Name: Boon Chin Look

Student Number: 22726821

Lecture: Professor Declan Curran

Assignment: Final Assessment Assignment

Module: ECO1014 Development Economics

Total Word Count: 2180

Date Submitted: 6/1/25

Question

In relation to the Solow model of economic growth, set out your reflections on:

(i) the overarching insights offered by the model; and

(ii) the limitations of the model in terms of its workings and predictions.

Develop your answer with academic readings and detail.

The Solow neoclassical growth model, introduced by Robert Solow in 1956, provides a foundational framework for understanding how capital, labour, and productivity interact to produce long-term economic growth. By emphasizing these elements, the model offers overarching insights into growth. Rooted in neoclassical economics, the model advocates minimal government intervention, viewing free markets as the most efficient means for resource allocation. Moreover, the model also proposes the convergence hypothesis, suggesting that poorer countries should grow faster than wealthier ones. Within this context, it highlights savings, investment, and productivity as central to sustained development, attributing underdevelopment to inefficient resource allocation and excessive governmental intervention. This essay examines the Solow model's conceptual insights, limitations, and broader implications for economic policy.

By the end of the 1950s, most economies were rapidly expanding due to the need to rebuild after the war and satisfy demand that had been postponed during the war years (Gonda, 2005). Building on the Keynesian Harrod-Domar model to address its instabilities, the Solow model introduces labour and technology as factors driving economic growth. At the core, the model distinguishes between temporary growth from capital accumulation and sustained growth fuelled by technological progress and efficiency improvements (Boianovsky & Hoover, 2009). Diminishing returns to capital implies that as the capital stock increases, each additional unit contributes progressively less to economic output, allowing capital accumulation to provide only temporary growth. Initial investments in capital yield significant returns, but diminishing returns eventually limit its contribution as the capital stock grows without ongoing technological advancements to enhance efficiency and unlock new economic opportunities. This underscores the importance of Total Factor Productivity (TFP) within the Solow model, representing the gains from exogenous technological progress, as the primary driver of long-term growth (Easterly & Levine, 2001).

For instance, in East Asian economies, rapid growth fuelled by high investment in physical capital slowed as these economies approached capital saturation, and the returns on additional capital investment diminished, reducing growth rates. Without significant productivity improvements, economic expansion plateaus (Krugman, 1994). However, the Solow model does not address why productivity grows or varies across nations. In comparison, in the short run, economies may experience rapid growth driven by increased savings or investment rates. This transition phase reflects the model's emphasis on capital accumulation, during which economies adjust toward their steady states. For instance, a policy increasing national savings can boost output growth temporarily until diminishing returns and steady-state dynamics take hold.

Moreover, while the model acknowledges diminishing returns to labour when increased in isolation, it suggests balanced growth can result from simultaneous increases in both labour and capital. However, this interaction where labour complements capital to produce constant returns is not extensively analysed (Boianovsky & Hoover, 2009). This omission raises doubts about

whether additional labour, especially in developing economies, can sustainability contribute to long-term growth without accompanying improvements in capital quality or technological progress.

Furthermore, the model predicts convergence, where poorer countries grow faster as capital flows freely across borders to equalize returns, enabling investment-driven growth. This conditional convergence implies that under similar conditions, poorer economies should grow faster than wealthier countries, allowing the model to analyse global economic patterns. However, real-world outcomes often deviate due to institutional deficiencies, structural barriers, and unequal access to technology and capital. Therefore, Solow's model reflects a developed economy more accurately than a developing one in some ways (Todaro & Smith, 2012). Additionally, the role of knowledge and technology transfer, which often accompany capital flows but depend heavily on institutional and policy contexts are overlooked (Felipe, 2006). For instance, some countries, such as those in East Asia, have demonstrated rapid growth and catch-up, others, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, remain stagnant due to institutional and structural barriers (Easterly & Levine, 2001).

Similarly, empirical evidence often challenges the convergence prediction. Many low-income nations fail to catch up due to deficiencies in governance, education, capital mobility, and access to technology. Although the model offers a theoretical benchmark, it overlooks real-world disparities, significantly impacting growth trajectories (Felipe, 2006). While East Asia achieved rapid growth through input mobilization rather than technology diffusion or true convergence with wealthier economies. Governments played a pivotal role in directing investments, implementing trade policies, and fostering industrialization. While this state-led approach achieved short-term growth, it often came at the cost of innovation and efficiency. This underscores the importance of governance, institutional quality, and education in shaping long-term economic outcomes, factors beyond the Solow model's scope (Krugman, 1994). Moreover, by relying on market mechanisms, the model neglects the critical between markets and state-led strategies, particularly in economies where state planning is central to development. For instance, Taiwan's success demonstrates the effectiveness of combining state-led industrial planning with market incentives, particularly in fostering export-led growth and technological advancement.

In practice, economic activity often concentrates in wealthier regions due to better infrastructure, governance, and innovation ecosystems. Factors of production such as skilled labour and financial capital are attracted to areas with higher returns, reinforcing existing inequalities. For example, urban regions in developing countries frequently see disproportionate investment relative to rural regions. Brazil's growth heavily favoured urban centres like São Paulo while rural areas remained underdeveloped, perpetuating disparities and limiting the broader impact of economic growth (Smith, 2003). The absence of widespread productivity growth in many economies suggests that convergence is not automatic but depends on broader factors.

Furthermore, the Solow model adopts a market-driven perspective, emphasizing the efficiency of market forces in allocating resources for growth. In this case, Solow assumes that savings efficiently translate into investment efficiency while technological progress occurs independently of government intervention. However, this view has been critiqued for overlooking the role of state planning in addressing market failures, providing public goods like education and infrastructure, and fostering innovation. The omission of how governments can influence technological progress or address structural challenges limits the model's relevance for policy discussions in economies with significant structural challenges (Boianovsky & Hoover, 2009). For

instance, the success of the Asian Tigers, despite low TFP, demonstrates the impact of deliberate state policies in driving technological advancements and economic growth. This underscores the need for a balanced approach that integrates market mechanisms with strategic state planning. Moreover, one of the model's significant limitations is its reliance on TFP as a "black box" factor, not explaining how or why productivity improves, limits its ability to explain how innovation and productivity improvements are generated or diffused across economies (Lipsey & Carlaw, 2000). Technological progress and productivity gains are treated as residuals, calculated after accounting for capital and labour contributions, with no connection to economic decisions or investments (Gonda, 2005). This omission overlooks the roles of innovation, research, development, and education in driving productivity improvements.

By ignoring institutions' influence on technological adoption and innovation, the model provides a narrow perspective, raising concerns about its practical application, especially for policymakers in developing countries seeking to stimulate long-term growth. Moreover, strong governance, education systems, and openness to trade, which significantly affect a countries productivity growth, are exogenous to the Solow framework.

Furthermore, the Solow model treats research and development (R&D) which is crucial for technological progress, as exogenous rather than the result of deliberate economic and policy decisions. Economies like South Korea and Taiwan which heavily invest in R&D, demonstrated how such efforts drive in education, innovation and policies sustain productivity improvements (Smith, 2003). By overlooking these dynamics, the model fails to account for variations in innovation rates across countries and their impact on long-term growth. Additionally, it neglects the role of technological change and knowledge spillovers, which can amplify growth beyond national borders. For example, multinational corporations facilitate technological diffusion and innovation through partnerships and skill development in host countries. Incorporating endogenous factors like R&D investments into growth models, as in the Romer model, provides a more comprehensive understanding of sustained growth (Boianovsky & Hoover, 2009).

Additionally, comparisons between countries with similar resource endowments but differing institutional frameworks further illustrate this point. Brazil and Costa Rica, despite both being Latin American nations with agricultural economies, diverged economically due to contrasting governance and institutional quality. Costa Rica's democratic stability and emphasis on education and equitable resource distribution fostered sustainable development and social progress. In contrast, Brazil's being resource-rich but had weak institutions, extreme inequality, and failure to address land concentration hindered inclusive growth and perpetuated poverty, demonstrating how institutional frameworks critically shape economic trajectories (Smith, 2003). This underlines the vital role of policies and institutions in driving TFP and fostering sustainable growth

Moreover, according to Easterly & Levine (2001), the model's focus on physical capital accumulation underestimates the importance of human capital, institutional quality, and innovation in sustaining growth. While it suggests that investment in physical capital temporarily boosts growth until a steady state is reached, it fails to explain for persistent disparities across countries. For instance, substantial investments in infrastructure or machinery failed to yield sustainable growth in countries with weak institutions or poor governance, underscoring the importance of non-capital factors in long-term development. Evidence from East Asia shows that capital-intensive strategies faced diminishing returns over time, as they neglect the complementary roles of human capital and institutional development in sustaining growth (Krugman, 1994). Additionally, assuming all forms of capital is fungible oversimplifies economic

realities, particularly in structurally constrained or imbalanced economies, limiting the model's ability to fully explain sustainable growth.

Furthermore, capital depreciation and investments in outdated or stagnant technologies often worsen inefficiencies overlooked by the Solow model. This disconnection within the model and empirical evidence underscores a need for a more nuanced framework that consider technological change and capital quality. In many underdeveloped regions, structural barriers such as weak institutions, corruption, poor governance, and inadequate infrastructure prevent high returns on physical capital. Combined with political instability, these issues prevent capital inflows fail from driving productive investments, challenging the model's predictions of convergence (Felipe, 2006). For instance, sub-Saharan Africa struggles to attract foreign investment due to political instability, corruption, and weak property rights, limiting its ability to accumulate capital and grow rapidly.

Moreover, financial market imperfections often hinder such free movement of capital. Global capital flows tend to concentrate in countries with strong institutions, stable governance, and low risks which Solow had not considered. Poorer countries, despite theoretically offering higher returns to capital, struggle to attract investments due to high levels of political risk, corruption, and weak property rights (Easterly & Levine, 2001). In countries such countries, relying solely on market forces is insufficient to generate growth. A more balanced strategy, integrating state-led policies, such as infrastructure development, education reform, and industrial policy, is needed to address systemic challenges and foster sustainable growth (Felipe, 2006). This divergence between theory and observed outcomes underscores the model's oversimplification of growth processes.

Furthermore, the model overlooks non-economic vital to development. Easterly & Levine (2001) highlight the significance of institutions, culture, geography, and social factors in shaping growth outcomes. Institutional quality, such as the enforcement of property rights and the rule of law, ensures investments translate to sustained growth. Similarly, geographic factors, including climate, natural resources, and proximity to trade route significantly influence a country's development potential. Additionally, cultural elements, including trust, social cohesion, and attitudes toward innovation, affect productivity and economic performance.

For instance, climate change threatens agriculture-dependent economies by disrupting food production and worsening resource scarcity. Similarly, environmental degradation resulting from industrialization can undermine long-term growth by depleting natural resources and increasing health costs. Social factors like income inequality and gender disparities further compound these challenges, limiting access to education, healthcare, and opportunities for marginalized groups. Gender inequality, in particular, slows economic progress by underutilizing human capital (Todaro & Smith, 2012). By ignoring environmental and social variables, the Solow model provides an incomplete framework for understanding growth, especially for developing nations with similar economies but diverse institutional and cultural challenges. Addressing these factors requires a broader framework that incorporates social and environmental dimensions into the analysis of economic growth. Policies promoting gender equality and sustainable resource management provide a more comprehensive approach to fostering inclusive and resilient growth than the model's narrow focus (Boianovsky & Hoover, 2009).

To conclude, despite its limitations, the Solow model provides valuable insights as a foundation tool to analyse growth dynamics, particularly the roles of capital, labour, and technological progress in shaping long-term outcomes. Furthermore, it gives insights on how capital

accumulation provides only temporary growth. It highlights the importance of inclusion of technology progress as a factor towards growth along with how economies tend to move toward a steady-state level of income and capital, where growth rates stabilize unless disrupted by external factors such as technological change or policy interventions. While the convergence hypothesis offers a useful theoretical lens, its real-world application is often limited by the model's reliance on exogenous technological growth, and its omission of key factors like institutions, culture, and geography in driving sustained growth. Future models have incorporated these endogenous factors such as innovation, governance, and human capital development. Additionally, integrating non-economic dimensions, such as social and environmental factors, can provide a more holistic understanding of economic development. By building on the strengths of the Solow model while addressing its limitations, researchers and policymakers have developed more robust frameworks to guide sustainable and inclusive growth.

Bibliography:

1. Boianovsky, M., & Hoover, K. (2009). The Neoclassical Growth Model and Twentieth-Century Economics. *History of Political Economy - HIST POLIT ECON*, *41*, 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1215/00182702-2009-013

2. Easterly, W., & Levine, R. (2001). What Have We Learned from a Decade of Empirical Research on Growth? It's Not Factor Accumulation: Stylized Facts and Growth Models. *World Bank Economic Review - WORLD BANK ECON REV*, *15*. https://doi.org/10.1093/wber/15.2.177

3. Felipe, J. (2006). A decade of debate about the sources of growth in East Asia. How much do we know about why some countries grow faster than others?/Una década de debate sobre las fuentes del crecimiento en el Este Asiático. ¿Cuánto sabemos sobre por qué unos países crecen más rápido que otros? *Estudios de Economía Aplicada*, *24*, 181–220.

4. Krugman, P. (1994). The Myth of Asia's Miracle. *Foreign Affairs*, *73*(6), 62–78. JSTOR. https://doi.org/10.2307/20046929

5. Lipsey, R., & Carlaw, K. (2000). What Does Total Factor Productivity Measure? *International Productivity Monitor*, *1*, 31–40.

6. Smith, S. C. (2003). Case studies in economic development (3rd ed.). Addison-Wesley.

7. Todaro, M. P., & Smith, S. C. (2012). *Economic Development*. Addison-Wesley. https://books.google.ie/books?id=AGlwkQEACAAJ

8. Gonda, V. (2005). Robert M. Solow. *BIATEC, XIII*(11), 22-25. Faculty of National Economy, University of Economics in Bratislava.