



Article

Green Economy and Theories of Sustainable Economic Growth: Evidence from Cross-Country Panel Data

Ashurova Jasmina Jo'ra qizi¹, Kholiqova Lola Nazarovna²

1. Student of the Faculty of Economics, Samarkand Institute of Economics and Service
2. Doctor of Economics, Samarkand Institute of Economics and Service

Citation: Jo'ra qizi, A. J., Nazarovna, K. L. Green Economy and Theories of Sustainable Economic Growth: Evidence from Cross-Country Panel Data. American Journal of Economics and Business Management 2026, 9(6), 218-225.

Received: 10th Apr 2026

Revised: 30th Apr 2026

Accepted: 20th May 2026

Published: 09th June 2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

Abstract: This study examines the theoretical and empirical linkages between green economy frameworks and sustainable economic growth, focusing on how investments in renewable energy, carbon reduction strategies, and environmental governance collectively influence long-run GDP trajectories across a diverse panel of 42 economies over the period 2005–2022. The primary objective is to evaluate which components of green economy transition exert the most statistically significant and economically meaningful effects on sustained output expansion. The study employs a mixed-methods design integrating systematic literature review, panel data econometric modelling (fixed-effects and random-effects estimation with Hausman specification testing), and k-means cluster analysis. Data were sourced from World Bank Development Indicators, OECD Environmental Statistics, and the Environmental Performance Index (EPI) database. Robustness was assessed through heteroskedasticity-corrected standard errors and sensitivity tests. Results indicate that green investment ($\beta = 0.412$, $p < 0.001$) and renewable energy share ($\beta = 0.287$, $p < 0.001$) are the strongest positive predictors of GDP growth. Countries classified in the advanced green economy cluster demonstrated average annual growth rates 1.5–2.1 percentage points higher than conventionally managed counterparts, while simultaneously achieving statistically significant reductions in carbon emission intensity. The model explains approximately 78.9% of variance in growth outcomes ($R^2 = 0.789$). The paper contributes an integrative analytical framework bridging endogenous growth theory, ecological modernisation theory, and the UNEP Green Economy Model. Unlike prior studies that treat these paradigms in isolation, the present work operationalises their joint effects through a composite Green Economy Index (GEI), offering a novel empirical tool for comparative policy analysis. Findings suggest that national governments should prioritise regulatory reform supporting green public investment, carbon pricing, and clean technology diffusion. International financial institutions are advised to expand concessional lending instruments oriented towards low-emission infrastructure in emerging markets. Data availability constrained the sample to 42 countries, limiting generalisability to low-income economies with weak statistical systems. Future research should extend the panel horizon beyond 2022, incorporate sectoral disaggregation of green investment, and test causality through Granger procedures and structural equation modelling.

Keywords: Green Economy, Sustainable Economic Growth, Renewable Energy, Environmental Policy, Panel Data, Endogenous Growth Theory, Green Investment

1. Introduction

The relationship between economic growth and environmental sustainability has emerged as one of the defining intellectual challenges of contemporary economics. For

much of the twentieth century, dominant development paradigms treated natural resource depletion and environmental degradation as unavoidable costs of industrialisation — a perspective crystallised in the early literature on the Environmental Kuznets Curve (EKC), which posited that environmental quality would improve automatically once per-capita income crossed a certain threshold [1]. However, mounting empirical evidence and the accelerating pace of climate change have fundamentally unsettled this assumption, prompting a reconsideration of the relationship between output growth, resource use, and ecological stability.

The concept of the green economy, formalised in the aftermath of the 2008 global financial crisis and institutionalised through UNEP's 2011 Green Economy Report, represents one of the most significant reframings of development theory in recent decades. Broadly defined, a green economy is one that results in improved human well-being and social equity, while significantly reducing environmental risks and ecological scarcities [2]. This conceptualisation challenges the traditional dichotomy between growth and conservation, arguing instead that ecological investment — in renewable energy infrastructure, natural capital accounting, and low-carbon technology — generates productive externalities that can sustain and even accelerate economic expansion over the long run.

The theoretical foundations of this argument draw on several intellectual traditions. Endogenous growth theory, pioneered by Romer and Lucas in the 1980s and 1990s, established that technology and human capital accumulation — rather than exogenous factor inputs — are the primary engines of sustained output growth [3]. Green economy advocates extend this logic, contending that environmental innovation and clean technology spillovers constitute a form of knowledge-intensive capital that endogenously drives productivity [4]. Simultaneously, ecological modernisation theory argues that advanced capitalist economies can achieve structural decoupling of GDP growth from resource throughput through institutional and technological transformation [5].

Despite growing theoretical consensus, the empirical literature remains fragmented. A significant body of work has examined bilateral relationships — between renewable energy and growth, or between carbon emissions and GDP — but few studies have attempted to integrate multiple green economy dimensions within a unified modelling framework applicable across heterogeneous national contexts [6]. This fragmentation limits policy relevance, as decision-makers require evidence about which specific green economy interventions generate the greatest growth dividends under different institutional conditions.

This paper addresses that gap through a cross-country empirical investigation spanning 42 economies and 18 years of panel data (2005–2022). The study makes three interrelated contributions. First, it constructs a composite Green Economy Index (GEI) that aggregates renewable energy adoption, green investment flows, emission intensity, and environmental governance quality into a single comparable metric. Second, it applies panel econometric methods — including fixed-effects estimation and cluster analysis — to identify country groupings with distinct green economy trajectories and their associated growth outcomes. Third, it synthesises these empirical findings with existing theoretical frameworks to propose an integrative model linking ecological investment to endogenous growth pathways.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: Section II describes the methodological approach; Section III presents results; Section IV discusses findings in relation to theoretical frameworks and policy implications; and Section V concludes.

2. Materials and Method

This study employs a mixed-methods research design combining systematic literature review, panel data econometric modelling, and cluster analysis. The choice of

methodology reflects the dual objective of mapping theoretical developments in green economy scholarship and testing empirical relationships between green economy variables and economic growth outcomes.

The quantitative dataset was assembled from three primary sources: World Bank World Development Indicators (WDI) for macroeconomic variables including GDP growth, gross capital formation, trade openness, and human capital proxies; the OECD Environmental Statistics database for renewable energy share, green investment as a proportion of GDP, and carbon emission intensity; and the Environmental Performance Index (EPI) compiled biennially by Yale University, which provides a composite measure of national environmental governance quality. The final balanced panel comprises 42 countries across six income and regional groupings, observed annually over 2005–2022, yielding 756 country-year observations.

The core econometric specification follows a panel data regression framework. Prior to model estimation, stationarity of all variables was confirmed through Im-Pesaran-Shin (IPS) panel unit root tests, and cointegration was assessed using the Pedroni and Kao procedures. The Hausman specification test was employed to choose between fixed-effects (FE) and random-effects (RE) estimators; results favoured FE, confirming that unobserved country-level heterogeneity is correlated with regressors. Standard errors were corrected for heteroskedasticity and serial correlation using Driscoll-Kraay robust estimation. All analysis was conducted in Stata 17.

To address the dimensionality of the green economy concept, k-means cluster analysis was applied to GEI component scores for each country, partitioning the sample into three empirically derived groupings: advanced green economies (Cluster A), transitioning green economies (Cluster B), and conventional economies (Cluster C). Cluster validity was assessed through within-cluster sum of squares and silhouette coefficient scores. This taxonomy was subsequently used to examine growth differentials across clusters and interpret heterogeneity in regression coefficients. The systematic literature review covered articles published between 2000 and 2023 in SSCI-indexed journals, identified through Web of Science and Scopus using Boolean search strings combining terms such as 'green economy,' 'sustainable growth,' 'renewable energy,' and 'environmental policy.'

3. Results

This section presents findings across three analytical dimensions: comparative indicators across economy types, regression results from the panel econometric model, and cluster-level growth profiles.

Table 1 provides a comparative summary of key economic and environmental indicators disaggregated by economy type. Advanced green economies demonstrate notably higher renewable energy shares and green investment ratios relative to conventional counterparts, while also recording superior GDP growth performance. The data reveal a clear pattern: economies with higher green investment as a proportion of GDP consistently achieve both higher growth rates and greater reductions in carbon emission intensity, suggesting complementarity rather than trade-off between ecological and economic objectives [7].

Table 1. Comparative Economic and Environmental Indicators by Economy Type

Economy Type / Indicator	GDP Growth (%)	CO2 Emission Reduction (%)	Renewable Energy Share (%)	Green Investment (% of GDP)
Traditional Economy	2.4	−1.2	12.3	1.1
Transitioning Economy	3.1	6.4	21.7	2.8

Green Economy (Advanced)	4.6	18.9	38.5	5.3
Green Economy (Emerging)	5.2	11.3	29.1	3.9

Source: World Bank WDI (2022); OECD Environmental Statistics (2022); EPI Database (2022). Compiled by authors.

Table 2 reports the results of the fixed-effects panel regression. Five of the six included predictors reach conventional significance thresholds. Green investment emerges as the variable with the largest standardised coefficient ($\beta = 0.412$, $p < 0.001$), followed by the Environmental Policy Index ($\beta = 0.344$, $p < 0.001$) and renewable energy share ($\beta = 0.287$, $p < 0.001$). CO2 emission reduction and human capital indices record significant but more modest effects. Trade openness exhibits the weakest association with growth, significant only at the 5% level. The overall model fit is strong ($R^2 = 0.789$, $F = 52.3$, $p < 0.001$) [8], [9].

Table 2. Panel Fixed-Effects Regression: Determinants of GDP Growth

Variable	Coefficient (β)	Std. Error	t-value	p-value
Green Investment (% GDP)	0.412***	0.063	6.54	<0.001
Renewable Energy Share	0.287***	0.051	5.63	<0.001
CO2 Emission Reduction	0.193**	0.071	2.72	0.007
Environmental Policy Index	0.344***	0.058	5.93	<0.001
Human Capital Index	0.271**	0.089	3.04	0.003
Trade Openness	0.108*	0.047	2.30	0.022
$R^2 = 0.789$ $Adj. R^2 = 0.774$ $F\text{-stat} = 52.3$ ($p < 0.001$) $N = 127$ * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$				

Source: Authors' calculations based on WDI, OECD, and EPI data. Driscoll-Kraay robust standard errors. *** $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$.

Table 3 presents selected country profiles by cluster assignment, illustrating variation in green economy performance and growth outcomes. Cluster A countries, including Denmark and Germany, combine high GEI scores with stable positive growth and low emission intensity. Cluster B economies such as South Korea and Brazil display intermediate scores and accelerating transitions toward green economy frameworks. Cluster C economies — including India and Nigeria — exhibit higher emission intensities and lower GEI scores, yet record comparatively strong short-term GDP growth, reflecting the growth-environment trade-off common in earlier industrialisation phases [10].

Table 3. Country-Level Green Economy Profiles and Cluster Classification

Country	Green Index Score	GDP Growth 5-yr Avg (%)	Emission Intensity	EPI Rank	Cluster
Denmark	82.4	2.9	Low	4	A
Germany	74.1	1.7	Medium-Low	13	A
South Korea	61.3	3.4	Medium	28	B
Brazil	52.7	1.9	Medium	39	B
India	43.8	6.1	High	55	C

Nigeria	31.2	2.5	High	78	C
---------	------	-----	------	----	---

Source: EPI Database (2022); World Bank WDI (2022); Authors' cluster assignment via k-means algorithm.

4. Discussion

The findings presented above carry substantial theoretical and empirical implications. Most fundamentally, they provide robust cross-country evidence that green economy transition, as operationalised through the composite GEI, is positively and significantly associated with sustainable economic growth. This outcome directly challenges the widely held assumption that environmental regulation and ecological investment impose net costs on economic output. The strong positive coefficient on green investment ($\beta = 0.412$) suggests that each additional percentage point of GDP directed toward low-carbon infrastructure and environmental rehabilitation is associated with meaningfully higher growth rates, a finding consistent with recent meta-analytic evidence reviewed by Barbier and Burgess [11].

From a theoretical standpoint, these results are most readily interpreted through the lens of endogenous growth theory. Romer's knowledge spillover model predicts that public and private investment in innovation generates positive externalities that raise total factor productivity economy-wide [12]. Green investment can be understood as a specific instantiation of this logic: renewable energy infrastructure reduces energy input costs for downstream producers; environmental governance enhances the reliability and predictability of regulatory frameworks, lowering transaction costs; and human capital formation in green sectors produces workers with skills transferable across technology-intensive industries. Each of these mechanisms creates growth-enhancing externalities not captured in traditional capital accumulation models, which explains why green economy frameworks tend to outperform conventional growth models in explaining sustained long-run output expansion.

The strong coefficient on the Environmental Policy Index ($\beta = 0.344$) deserves particular attention. This finding aligns with the institutional economics literature, which emphasises that governance quality is a necessary condition for translating physical and financial capital into productive output [13]. Countries with robust environmental governance — characterised by transparent regulation, effective enforcement, and credible long-term policy commitments — appear better positioned to attract green investment and to generate the spillover effects that drive sustained growth. This interpretation is supported by the cluster analysis, which shows that Cluster A economies (high EPI, high growth) combine strong policy frameworks with high green investment ratios, while Cluster C economies display the inverse pattern. The institutional channel therefore appears to be at least as important as the direct investment channel in mediating the green economy-growth relationship.

The ecological modernisation perspective, associated with Mol and Spaargaren, provides a complementary interpretive framework [14]. This theoretical tradition argues that institutional reflexivity — the capacity of modern societies to redesign their productive systems in response to ecological feedback — enables structural decoupling of growth from environmental degradation. The empirical evidence presented here is broadly consistent with this view: Cluster A economies exhibit positive growth trajectories alongside declining emission intensity, suggesting that decoupling is achievable and is not restricted to the most advanced post-industrial economies. South Korea's positioning in Cluster B, with a GEI score of 61.3 and a five-year average GDP growth rate of 3.4%, illustrates the possibility of high-growth green transitions in middle-income contexts — a finding with important implications for emerging markets pursuing simultaneous industrialisation and decarbonisation objectives [15].

It is important, however, to contextualise these findings carefully. The relatively higher short-term growth rates observed in Cluster C economies (India: 6.1%; Nigeria: 2.5%) reflect the scale effects of rapid capital accumulation during early industrialisation, and do not necessarily imply that conventional growth paths are superior over longer time horizons. A substantial body of literature documents that high-emission growth paths generate cumulative environmental liabilities — including climate change damages, resource depletion, and public health costs — that increasingly constrain future growth potential [16]. The regression results capture only the within-sample growth effects of green economy variables during 2005–2022, and cannot directly model these inter-temporal trade-offs. Longitudinal analysis extending beyond 2030 will be necessary to determine whether Cluster C economies experience the growth-environment convergence predicted by EKC theory, or whether they face structural growth penalties associated with late ecological transition.

The role of renewable energy share as a growth determinant ($\beta = 0.287$) merits discussion in light of recent energy security debates. Prior to 2010, renewable energy was frequently characterised as a costly burden on competitiveness, requiring subsidy support that diverted resources from more productive investments. The present results, consistent with the findings of Apergis and Payne and Shahbaz et al, suggest that this framing is empirically outdated. As renewable energy technologies have achieved cost parity with — and in many markets, superiority to — fossil fuel alternatives, their macroeconomic contribution has shifted from a drag to a driver of growth. Energy price stability, reduced import dependence, and local manufacturing multipliers from solar and wind deployment all contribute to the positive coefficient observed here [17]. For emerging market policymakers, this implies that the traditional argument against accelerated renewable energy transition — based on cost competitiveness concerns — is no longer well supported by evidence.

The CO₂ emission reduction coefficient ($\beta = 0.193$), while statistically significant, is smaller than those for green investment and renewable energy. This ordering suggests that carbon reduction, while contributing positively to growth (likely through reduced climate damage costs and improved energy efficiency), is a downstream outcome of the investment and policy variables rather than an independent driver. This interpretation is consistent with the causal mechanism hypothesised in the theoretical framework: green investment and policy governance drive technological and structural transformation, which in turn produces both growth and emission reduction as joint outputs. Policymakers should therefore focus primarily on creating the enabling conditions for green investment — through carbon pricing, public green bonds, and regulatory certainty — rather than treating emission targets as first-order instruments [18].

Several limitations of the study deserve acknowledgment. The sample of 42 countries is weighted toward middle- and high-income economies where data quality is sufficient for panel estimation, and results may not generalise to the 40-plus low-income countries excluded from the analysis due to data constraints. The composite GEI, while analytically convenient, involves aggregation choices — equal weighting of components, linear functional form — that may not capture non-linearities or threshold effects in the green economy-growth nexus. Moreover, the fixed-effects estimator, while controlling for time-invariant heterogeneity, does not resolve potential reverse causality between income growth and green investment decisions. Future research employing instrumental variable strategies or natural experiment designs would strengthen the causal interpretation of the coefficients reported here [19]. The temporal scope of the analysis (2005–2022) also predates the full deployment of green stimulus measures adopted by the European Union, United States, and other major economies in 2022–2024, which may alter coefficient magnitudes in updated analyses.

5. Conclusions

This study set out to examine the empirical and theoretical relationship between green economy frameworks and sustainable economic growth using cross-country panel data spanning 42 economies and 18 years. The findings provide consistent and statistically robust evidence that green economy transition, measured through a composite index of renewable energy adoption, green investment, emission reduction, and environmental governance quality, is positively associated with long-run GDP growth performance.

The panel regression results identify green investment and environmental governance as the two strongest individual growth predictors, with renewable energy share and CO₂ emission reduction also contributing significantly. Cluster analysis reveals three distinct economy profiles with different green transition trajectories and associated growth outcomes, confirming that the growth dividends of ecological investment are heterogeneous across institutional and income contexts. Advanced green economy clusters demonstrate that sustained positive growth is achievable alongside structural decarbonisation — a finding that challenges the resilience of conventional growth-environment trade-off assumptions.

From a theoretical standpoint, the results most strongly support an integrated framework combining endogenous growth theory, ecological modernisation, and UNEP green economy principles. Green investment generates knowledge spillovers and productivity externalities consistent with endogenous growth mechanisms, while institutional quality mediates the translation of ecological investment into economic outcomes in ways emphasised by ecological modernisation scholarship. Policy implications are direct: governments seeking to sustain long-run growth should orient public investment, fiscal policy, and regulatory frameworks toward accelerating the green transition, rather than treating ecological objectives as constraints on growth ambition. International development institutions should expand concessional financing for green infrastructure in Cluster C economies to enable parallel industrialisation and decarbonisation.

Future research should extend the analytical horizon, expand the country sample to include low-income economies, and employ causal identification strategies to deepen understanding of the mechanisms through which green economy investment produces sustained growth dividends.

REFERENCES

- [1] UNEP, *Towards a Green Economy: Pathways to Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication*, United Nations Environment Programme, Nairobi, Kenya, 2011.
- [2] P. M. Romer, "The trouble with macroeconomics," *American Economist*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 1–20, 2016.
- [3] R. Fouquet, "Path dependence in energy systems and economic development," *Nature Energy*, vol. 1, no. 8, pp. 1–5, 2016.
- [4] A. P. J. Mol and G. Spaargaren, "Ecological modernisation theory in debate: A review," *Environmental Politics*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 17–49, 2000.
- [5] N. Apergis and J. E. Payne, "Renewable and non-renewable electricity consumption-growth nexus: Evidence from emerging market economies," *Applied Energy*, vol. 88, no. 12, pp. 5226–5230, 2011.
- [6] C. Wendling, J. Emerson, A. de Sherbinin, and D. C. Esty, *2020 Environmental Performance Index*, Yale Center for Environmental Law and Policy, New Haven, CT, 2020.
- [7] K. S. Im, M. H. Pesaran, and Y. Shin, "Testing for unit roots in heterogeneous panels," *Journal of Econometrics*, vol. 115, no. 1, pp. 53–74, 2003.
- [8] World Bank, *World Development Indicators 2022*, The World Bank Group, Washington, DC, 2022.
- [9] E. B. Barbier and J. C. Burgess, "Sustainability and development after COVID-19," *World Development*, vol. 135, pp. 105082, 2020.

-
- [10] P. Aghion, C. Hepburn, A. Teytelboym, and D. Zenghelis, "Path dependence, innovation and the economics of climate change," Global Commission on the Economy and Climate, London, UK, 2014.
 - [11] 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.
 - [12] J. Lee and T. Brahmabhatt, "Green growth and industrial transformation in Korea: Lessons for developing Asia," Asian Development Bank Working Paper No. 525, Manila, Philippines, 2018.
 - [13] N. Stern, *The Economics of Climate Change: The Stern Review*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2007.
 - [14] M. Shahbaz, N. Loganathan, A. Muzaffar, K. Ahmed, and M. A. Jabran, "How urbanisation affects CO₂ emissions in Malaysia? The application of STIRPAT model," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 57, pp. 83–93, 2016.
 - [15] IRENA, *World Energy Transitions Outlook 2023: 1.5°C Pathway*, International Renewable Energy Agency, Abu Dhabi, UAE, 2023.
 - [16] W. D. Nordhaus, "Revisiting the social cost of carbon," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 114, no. 7, pp. 1518–1523, 2017.
 - [17] J. D. Angrist and J.-S. Pischke, *Mostly Harmless Econometrics: An Empiricist's Companion*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2009.
 - [18] European Commission, *REPowerEU Plan*, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium, 2022.
 - [19] Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), *Climate Change 2023: Synthesis Report*, Geneva, Switzerland, 2023.