Insights
Journal of Humanities & Media Studies Review

Original Article

Technology Investment and New Global Growth Architecture: A Case Study of Russian Technological Sovereignty

Sabeen Azam[1]

1. PhD Scholar, International Relations Department, Federal Urdu University Karachi; sabeen.azam@numl.edu.pk

Citation: Azam, S. (2026). Technology Investment and New Global Growth Architecture: A Case Study of Russian Technological Sovereignty. Insights: Journal of Humanities and Media Studies Review, 2(2). https://doi.org/10.63290/jhmsr.v2.i2.44

Received: 21, April 2026 Revised: 11, April 2026
Accepted: 15, May 2026 Published: 30, June 2026

Academic Editors: Masroor Khanum

Publisher:
Unity Research SMC Pvt. Ltd

Abstract: The research article explores the theory that strategic investment in technology is the main driving force of transformation that will determine 21st century economic and geopolitical structures across the globe. Going beyond the conventional factors of production, this paper suggests that national competitiveness and resilience are now characterized by control over algorithms, data and digital ecosystems. This study is done as a qualitative, single-case study to examine the explicit strategy of technological sovereignty of the Russian Federation. Through the analysis of the main policy documents, the program of the Digital Economy of the Russian Federation and the National Strategy of the Development of Artificial Intelligence, as well as official words of prominent politicians, the paper will discuss how one of the nation-states forms an internally strong and prospect-oriented model of development. The results indicate a multi-dimensional national approach that includes investments in digital infrastructure, artificial intelligence (AI), human capital building (STEM education), and the implementation of technology to achieve sustainability. Russia illustrates a holistic model in which the technological prowess is not only regarded as an economic instrument but is a national security, social development, and world power necessity in the growing multipolar world. The article concludes by saying that although the process of sovereignty has its own challenges in terms of global cooperation, strategic prioritization of technology cannot be ignored in countries that want to find their way through the complexity of the new global growth architecture.

Keywords: Technological Sovereignty, Digital Economy, Artificial Intelligence, Russia, Global Growth

Introduction:

The beginning of the 21st century can be characterized by a pace of change which has never been witnessed in the history of mankind. This change is not an evolution but restructuring of the working logic of civilization under the pressure of the ever-growing and accelerating technological revolution. The development of artificial intelligence, quantum engineering, highly developed robotics, biotechnology, and the overall digitalization of whole industries are no longer fantasy scenarios within the fantastical society;

they are the real-life and immediate processes by which current economies operate, societies interact, and geopolitical power is projected (Schwab, 2017). The classical patterns of growth that characterized the world economic trends in the industrialized era focused on the domination of the manufacturing power and natural resources no longer suffice to ensure national success or national security. There is the development of a new architecture which pivots the traditional components of data, computing capabilities, and innovative abilities.

In this new order, those countries which will be ahead will be those which will perceive the investment in technology not as some peripheral arm of economic policy, but as the main nervous system of national life. This investment identifies the capacity of one country to develop productivity, competitiveness in the international markets, social good and influence at the global front. This is a major shift and the art of code, the skill of high-performance computing, and the power to create sustainable digital spaces are on the verge of becoming the reasons of the first and second difference between the world leaders and followers (Mazzucato, 2013). This new reality provokes the re-think of the very concept of statecraft, and the nations have to construct within themselves powerful and perceptively structures of development.

Russian Federation is a state that has made a conscious and strategic step towards this necessity. Russia has seen technology leadership as a core strategic concern, both according to the national development agenda and according to the evolving world order, which is characterized by digital fragmentation and increased competition. The national strategy, which is reflected in the historic projects, including the Digital Economy of the Russian Federation and the National Strategy to develop Artificial Intelligence is the collective attempt to create a self-sufficient and strong technological environment. The main aim of the research is to examine the issue of technological sovereignty as a strategy of national development. This article seeks to offer a conceptual insight into the way a nation-state can actively build a prospective developmental model by analyzing the Russian case. The thesis of the current paper consists in the idea that strategic technology investment is the most radical, decisive and transformative phenomenon in the modern world evolution and that the Russian project of technological sovereignty provides the best chance to understand the mechanisms and problems and possible consequences of this paradigm.

Literature Review:

Technology as a Foundation of the 21st Century Development

A paradigm shift in determining factors of economic growth and national might is highlighted in both theoretical and empirical literature. The review is a synthesis of major themes, which shift towards the general economic theory to the particular aspects of the digital economy and the notion of sovereignty.

The Theory of Evolution of Growth: Industrial Potency to Digital Dexterity

The classical and neoclassical economic theories singled out land, labor and capital as the main factors of production. The 20th century (especially the post-World War II period) discussed the significance of technological change as an endogenous growth factor, as captured by Solow (1957) and later expounded by Romer (1990) in his endogenous growth theory. The contribution of Romer was critical because he stated that the intensive approach of technological transformation with the purposeful investment in knowledge and innovation is not an external phenomenon but rather an internal production of economic activity. This preconditioned the appearance of knowledge as a non-rival and partially exclusion good with increasing returns, which radically changed the growth path of countries.

This trend has become even more acute in the 21st century. Digital revolution has changed knowledge to be the main source of value creation. Brynjolfsson and McAfee (2014) maintain that this is the Second Machine

Age, where cognitive work is becoming more and more automated as a result of the exponential growth of digital power, and it is creating unprecedented opportunities to be more productive and innovative. No longer merely capital investment, but data and algorithm generation, processing and application is the key differentiator. This has led to the emergence of a new economic regime of platforms, networks, and digital ecosystems as the predominant forms of organization that generate winner-takes-all dynamics and concentrating power in those organizations that possess such assets (Parker, Van Alstyne, and Choudary, 2016). Thus, national competitiveness is currently unavoidably connected with the digital capacities of a nation.

The Pillars of Digital Economy and geopolitical authority

The digital economy is not a one-pole but has a number of pillars, which are critical to its creation. To begin with, digital infrastructure such as broadband networks, data centers, cloud computing platforms, and cybersecurity systems is the base as a workhorse of all the digital activity. Quality, resilience and security of this infrastructure according to the OECD (2020) are the key to economic activity and national security. Second, artificial intelligence has become a new general-purpose technology that can transform all industries, including manufacturing and finance, healthcare and governance (Agrawal, Gans, and Goldfarb, 2018). Developing and deploying AI is now viewed as a fundamental element of national strength, and countries are competing to get ahead in the field of research, talent, and utilization.

There are far-reaching geopolitical implications of this technological competition. Technological sovereignty has emerged as a popular idea especially in the European Union and other countries such as Russia and China in reaction to the dominance of US-based technology giants and weaponization of digital interdependence (Creemers, 2022). In this regard, sovereignty means the ability of a state to operate its digital realm, safeguard its data, achieve the safety and durability of its critical infrastructure, and develop its domestic innovation potential in order to decrease strategic reliance. This is a return to a vision of a borderless, globalized internet to a more fragmented splinternet with competing technology ecosystems and standards (Mueller, 2017). It is a geopolitical prism through which one should interpret national technology policies with an emphasis on independence and hardening in addition to economic effectiveness.

Human Capital and Sustainability Imperative

Without an investment in human capital, no technological change can possibly be successful. The digital economy needs the abilities of critical thinking, problem solving, data literacy and specialized abilities in STEM disciplines, which are highly demanded worldwide. Acemoglu and Autor (2011) emphasize the opportunity of the technological change being the one that is skill-based, which may result in job polarization and inequality when the workforce is not well-prepared. As a result, national policies should include education reform, lifelong learning, workforce development so that the impact of technology becomes widespread as well as to make sure that an economy has a pool of talent that will be able to innovate and develop.

Moreover, there is an increasing amount of literature on the purpose of technology in the realization of environmental sustainability. The problem of the climate crisis and the lack of resources require new solutions. Decoupling of economic growth and environmental degradation requires green technologies, such as renewable energy systems, smart grids, carbon capture, and AI-powered precision agriculture, which can be achieved through satellites and smart grid monitoring (Sachs, 2015). The investment into these spheres is not only an environmental policy but a fundamental part of the long-term economic and social robustness, which forms new industries and contributes to the ensuring of the sustainable utilization of the natural resources of the planet.

Methodology

The research design used in this study is a qualitative and a single case study research design, to analyses and examine the contextual analysis of the strategic domination of technological sovereignty by Russia in an in depth manner. This investigation is especially well-differentiated to be carried out using the case study method because it enables a holistic and complex approach to a modern phenomenon in the context of the real world (Yin, 2018). Three main reasons have been used to choose the Russian Federation as a case: (a) its articulation of technological sovereignty as a national policy goal, which is explicit and on the high level; (b) and the national programs adopted to support this objective are comprehensive and state-led, which means that its strategic choices are consequential to the overall international order. The case is framed by the timeframe of 2017 (when the program "Digital Economy of the Russian Federation" was launched) to the current date, which enables a case of the coherent cycle of policy to be analyzed (Lowry, 2020).

The qualitative analysis of primary and secondary sources using the document analysis method which was applied to collect data. Primary sources of data will be:

1. **Official Policy Documents:** The entire content of the most important national strategies was examined, such as the program of Digital Economy of the Russian Federation, the national strategy of the development of artificial intelligence until 2030, and the national project of science and universities.

2. **Governmental and official statements:** The speeches of the government, statements of the policy, and articles of the top officials of Russia, such as Prime Minister Mikhail Mishustin and the main economical advisors, such as Maxim Oreshkin, were gathered on the official governmental websites and authoritative news archives. These quotes shed some light into the reasons behind the technology agenda, what it aims to achieve, and how significant it is deemed to be.

3. **Laws:** The Acts of Parliament on the digital infrastructure, data localization, and incentives in the IT industry were examined to determine the legislation that supports the strategy.

4. Secondary Sources: The information of primary sources was triangulated through referring to the secondary sources (i.e. articles by scholars, reports of various international organizations (e.g. OECD, World Bank) and due credence of policy analysis by the think tanks working with the problems of the digital economy and policy of Russia.

The thematic analysis approach upon which the data was analyzed is founded on the identification, analysis, and reporting of patterns (themes) in the qualitative data (Braun and Clarke, 2006). This was done in several phases. First of all, acquaintance was made through reading of all documents. Second, the text was coded to come up with primary codes that described particular strategies, objectives and rationale of investment in technology. These codes were further condensed into bigger and more general themes, which resonated with the pillars of the growth architecture found in the literature review, such as: Digital Infrastructure Development, AI as a Strategic Priority, Human Capital Formation and Technology as a Sustainability Enforcer. This was analyzed in the light of the manifest content (explicit goals), and the latent one (underlying assumptions about national power, the dynamics of the world and development). This methodological process renders the findings credible since it is restated on a coherent and replicable analytical framework that assists in building some rational narrative that explains in what ways Russia is attempting to form its future crafted development framework.

Critique: The Pillars of Technological Sovereignty of Russia

On the analysis of policy documents and official statements, there is a consistent and multi-dimensional national policy. The Russian concept is not a complex of separate projects but a multifaceted framework that

is intended to establish an entire and full-fledged technological ecosystem. In this section, the key pillars of this architecture are discussed, which have been determined through the thematic analysis.

Strategic Imperative: Technological Sovereignty of National Resilience

The open objective of technological autonomy is the most crucial aspect of the Russian strategy. This is not merely the mere import substitution as it is being touted by Prime Minister Mikhail Mishustin and others. It is a comprehensive perspective on national resilience and competitive advantage in a divisive world. One of the central ideas Mishustin has been focusing on in numerous speeches is that technological independence is the most effective measure to reduce the extent of exposure to external pressures and ensure the stable functioning of the economy and the state (Government of the Russian Federation, 2021). It is an unambiguous acknowledgment of the geopolitical reality of the 21st century when digital infrastructure and technology supply chains can become a source of pressure and conflict.

This has also been developed further by one of the most critical economic consultants Maxim Oreshkin who points out that autonomous, technological ecosystem are vital to sustainable growth in the long run. Not only is a defensive position, this opinion that the creation of indigenous capabilities in such critical technologies as AI, microelectronics, and quantum computing is a source of active competitive advantage. The state has a role to ensure that this ecosystem is successful through strategic investment, establishment of regulatory frameworks and demand-side policies that concentrate on domestic solutions. This strategic direction is imprinted in the national programs, which have ambitious objectives of increasing the share of the digital economy in GDP, becoming a technological leader in the most topical areas, and ensuring the security of the digital space of Russia by the year 2030. The reasoning behind it is rather obvious: in the world where technological prowess becomes a deciding role of the ranking of nations, it is not an option, but a mandatory component.

Digital Infrastructure: The Nervous System of the New Economy

After acknowledging that one cannot have a digital economy without a powerful foundation, Russia has made investment in national digital infrastructure a priority. This is the keystone of its development schemes. The Digital Economy of the Russian Federation national program presupposes considerable investments in many important spheres. The first and most critical one is the development and modernization of connectivity. This also includes the high speed broadband internet connectivity to even the most remote places and closing the digital divide and ensuring that everybody is reaping the benefits of the digital economy.

Besides connectivity, the plan is oriented towards development of sovereign digital capacity. This involves the development of a national architecture of data centers to offer data sovereignty and reliability. This is a concerted effort to design and deploy national software ecosystems, which will reduce reliance on foreign-based systems, particularly in such sensitive sectors as government administration, finance and energy. The development of a quantum communication network is one of the elements and it will provide the theoretically impossible encryption of state secrets and critical infrastructure, which is a significant advancement in what the national security system is capable of doing.

This was already seen in how the masses services were revolutionized through the portal called GoSuslugi portal that has now become the high-tech and popular portal of access to government services on the internet. This state digitalization does not only make the state more efficient and convenient to the citizens but it is also a powerful tool in the promotion of digital literacy and adoption of digital practices in the society. In addition, the robust digital foundation facilitates novelty in other operations. The growth of the Russian fintech sector, digital banks like Tinkoff (pre-acquisition) and the creation of AI-powered services across the

economy depends on having this underlying digital infrastructure. It is the affixing force between the economic progress, social progress and the national security.

Artificial intelligence: The economic engine

The use of AI in the Russian strategy is not only explicitly declared as a technology component, but a driver of economic revolution. The National Strategy of the Development of Artificial Intelligence until 2030 develops an elaborate roadmap of how Russia can become one of the leaders of AI in the world. This plan appreciates the returns that the investment in AI would provide in the entire economy, which would be exponential. Machine control AI and predictive maintenance can also be employed by the manufacturing industry to lower the production cost and raise accuracy. Algorithms in AI are already utilized in the financial industry to carry out complex risk assessment, fraud detection and algorithmic trading. The agricultural sector can also be benefited by the AI applications by the way of optimizing the planting schedules, water management and the forecasting of the harvests more accurately than ever before. AI is going to revolutionize healthcare in the sphere of diagnostics, where the ailment could be identified in an appropriate manner basing on medical pictures and patient information, which, ultimately, would increase patient outcomes and cost reduction.

The national plan focuses on enhancing the potential of research, investing in both basic and applied AI research, providing support to AI startups through grants and accelerators, and realizing regulatory sandboxes to allow AI solutions to be tested. The Russian approach is a peculiarity of the emphasis on trusted AI. The thought process will promote the development of clarifiable, explainable, and ethics-based algorithms and proper data security and system stability. As the global community wrestles with the AI governance bias issue, privacy, accountability, the Russian emphasis on responsible and ethical AI ecosystem positive model is possibly powerful. The strategy will guarantee the confidence of the people through the lens of trust and innovation to make sure that AI implementation will benefit the society to prevent the mass resistance that could terminate the further development of the technology.

Human Capital: The Technological Future

The fact that technology is a human activity has been one of the major themes that run through all the policy documents. This is particular to the success of the technological change in Russia because it has been able to develop, retain and attract the best talent. This is already implemented by implementing enormous investment in education, research, and worker upbringing, as required by the National Project "Science and Universities.

The strategy focuses on empowering the total talent pipeline. This begins with re-introduction of STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) in schools, thus, imbue an early interest and capacity in these highly significant fields. On the higher educational level, an organized campaign is underway to modernize universities and research institutions that would result in world standard institutions that can compete internationally. To provide the infrastructure and environment within which the breakthrough ideas could flourish, young scientist support programs, new laboratories, technology parks and innovation territories are planned. Even more so, the pace of technological change is perceived to be dynamic, hence, the strategy implicitly and explicitly advances the notion of lifelong learning and retraining the workforce so that the present-day labor force is flexible enough to keep up with the demands of an increasingly automated and digitalized economy. Its logic is quite simple, the nations that fail to equip their nation to confront the future of work, threaten not only to remain trapped in the conditions of economic stagnation but also to become socially unstable. Human capital investment is therefore placed as the simplest of all investments and it is what will power the technological engine the creativity, ingenuity, and expertise that.

Sustainability and internationalization technology

Finally, the Russian strategy is not competitive in the context of pure economics only, but the role of technology in overcoming global barriers and creating new trends in international cooperation. In the discussion, it demonstrates that there is a perception of devotion to technological innovation to help environmental sustainability. Russia contributes to the global energy transition with the high investments it has done on the next-generation nuclear technologies, hydrogen energy, and advanced materials. Greater is that its capabilities when it comes to monitoring the Arctic climate and environmental modeling, which, in most instances, rely on sophisticated satellite systems, provide vital information to climate-related research and evidence-based policymaking. This makes technology one of the pillars of sustainability and in this scenario, sustainable and economical development is possible as well as environmental stewardship.

Ironically, though, the need to adopt the strategy is rooted in the very idea of sovereignty, yet the need to address the cooperation of the international community is also taken into account. The de-globalization of digital systems and unequal access to technology are viewed as a menace to global stability. The participation of Russia in the multilateral agreements, like the BRICS group and the Eurasian Economic Union, in which the process of digital integration and technological cooperation is a crucial issue on the agenda, evidences the fact that the attempt is undertaken to create a new paradigm of global connectivity. It is the concept of a multipolar technological universe where different national ecosystems will be capable of collaborating on the basis of shared principles and standards that will prompt them to collaborate on common challenges, such as cybersecurity and ethical control of AI rather than allowing technology to become a new dividing force. This two pronged approach of fortification both inside and also in search of external partnership is a sophisticated understanding of the complexity of the new world developmental design.

Discussion

The case of the Russian quest towards technological self-sufficiency can offer profound understanding of the spirit of the statecraft and state development in the 21st century. The results of the thematic analysis may serve to prove the general assumption of this paper: the most radical factor in the global future is technology investment. The Russian model demonstrates the holistic approach to the question of technology as not a sectoral policy, but the primary organizing principle of the national strategy with an approach that includes an economic, social, geopolitical, and environmental agenda. It is definitely a paradigm shift to the old ways of growth where technology in most instances was an after-product of a process of growth rather than being a catalyst.

The focus on the digital infrastructure, AI, and human capital directly refers to the pillars of the digital economy identified in the literature (Brynjolfsson and McAfee, 2014; Gürler, 2023). A very significant aspect of intentionality introduced by Russian strategy, however, is the state-oriented, geopolitically aware one. Russian way is further distinguished by more market-oriented models owing to the explicit goal of technological sovereignty that the latter is driven by the recognition of fractured global digital space (Mueller, 2017). It is a dynamic planning policy of hardness, which is likely to generate not only a competitive ecosystem but also a safe ecosystem and a self-sufficient one. This is not new to the conceptual work of Cattaneo (2014), who is of the opinion that there is an entrepreneurial active state that is proactive in designing and creating markets and not just correcting their failures. The other domain investments that the state has made, including quantum communications, and development of national AI are classic examples of the entrepreneurial state at work, and prioritize high-risk, high-reward areas, which are regarded to be of importance to national interests in the long term.

One of the most successful findings is the emphasis on the trusted AI and the ethical component of technology. It provides a clue of a growing awareness that the lack of social license and trust of the people makes technological leadership unsustainable. As the world grows increasingly concerned about the societal impact of AI, the attempt by Russia to pursue the status of a nation that facilitates responsible innovation could be an important soft power asset. It also indicates the understanding that the digital economy would become sustainable in the long run under social stability and the perception that technology is a good thing to the common good. This is in accordance with the human capital literature (Acemoglu & Autor, 2011) which has stressed the need to have a social contract that will be used to distribute the benefits of technological change to all to prevent backlash and inequality.

However, the Russian model has its own tensions and challenges that are intrinsic. Even the concept of the so-called sovereignty in a highly interconnected technological world is a contradiction. The emergence of self-sufficiency, whereas it is a prudent measure in the event of geopolitical risks, cannot and will not leave the country alone in respect of the streams of world innovations. The attempt to build a national ecosystem and, simultaneously, to attempt to affect international cooperation in such fora as BRICS is the measure aimed at managing this paradox. The long term effectiveness of this strategy will be defined by the ability of Russia to come up with genuine domestic innovation which will be able to compete with the rest of the world without going into the pitfalls of protectionism which could lead to technological stagnation. One of the questions is the success of state-directed investment in the development of breakthrough innovation in comparison with incremental improvement.

There are certain implications of this study beyond the case of Russia. It provides a framework within which one can understand the technological policies of other great powers particularly as the world becomes increasingly multipolar in terms of technology. The paper observes that the strategic technology policy emerges as one of the pillars of national security and grand strategy in the modern world. The Russian experience is an example and a warning to other nations, and most notably to the developing nations. It demonstrates the importance of long term and holistic vision and the reason why investment into the underlying components infrastructure and human capital that help all technological development is worth making. It also brings out the difficult trade-offs which every country will have to make between openness and autonomy in the coming decades.

Conclusion

The hypothesis that strategic investment in technology is the foremost transformative factor that determines the global future by making Russia a prime example in their endeavor to realize technological sovereignty was the target of this research article. It has been determined in the discussion that the investment on technology, in fact, is the most radical and decisive phenomenon in the contemporary global development which is basically reorganizing economies, enhancing human capabilities, generating sustainable growth, and geopolitical sustainability. It is in those countries that consider technology as a tool of national policy rather than an economic process on the fringes that are not only in the best position to thrive economically but also can establish the new world order.

A very good example of this paradigm is the Russian. The holistic strategy that is undergoing and involves the investments in digital infrastructure, artificial intelligence, scientific research activities, and human capital indicates the level of awareness of how to develop a resistant and future-oriented national economy. The objective view of technological sovereignty, driven by such ruthlessly clear eyed assessment of global fragmentation and competition, is proactive statecraft, which is meant to provide the country with resilience and long-term competitive advantage. The emphasis on trusted AI and ethical governance is also indicative that it is a delicate handling that tries to bring innovation into a system of social stability and responsibility.

Moving into a radical and constant transformative new epoch, now it is clear the lessons of the approach of Russia that strategic technology investment is not only about the returns to the economy, it is the necessary provision of the formation of a new architecture of national development, an international cooperation in identical problems, and the establishment of a seat in the multipolar world of the future. It will be the people that create their own future and the means of such creation is definitely technological.

References

1. Acemoglu, D., & Autor, D. (2011). Skills, tasks and technologies: Implications for employment and earnings. In *Handbook of labor economics* (Vol. 4, pp. 1043-1171). Elsevier.
2. Agrawal, A., Gans, J., & Goldfarb, A. (2018). Prediction, judgment, and complexity: a theory of decision-making and artificial intelligence. In *The economics of artificial intelligence: An agenda* (pp. 89-110). University of Chicago Press.
3. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101.
4. Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The second machine age: Work progress and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies*. WW Norton & company.
5. Cattaneo, M. C. (2014). Mazzucato M.(2013), The entrepreneurial state. Debunking public vs. private sector myths. *Economia politica*, *31*(1), 103-110.
6. Creemers, R. (2020). China's conception of cyber sovereignty. *Governing cyberspace: Behavior, power and diplomacy*, 107-145.
7. Edmonds, J., Bendett, S., Fink, A., Chesnut, M., Gorenburg, D., Kofman, M., ... & Waller, J. (2021). Artificial intelligence and autonomy in Russia.
8. Gürler, M. (2023). The effect of digitalism on the economic growth and foreign trade of creative, Information and Communication Technology (ICT) and high-tech products in OECD countries. *The European Journal of Research and Development*, *3*(2).
9. Кравчук, О. І. (2025). Цифрова трансформація управління людським капіталом: підвищення соціальної мобільності в цифровій економіці.
10. Lowry, A. (2020). Russia's digital economy program: An effective strategy for digital transformation?. In *The Palgrave handbook of digital Russia studies* (pp. 53-75). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
11. Mueller, M. (2017). *Will the internet fragment?: Sovereignty, globalization and cyberspace*. John Wiley & Sons.
12. Parker, G. G., Van Alstyne, M. W., & Choudary, S. P. (2016). *Platform revolution: How networked markets are transforming the economy and how to make them work for you*. WW Norton & Company.
13. Romer, P. M. (1990). Endogenous technological change. *Journal of political Economy*, *98*(5, Part 2), S71-S102.
14. Sachs, J. D. (2015). The age of sustainable development. In *The age of sustainable development*. Columbia University Press.
15. Schwab, K. (2017). *The fourth industrial revolution*. Crown Currency.
16. Shao, B., & Wang, H. (2025). Digital economy, industrial structure advancement and human capital accumulation. *Finance Research Letters*, *83*, 107727.Solow, R. M. (1957). Technical change and the aggregate production function. The Review of Economics and Statistics, 39(3), 312–320.
17. Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications* (Vol. 6). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.