technology in explaining economic growth.

Key assumptions

Neoclassical growth models typically rest on the following main assumptions:

Competitive markets

Commodity and factor markets are assumed to be perfectly competitive. Both firms and households are treated as price-taking agents.

Neoclassical properties of the production function

The production process in the economy is often represented by a Cobb–Douglas production function of the form:

Y=F(K,L)=Kα(AL)1−α,0<α<1,Y = F(K, L) = K^{\alpha}(AL)^{1-\alpha}, \quad 0 < \alpha < 1,Y=F(K,L)=Kα(AL)1−α,0<α<1,

where YYY is aggregate output (gross domestic product), KKK is the capital stock, LLL is labour, AAA is the level of technology representing labour productivity, and α\alphaα is the share of capital in production.

This function has the standard neoclassical properties:

Positive but diminishing marginal products: as the capital stock increases, the additional output produced by an extra unit of capital declines.

Constant returns to scale: if capital and labour are increased in the same proportion, output rises in exactly the same proportion.

Savings–investment identity.

The share of income saved by households is used as investment in the economy. Therefore, in Solow-type models, the savings rate is taken as given and investment is assumed to be equal to savings.

Population and labour force growth

The labour force is assumed to grow at a constant rate:

L˙L=n,\frac{\dot{L}}{L} = n,LL˙=n,

where nnn is the growth rate of the population (labour supply).

Exogenous technological progress

The level of technology AAA is usually assumed to grow at a constant rate:

A˙A=g,\frac{\dot{A}}{A} = g,AA˙=g,

where ggg is the rate of technological progress. In the neoclassical model, this is treated as an external (exogenous) factor, i.e. a parameter determined outside the model rather than endogenously within it.

Capital depreciation (amortization)

A certain fraction of the capital stock depreciates each period. This is captured by the depreciation rate δ\deltaδ:

K˙=sY−δK,\dot{K} = sY - \delta K,K˙=sY−δK,

where sss is the savings rate.

Capital accumulation and the idea of the steady state

The central concept in neoclassical growth theory is the notion of a steady state. In the long run, the economy converges to a situation where capital per effective worker and output per effective worker become constant.

The basic dynamic equation for capital accumulation is:
K˙=sY−δK.\dot{K} = sY - \delta K.K˙=sY−δK.
If we express this relationship in per-capita (or, more precisely, per effective worker) terms, taking into account population and technological growth, we obtain:
Capital per effective worker:
k=KAL,k = \frac{K}{AL},k=ALK,
Output per effective worker:
y=YAL=f(k).y = \frac{Y}{AL} = f(k).y=ALY=f(k).
The law of motion for capital per effective worker is then written as:
k˙=sf(k)−(n+g+δ)k.\dot{k} = s f(k) - (n + g + \delta)k.k˙=sf(k)−(n+g+δ)k.
In the steady state:
k˙=0⇒sf(k∗)=(n+g+δ)k∗,\dot{k} = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad s f(k^*) = (n + g + \delta) k^*,k˙=0⇒sf(k∗)=(n+g+δ)k∗,
where k∗k^*k∗ is the steady-state level of capital per effective worker.
The neoclassical idea can be summarised as follows:
If k<k∗k < k^*k<k∗, savings and investment exceed the amount needed to offset depreciation, population growth and technological progress, so capital per effective worker rises.
If k>k∗k > k^*k>k∗, depreciation and effective labour growth "eat up" capital, so capital per effective worker declines and the economy moves back towards k∗k^*k∗.
In this way, the model predicts convergence towards a unique steady state under standard conditions.
n other words, in the neoclassical model the economy converges to a steady state in the long run.

Per capita growth and the role of technological progress

One of the key implications of neoclassical growth theories is that, in the long run, the growth rate of output per capita is determined by the rate of technological progress ggg.
Interpretation. If the saving rate sss increases, the steady-state level of the economy – that is, the level of income per capita – rises. However, this is a one-time level effect. Once the economy has transitioned to a new, higher steady state, the growth rate of output per capita stabilizes again around ggg.
Thus, higher savings and capital accumulation can speed up growth, but only for a certain period; in the long run, technological progress remains the decisive factor. The policy implication of the neoclassical view is that:
the state can raise per capita income by encouraging savings and investment;
but to sustain high growth rates over the long run, the key drivers are innovation, science, technology, education and human capital.

The idea of convergence in the neoclassical model

Another important idea in neoclassical growth theory is the notion of convergence. Suppose two countries have the same technology level AAA, the same population growth rate nnn, and the same saving rate sss, but different initial levels of capital. In that case, the poorer country

(with lower capital per capita) will exhibit a higher growth rate and, over time, will catch up with the richer country.

The underlying reason is diminishing marginal returns to capital: where capital is scarce, each additional unit of capital generates more extra output, so investment is "more productive" there. Of course, in reality, substantial differences in technology, institutions, saving behaviour and political stability mean that such ideal convergence is not always observed. Nevertheless, neoclassical theory provides a useful theoretical basis for understanding the relationship between growth rates and initial conditions.

A neoclassical approach based on household and firm decisions (the Ramsey–Cass–Koopmans idea)

In the Solow model, the saving rate is simply given exogenously, as a parameter. In the Ramsey–Cass–Koopmans (RCK) framework, by contrast:

households make intertemporal decisions about consumption and saving;

their objective is to maximise utility over time.

Accordingly, the saving rate becomes endogenous and is determined by the optimisation behaviour of economic agents. Theoretically, this means that the neoclassical model links aggregate growth not only to macroeconomic variables but also to micro-level decision-making. However, the core insight about the steady state and technology-driven growth remains unchanged: in the long run, the growth rate of output per capita is again determined by the rate of technological progress ggg.

Advantages and limitations of neoclassical growth ideas

Advantages:

They describe the growth process in a relatively simple, transparent and mathematically precise way.

They highlight the logical relationship between savings, investment and technology.

They clearly formalise such concepts as the steady state, convergence and diminishing marginal returns to capital.

They identify important directions for economic policy: the need to promote savings, capital formation, education and technology.

Limitations:

Technology is treated as an exogenous factor; the model does not explain, within its own structure, where new technologies come from or who generates and finances innovation.

Institutional factors such as political stability, economic freedom, corruption, and the protection of property rights are left outside the model.

Since ideal convergence is not observed in many real-world economies, model predictions do not always fully match empirical data.

For these reasons, later endogenous growth theories (Romer and others) have sought to bring technology, innovation and human capital inside the model as endogenous variables. Nevertheless, neoclassical growth theories remain the foundational framework of modern growth theory and continue to be highly relevant in economic analysis.

Neoclassical growth theories in the context of the Uzbek economy

In recent years, Uzbekistan's economy has demonstrated stable growth rates driven by structural reforms, the development of market institutions and an increase in investment volumes. From the perspective of neoclassical growth theories, this process is primarily explained by capital accumulation, labour force growth and a certain degree of technological modernisation.

In terms of capital accumulation, the rising share of investment in fixed capital and the implementation of large-scale projects in infrastructure, industry and services increase the amount of capital per capita. According to the Solow model, a higher saving rate leads to a higher steady-state level of income per capita. In other words, the expansion of capital investments in Uzbekistan contributes to a gradual improvement in the level of economic welfare.

Demographic factors are also important. Population growth and a high share of young people expand the labour force. However, from a neoclassical viewpoint, quantitative growth alone is not sufficient: in order to prevent capital per worker from declining, the labour force must be upgraded in qualitative terms through education, vocational training and healthcare. In practice, this means raising labour productivity and, in the production function, increasing the contribution of the technology term.

Ongoing efforts in technological modernisation and the development of the digital economy correspond to the technological progress parameter ggg in the neoclassical model. The introduction of new equipment, the automation of production processes and the expansion of ICT infrastructure increase output per capita and support growth rates in the long run.

From the standpoint of the neoclassical convergence hypothesis, Uzbekistan – as a country with a relatively low initial capital stock – has the potential to partially catch up with more advanced economies, provided that effective policies are implemented in the areas of savings, technological progress and institutional quality. At the same time, the treatment of technology as an exogenous factor and the exclusion of institutional variables from the core model also reveal the limitations of neoclassical theory for analysing Uzbekistan's development.

Therefore, while neoclassical growth theories serve as a fundamental analytical framework for studying Uzbekistan's economic growth, they can only fully reflect real economic dynamics when used in combination with endogenous growth and institutional approaches.

Challenges and Solutions

From the perspective of the neoclassical approach, Uzbekistan's economic growth faces several challenges.

First, despite a high volume of capital investment, efficiency remains insufficient because investment projects are not always selected based on thorough economic analysis. To address this issue, projects should be evaluated using indicators such as NPV and IRR, state participation should be reduced, and the private sector and competition should be strengthened.

Second, the structure of savings and investment is suboptimal: a significant portion of funds is short-term and consumption-oriented, leaving long-term resources for the real sector insufficient. To remedy this, financial markets should be deepened, and long-term instruments such as bonds, pension, and investment funds should be developed.

Third, labor productivity is inadequate due to low skills and limited modern technical and digital competencies. Enhancing education quality, modernizing vocational and technical training, and implementing practical, production-integrated training systems are essential to improve workforce quality.

Fourth, technological renewal is slow: technologies are largely imported, and domestic innovation capacity is low. Supporting scientific research and R&D, strengthening collaboration between universities and businesses, and developing innovation clusters and technoparks are necessary to accelerate technological progress.

Fifth, institutional constraints—insufficient protection of property rights, judicial shortcomings, bureaucracy, and corruption—slow capital efficiency and technological development. Addressing these issues requires ensuring the rule of law, simplifying procedures, and implementing institutional reforms aimed at transparency and fostering competition.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Neoclassical economic growth theories, particularly the Solow–Swan and Ramsey–Cass–Koopmans models, provide a foundational framework for understanding the long-term determinants of economic growth. These approaches explain production through capital, labor, and technology, emphasizing key concepts such as diminishing marginal returns to capital, the steady state, and convergence. According to the models, savings and investment raise per capita income levels, but in the long run, per capita growth is primarily determined by the rate of technological progress. In the case of Uzbekistan, recent economic growth can be explained by capital accumulation, demographic factors, and technological modernization.

However, treating technology as exogenous and overlooking institutional factors highlights the limitations of the neoclassical approach. Therefore, a comprehensive analysis of real economic processes requires combining neoclassical theory with endogenous growth and institutional approaches.

Based on the insights of neoclassical growth theories and the experience of Uzbekistan's economy, the following practical recommendations can be proposed:

Enhancing investment efficiency: Strengthen economic analysis methods for project selection and monitoring, increase the role of the private sector, and improve the competitive environment to maximize the effectiveness of savings and investments.

Improving labor productivity: Modernize the education system, develop vocational and technical training programs, and focus on preparing personnel with digital and technical skills to enhance the quality of the workforce.

Accelerating technological progress and innovation: Support scientific research and R&D, expand university–industry collaboration, and strengthen the operations of innovation clusters and technoparks to promote technological advancement.

Strengthening institutional frameworks: Protect property rights, enhance the efficiency of the judicial system, reduce bureaucratic barriers, and combat corruption to unlock the full potential of economic growth.

These measures aim to increase the efficiency of capital, labor, and technology, thereby facilitating stable and high-quality economic growth as predicted by neoclassical growth theories.

References:

1.Solow, R. M. (1956). A Contribution to the Theory of Economic Growth. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 70(1), 65–94.

2.Swan, T. W. (1956). Economic Growth and Capital Accumulation. The Economic Record, 32(2), 334–361.

3.Barro, R. J., & Sala-i-Martin, X. (2004). Economic Growth (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

4.Romer, D. (2012). Advanced Macroeconomics (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.

5. Theory of Economics: Textbook for Higher Education Institutions (Latest revised edition). Tashkent: Various publishers (electronic version).

6.Economic Growth: Textbook. Tashkent: Relevant higher education institutions (electronic version).