Human Capital, Innovation, and Sustainable Development: An Economic Perspective

Dr. Vaishali Kharva
Temporary Assistant Professor
Veer Narmad South Gujarat University, Surat,
Email:- vjkharva@gmail.com
ORCID iD: 0009-0000-8842-0488

Dr. Manish R. Patel
Assistant Professor,
Department of Economics,
Veer Narmad South Gujarat University, Surat,
Email:- mrpatel@vnagu.ac.in

Naik Smitaben Abhimanyubhai
Temporary Assistant Professor
Veer Narmad South Gujarat University, Surat,
Email:- naiksmita1407@gmail.com

Abstract:

This study examines the economic relationship among human capital, innovation, and sustainable development. The paper develops an integrated framework in which education, skills, health, and knowledge formation constitute productive capabilities; innovation represents the mechanism through which capabilities are translated into new technologies, products, processes, and organisational practices; and sustainable development is treated as a multidimensional outcome encompassing economic prosperity, social inclusion, and environmental sustainability. Drawing on human-capital theory, endogenous growth theory, innovation economics, and the capability approach, the study combines a conceptual synthesis with an exploratory cross-country empirical analysis. Secondary indicators are assembled for 16 economies from the World Bank Human Capital Index (HCI), the World Intellectual Property Organization's Global Innovation Index (GII), and the Sustainable Development Report's SDG Index. Pearson correlations and an ordinary least squares regression with heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors are estimated. The results show a strong positive association between human capital and sustainable development ($r = .850$, $p < .001$) and a moderate positive association between innovation and sustainable development ($r = .577$, $p = .020$). Human capital and innovation are also positively correlated ($r = .612$). In the multivariate specification, the two predictors jointly explain approximately 72.8% of the cross-sectional variation in SDG Index scores (adjusted $R^2 = .686$; $p < .001$). The coefficient on human capital is positive and statistically significant, whereas the coefficient on the overall innovation index is positive but not statistically significant after controlling for human capital. These findings suggest that innovation policy cannot be separated from the quality and inclusiveness of human capabilities. The paper therefore argues for a policy architecture that simultaneously strengthens foundational education and health, advanced skills, research capacity, technology diffusion, and sustainability-oriented innovation. The empirical results are interpreted as exploratory associations rather than causal effects because of the small, purposive cross-sectional sample and the non-identical reference years of the international indicators.

1. Introduction:

The transition from resource-intensive growth to knowledge-intensive and environmentally sustainable development has altered the central questions of economic policy. Traditional growth models emphasised physical capital accumulation, labour, and technological progress, while contemporary development economics increasingly treats knowledge, skills, health, institutions, and innovation ecosystems as complementary productive assets. In this context, human capital is not simply an input into production. It

shapes an economy's ability to absorb technology, conduct research, reorganise production, solve collective problems, and adapt to structural change (Becker, 1964; Lucas, 1988; Nelson & Phelps, 1966). At the same time, innovation determines whether accumulated knowledge can be converted into higher productivity, new products and services, improved resource efficiency, and solutions to environmental and social constraints (Aghion & Howitt, 1992; Romer, 1990).

Sustainable development adds a further dimension to the analysis. Economic growth is insufficient when it is accompanied by persistent inequality, depletion of natural assets, poor health and education outcomes, or environmental degradation. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) therefore require economies to reconcile productivity and innovation with social inclusion and ecological constraints. The United Nations' recent evidence shows that global progress towards the SDGs remains substantially below the pace required for 2030, strengthening the case for structural investments in productive and human capabilities (United Nations, 2024). Similarly, the 2025 Human Development Report emphasises that technological change, including artificial intelligence, should be evaluated through its implications for people's capabilities, choices, and agency rather than through technological performance alone (United Nations Development Programme [UNDP], 2025).

The economic logic connecting the three concepts can be expressed through complementarities. Human capital increases the stock of knowledge embodied in workers; knowledge improves the capacity to generate and adopt innovations; innovations raise productivity and can reduce the resource intensity of production; and higher productivity can expand fiscal and private resources available for health, education, infrastructure, and environmental protection. However, the relationship is neither automatic nor linear. High innovation expenditure can coexist with weak social outcomes, while human-capital investments may have limited productivity effects when institutions, finance, infrastructure, or markets do not permit knowledge to diffuse. The OECD (2025) consequently stresses the need to broaden participation in innovation, strengthen science systems, and align science, technology, and innovation policy with transformative sustainability objectives.

This study addresses the following research problem: to what extent are human capital and innovation associated with sustainable development across economies, and what does the relationship imply for economic policy? Three research questions guide the analysis: (1) Is human capital positively associated with sustainable development? (2) Is innovation positively associated with sustainable development after accounting for human capital? and (3) Does the

combined human-capital and innovation framework provide a useful empirical explanation of cross-country differences in SDG performance?

The contribution of the paper is threefold. First, it integrates human-capital theory and innovation-led growth with the sustainability literature rather than examining these dimensions independently. Second, it provides a transparent exploratory empirical model using internationally recognised indicators. Third, it translates the statistical findings into an economic-policy framework centred on capability formation, innovation diffusion, green skills, and inclusive technological change. The study is intentionally cautious about causal interpretation: the empirical section is designed to identify patterns and estimate conditional associations, not to establish structural causality.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

2.1 Human capital as a productive asset

Human-capital theory treats expenditure on education, training, health, and related capabilities as investment because such expenditure changes the productive characteristics of individuals and populations (Becker, 1964). Lucas (1988) incorporated human-capital accumulation directly into a theory of endogenous growth, arguing that learning and skill formation can generate persistent productivity effects. From this perspective, the social return to education extends beyond individual earnings because educated populations can improve knowledge diffusion, civic participation, health behaviour, and technological adoption.

The distinction between years of schooling and learning quality is especially important. Human capital is not adequately represented by enrolment alone; the productive value of education depends on actual cognitive skills, health, and the capacity to use knowledge. Hanushek and Woessmann (2015) demonstrate that cognitive skills are more strongly associated with long-run economic growth than simple measures of educational attainment. The World Bank's Human Capital Index similarly combines dimensions related to survival, schooling, learning, and health to approximate the productivity that children can attain under prevailing conditions of education and health (World Bank, 2020).

Human capital also matters for innovation. Nelson and Phelps (1966) argued that education enhances an economy's capacity to adopt technologies developed elsewhere, while modern innovation systems depend on researchers, engineers, managers, entrepreneurs, and skilled workers. Consequently, the economic value of education is partly mediated through technological diffusion and organisational change.

2.2 Innovation and endogenous growth

Endogenous growth theory places ideas and knowledge at the centre of long-run growth. Romer (1990) conceptualised technological knowledge as a non-rival input capable of generating increasing returns, while Aghion and Howitt (1992) explained growth through innovation and creative destruction. In these models, research and development, human capital, and entrepreneurial activity are not external additions to the growth process; they are mechanisms through which economies continually expand their technological frontier.

Innovation is broader than research expenditure. It includes the development and commercialisation of new products, process improvements, digital technologies, organisational practices, business models, and knowledge-intensive services. The Global Innovation Index (GII) reflects this multidimensional character by combining innovation inputs and outputs across institutions, human capital and research, infrastructure, market and business sophistication, knowledge and technology outputs, and creative outputs (World Intellectual Property Organization [WIPO], 2024).

Innovation also creates an important sustainability channel. Technologies can improve energy efficiency, reduce material use, enable renewable energy, improve agricultural productivity, strengthen public services, and support circular-economy models. Yet technological progress is not inherently sustainable. Rebound effects, unequal access, resource-intensive digital infrastructures, and labour displacement can weaken the social and environmental benefits of innovation. Therefore, the policy objective is not innovation in isolation but innovation aligned with broad-based welfare and ecological constraints.

2.3 Sustainable development as an economic outcome

Sustainable development requires intertemporal compatibility between economic activity and the preservation of social and environmental foundations. Sachs (2015) argues that sustainable development is simultaneously an economic, social, environmental, and governance challenge. The SDG framework operationalises this broad conception through 17 goals covering poverty, health, education, gender, energy, decent work, infrastructure, inequality, climate, ecosystems, institutions, and international cooperation.

From an economic perspective, sustainability can be interpreted as the quality of the development path rather than the level of output at a single point in time. Human capital affects this path through health, education, labour productivity, and social mobility. Innovation affects it through productivity, technology diffusion, resource efficiency, and the creation of new markets. The interaction between the two is particularly relevant to green structural

transformation because new technologies require skilled workers to be designed, adopted, maintained, regulated, and adapted to local conditions.

2.4 Research gap and analytical proposition

A substantial body of literature separately documents the growth effects of human capital and innovation, while the sustainability literature has expanded rapidly around the SDGs and green transition. Less attention, however, is given to an integrated empirical interpretation in which human capital is treated as an enabling capability for innovation and innovation as a transmission mechanism between capabilities and sustainable development.

This paper addresses that gap through a parsimonious empirical framework. The core proposition is that sustainable development is more likely when economies possess both strong human capabilities and an innovation system capable of translating knowledge into productive, inclusive, and environmentally compatible applications. Accordingly, the empirical model tests whether human capital and innovation are positively associated with SDG performance.

2.5 Research hypotheses

- $H1_1$: Human capital is positively and significantly associated with sustainable development performance.
- $H0_1$: Human capital is not positively and significantly associated with sustainable development performance.
- $H1_2$: Innovation is positively and significantly associated with sustainable development performance, after controlling for human capital.
- $H0_2$: Innovation is not positively and significantly associated with sustainable development performance, after controlling for human capital.
- $H1_3$: Human capital and innovation are positively and significantly associated with each other, indicating complementarity between human capital formation and innovation capacity.
- $H0_3$: Human capital and innovation are not positively and significantly associated with each other, indicating no significant complementarity between human capital formation and innovation capacity.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research design

This study adopts a quantitative, explanatory, cross-sectional research design based entirely on secondary international data. The empirical unit is the country/economy. The design is appropriate for testing whether observed differences in human capital and innovation are

systematically associated with differences in sustainable-development performance. Because the indicators are not observed for exactly the same reference year and because the sample is purposively selected to contain economies with internationally comparable innovation and human-capital data, the estimates should be interpreted as exploratory rather than causal.

3.2 Data sources and variable construction

The dependent variable is the 2024 SDG Index score published in the Sustainable Development Report. The index summarises progress across the 17 SDGs on a 0–100 scale, where higher scores indicate stronger overall performance. The independent variables are the World Bank's Human Capital Index (HCI) and the 2024 Global Innovation Index (GII). The HCI is measured on a 0–1 scale, while the GII is reported on a 0–100 scale. The GII 2024 rankings draw predominantly on 2022–2023 observations, while the HCI values used here are the World Bank's latest comparable 2020 estimates. This temporal mismatch is explicitly recognised as a limitation.

Table 1. Variables, measurement, and sources

Variable	Symbol	Measurement	Role
Sustainable development	SDG	SDG Index, 0–100	Dependent
Human capital	HCI	Human Capital Index, 0–1	Independent
Innovation	GII	Global Innovation Index, 0–100	Independent

Source: Author's compilation based on World Bank (2020), World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO, 2024), and Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN, 2024). The World Bank HCI is measured on a 0–1 scale; the GII is the WIPO's composite innovation measure; and the SDG Index is reported on a 0–100 scale.

3.3 Sample selection

The empirical sample contains 16 economies: Finland, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, France, Norway, the United Kingdom, Japan, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Canada, Australia, the Republic of Korea, the United States, China, and India. The sample was selected to provide variation in human capital, innovation performance, and SDG outcomes while retaining countries for which internationally comparable indicators are available. It is not a probability sample and therefore should not be interpreted as representative of all countries.

3.4 Econometric specification

The baseline model is specified as:

$$SDG_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 HCI_i + \beta_2 GII_i + \varepsilon_i$$

where SDG_i is the sustainable-development score of country i; HCI_i is human capital; GII_i is innovation performance; β_0 is the intercept; β_1 and β_2 are partial association coefficients; and ε_i is the disturbance term. Ordinary least squares (OLS) is estimated with heteroskedasticity-robust (HC1) standard errors. Pearson correlations are reported as a bivariate diagnostic. Multicollinearity is assessed through variance inflation factors (VIF), residual normality through the Shapiro–Wilk test, and heteroskedasticity through the Breusch–Pagan test.

4. Results and Statistical Analysis

4.1 Descriptive statistics

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum
HCI	16	0.752	0.082	0.49	0.81
GII	16	56.763	6.794	38.30	67.50
SDG	16	79.244	5.912	63.50	86.40

Source: Author's calculation based on country-level HCI, GII, and SDG Index data obtained from World Bank (2020), WIPO (2024), and SDSN (2024).

The sample exhibits substantial cross-country dispersion. HCI ranges from 0.49 in India to 0.81 in Finland and Sweden, while GII ranges from 38.3 in India to 67.5 in Switzerland. SDG scores range from 63.5 in India to 86.4 in Finland. The dispersion is economically meaningful: it indicates that the selected economies differ not only in innovation capacity but also in the human capabilities required to use knowledge productively.

Table 2. Country-level empirical dataset

Economy	HCI (2020)	GII (2024)	SDG Index (2024)
Finland	0.81	59.4	86.4
Sweden	0.81	64.5	85.7
Denmark	0.77	57.1	85.0
Germany	0.75	58.1	83.4
France	0.75	55.4	82.8
Norway	0.80	50.8	82.2
United Kingdom	0.78	61.0	82.2
Japan	0.80	54.1	79.9
Switzerland	0.76	67.5	79.3
Netherlands	0.80	59.4	79.2
Canada	0.80	52.9	78.8
Australia	0.77	51.1	76.9
Korea, Rep.	0.80	60.9	77.3
United States	0.70	62.4	74.4
China	0.65	55.3	70.9
India	0.49	38.3	63.5

Source: Author's compilation from World Bank (2020), WIPO (2024), and SDSN (2024).

4.2 Correlation analysis

Pair	Pearson r	p-value
HCI–SDG	0.850	< .001
GII–SDG	0.577	0.020
HCI–GII	0.612	< .001

Source: Author's calculation based on World Bank (2020), WIPO (2024), and SDSN (2024) country-level data.

The correlation results provide initial support for all three hypotheses. Human capital has a strong positive association with SDG performance ($r = .850$, $p < .001$). Innovation has a moderate positive association with SDG performance ($r = .577$, $p = .020$). Human capital and innovation are also positively related ($r = .612$, $p < .001$). The latter result is consistent with the theoretical argument that innovation systems require skilled researchers, managers, entrepreneurs, technicians, and workers capable of learning and adaptation.

4.3 Multivariate regression results

Variable	Coefficient	Robust SE	z/t	p-value
Constant	31.777	4.154	7.65	0.000
HCI	57.132	8.699	6.57	< .001
GII	0.079	0.106	0.74	0.458

Source: Author's estimation based on World Bank (2020), WIPO (2024), and SDSN (2024) data.

The innovation coefficient is positive ($\beta = 0.079$) but not statistically significant in the multivariate model ($p = .458$). This finding does not contradict the positive bivariate relationship. Rather, it suggests that part of the cross-country association between innovation and sustainable development overlaps with differences in human capital. The result is theoretically plausible: sophisticated innovation systems often require strong education and research capabilities, and the same institutional and fiscal conditions may influence both innovation and sustainability outcomes.

4.4 Diagnostic tests

Diagnostic	Statistic	p-value	Interpretation
Shapiro–Wilk test of residuals	W = 0.922	p = 0.180	No evidence against normality at 5%
Breusch–Pagan test	LM = 1.460	p = 0.482	No significant heteroskedasticity detected
VIF – HCI	1.599	—	Low multicollinearity
VIF – GII	1.599	—	Low multicollinearity

Source: Author's calculations based on the estimated OLS regression model.

The diagnostic evidence is broadly consistent with the use of OLS. The Shapiro–Wilk statistic does not indicate significant departure from residual normality ($W = .922$, $p = .180$),

and the Breusch–Pagan test does not reject heteroskedasticity at conventional levels (p = .482). VIF values are approximately 1.60 for both explanatory variables, indicating that the predictors are not excessively collinear. Nevertheless, the small sample means that diagnostic tests have limited statistical power; robust standard errors are therefore retained as a conservative specification.

5. Discussion

The empirical results reinforce the central proposition that human capabilities are foundational to sustainable economic transformation. The strong HCI–SDG relationship is consistent with human-capital theory and with the broader development literature in which education, health, and learning capacity influence productivity, social mobility, and the ability of individuals to participate in structural transformation (Becker, 1964; Hanushek & Woessmann, 2015). The result also corresponds with the capability perspective: development depends not merely on aggregate income but on people's substantive opportunities to live healthy, educated, and productive lives (Sen, 1999).

The positive bivariate relationship between innovation and SDG performance is equally important. Innovation can support sustainable development through several channels: energy efficiency, low-carbon technologies, improved public services, digital inclusion, better logistics, agricultural technologies, medical innovation, and productivity-enhancing organisational change. Recent OECD evidence emphasises that STI policy should be explicitly connected with sustainability transitions, resilience, inclusion, and the diffusion of technologies beyond frontier firms and regions (OECD, 2025).

However, the loss of statistical significance for GII in the multivariate model provides a substantive policy insight. Innovation capacity may be necessary but not sufficient for sustainable development. Where human capital is weak, innovations may remain concentrated in a small set of firms or sectors, imported technologies may not diffuse effectively, and the benefits of productivity growth may not reach disadvantaged groups. Conversely, a strong human-capital base can increase absorptive capacity, improve technology adoption, strengthen institutions, and broaden participation in innovation. This interpretation is consistent with Nelson and Phelps (1966) and with contemporary innovation-system thinking.

The finding should not be read as evidence that governments should reduce innovation expenditure. Instead, it supports a complementary policy model. Investment in research and development should be accompanied by foundational education, advanced technical and digital skills, research careers, university–industry linkages, lifelong learning, and institutions that

facilitate technology diffusion. Such complementarity is particularly important for the green transition because sustainability technologies are often knowledge-intensive and require workers and institutions capable of adapting them to local production systems.

The country-level evidence also illustrates why aggregate rankings should be interpreted carefully. India and China demonstrate that middle-income economies can build substantial innovation capacity even when their overall SDG scores remain below those of leading high-income economies. WIPO (2024) reports that China reached 11th and India 39th in the GII 2024 ranking, while the Sustainable Development Report records SDG Index scores of 70.9 for China and 63.5 for India. These differences indicate that innovation advancement and sustainable-development performance do not move one-for-one. Economic structure, inequality, environmental pressures, public services, institutions, and the distribution of innovation gains all matter.

6. Policy Implications

- Governments should treat education, health, nutrition, and employability as mutually reinforcing investments. Foundational literacy and numeracy should be followed by advanced scientific, technical, digital, entrepreneurial, and green skills. Lifelong learning systems are particularly important because technological change continuously changes occupational skill requirements.
- Higher education and research policy should be coordinated with national innovation priorities. Universities, firms, laboratories, and public agencies should have stronger incentives for collaborative research, technology transfer, applied problem-solving, and entrepreneurship. Research assessment should reward high-quality interdisciplinary work addressing sustainability challenges.
- Innovation policy should not focus exclusively on frontier firms. Public support should also help small and medium enterprises, rural producers, informal-sector workers, and disadvantaged communities adopt productive and environmentally efficient technologies. Digital infrastructure and affordable access to knowledge are essential for reducing technology gaps.
- The green transition requires electricians, engineers, data specialists, environmental economists, technicians, urban planners, agronomists, and skilled workers who can operate low-carbon technologies. National skill strategies should therefore integrate climate literacy, circular-economy competencies, resource efficiency, and clean-technology maintenance.

- Governments can use competitive grants, public procurement, blended finance, tax incentives, and mission-oriented programmes to reduce risks associated with sustainability innovation. Such policies should include measurable social and environmental outcomes rather than relying only on patent counts or R&D expenditure.
- A robust policy framework requires integrated monitoring of human capital, innovation, productivity, inclusion, and environmental outcomes. National statistical systems should improve the availability of comparable subnational and sectoral indicators so that policymakers can identify whether innovation is broadening opportunity or concentrating gains.

7. Conclusion

This study examined the relationship among human capital, innovation, and sustainable development from an economic perspective. The conceptual analysis shows that the three components form a mutually reinforcing system: human capital builds the capacity to create and absorb knowledge; innovation converts knowledge into productivity and technological change; and sustainable development provides the broader welfare and environmental objectives against which growth should be evaluated.

The exploratory cross-country evidence is consistent with this framework. Human capital is strongly and positively correlated with SDG performance, innovation is moderately positively correlated with SDG performance, and human capital is positively related to innovation. The regression model explains a substantial share of cross-country variation in SDG scores, with human capital remaining statistically significant after controlling for innovation. Innovation retains a positive sign but does not reach conventional significance in the small multivariate sample.

The central policy conclusion is therefore one of complementarity rather than substitution. Economies seeking sustainable development should not choose between human-capital investment and innovation policy. They should build the capabilities that enable innovation to diffuse widely and generate socially and environmentally desirable outcomes. Education quality, health, research capacity, digital skills, green skills, technology diffusion, and inclusive institutions should consequently be treated as components of a single long-term development strategy.

The empirical analysis has important limitations. The sample is small and purposive; the design is cross-sectional; the indicators come from different reference periods; and omitted variables such as institutions, income, inequality, trade openness, natural-resource dependence,

and environmental policy may affect the estimated relationships. The results therefore establish associations rather than causal effects. Future research should construct a larger panel dataset and use fixed effects, dynamic panel models, instrumental variables, or system-GMM approaches to investigate temporal dynamics and endogeneity. Future work could also examine whether human capital moderates the effect of innovation on green productivity and SDG performance.

Despite these limitations, the analysis provides a clear economic message: sustainable development is increasingly a capability-and-innovation problem. The most durable development strategies are likely to be those that expand human capabilities while directing technological change towards productivity, inclusion, resilience, and environmental sustainability.

References

- Aghion, P., & Howitt, P. (1992). A model of growth through creative destruction. Econometrica, 60(2), 323–351. https://doi.org/10.2307/2951599
- Arrow, K. J. (1962). The economic implications of learning by doing. The Review of Economic Studies, 29(3), 155–173. https://doi.org/10.2307/2295952
- Barbier, E. B. (2010). A global green new deal: Rethinking the economic recovery. Cambridge University Press.
- Becker, G. S. (1964). Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education. University of Chicago Press.
- Hanushek, E. A., & Woessmann, L. (2015). The knowledge capital of nations: Education and the economics of growth. MIT Press.
- Lucas, R. E., Jr. (1988). On the mechanics of economic development. Journal of Monetary Economics, 22(1), 3–42. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3932(88)90168-7
- Nelson, R. R., & Phelps, E. S. (1966). Investment in humans, technological diffusion, and economic growth. The American Economic Review, 56(1/2), 69–75.
- OECD. (2025). OECD science, technology and innovation outlook 2025: Driving change in a shifting landscape. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/5fe57b90-en
- Romer, P. M. (1990). Endogenous technological change. Journal of Political Economy, 98(5, Part 2), S71–S102. https://doi.org/10.1086/261725
- Sachs, J. D. (2015). The age of sustainable development. Columbia University Press.
- Sen, A. (1999). Development as freedom. Oxford University Press.

- United Nations. (2024). The sustainable development goals report 2024. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2024/
- United Nations Development Programme. (2025). Human development report 2025: A matter of choice: People and possibilities in the age of AI. UNDP. https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-2025
- World Bank. (2020). The human capital index 2020 update: Human capital in the time of COVID-19. World Bank.
- World Intellectual Property Organization. (2024). Global innovation index 2024: Unlocking the promise of social entrepreneurship. WIPO. https://www.wipo.int/web-publications/global-innovation-index-2024/
- Sustainable Development Solutions Network. (2024). Sustainable development report 2024: The SDGs and the UN Summit of the Future. Dublin University Press.