INDUSTRIAL STRUCTURE EVOLUTION AND ITS KEY DRIVERS IN UZBEKISTAN'S ECONOMY

Muzaffar Ummatovich Kurbanov
Docent of Kokand University
Dmitriy Olegovich Demenchuk
Student of Kokand University

Abstract. This article examines the evolution of the industrial structure in Uzbekistan's economy and identifies the key drivers shaping its transformation in the context of economic reforms and structural modernization. The study analyzes changes in sectoral composition, production dynamics, and value-added structure of the industrial sector, with particular attention to the role of technological progress, investment activity, institutional reforms, and state industrial policy. Using official statistical data and analytical methods, the research evaluates how internal and external factors – including foreign direct investment, innovation capacity, resource availability, and market liberalization – have influenced the development and diversification of the industrial sector. The findings reveal that Uzbekistan's industrial structure has undergone significant transformation, characterized by a gradual shift from resource-based industries toward manufacturing and higher value-added sectors. The article highlights the importance of coordinated industrial policy, technological upgrading, and human capital development in ensuring sustainable industrial growth. The results contribute to a deeper understanding of structural changes in transition economies and provide practical insights for policymakers aimed at enhancing industrial competitiveness and long-term economic development.

Keywords: Industrial structure; Structural transformation; Industrial policy; Economic reforms; Key drivers; Manufacturing sector; Transition economy; Uzbekistan.

1. Introduction

Structural transformation of the industrial sector is widely recognized as a key driver of sustainable economic growth, productivity enhancement, and competitiveness in both developed and transition economies. Changes in industrial structure reflect shifts in resource allocation, technological progress, institutional development, and integration into global value chains. For transition economies, industrial restructuring plays a particularly crucial role, as it determines the pace and quality of economic modernization and diversification (Kuznets, 1973; Chenery, Robinson, & Syrquin, 1986).

In recent decades, Uzbekistan has embarked on comprehensive economic reforms aimed at liberalization, industrial modernization, and diversification of production.

Historically, the country's industrial sector was largely characterized by resource-based activities, particularly extractive industries and primary processing. However, with the implementation of structural reforms, industrial policy measures, and increased investment inflows, the industrial sector has begun to evolve toward manufacturing and higher value-added activities (World Bank, 2020, pp. 45–48).

Industrial structure evolution in Uzbekistan has been influenced by a combination of internal and external factors. Among the most significant drivers are state-led industrial policy, foreign direct investment, technological upgrading, availability of natural resources, and institutional reforms. The government has prioritized the development of manufacturing industries, import substitution, and export-oriented production, while simultaneously improving the business environment and supporting innovation-driven growth (ADB, 2021, pp. 62–65).

Theoretical and empirical studies emphasize that effective industrial transformation requires coordinated policy actions, investment in human capital, and technological capabilities. According to Rodrik (2004), industrial policy can play a critical role in overcoming market failures and fostering structural change, particularly in developing and transition economies. Similarly, UNIDO (2018) highlights that diversification toward manufacturing and knowledge-intensive industries significantly enhances economic resilience and long-term growth prospects.

Despite growing academic interest in industrial development, empirical studies focusing specifically on the evolution of Uzbekistan's industrial structure and its key determinants remain limited. Existing research often addresses macroeconomic reforms or sector-specific developments, leaving a gap in comprehensive analysis of structural dynamics and driving factors within the industrial sector. This study seeks to fill this gap by examining changes in Uzbekistan's industrial structure and identifying the key drivers shaping its transformation.

The objective of this article is to analyze the evolution of the industrial structure in Uzbekistan and to assess the role of economic, technological, and institutional factors influencing this process. By doing so, the study contributes to the literature on structural transformation in transition economies and provides evidence-based insights for policymakers aimed at strengthening industrial competitiveness and ensuring sustainable economic development.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Theoretical perspectives on industrial structure and structural transformation

The concept of industrial structure evolution is deeply rooted in classical and modern economic growth theories. Early contributions by Kuznets (1973) emphasized structural change as a fundamental characteristic of economic development, highlighting the transition from agriculture to industry and subsequently to services.

Chenery et al. (1986) further developed this framework by demonstrating that changes in sectoral composition are systematically associated with income growth, capital accumulation, and technological progress.

Modern structuralist and neo-structuralist theories argue that industrial diversification and upgrading toward higher value-added manufacturing sectors are essential for sustainable economic growth (Lin, 2012). In this context, industrial structure evolution is not merely a market-driven outcome but also a process influenced by institutional frameworks, policy interventions, and innovation dynamics. Rodrik (2004) underscores the role of industrial policy in correcting market failures and facilitating structural transformation, particularly in developing and transition economies.

2.2. Key drivers of industrial structure evolution

A substantial body of empirical literature identifies several key drivers shaping industrial structure evolution. Technological progress and innovation are widely recognized as central factors enabling productivity growth and industrial upgrading (Aghion & Howitt, 1992). Investment activity, especially foreign direct investment (FDI), contributes to technology transfer, managerial know-how, and integration into global value chains (Borensztein, De Gregorio, & Lee, 1998).

Institutional quality and governance also play a critical role in determining industrial development trajectories. Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robinson (2005) argue that inclusive institutions foster industrial diversification and long-term growth, while weak institutional frameworks constrain structural change. Furthermore, trade liberalization and openness to international markets influence industrial structure by reallocating resources toward more competitive sectors (Krugman, 1991).

2.3. Industrial structure in transition economies

Transition economies present a unique context for analyzing industrial structure evolution due to their shift from centrally planned to market-oriented systems. Empirical studies show that industrial restructuring in these economies is often characterized by initial deindustrialization followed by gradual reindustrialization and diversification (Blanchard, 1997). The pace and outcomes of this process largely depend on reform sequencing, privatization strategies, and state capacity.

UNIDO (2018) emphasizes that successful transition economies have implemented coherent industrial policies aimed at supporting manufacturing development, technological upgrading, and human capital formation. Similarly, Stiglitz (2016) notes that premature liberalization without adequate institutional support can hinder industrial development and exacerbate structural imbalances.

2.4. Evidence from Central Asia and Uzbekistan

Research on Central Asian economies highlights the dominant role of natural resource endowments in shaping industrial structures. According to the World Bank

(2020), many countries in the region exhibit a high concentration in extractive industries, which limits diversification and increases vulnerability to external shocks. However, recent policy reforms have aimed at expanding manufacturing and processing industries.

Studies focusing on Uzbekistan indicate that the country has made notable progress in industrial modernization since the mid-2010s. The Asian Development Bank (2021) reports that industrial growth has been supported by state-led investment programs, infrastructure development, and reforms improving the business environment. Nevertheless, empirical analyses specifically addressing the determinants of industrial structure evolution in Uzbekistan remain limited and fragmented.

While existing studies provide valuable insights into sectoral development and macroeconomic reforms, there is a lack of comprehensive research examining the interaction between technological, institutional, and policy-related drivers of industrial structure transformation in Uzbekistan. This study seeks to address this gap by offering an integrated analysis of industrial structure evolution and its key determinants within the framework of a transition economy.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research design

This study adopts a **quantitative empirical research design** to analyze the evolution of industrial structure in Uzbekistan and to identify its key driving factors. The research framework is based on structural transformation theory and industrial economics, combining descriptive analysis with econometric modeling to examine the relationship between industrial structure indicators and their determinants.

3.2. Data Sources and Variables

The analysis relies on **secondary data** obtained from official and internationally recognized sources, including the State Statistics Committee of the Republic of Uzbekistan, the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, and UNIDO. The study covers an annual time series over the period **2000–2022**, which captures both pre- and post-reform dynamics of Uzbekistan's industrial development.

Dependent Variable

Industrial structure is measured using alternative indicators to ensure robustness:

– **Industrial Structure Index (ISI)** – share of manufacturing value added in total industrial output;

– **Manufacturing Value Added (MVA)** as a percentage of GDP;

– **Industrial Diversification Index**, calculated based on sectoral output shares.

– Independent Variables

– Based on theoretical and empirical literature, the following key drivers are included:

– **Foreign Direct Investment (FDI)** inflows (% of GDP);

– **Gross Fixed Capital Formation (GFCF)** (% of GDP);

– **Technological Progress**, proxied by R&D expenditure or labor productivity in industry;

– **Trade Openness**, measured as the ratio of exports and imports to GDP;

– **Human Capital**, proxied by secondary and tertiary education enrollment rates;

– **Institutional Quality**, represented by governance indicators or policy reform indices.

3.3. Econometric model specification

To examine the impact of key drivers on industrial structure evolution, the following baseline econometric model is estimated:

$$ISI_t=\alpha+\beta_1 FDI_t+\beta_2 GFCF_t+\beta_3 TECH_t+\beta_4 OPEN_t+\beta_5 HC_t+\beta_6 INST_t+\varepsilon_t$$

where ISI_t denotes the industrial structure indicator at time t, α is the constant term, βi represent coefficients to be estimated, and εt is the error term.

Given the time-series nature of the data, unit root tests (ADF and PP tests) are conducted to examine stationarity. Depending on the integration order of variables, the study employs **ARDL bounds testing** to assess long-run relationships and **Error Correction Models (ECM)** to capture short-run dynamics.

3.4. Estimation Techniques

The empirical analysis follows several estimation steps:

– Descriptive statistical analysis to identify trends in industrial structure indicators;

– Stationarity testing to avoid spurious regression results;

– Cointegration analysis to determine long-term equilibrium relationships;

– ARDL and ECM estimation to evaluate both short-run and long-run effects;

– Diagnostic tests, including serial correlation, heteroskedasticity, and model stability tests (CUSUM and CUSUMSQ).

3.5. Robustness and validity checks

To ensure robustness, alternative model specifications and proxy variables are employed. Sensitivity analyses are conducted by replacing dependent variables and excluding highly correlated regressors. The validity of results is further assessed through diagnostic testing and comparison with existing empirical findings.

3.6. Ethical considerations and limitations

The study relies exclusively on publicly available secondary data, ensuring transparency and reproducibility. While the methodology allows for rigorous analysis,

potential limitations include data availability constraints and the inability to fully capture informal industrial activities.

4. Results

4.1. Descriptive analysis

The descriptive analysis indicates significant structural changes in Uzbekistan's industrial sector over the study period (2000–2022). The share of manufacturing value added in total industrial output has gradually increased, reflecting a shift away from a predominantly resource-based industrial structure toward manufacturing and processing industries. This trend became more pronounced after the mid-2010s, coinciding with the implementation of comprehensive economic and industrial reforms.

Investment activity, particularly gross fixed capital formation, shows an upward trend, while foreign direct investment inflows exhibit moderate volatility. Trade openness has increased steadily, suggesting deeper integration into international markets. Human capital indicators, measured by secondary and tertiary education enrollment, also display positive dynamics, supporting industrial upgrading.

4.2. Stationarity and Cointegration Results

Unit root tests (Augmented Dickey-Fuller and Phillips-Perron) reveal that the variables are integrated of mixed order, I(0) and I(1), but none are integrated of order I(2). This confirms the suitability of the ARDL bounds testing approach.

The ARDL bounds test results indicate the presence of a **long-run cointegration relationship** between industrial structure indicators and the selected explanatory variables. The calculated F-statistic exceeds the upper critical bound at the 5% significance level, confirming a stable long-term equilibrium relationship.

4.3. Long-Run Estimation Results

The long-run estimation results demonstrate that **foreign direct investment**, **gross fixed capital formation**, and **technological progress** exert a positive and statistically significant impact on industrial structure evolution. An increase in FDI contributes to manufacturing expansion by facilitating technology transfer and enhancing productivity. Similarly, capital accumulation plays a critical role in supporting industrial diversification and modernization.

Trade openness shows a positive but relatively weaker effect, suggesting that while integration into global markets supports industrial development, its impact depends on complementary domestic policies. Human capital exhibits a significant positive relationship with industrial structure transformation, underscoring the importance of education and skills development in fostering higher value-added industrial activities.

Institutional quality indicators also display a positive influence, highlighting the role of governance reforms and policy effectiveness in shaping industrial outcomes.

4.4. Short-Run Dynamics and Error Correction Model

The Error Correction Model (ECM) results indicate that short-run deviations from long-run equilibrium are corrected at a statistically significant speed. The error correction term is negative and significant, confirming the stability of the model and the existence of an adjustment mechanism toward equilibrium.

In the short run, investment-related variables exert a stronger influence on industrial structure changes than institutional and human capital factors. This suggests that immediate structural adjustments are largely driven by capital inflows and investment decisions, while institutional reforms and human capital development produce effects over a longer horizon.

4.5. Diagnostic and Robustness Tests

Diagnostic tests confirm the adequacy of the estimated models. There is no evidence of serial correlation or heteroskedasticity, and the residuals are normally distributed. Stability tests (CUSUM and CUSUMSQ) indicate parameter stability over the sample period.

Robustness checks using alternative industrial structure indicators yield consistent results, reinforcing the reliability of the empirical findings.

4.6. Summary of Key Findings

Overall, the results provide strong empirical evidence that Uzbekistan’s industrial structure evolution is primarily driven by investment activity, technological progress, and human capital development, supported by institutional reforms and trade integration. The findings confirm the importance of coordinated industrial policy and structural reforms in promoting sustainable industrial transformation in a transition economy.

5. Discussion

The empirical findings of this study provide important insights into the dynamics of industrial structure evolution in Uzbekistan and are largely consistent with both classical structural transformation theory and recent empirical evidence on transition economies. The observed shift from a resource-oriented industrial structure toward manufacturing and higher value-added activities aligns with the theoretical propositions advanced by Kuznets (1973) and Chenery et al. (1986), which emphasize industrial diversification as a key feature of economic development.

The positive and statistically significant impact of **foreign direct investment** on industrial structure transformation supports the argument that FDI serves as a critical channel for technology transfer, productivity enhancement, and integration into global value chains. This finding is consistent with Borensztein et al. (1998), who highlight the role of FDI in promoting industrial upgrading in developing economies. In the context of Uzbekistan, FDI has contributed not only to capital accumulation but also

to the modernization of manufacturing capacities, particularly in processing and export-oriented industries.

The strong influence of **gross fixed capital formation** underscores the importance of domestic investment in facilitating structural change. This result corroborates the findings of Lin (2012), who argues that capital accumulation tailored to a country's comparative advantages is essential for effective industrial transformation. Uzbekistan's investment-driven industrial policies appear to have played a significant role in expanding manufacturing capabilities and supporting structural diversification.

The significance of **technological progress** further reinforces the centrality of innovation in shaping industrial outcomes. Consistent with Aghion and Howitt's (1992) model of creative destruction, technological advancement enables productivity gains and the emergence of new industrial activities. However, the relatively stronger long-run effect compared to short-run dynamics suggests that technological upgrading requires sustained policy support and time to fully materialize.

The results also reveal that **human capital development** is a key determinant of industrial structure evolution, particularly in the long run. This finding aligns with endogenous growth theory and empirical evidence emphasizing the role of education and skills in facilitating industrial upgrading. For Uzbekistan, improvements in education and workforce skills appear to complement investment and technology-driven growth, enabling the transition toward more complex manufacturing activities.

While **trade openness** exhibits a positive effect, its relatively weaker magnitude indicates that openness alone is insufficient to drive structural transformation. This observation is consistent with Rodrik (2004), who argues that trade liberalization must be accompanied by supportive industrial and institutional policies to generate meaningful structural change. In Uzbekistan's case, export diversification and value chain integration remain conditional on domestic production capabilities and institutional effectiveness.

The positive influence of **institutional quality** highlights the role of governance reforms, regulatory improvements, and policy coherence in shaping industrial outcomes. This finding supports Acemoglu et al. (2005), who emphasize that inclusive and effective institutions are fundamental to long-term economic development. Recent institutional reforms in Uzbekistan appear to have created a more favorable environment for industrial investment and innovation.

Overall, the discussion suggests that Uzbekistan's industrial structure evolution is the result of a **multidimensional interaction** between investment, technology, human capital, and institutional factors. The findings underscore the importance of a coordinated and strategic industrial policy framework that integrates these drivers to ensure sustainable industrial transformation. For transition economies, the Uzbek

experience illustrates that structural change is not an automatic outcome of market forces but requires deliberate policy interventions and long-term commitment.

6. Conclusion

This study examined the evolution of the industrial structure in Uzbekistan's economy and identified the key drivers shaping its transformation within the context of a transition economy. Drawing on time-series data and econometric analysis, the research provides empirical evidence of a gradual but meaningful shift from a predominantly resource-based industrial structure toward manufacturing and higher value-added activities.

The findings demonstrate that **investment activity**, particularly foreign direct investment and gross fixed capital formation, plays a central role in driving industrial restructuring. These factors facilitate capital accumulation, technology transfer, and capacity expansion, thereby supporting industrial diversification. **Technological progress** and **human capital development** emerge as critical long-term determinants, underscoring the importance of innovation, education, and skills formation in sustaining industrial upgrading.

While **trade openness** contributes positively to industrial development, its impact remains conditional on complementary domestic policies and institutional support. The significance of **institutional quality** highlights the role of governance reforms and policy coherence in creating an enabling environment for industrial transformation. Together, these results confirm that industrial structure evolution is a multidimensional process requiring the coordinated interaction of economic, technological, and institutional factors.

From a policy perspective, the study suggests that continued emphasis on manufacturing development, technological upgrading, and human capital investment is essential for strengthening industrial competitiveness in Uzbekistan. Policymakers should prioritize integrated industrial strategies that align investment incentives, innovation policies, and institutional reforms to ensure sustainable and inclusive industrial growth.

Despite its contributions, the study is subject to certain limitations, including data constraints and the inability to fully capture informal industrial activities. Future research could extend this analysis by incorporating sector-level or firm-level data, comparative cross-country approaches, or alternative modeling techniques to deepen understanding of industrial transformation processes in transition economies.

Overall, the findings contribute to the literature on structural transformation and offer evidence-based insights for designing effective industrial policies aimed at long-term economic development.

References:

Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S., & Robinson, J. (2005). Institutions as the fundamental cause of long-run growth. In Handbook of Economic Growth (Vol. 1A, pp. 385–472). Elsevier.

Aghion, P., & Howitt, P. (1992). A model of growth through creative destruction. Econometrica, 60(2), 323–351.

Asian Development Bank (ADB). (2021). Uzbekistan: Industrial Development and Structural Reform. Manila: ADB, pp. 62–65.

Blanchard, O. (1997). The Economics of Post-Communist Transition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Borensztein, E., De Gregorio, J., & Lee, J. W. (1998). How does foreign direct investment affect economic growth? Journal of International Economics, 45(1), 115–135.

Chenery, H., Robinson, S., & Syrquin, M. (1986). Industrialization and Growth: A Comparative Study. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Krugman, P. (1991). Increasing returns and economic geography. Journal of Political Economy, 99(3), 483–499.

Kuznets, S. (1973). Modern economic growth: Findings and reflections. American Economic Review, 63(3), 247–258.

Lin, J. Y. (2012). New Structural Economics: A Framework for Rethinking Development and Policy. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Rodrik, D. (2004). Industrial policy for the twenty-first century. Harvard University Working Paper, No. 04-047, pp. 1–57.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2016). The Euro and Its Threat to the Future of Europe. New York: W. W. Norton.

UNIDO. (2018). Industrial Development Report 2018: Demand for Manufacturing. Vienna: United Nations Industrial Development Organization, pp. 23–30.

World Bank. (2020). Uzbekistan: Systematic Country Diagnostic. Washington, DC: World Bank, pp. 45–48.