

American Journal of Economics and Business Management

Vol. 9 Issue 6 | **pp.** 58-67 | **ISSN:** 2576-5973
Available online @ https://www.globalresearchnetwork.us/index.php/ajebm

Article

Mechanisms for Improving Economic Well-Being of Rural Areas Based on Digital Inclusivity: Labor and Capital Perspectives

Urozaliev Elyor*[1]

1. Samarkand Branch of Tashkent State University of Economics
*Correspondence: eurozaliyev@gmail.com

Citation: Elyor U. Mechanisms for Improving Economic Well-Being of Rural Areas Based on Digital Inclusivity: Labor and Capital Perspectives. American Journal of Economics and Business Management 2026, 9(6), 58-67.

Received: 19th Mar 2026
Revised: 30th Apr 2026
Accepted: 20th May 2026
Published: 03th Jun 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Abstract: This study investigates the mechanisms through which digital inclusivity enhances economic well-being in the rural areas of Samarkand Region, Uzbekistan, drawing on classical and contemporary theories of labor and capital. Employing a mixed-methods research design that integrates econometric modeling with qualitative fieldwork, the analysis evaluates the impact of digital technology adoption, human capital formation, and physical capital allocation on rural economic output. Panel data spanning 2018 to 2024 across fourteen districts of Samarkand Region were analyzed using fixed-effects regression and a modified Cobb-Douglas production function augmented with digital inclusivity indices. The findings demonstrate that a one-unit increase in the digital inclusivity index corresponds to a 12.7 percent rise in agricultural labor productivity and a 9.3 percent improvement in capital utilization efficiency. The study contributes to the literature by providing empirical evidence on the complementary relationship between digital infrastructure and traditional factors of production in transitional rural economies.

Keywords: Digital inclusivity, rural economic well-being, labor economics, capital theory, Cobb-Douglas production function, Samarkand Region, agricultural productivity, digital infrastructure, human capital.

1. Introduction

The transformation of rural economies through digital technologies has emerged as one of the most compelling development paradigms of the twenty-first century. Across developing and transitional nations, governments and international organizations have increasingly recognized that bridging the digital divide constitutes a prerequisite for achieving sustainable and inclusive growth **[1]**. This recognition stems from the understanding that digital tools and platforms fundamentally alter the way in which labor and capital interact within productive systems, thereby reshaping the economic landscape of historically underserved communities.

Uzbekistan, as a rapidly reforming economy in Central Asia, presents a particularly instructive case for examining how digital inclusivity can serve as a catalyst for rural economic transformation. Since 2017, the country has embarked on a comprehensive modernization agenda that encompasses agricultural reform, financial liberalization, and digital infrastructure expansion **[2]**. The Samarkand Region, home to over 3.8 million inhabitants with approximately 67 percent residing in rural areas, exemplifies the tensions

between traditional agrarian livelihoods and the imperatives of technological modernization **[3]**.

From the perspective of economic theory, the relationship between digital inclusivity and rural prosperity can be framed through the lens of labor and capital analysis. Classical economists, from Adam Smith to Karl Marx, emphasized that the productive capacity of any economy ultimately depends on the quality and quantity of its labor force and its stock of capital **[4]**. The neoclassical synthesis, articulated through the Cobb-Douglas production function, formalized this relationship by expressing output as a function of labor and capital inputs, modulated by technological efficiency parameters **[5]**. In contemporary discourse, digital inclusivity operates as a technological augmentation factor that enhances the marginal productivity of both labor and capital.

The purpose of this study is twofold. First, it seeks to develop a theoretical framework that integrates digital inclusivity into the classical labor-capital paradigm, adapting the Cobb-Douglas function to account for the specific characteristics of rural economies in transition. Second, it provides empirical evidence from Samarkand Region to test the proposition that digital inclusivity significantly improves both labor productivity and capital allocation efficiency in rural settings. The research addresses the following questions: (1) To what extent does digital inclusivity influence the marginal productivity of labor in rural Samarkand Region? (2) How does digital technology adoption affect the efficiency of capital utilization in agricultural and non-agricultural rural enterprises? (3) What policy mechanisms can optimize the complementary relationship between digital infrastructure and traditional factors of production?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Classical and Neoclassical Theories of Labor and Capital

The foundational framework for understanding economic production through the interaction of labor and capital traces its origins to the works of Adam Smith and David Ricardo. Smith's division of labor thesis posited that the specialization of tasks within productive processes generates increasing returns, a proposition that remains salient in analyzing how digital platforms enable the disaggregation and redistribution of rural labor across value chains **[4]**. Ricardo's theory of comparative advantage, when transposed to the rural digital context, suggests that communities possessing digital infrastructure may specialize in higher-value activities while outsourcing labor-intensive tasks through digital marketplaces **[6]**.

The neoclassical tradition, particularly the Solow-Swan growth model, introduced the concept of total factor productivity as a residual capturing technological progress beyond the contributions of labor and capital accumulation **[7]**. Solow's seminal work demonstrated that long-run economic growth derives primarily from technological change rather than mere input accumulation, a finding that underscores the potential significance of digital inclusivity as a modern expression of technological advancement in rural settings. Mankiw, Romer, and Weil extended this framework by incorporating human capital as a distinct factor of production, arguing that education and skill formation substantially influence cross-country growth differentials **[8]**.

2.2 Digital Inclusivity and Rural Development

The concept of digital inclusivity encompasses not merely access to digital infrastructure but also the capacity of individuals and communities to utilize digital tools effectively for economic and social purposes **[9]**. The World Bank's Digital Development Strategy emphasizes that meaningful digital inclusion requires simultaneous investment in connectivity, digital literacy, and enabling institutional frameworks **[10]**. In the context of rural economies, digital inclusivity manifests through several channels including mobile banking penetration, e-commerce platform utilization, digital agricultural extension services, and online labor market access.

Empirical studies from developing economies provide mixed but generally positive evidence regarding the economic impact of digital inclusion on rural livelihoods. Aker and Mbiti found that mobile phone adoption in sub-Saharan Africa reduced information asymmetries in agricultural markets, leading to price convergence and improved farmer welfare **[11]**. Similarly, Jensen's landmark study of Kerala fishermen demonstrated that mobile phone access reduced price dispersion by an average of 60 percent and virtually eliminated waste in the fish market **[12]**. In the Central Asian context, Abdullaev and Rasulov documented that digital financial services adoption among rural households in Uzbekistan increased savings rates by 18 percent and expanded access to micro-credit facilities **[13]**.

2.3 The Labor-Capital-Digital Nexus in Transitional Economies

A growing body of literature has sought to integrate digital technology variables into production function frameworks. Brynjolfsson and Hitt demonstrated that investments in information technology complement human capital, generating superadditive returns when combined with organizational restructuring **[14]**. This finding has particular relevance for rural economies where digital tools can amplify the productivity of relatively scarce skilled labor. Czernich and colleagues established a causal relationship between broadband infrastructure and regional economic growth in OECD countries, estimating that a ten-percentage-point increase in broadband penetration raised per-capita GDP growth by 0.9 to 1.5 percentage points **[15]**.

In the specific context of Uzbekistan, recent studies have begun to explore the digital-economic nexus. Hasanov and Khudoyberganov examined the relationship between ICT investment and agricultural productivity in Ferghana Valley, finding significant positive effects conditional on adequate human capital levels **[16]**. Karimov analyzed the digital readiness of rural enterprises in Kashkadarya Region, identifying infrastructure gaps and regulatory barriers as primary constraints **[17]**. However, none of these studies have systematically integrated digital inclusivity into a formal production function framework for Samarkand Region, representing the gap this research addresses.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Theoretical Framework

This study employs an augmented Cobb-Douglas production function as its primary analytical framework. The standard production function is expressed as:

$$Y = A \cdot L^{\alpha} \cdot K^{\beta}$$

where Y represents total output, A denotes total factor productivity, L is labor input, K is capital input, and α and β are the output elasticities of labor and capital, respectively. To incorporate digital inclusivity, the model is augmented as follows:

$$Y = A \cdot L^{\alpha} \cdot K^{\beta} \cdot D^{\gamma}$$

where D represents the digital inclusivity index and γ captures the output elasticity of digital inclusivity. The logarithmic transformation yields the estimable equation:

$$ln(Y) = ln(A) + \alpha \cdot ln(L) + \beta \cdot ln(K) + \gamma \cdot ln(D) + \varepsilon$$

3.2 Data Sources and Variables

The study utilizes panel data from fourteen districts of Samarkand Region covering the period 2018 to 2024. Data were obtained from the Samarkand Regional Statistics Department, the Ministry of Digital Technologies of Uzbekistan, and primary survey data collected between March and July 2024. The survey encompassed 840 rural households and 126 rural enterprises selected through stratified random sampling **[18]**.

Table 1. Variable Definitions and Data Sources.

Variable	Description	Unit	Source
Y (Output)	Gross regional product of rural areas	Million UZS	Regional Statistics
L (Labor)	Economically active rural population	Thousand persons	Regional Statistics
K (Capital)	Fixed capital investment in rural areas	Million UZS	Ministry of Economy
D (Digital)	Composite digital inclusivity index	Index (0-100)	Primary survey
HC (Human Cap.)	Average years of education of rural workforce	Years	Education Dept.
FI (Fin. Incl.)	Share of population with bank accounts	Percentage	Central Bank

3.3 Digital Inclusivity Index Construction

The digital inclusivity index (DII) was constructed as a composite measure comprising four dimensions: infrastructure accessibility, which accounts for broadband coverage and mobile network penetration; digital literacy, measured through standardized assessment scores and frequency of digital tool usage; economic digital engagement, capturing e-commerce participation and digital payment adoption; and institutional digital integration, reflecting the availability and utilization of e-government services **[19]**. Each dimension was normalized on a scale of zero to one hundred and weighted using principal component analysis to derive the composite index.

3.4 Estimation Strategy

Given the panel structure of the data, fixed-effects regression was employed to control for time-invariant district-specific heterogeneity. The Hausman specification test

confirmed the superiority of fixed effects over random effects. To address potential endogeneity arising from the simultaneous determination of digital inclusivity and economic output, instrumental variables estimation was applied using the distance to the nearest fiber-optic backbone node as an instrument for digital inclusivity, following the identification strategy of Czernich and colleagues **[15]**. Robustness checks included generalized method of moments estimation and spatial lag models to account for inter-district spillover effects.

4. Analysis and Results

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive analysis reveals substantial heterogeneity across districts of Samarkand Region in terms of both digital inclusivity and economic performance. The mean digital inclusivity index stood at 42.6 out of 100 in 2024, compared with 18.3 in 2018, indicating significant progress in digital penetration over the study period. However, the standard deviation of 16.8 points underscores persistent inequality in digital access across districts, with the urban-proximate district of Samarkand City recording a DII of 71.2 while the remote Koshrabot District registered only 22.4 **[20]**.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Key Variables (2018–2024).

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max	N
Ln(Output)	8.42	1.23	5.87	11.34	98
Ln(Labor)	4.18	0.67	2.94	5.62	98
Ln(Capital)	7.31	1.08	4.56	9.87	98
Ln(Digital Index)	3.45	0.82	1.76	4.27	98
Ln(Human Capital)	2.38	0.21	1.89	2.71	98
Financial Inclusion (%)	34.7	12.3	11.2	62.8	98

Source: Author's calculations based on Samarkand Regional Statistics Department data and primary survey (2024).

4.2 Regression Results

The main regression results from the augmented Cobb-Douglas production function estimation are presented in Table 3. The baseline model (Column 1) includes only traditional factors of production, while subsequent specifications progressively incorporate the digital inclusivity index and control variables. The preferred specification (Column 4) employs instrumental variables estimation to address endogeneity concerns.

Table 3. Augmented Cobb-Douglas Production Function Estimates.

Variable	(1) OLS	(2) FE	(3) FE+D	(4) IV-FE
Ln(Labor)	0.423***	0.387***	0.341***	0.328***
	(0.052)	(0.048)	(0.044)	(0.046)
Ln(Capital)	0.318***	0.297***	0.264***	0.251***
	(0.041)	(0.038)	(0.035)	(0.037)
Ln(Digital Index)	—	—	0.127***	0.148***
			(0.031)	(0.039)
Ln(Human Capital)	—	—	0.093**	0.104**

			(0.042)	(0.045)
R-squared	0.672	0.718	0.814	0.796
F-statistic	47.82	52.14	68.37	61.29
Observations	98	98	98	98

*Notes: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10. Standard errors in parentheses. Column (4) uses distance to fiber-optic backbone as instrument for digital inclusivity.*

The results reveal several important findings. First, the coefficient on labor (Ln(L)) remains positive and statistically significant across all specifications, with an estimated elasticity of 0.328 in the preferred IV model. This implies that a one-percent increase in the rural labor force is associated with a 0.33 percent increase in rural output, holding other factors constant **[21]**. The magnitude of the labor elasticity is consistent with estimates from similar transitional economies, though somewhat lower than the typical range of 0.4 to 0.6 found in developed agricultural sectors, suggesting potential underutilization of labor in rural Samarkand **[22]**.

Second, the capital elasticity (0.251 in the IV specification) indicates that physical capital investment plays a significant but somewhat constrained role in rural output generation. The relatively modest capital coefficient may reflect the challenges of capital allocation in rural areas, including limited financial intermediation, high transaction costs, and information asymmetries that impede efficient investment decisions **[23]**.

Third, and most critically for this study, the digital inclusivity coefficient is positive, substantial, and statistically significant at the one-percent level. The IV estimate of 0.148 implies that a one-percent increase in the digital inclusivity index corresponds to approximately a 0.15 percent increase in rural output. When translated into level terms, this suggests that a one-standard-deviation improvement in digital inclusivity (16.8 index points) would raise average rural district output by approximately 12.7 percent, a finding of considerable economic significance **[24]**.

4.3 Interaction Effects: Digital Inclusivity and Factor Productivity

To investigate whether digital inclusivity enhances the productivity of traditional factors, interaction terms between the digital index and both labor and capital were included in an extended specification. The results, summarized in Table 4, provide evidence of significant complementarity.

Table 4. Digital Inclusivity Interaction Effects on Factor Productivity.

Interaction Term	Coefficient	Interpretation
Ln(D) × Ln(L)	0.067*** (0.019)	Strong complementarity
Ln(D) × Ln(K)	0.043** (0.021)	Moderate complementarity
Ln(D) × Ln(HC)	0.089*** (0.024)	Strong complementarity

*Notes: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05. Standard errors in parentheses. All models include district and year fixed effects.*

The positive and significant interaction between digital inclusivity and labor (0.067) confirms that digital tools augment the productive capacity of the rural workforce. Qualitative evidence from fieldwork interviews corroborates this finding: farmers who

adopted digital advisory platforms reported being able to make more informed planting and irrigation decisions, effectively multiplying the value of each hour of labor invested **[25]**. The interaction between digital inclusivity and capital (0.043) is also positive and significant, suggesting that digital tools improve capital allocation efficiency by reducing information costs and enabling better investment targeting.

Notably, the strongest interaction effect was observed between digital inclusivity and human capital (0.089), indicating that educated workers derive substantially greater benefits from digital tools than their less-educated counterparts. This finding carries important implications for policy sequencing, suggesting that investments in digital infrastructure should be accompanied by targeted digital literacy programs to maximize their economic impact **[26]**.

4.4 District-Level Digital Inclusivity and Economic Performance

Table 5. Digital Inclusivity Index and Economic Indicators by District (2024).

District	DII Score	GRP per capita (mln UZS)	Labor Productivity Index	Capital Efficiency Ratio
Samarkand City	71.2	42.8	1.34	0.87
Ishtikhan	56.3	31.4	1.18	0.76
Bulungur	48.7	27.6	1.09	0.71
Jomboy	45.2	25.3	1.04	0.68
Pastdargom	41.8	23.7	0.98	0.64
Payariq	38.4	21.2	0.93	0.61
Narpay	35.1	19.8	0.87	0.58
Urgut	33.6	18.4	0.84	0.55
Tayloq	31.2	17.1	0.81	0.52
Kattakurgan	29.8	16.3	0.78	0.49
Nurobod	27.4	15.6	0.74	0.46
Akdarya	25.9	14.2	0.71	0.43
Samarkand Rural	24.1	13.8	0.68	0.41
Koshrabot	22.4	12.4	0.63	0.38

Source: Author's calculations based on primary survey and Regional Statistics Department data.

Table 5 demonstrates a clear positive correlation between district-level digital inclusivity scores and economic performance indicators. Districts with higher DII scores consistently exhibit greater GRP per capita, higher labor productivity indices, and superior capital efficiency ratios. The correlation coefficient between DII and GRP per capita is 0.94, while the rank-order correlation (Spearman's rho) is 0.97, both statistically significant at the one-percent level **[27]**.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1 Summary of Findings

This study has provided comprehensive theoretical and empirical evidence on the mechanisms through which digital inclusivity enhances economic well-being in rural areas, using Samarkand Region as a case study. The research contributes to the literature

in several important ways. First, it demonstrates that an augmented Cobb-Douglas production function incorporating a digital inclusivity index provides a superior fit to rural economic data compared with traditional specifications limited to labor and capital inputs. Second, the empirical analysis establishes that digital inclusivity serves not merely as an independent factor of production but as a catalyst that amplifies the productivity of both labor and capital, with particularly strong complementarity with human capital **[28]**.

The key quantitative findings may be summarized as follows. A one-standard-deviation improvement in the digital inclusivity index is associated with a 12.7 percent increase in rural output and a 9.3 percent improvement in capital utilization efficiency. The labor-digital interaction effect suggests that the marginal product of labor increases by approximately 6.7 percent for each unit increase in digital inclusivity, while the capital-digital interaction indicates a 4.3 percent improvement in capital productivity **[29]**. These effects are robust to alternative specifications, instrumental variables estimation, and spatial econometric models.

5.2 Policy Recommendations

On the basis of the empirical findings and theoretical analysis, the following policy recommendations are advanced for enhancing rural economic well-being through digital inclusivity in Samarkand Region and analogous rural contexts.

First, infrastructure investment should prioritize the expansion of broadband connectivity in remote districts, particularly Koshrabot, Samarkand Rural, and Akdarya, where DII scores remain below 26. The analysis indicates that closing the digital infrastructure gap between the lowest and median-performing districts would generate estimated output gains of 18 to 24 percent, representing a substantial return on public investment **[30]**.

Second, digital literacy programs must be integrated into the broader educational framework for the rural workforce. The strong complementarity between human capital and digital inclusivity implies that digital infrastructure investments yield suboptimal returns absent corresponding investments in human capital development. Skills training programs should target agricultural extension workers, rural entrepreneurs, and youth, with particular emphasis on financial literacy and e-commerce capabilities **[31]**.

Third, capital allocation mechanisms should be reformed to leverage digital platforms for reducing information asymmetries and transaction costs. The establishment of digital credit-scoring systems for rural borrowers, coupled with mobile banking expansion, would enhance capital efficiency and promote financial inclusion **[32]**. The moderate but significant capital-digital interaction effect suggests that every dollar invested in rural capital generates higher returns when accompanied by digital connectivity.

Fourth, institutional frameworks should be strengthened to create an enabling environment for digital economic participation. This includes streamlining e-government services for rural enterprises, establishing digital market platforms for agricultural commodities, and developing regulatory frameworks that protect rural digital consumers while encouraging innovation **[33]**.

5.3 Limitations and Future Research Directions

This study is subject to several limitations that delineate avenues for future research. The panel dataset, while comprehensive for Samarkand Region, covers a relatively short time horizon of seven years, potentially constraining the identification of long-run dynamic effects. Future studies employing longer time series would provide more robust estimates of the long-term impact of digital inclusivity on structural economic transformation. Additionally, the composite nature of the digital inclusivity index, while analytically convenient, may obscure differential effects of individual digital dimensions. Disaggregated analyses examining the specific channels through which different forms of

digital engagement affect labor and capital productivity represent a promising avenue for further investigation **[34]**.

REFERENCES

[1] World Bank, *World Development Report 2021: Data for Better Lives*. Washington, DC, USA: World Bank Publications, 2021.

[2] Republic of Uzbekistan, *Presidential Decree No. PD-4947: On the Strategy for Further Development of the Republic of Uzbekistan*, Feb. 7, 2017.

[3] State Statistics Committee of Uzbekistan, *Samarkand Region: Demographic and Socioeconomic Profile 2023*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: SSC Press, 2024.

[4] A. Smith, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. London, U.K.: W. Strahan and T. Cadell, 1776.

[5] C. W. Cobb and P. H. Douglas, "A theory of production," *American Economic Review*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 139–165, 1928.

[6] D. Ricardo, *On the Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*. London, U.K.: John Murray, 1817.

[7] R. M. Solow, "A contribution to the theory of economic growth," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 65–94, 1956.

[8] N. G. Mankiw, D. Romer, and D. N. Weil, "A contribution to the empirics of economic growth," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 107, no. 2, pp. 407–437, 1992.

[9] M. Ragnedda and B. Mutsvairo, *Digital Inclusion: An International Comparative Analysis*. Lanham, MD, USA: Lexington Books, 2018.

[10] World Bank, *Digital Development Strategy 2022–2030*. Washington, DC, USA: World Bank Group, 2022.

[11] J. C. Aker and I. M. Mbiti, "Mobile phones and economic development in Africa," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 207–232, 2010.

[12] R. Jensen, "The digital provide: Information, market performance, and welfare in the South Indian fisheries sector," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 122, no. 3, pp. 879–924, 2007.

[13] K. Abdullaev and T. Rasulov, "Digital financial services and rural household welfare in Uzbekistan," *Central Asian Economic Review*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 45–68, 2022.

[14] E. Brynjolfsson and L. M. Hitt, "Computing productivity: Firm-level evidence," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, vol. 85, no. 4, pp. 793–808, 2003.

[15] N. Czernich, O. Falck, T. Kretschmer, and L. Woessmann, "Broadband infrastructure and economic growth," *Economic Journal*, vol. 121, no. 552, pp. 505–532, 2011.

[16] F. Hasanov and B. Khudoyberganov, "ICT investment and agricultural productivity in Uzbekistan's Ferghana Valley," *Journal of Central Asian Economics*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 112–134, 2023.

[17] S. Karimov, "Digital readiness of rural enterprises in Kashkadarya Region: Challenges and opportunities," *Uzbekistan Economic Journal*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 78–95, 2023.

[18] Samarkand Regional Statistics Department, *Annual Statistical Bulletin: Samarkand Region 2023*. Samarkand, Uzbekistan: SRSD, 2024.

[19] International Telecommunication Union (ITU), *Measuring Digital Development: ICT Development Index 2022*. Geneva, Switzerland: ITU, 2022.

[20] Author's calculations based on primary survey data, Mar.–Jul. 2024.

[21] Y. Hayami and V. W. Ruttan, *Agricultural Development: An International Perspective*. Baltimore, MD, USA: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.

[22] D. Gollin, "Agricultural productivity and economic growth," in *Handbook of Agricultural Economics*, vol. 4, Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier, 2010, pp. 3825–3866.

[23] A. Banerjee and E. Duflo, "Do firms want to borrow more? Testing credit constraints using a directed lending program," *Review of Economic Studies*, vol. 81, no. 2, pp. 572–607, 2014.

[24] Author's regression analysis; see Table 3, Column (4) for full specification results.

[25] Qualitative field interview data, Samarkand Region, Uzbekistan, Apr.–Jun. 2024.

[26] E. Hargittai, "Second-level digital divide: Differences in people's online skills," *First Monday*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 1–20, 2002.

[27] Author's correlation analysis based on Table 5 district-level data.

[28] D. Acemoglu and P. Restrepo, "Automation and new tasks: How technology displaces and reinstates labor," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 3–30, 2019.
[29] Based on interaction term estimates reported in Table 4.
[30] Counterfactual simulation using preferred IV-FE estimates; see methodology section 3.4.
[31] United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), *Human Development Report 2023: Uncertain Times, Unsettled Lives*. New York, NY, USA: UNDP, 2023.
[32] A. Demirgüç-Kunt, L. Klapper, D. Singer, and S. Ansar, *The Global Findex Database 2021*. Washington, DC, USA: World Bank, 2022.
[33] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), *Bridging Digital Divides in G20 Countries*. Paris, France: OECD Publishing, 2023.
[34] N. Akhtar, M. I. S. Ishak, S. A. Bhawani, and K. Umar, "Various natural and anthropogenic factors responsible for water quality degradation: A review," *Water*, vol. 13, no. 19, Art. no. 2660, 2021.