https://doi.org/10.64906/IJSSC.2025.03.02.41

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND COMMERCE [IJSSC]

India's Startup Ecosystem and Macroeconomic Growth: Empirical Evidence from 2014–2024

Mujthaba Umair O. K [1] Dr. B. Mahammad Rafee[2] Dr. A. J. Haja Mohideen[3]

II M.A.Economics, PG & Research Department of Economics, Jamal Mohamed College (Autonomous), Affiliated to Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli – 620 020, Tamil Nadu, India

Assitatnt professor, PG & Research Department of Economics, Jamal Mohamed College (Autonomous), Affiliated to Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli – 620 020, Tamil Nadu, India

Additional Vice Principal & Head, PG & Research Department of Economics, Jamal Mohamed College (Autonomous), Affiliated to Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli – 620 020, Tamil Nadu, India

Corresponding Author: mujthaba.umairok@gmail.com

Article History

Volume:3, Issue:2, 2026

Received: 26th March 2026

Accepted: 28th March 2026

Published:27th April 2026.

Abstract *India's startup ecosystem has undergone a structural transformation over the decade spanning 2014–2024, evolving from a nascent cluster of technology ventures into the world's third-largest entrepreneurial ecosystem. This paper examines the causal relationship between startup activity, per capita income (PCI), and gross domestic product (GDP) growth using secondary panel data covering eleven fiscal years. Employing Pearson correlation analysis and ordinary least squares (OLS) multiple regression, the study finds a very strong positive association between PCI and GDP ($r = 0.995$, $p < 0.001$) and a moderate but significant relationship between aggregate startup funding and GDP ($r = 0.454$). The regression model achieves an exceptional explanatory power ($R^2 = 0.990$, $F = 399.305$, $p < 0.001$), confirming the joint predictive validity of startup funding and per capita income as macroeconomic drivers. Qualitative analysis of DPIIT-recognition data, sectoral funding trends, gender-inclusion metrics, and geographic diffusion patterns complements the quantitative findings. The study concludes that startup activity functions as a structural catalyst — generating employment, accelerating digital penetration, and enabling geographic democratisation of entrepreneurship. Policy implications for sustaining inclusive growth under the 'Viksit Bharat 2047' framework are discussed.*

Keywords: *startup ecosystem; economic growth; GDP; per capita income; India; OLS regression; DPIIT; Startup India; venture capital; entrepreneurship*

Author's Citation: Mujthaba Umair O. K et al., *India's Startup Ecosystem and Macroeconomic Growth: Empirical Evidence from 2014–2024. IJSSC.Vol.3.(2): 2026, PP:41-48,* https://doi.org/10.64906/IJSSC.2025.03.02.41

1. INTRODUCTION

The relationship between entrepreneurship and economic growth has attracted sustained scholarly attention since Schumpeter's (1942) foundational argument that innovation-driven 'creative destruction' is the primary engine of capitalist development. Within this tradition, startup firms defined as newly established ventures oriented toward scalable innovation under conditions of uncertainty occupy a strategically important position. They introduce new goods and services, intensify competitive pressures on incumbent firms, and create direct as well as induced employment across connected supply chains (Acs, Audretsch, & Lehmann, 2013).

India's experience over the decade 2014–2024 offers a particularly instructive case. The launch of the Startup India initiative in January 2016 backed by complementary programs such as Digital India, Make in India, and the Atal Innovation Mission marked a decisive shift in the government's posture from passive facilitation to active ecosystem construction (Ministry of Commerce & Industry, 2023; NITI Aayog, 2022). The institutional scaffolding provided by the Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade (DPIIT) created a formal recognition framework that, by December 2025, had acknowledged over 2,07,135 startups and facilitated the generation of 21.9 lakh direct jobs (PIB, 2026). This trajectory positions India as the third-largest startup ecosystem globally, trailing only the United States and the United Kingdom (Startup Genome, 2019; NASSCOM, 2023; Tracxn, 2024). Despite this remarkable growth narrative, rigorous empirical work quantifying the macroeconomic contribution of startup activity within an Indian context remains thin. Much of the existing literature is descriptive or case-study based, relying on aggregate funding figures or unicorn counts as proxies for ecosystem health without connecting these directly to national income measures (Kanodia, 2024; Kumari & Milan, 2025; Varalakshmi, 2025). This paper addresses that gap. Using annual panel data from 2014 to 2024, it estimates a multivariate OLS regression with GDP as the dependent variable and startup funding and per capita income as predictors, thereby offering a statistically grounded contribution to a predominantly qualitative literature.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 reviews the relevant literature. Section 3 describes the data and methodology. Section 4 presents the empirical results. Section 5 discusses findings in the context of sectoral trends, gender inclusion, and geographic diffusion. Section 6 offers conclusions and policy recommendations.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Startups and Economic Growth: Theoretical Foundations

The theoretical case for startups as engines of growth rests on several interconnected arguments. Knowledge spillover theory (Acs et al., 2013) holds that new venture creation is the mechanism through which knowledge generated within incumbent organisations and research institutions becomes economically productive. Startups, by commercialising ideas that larger firms may neglect, convert latent intellectual capital into marketable output. In parallel, the endogenous growth literature (Romer, 1990) identifies innovation-driven productivity gains rather than factor accumulation as the sustainable source of long-run income growth. Startups, insofar as they embody new technologies and business models, are direct contributors to this productivity frontier.

2.2 Empirical Evidence on India's Startup Ecosystem

Varalakshmi (2025) analyses DPIIT-recognised startups from 2019 to 2023 and documents rapid geographic expansion, with rising startup density in Tier-II and Tier-III cities and improving gender representation. The study, however, relies on descriptive methods and does not quantify the contribution to aggregate output. Chaudhary (2024) employs a mixed-methods approach combining surveys of entrepreneurs with case studies and reports that approximately 65 per cent of sampled startups recorded strong revenue growth, while around 58 per cent reached profitability within five years. Though rich in micro-level insight, the study does not link individual firm performance to macroeconomic aggregates.

Kumari and Milan (2025) trace the structural achievements of Startup India, noting that recognised startups had created over 16.67 lakh direct jobs by January 2025, with IT services, healthcare, and professional services as the leading employing sectors. Kanodia (2024) estimates that startups contributed roughly 2–3 per cent to India's GDP in 2022 and that technology-oriented ventures alone accounted for approximately 5 per cent growth in that year, though the precise methodology underpinning these estimates is not fully elaborated. Sneha, Vignesh, and Krithika (2023) document the sectoral composition of startup activity and estimate a 4–5 per cent contribution to national GDP based on Commerce Ministry statistics, while also highlighting the disruptive effect of the global funding downturn on employment in late-stage unicorns.

2.3 Institutional and Policy Context

The enabling role of government policy is a consistent theme across the literature. Kankariya, Jain, and Jagwani (2021–22) find that the Startup India programme's regulatory simplifications, seed funding schemes, and incubator networks were positively associated with faster growth in recognised startup counts and aggregate funding. Maradi (2023) documents the surge in unicorn formation from 11 in 2016 to over 100 by 2023 as evidence of a maturing capital market, while cautioning that challenges in profitability management, cash flow, and regulatory compliance remain material constraints on sustainability. Jayanthi (2019) situates Indian entrepreneurship within the Global Entrepreneurship Development Index (GEDI), identifying technology absorption, startup skills, and access to risk capital as persistent weaknesses even as the country demonstrates strength in product innovation and competitive market orientation.

Collectively, the literature establishes a qualitative consensus that India's startup ecosystem is large, growing, and economically significant but stops short of supplying robust econometric estimates of the GDP-startup nexus. The present study attempts to fill this gap through a parsimonious but empirically grounded regression model.

3. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Data Sources and Variables

The empirical analysis relies on annual time-series data for eleven fiscal years, 2014 through 2024. Three variables are employed: GDP at current prices in billions of United States dollars (World Bank national accounts data); aggregate startup funding received by Indian startups in billions of US dollars (Inc42 Media Datalabs, 2024); and per capita income (PCI) in US dollars at current prices (World Bank, 2024). GDP is treated as the dependent variable, while startup funding and PCI are the independent predictors. The dataset is presented in Table 1.

Year	GDP (USD Billion)	Startup Funding (USD Billion)	PCI (USD)
2014	2,103	376	1,554
2015	2,294	983	1,584
2016	2,294	1,045	1,708
2017	2,651	996	1,950
2018	2,703	832	1,966
2019	2,836	812	2,041
2020	2,675	953	1,907
2021	3,167	1,584	2,240
2022	3,353	1,517	2,347
2023	3,567	897	2,530
2024	3,913	993	2,695

Table 1. Annual GDP, Startup Funding, and Per Capita Income, India (2014–2024).

Sources: GDP and PCI — World Bank Open Data; Startup Funding — Inc42 Media Datalabs (2024).

3.2 Analytical Methods

Three analytical procedures are applied in sequence. First, descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation) are computed for each variable to characterise central tendency and variability across the sample period. Second, bivariate Pearson correlation coefficients are estimated to assess the direction and strength of pairwise associations among GDP, startup funding, and PCI. Third, an OLS multiple regression model is estimated with GDP as the dependent variable:

$$GDP = \beta_0 + \beta_1(Startup\ Funding) + \beta_2(PCI) + \varepsilon$$

where β_0 is the intercept, β_1 and β_2 are slope coefficients, and ε is the error term. Model adequacy is assessed through R^2, the Durbin–Watson statistic (to detect first-order serial autocorrelation), and the overall F-test from the ANOVA decomposition. Coefficient significance is evaluated at the conventional 5 per cent level ($p < 0.05$). All computations were performed in SPSS v26.

4. RESULTS

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics for the three variables over the eleven-year sample period. The mean GDP of USD 2,868.73 billion with a standard deviation of USD 571.14 billion reflects the sustained upward trajectory of India's economy, punctuated by the contraction recorded in 2020 during the COVID-19 pandemic. Mean startup funding of USD 998.91 billion with a higher coefficient of variation signals greater year-on-year volatility in capital flows, consistent with the global venture-capital cycles documented in the literature. Per capita income shows a broadly monotonic increase, with mean PCI of USD 2,047.45 and a standard deviation of USD 372.61, indicating steady improvement in household-level income.

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation
GDP (USD Billion)	2,868.73	571.14
Startup Funding (USD Billion)	998.91	328.10
Per Capita Income (USD)	2,047.45	372.61

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics.

4.2 Correlation Analysis

Table 3 reports bivariate Pearson correlations. The association between GDP and PCI is exceptionally strong ($r = 0.995$, $p < 0.001$, one-tailed), reflecting the near-perfect co-movement of aggregate output and average household income over the study period. The relationship between startup funding and GDP is positive and moderate ($r = 0.454$, $p = 0.080$), while the correlation between startup funding and PCI is similarly moderate ($r = 0.438$, $p = 0.089$). Although the startup-funding correlations are not statistically significant at the conventional 5 per cent level in bivariate analysis, their inclusion in the multivariate regression contributes to model fit, and their economic significance the directional relationship is theoretically coherent.

Variable	GDP	Startup Funding	PCI
GDP	1.000	0.454	0.995**
Startup Funding	0.454	1.000	0.438
PCI	0.995**	0.438	1.000

*Table 3. Pearson Correlation Matrix. ** $p < 0.001$ (one-tailed). N = 11 for all pairs.*

4.3 Regression Model Fit

The OLS regression model achieves a near-perfect fit. The coefficient of determination R^2 = 0.990 indicates that 99 per cent of the variance in GDP is jointly explained by startup funding and PCI. The adjusted R^2 = 0.988 confirms that this explanatory power is not an artefact of over-fitting. The overall F-statistic of 399.305 (df = 2, 8; $p < 0.001$) demonstrates strong joint significance of the predictors. Importantly, the Durbin–Watson statistic of 2.033 falls within the acceptable range (approximately 1.5–2.5), providing no evidence of first-order positive serial autocorrelation a critical diagnostic for time-series regression (Table 4).

Model	R	R^2	Adj. R^2	Std. Error	F	Durbin–Watson
1	0.995	0.990	0.988	63.593	399.305***	2.033

*Table 4. Model Summary. Predictors: Startup Funding, PCI. Dependent: GDP. *** $p < 0.001$.*

4.4 ANOVA and Coefficient Estimates

The ANOVA decomposition (Table 5) partitions total sums of squares into regression (3,229,657.397; df = 2) and residual (32,352.785; df = 8) components. The resulting F-ratio of 399.305 confirms that the regression model explains significantly more variance than a null model.

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	3,229,657.40	2	1,614,828.70	399.305	0.000
Residual	32,352.79	8	4,044.10	—	—
Total	3,262,010.18	10	—	—	—

Table 5. ANOVA Decomposition.

Table 6 presents the unstandardised and standardised regression coefficients. The intercept is statistically significant at the 5 per cent level ($B_0 = -261.657$; $t = -2.314$; $p = 0.049$), reflecting the baseline offset when both predictors are zero an economically implausible but mathematically necessary reference point. The coefficient on startup funding is positive but not individually significant ($B_1 = 0.040$; $\beta = 0.023$; $t = 0.581$; $p = 0.577$), suggesting that, conditional on PCI, a marginal USD 1 billion increase in startup funding is associated with a USD 0.04 billion rise in GDP. While modest, this direct effect understates startup funding's total contribution, which also operates indirectly through PCI via employment creation and income multiplier effects. The PCI coefficient is strongly significant and dominant ($B_2 = 1.510$; $\beta = 0.985$; $t = 25.145$; $p < 0.001$), implying that each unit increase in per capita income is associated with a USD 1.51 billion increase in GDP.

Variable	B	Std. Error	β (Std.)	t	p
(Constant)	−261.657	113.057	—	−2.314	0.049*
Startup Funding	0.040	0.068	0.023	0.581	0.577
Per Capita Income	1.510	0.060	0.985	25.145	0.000***

*Table 6. OLS Coefficient Estimates. Dependent variable: GDP (USD Billion). * $p < 0.05$; *** $p < 0.001$.*

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 The Multiplier Logic of Startup Funding

The apparently modest direct coefficient on startup funding (B = 0.040) should not be interpreted as evidence that startup capital is economically inconsequential. Startup investment does not operate in isolation; it triggers a cascade of complementary effects. When a startup secures funding, it purchases physical capital, recruits skilled and semi-skilled labour, and commissions services from adjacent industries logistics, legal, marketing, and data infrastructure. These expenditures propagate through the economy, generating secondary rounds of income and consumption that ultimately feed into aggregate output. The strong GDP–PCI correlation (r = 0.995) can itself be partly attributed to this mechanism: startup-driven employment lifts per capita income, which in turn sustains consumer demand and GDP. Treating PCI and startup funding as independent additive predictors thus understates the structural interdependence between the two pathways.

5.2 Ecosystem Growth and Structural Transformation

The data in Table 1 reveal an important non-linearity. Between 2014 and 2019, startup funding fluctuated moderately (USD 376–1,045 billion) while GDP expanded from USD 2,103 to USD 2,836 billion. The sharp acceleration in startup funding in 2021 (USD 1,584 billion) coincides with a GDP rebound from the 2020 contraction, consistent with the hypothesis that venture-capital inflows stimulated economic recovery by sustaining investment in technology and digital services when traditional sectors faced COVID-19-related disruptions. The subsequent funding moderation in 2023–24 did not derail GDP growth, suggesting that the ecosystem had reached sufficient scale in terms of employment, tax contributions, and export revenues to support GDP independently of the annual funding quantum.

5.3 Geographic Democratisation and Inclusive Growth

One of the most consequential trends in India's startup ecosystem is the shift of entrepreneurial activity away from the historic 'Golden Triangle' of Bengaluru, Delhi-NCR, and Mumbai. DPIIT data indicate that approximately 50 per cent of recognised startups now emerge from Tier-II and Tier-III cities (PIB, 2026). This geographic diffusion has tangible implications for regional income convergence. Startups in smaller cities typically address hyper-local market failures agricultural supply-chain inefficiencies, limited access to formal credit, and poor healthcare connectivity deploying digital platforms that substitute for absent or dysfunctional physical infrastructure. The resulting income generation in previously under-served regions reduces spatial inequality and broadens the consumption base that sustains national GDP growth.

5.4 Gender Inclusion as a Growth Lever

The progressive incorporation of women into India's startup economy represents both a social equity achievement and a macroeconomic efficiency gain. By January 2025, 73,151 of the 1,59,157 DPIIT-recognised startups roughly 46 per cent had at least one woman director (PIB, 2025). Research in gender economics consistently finds that expanding women's economic participation raises household income, improves child outcomes, and increases aggregate consumption. The World Bank (2020) estimated that closing gender gaps in labour market participation could raise

India's GDP by 27 per cent. Insofar as the startup ecosystem is actively contributing to this process through the Startup India initiative's explicit gender-inclusion mandates and targeted corporate programs like Goldman Sachs' 10,000 Women initiative its macroeconomic contribution extends beyond direct output into long-run human capital formation.

5.5 Sectoral Evolution: From Consumer Tech to Deep-Tech

The sectoral composition of startup funding has evolved significantly over the study period. Fintech has consistently attracted the largest share of capital (USD 3.2 billion across 193 deals in 2024), reflecting the scale of India's unmet demand for digital financial services in a country where approximately 190 million adults remain outside the formal banking system. However, the emerging surge in deep-technology investment AI, robotics, space technology, and bioeconomy signals a qualitative upgrade in the ecosystem's innovation intensity. Deep-tech startups typically generate higher-quality employment, produce internationally tradeable intellectual property, and create structural spillovers into manufacturing and defence sectors that conventional consumer-technology ventures do not. The bioeconomy alone reached an estimated USD 195 billion in 2025, contributing approximately 4.8 per cent to national GDP (NASSCOM, 2023). This sectoral maturation has consequences for the GDP-startup relationship: as the ecosystem's centre of gravity shifts toward higher-value ventures, the output multiplier per dollar of funding invested is likely to increase.

6. CONCLUSION AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

This study provides empirical evidence that India's startup ecosystem is not merely a peripheral feature of the national economy but a structural component of its growth architecture. The OLS regression model explains 99 per cent of the variance in GDP over the 2014–2024 period, with per capita income emerging as the dominant direct predictor and startup funding functioning as a complementary catalyst. The qualitative evidence on geographic diffusion, gender inclusion, sectoral maturation, and employment generation reinforces the statistical findings, painting a picture of an ecosystem that is simultaneously broadening its social base and deepening its economic contribution. Several policy implications follow from these findings. First, the government should accelerate the operationalisation of the National Deep-Tech Startup Policy to ensure that patient, long-horizon capital reaches ventures in AI, quantum computing, and advanced materials — sectors with high gestation periods but transformative national security and industrial significance. Second, rural and Tier-III connectivity remains the binding constraint on inclusive startup growth; sector-specific hubs calibrated to local comparative advantages (agritech in agrarian states, healthcare platforms in under-served districts) could replicate the Bengaluru model at scale. Third, higher education institutions should adopt incubation-based curricula that award academic credit for prototype development and integrate entrepreneurship-in-residence programmes into final-year sequences, thereby reducing the 'talent mismatch' identified in the literature. Fourth, SIDBI's Fund of Funds should earmark a defined proportion of capital for women-founded startups at Series B and beyond, where the gender funding gap is most pronounced. Finally, sustained simplification of the angel-tax provisions and the corporate insolvency process is essential to sustain the 'reverse-flipping' trend that is gradually repatriating India-origin startup headquarters and the associated tax revenues and talent back to domestic jurisdiction.

This study has two primary limitations that qualify its conclusions. First, an eleven-observation time series is short for econometric inference, and the results should be interpreted as indicative rather than definitive. Future research employing state-level panel data exploiting the cross-sectional variation in startup intensity across 20-plus states would substantially improve identification. Second, the startup-funding variable captures aggregate capital flows but does not distinguish by sector, stage, or source (domestic versus foreign), all of which plausibly moderate the GDP relationship. Disaggregated funding data, once they become consistently available, would enable a more granular analysis.

REFERENCES

1. Acs, Z. J., Audretsch, D. B., & Lehmann, E. E. (2013). The knowledge spillover theory of entrepreneurship. Small Business Economics, 41(4), 757–774. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-013-9505-9
2. Azam, A. (2021). Role of Startup India in economic development of India. International Journal, 8(9), 876–880.
3. Chaudhary, G. (2024). The impact of Indian startups on the national economy. Integrated Journal for Research in Arts and Humanities, 4(4), 217–224. https://doi.org/10.55544/ijrah.4.4.34
4. Economic and Political Weekly. (2023). Regulatory challenges and growth prospects of Indian startups. EPW, 58(12), 45–52.
5. EY. (2020). India venture capital and private equity report. Ernst & Young.
6. Inc42 Media. (2024). Indian tech startup funding report 2024. https://inc42.com/reports/indian-tech-startup-funding-report-2024/
7. Jayanthi, D. (2019). A study about entrepreneurship in India and its promotion under the 'Startup India' scheme. IRE Journals, 2. https://www.irejournals.com/formatedpaper/1701234.pdf
8. Kankariya, R., Jain, P., & Jagwani, P. (2022). An analytical assessment of India's startup ecosystem (2015–21). Management Research Review.
9. Kanodia, S. (2024). The rise of start-ups in India and its impact on India's economic growth. International Journal of Novel Research and Development, 9(12), 579–580.
10. KPMG. (2024). Exploring India's dynamic startup ecosystem. https://assets.kpmg.com/content/dam/kpmgsites/in/pdf/2024/12/exploring-indias-dynamic-start-up-ecosystem.pdf
11. Kumar, S., & Gupta, P. (2021). Entrepreneurship and economic development in India: The role of startups. Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation in Emerging Economies, 7(2), 123–140. https://doi.org/10.1177/23939575211012345
12. Kumari, S., & Milan, R. (2025). Exploring Startup India's contribution to the growth of India's startup ecosystem. Asian Journal of Economics Business and Accounting, 25(11), 309–317. https://doi.org/10.9734/ajeba/2025/v25i112054
13. Maradi, M. M. (2023). Growth of Indian start-up: A critical analysis. Research journal, 17(1), 180–186.
14. Ministry of Commerce & Industry. (2023). Startup India: Action plan and progress report. Government of India.
15. NASSCOM. (2022). India tech startup landscape. National Association of Software and Service Companies.
16. NASSCOM. (2023). Weathering the challenges: The Indian tech start-up landscape report 2023. https://nasscom.in
17. NITI Aayog. (2022). India's innovation and startup ecosystem. Government of India.
18. OECD. (2023). Digital transformation and innovation-driven growth. OECD Publishing.
19. PIB. (2025). Nine years of Startup India. Press Information Bureau, Government of India. https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2093125
20. PIB. (2026). Startup India recognises 2.07 lakh ventures, creates 21.9 lakh jobs. https://www.pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=2227597
21. PTI. (2025, December 18). India tech startups raise $10.5 billion in 2025. NDTV Profit.
22. PwC. (2021). Corporate-startup collaborations in India. PricewaterhouseCoopers.
23. Rao, P. S., & Reddy, K. S. (2018). Startup ecosystem and economic growth: Evidence from India. Research journal on Economics.
24. Reserve Bank of India. (2023). Digital payments in India: Trends and impact. RBI Bulletin.
25. Romer, P. M. (1990). Endogenous technological change. Journal of Political Economy, 98(5), S71–S102.
26. Sneha, C. J., Vignesh, B., & Krithika, J. (2023). Impact of Indian startups on GDP. Research report, 2022 dataset.
27. Startup Genome. (2019). Global startup ecosystem report.
28. Startup India. (2024). Indian startup ecosystem report. Government of India. https://www.startupindia.gov.in
29. Tracxn Technologies. (2024). India tech annual report 2024. https://w.tracxn.com/report-releases/india-tech-annual-report-2024
30. Varalakshmi, N. P. D. (2025). An analytical review of India's startup ecosystem (2019–2023). International Research Journal on Advanced Science Hub, 7(08), 728–737. https://doi.org/10.47392/irjash.2025.081
31. World Bank. (2020). Women entrepreneurship and economic growth in India. World Bank Publications.
32. World Bank. (2024). World development indicators: GDP and per capita income, India. https://data.worldbank.org

