

A Theoretical Interpretation on the Transformation of the Macroeconomic Growth Paradigm of China from the Perspective of New Quality Productive Forces

Yuyao Zhang

Beijing National Accounting Institute, Beijing, China

Abstract: China's economy has maintained fast growth for many years and is currently at the stage of high-quality development. The old factor-driven growth paradigm is in a stagnant state, marginal returns are falling, and structural contradictions are piling up. Therefore, this situation calls for a systematic theoretical explanation. This study uses the political-economic framework of productive forces and relations of production as the basis. It first clarifies the meaning of the macroeconomic growth paradigm, an overall concept, and then sorts out the core features and the built-in limits of the old factor-driven model. Subsequently, this study analyzes the internal logic of how new quality productive forces push the paradigm to shift. This push is realized through four channels: transformation of growth momentum, restructuring of factors, structural change, and institutional adaptation. Subsequently, it examines the structural and institutional constraints encountered in the process, such as the allocation of innovation factors, path dependence, coordination of macroeconomic governance, and factor market reform. The conclusion of this study is that the essence of paradigm transformation is adaptive restructuring, which a qualitative leap in productive forces demands from the relations of production. Only by making the institutions work together, covering innovation systems, factor markets, macroeconomic governance, and industrial policy, can China realize the triple transformation of drivers, efficiency, and quality at a higher level, thereby solidifying the economic foundation for Chinese-style modernization.

Keywords: New Quality Productive Forces; Macroeconomic Growth Paradigm; High-Quality Development; Political Economy; Institutional Constraints

1. Introduction

The economy of China has already moved out of the rapid-growth phase and entered the high-quality development phase. The old growth paradigm that relied on factor inputs and ran for decades is now being squeezed from two sides: diminishing marginal returns and structural contradictions. Serious theoretical inquiry is no longer optional. Looking back at the course of more than four decades of reform and opening-up, the economy has achieved sustained rapid growth, and aggregate output has already been pushed to the front position of the world. However, after entering the new era, the internal and external conditions that supported domestic development have already undergone deep changes. The factor endowments, the expectation structures, and the international environment, all the conditions that the old growth model leaned on, have already been visibly recalibrated, and the foundation for that extensive outward expansion is being eroded [1]. To build a modern national-modern country in all respects, high-quality development is the primary task, and cultivating new quality productive forces has been identified as the pivotal lever to push that agenda forward. However, understood at a deeper level, this strategic deployment is not just a methods upgrade at the industrial level; it makes the entire country commit to carrying out systematic reshaping of the entire macroeconomic growth paradigm [2]. Therefore, the theoretical conclusion that follows is this: the profound transformation and reconstruction of the macroeconomic growth paradigm is the defining feature of China's transition from rapid growth to high-quality growth. This is the thesis of this paper.

A considerable body of scholarship has studied new quality productive forces from the perspectives of conceptual connotation, generative logic, and industrial pathways. On definitions, the prevailing view is as follows: new quality productive forces are an advanced

modality of productive forces that give full play to innovation-led leadership, break free of dependence on traditional growth paths, and meet the requirements of high-quality development [2]. On the measurement and empirical side, many studies have built multidimensional indicator systems to quantify the level of these productive forces and then analyzed the effects they produce on industrial structure, embedding in global value chains, and coordinated regional development. However, most of this work is at the meso-industrial and micro-actor levels. From a purely theoretical standpoint, the question of how new quality productive forces reshape the growth model inside the integral category of the macroeconomic growth paradigm remains underexplored. The gap lies here. The macroeconomic growth paradigm carries the overall determination of factor combinations, dynamic mechanisms, structural patterns, and institutional logics, and theoretical reflection carried out at this level holds an irreplaceable place in grasping the holistic picture of economic transformation [3]. If this level is skipped, only partial pieces can be seen.

Against these gaps in existing research, this paper draws on political economy to conduct an interpretive study at the level of pure theoretical mechanism. The argument goes as follows: first, it delimits the core overarching concept of the macroeconomic growth paradigm and specifies the political-economic theoretical foundation that matches the transformation of the Chinese growth paradigm; then, it analyzes the principal features and the inherent theoretical limitations of the traditional paradigm; on that basis, it elaborates the internal operative mechanism by which new quality productive forces drive paradigm transformation; next, it probes the various structural institutional constraints that are met along the way; and finally, it outlines the theoretical pathways and institutional construction scheme to advance the transformation. In contrast to existing empirical analyses, this study supplies a holistic theoretical framework that situates the impact of new quality productive forces on the growth paradigm inside the macroscopic logic of the contradictory movement between productive forces and relations of production. This framework offers a more penetrating theoretical reference for analyzing economic transformation during Chinese-style modernization.

2. The Theoretical Connotation of New Quality Productive Forces and the Macroeconomic Growth Paradigm

2.1 Delimiting the Concept of the Macroeconomic Growth Paradigm

The concept of a paradigm comes from the philosophy of science; it denotes the theoretical frameworks, value standards, and operational norms that a research community jointly adheres to at a given stage. Bringing it into the study of economic growth serves one purpose: moving past the isolated examination of any single growth factor and instead systematically grasping the overall state of the factor combinations, dynamic mechanisms, structural patterns, and institutional logics that drive growth [4]. On this basis, this paper defines the macroeconomic growth paradigm as the systematic condensation of the fundamental ways and internal logics by which a country or region propels macroeconomic operations and growth, at a given stage of productive force development and under the corresponding social-institutional conditions. The concept involves, at minimum, four interrelated dimensions: on factor combination, which productive factor growth relies on and how they get allocated; on dynamic mechanism, whether the core source of growth is factor input and investment expansion or a rise in total factor productivity; on structural pattern, how the industrial system, demand structure, and supply-demand relations evolve; and on institutional logic, the economic system and governance framework that match the factor combinations, dynamic mechanisms, and structural patterns just laid out.

The macroeconomic growth paradigm is by no means a fixed, static category in the historical progression where the level of productive forces keeps advancing, and the paradigm itself undergoes successive leaps. The evolution of economic doctrine shows that classical political economy centered on labor and capital accumulation, neoclassical growth theory emphasized capital deepening and technological progress, and endogenous growth theory included knowledge, human capital, and innovation in the core explanatory framework of growth [4,5]. Each forward leap at the theoretical level came with substantive changes in the growth paradigm in practice. To correctly grasp the current paradigm transformation of China, it is necessary to understand it inside the overarching framework

of these multidimensional categories, and not confine it to the rise or fall of any single factor; it does not work in that way.

2.2 The Theoretical Determination of New Quality Productive Forces

From its inception, the concept of new productive forces is a pivotal innovative extension of the political-economic theory of productive forces, one that carries substantial theoretical substance. In its core determination, new quality productive forces rely on innovation to exercise a leading role, thereby breaking out of traditional growth models and developmental pathways of productive forces, and emerging as a new, advanced form of productive forces that meet the requirements of high-quality development [2]. The essential difference from traditional productive forces lies in a qualitative leap in the state of productive forces, not merely a quantitative expansion. The whole key lies in this point.

This qualitative leap is evident in at least three dimensions. First, innovation-led dominance: scientific and technological progress, especially disruptive technological innovation, becomes the primary driver of productive force development, and innovation is no longer an exogenous variable of growth; it is internalized as a core determination of the productive force system. Second, factor restructuring: new factors of production, such as data and advanced technology, become deeply embedded in the production system, recalibrating the allocation logic and combination patterns of traditional factors such as land, labor, and capital, and giving rise to new forms of production functions [3]. Third, industrial transformation: the in-depth upgrading of strategic emerging, future, and traditional industries proceeds in tandem, steering the overall industrial system toward greater sophistication, intelligence, and greenness.

New quality productive forces do not simply negate the value of traditional productive forces; they achieve sublation and transcendence while inheriting the rational core of the latter. Among their constituent parts, the new-quality technological modality centered on scientific and technological innovation also takes in the new industries, new models, and new growth drivers that such technologies spawn. The concept has already become a strategic orientation that bears on the overall situation of Chinese-style modernization and provides a new theoretical

reference for examining the developmental process of China's economic transformation [6].

2.3 The Theoretical Foundation of the Transformation of the Chinese Growth Paradigm

The core theoretical foundation of the transformation of the Chinese growth paradigm rests entirely on the political-economic framework of the dialectical unity of productive forces and relations of production. The principles of historical materialism make it clear that productive forces determine the basic form of relations of production, and relations of production in turn exert a reactionary influence on the development of productive forces once the development of productive forces exceeds the boundary that existing relations of production can accommodate; adaptive adjustment of the relations of production becomes an inexorable requirement for the continued advance of productive forces [7]. The growth paradigm transformation now underway in China is precisely the concrete manifestation of this law of contradictory movement in the new era. The cultivation and development of new quality productive forces objectively require the systematic reconstruction of those segments of the relations of production that fail to adapt to it; in essence, the transformation of the growth paradigm is the adaptive transformative demand that a qualitative leap in productive forces imposes on the relations of production.

The transformation of the Chinese growth paradigm has had distinct indigenous characteristics. Unlike the paradigm evolution of Western developed economies, which leans chiefly on the gradual self-unfolding of the market, China has not directly transplanted any ready-made developmental model. Rather, within the overall context of Chinese-style modernization, it has proactively adjusted its development mode through deliberate institutional design and policy guidance [6]. This institutional character of self-conscious transformation is a primary marker that distinguishes Chinese-style modernization from its Western counterpart, and it is also the theoretical vantage point from which this analysis proceeds.

3. China's Traditional Macroeconomic Growth Paradigm and Its Inherent Theoretical Limitations

3.1 The Overall Characteristics of the Traditional Paradigm

After a fairly long period of time after the reform and opening-up started, China's economic growth relied on a paradigm that took factor input as the base, this paradigm centered on scale and growth speed, its logic of factor allocation was fairly direct: it relied on sustained heavy investment in physical capital, relied on the supply of large amounts of cheap labor, and relied on the extensive use of natural resources such as land; in this way, it formed a development pattern of high input, high consumption, high emissions, and high growth [1]. Investment, especially fixed-asset investment, played a key role in pulling growth, the export-oriented strategy relied on foreign demand in a specific stage and produced visible effects; thus, a growth structure driven by the two engines of investment and exports was formed. The industrial system as a whole took scale expansion as its direction, manufacturing long sat in the middle and lower reaches of the value chain, and the development of services and high-end manufacturing was relatively slow. Although it was market-oriented, the economic system that supported this growth model maintained a strong capacity for government mobilization, and the local competition mechanism played a uniquely important role in shaping growth dynamics.

The rationality and inevitability of this traditional growth paradigm in the historically distinctive stage of rapid industrialization and urbanization must be assessed. This enabled China to build a complete modern industrial system within a relatively short span of time, achieve leapfrog growth in aggregate output, and accumulate a solid material foundation for the high-quality development that followed [1]. Every growth paradigm has its applicable historical range; this point is clear. Once factor conditions, demand structures, and the external environment undergo fundamental changes, the inherent limitations of the traditional paradigm will gradually emerge.

3.2 The Inherent Contradictions of the Traditional Paradigm

The old growth model has many limitations, and the core of these limitations is in a few deep internal contradictions. The law of diminishing marginal returns on factors is slowly taking effect. Capital stock keeps being piled up, and the marginal product of capital keeps falling.

Demographic changes make labor supply tighter and tighter. Therefore, a growth mode that only burns factor inputs has come to a dead end. If the old extensive-expansion path is kept, more and more factors must be mobilized to obtain ever smaller bits of growth, and both resource allocation efficiency and growth quality get squeezed hard. The mismatch between supply and demand is also clear. The supply system built under the old model was set mainly for large-batch, standardized middle-and-low-end needs, and it has difficulty in meeting the new personalized, high-quality, green demands. Therefore, a structural imbalance appears, in which low-end overcapacity sits together with insufficient high-end supply. The lock-in effect of path dependence also works in industrial upgrading. An industrial landscape built over a long period on low factor-cost advantages weakens the endogenous drive of enterprises to innovate and climb toward the higher ends of the value chain, and this forms a path dependence of low-end lock-in [1,3]. The contradiction between economic growth and green transformation is intensifying. The old paradigm over-consumed the carrying capacity of the ecological environment, which clearly runs against the requirements of ecological civilization. Extensive growth is becoming less sustainable.

By going through these internal contradictions, it can be seen that the factor base, demand structure, and institutional conditions that the traditional growth model relied on have all undergone profound changes. Its marginal costs continue to rise, while its marginal returns continue to fall; therefore, pushing forward the transformation of the growth paradigm has become an unavoidable requirement for realizing high-quality development.

3.3 The Limitations of the Macroeconomic Equilibrium Model under the Traditional Paradigm

The equilibrium model under traditional growth has fundamental problems at the macroeconomic equilibrium level. This model centers on investment-driven growth and relies on high savings and high investment to push aggregate demand outward and thereby enlarge output. However, a growth model with investment as its core engine carries the hidden risk of investment dependence. If reliance on investment is too heavy, the marginal efficiency of capital gets depressed, so that the stimulating effect of

investment on growth is weakened bit by bit. When the output generated by investment cannot be effectively converted into residents' consumption, the ratio between investment and consumption falls out of balance, and growth chronically moves away from the core engine of domestic demand, especially consumption demand.

This operating state makes macroeconomic equilibrium fragile. Once investment growth slows down in relative terms, the economy runs straight into downward pressure. Moreover, this equilibrium model concentrates on expansion at the aggregate level and pays little attention to structural optimization and the improvement of total factor productivity. If aggregate expansion cannot generate structural upgrading and efficiency gains, macroeconomic equilibrium sinks into a low-level equilibrium, and sustained healthy growth is difficult to find [5]. To break through the limits of the traditional macroeconomic equilibrium model, a fundamental conversion of the growth engine is needed, and this is precisely the historical mission that new quality productive forces are called upon to undertake.

4. The Internal Mechanism by Which New Quality Productive Forces Drive the Transformation of the Macroeconomic Growth Paradigm

4.1 The Mechanism of Engine Conversion

To determine whether a growth model has actually changed, the key point is to examine where the growth momentum comes from, that is, whether the source has shifted at its core. The old model relies on factor input as the main growth engine, but after new quality productive forces take shape, innovation becomes the leading driver, and total factor productivity replaces single-factor input as the core source that keeps the economy growing [2,3]. This engine replacement has deep meaning on the theory side: growth is no longer mainly about the piling up of quantity; it turns toward improvement in quality, that is, through technological progress, the building up of knowledge, and efficiency gains, a more effective output is obtained from the same set of inputs.

At the micro level, where things are actually done, disruptive technological innovation is the core hub that makes innovation-driven growth a reality. Scientific and technological innovation

pushes the technological level of production straight up, and through penetration, transformation, and recombination, it reshapes the way production is organized and resets the logic of factor allocation, which then makes the continuous climb of total factor productivity feasible. On the macro side, once innovation becomes the core source of growth, the quality, resilience, and sustainability of growth all improve fundamentally, and the growth model moves from a scale-and-speed type to a quality-and-efficiency type [3].

4.2 The Mechanism of Factor Restructuring

The second dimension comes down to this: the shift of the growth paradigm is to dismantle and rebuild the whole production factor system. New factors, such as data and advanced technology, have appeared everywhere and have been formally written into the growth accounting framework, and this is one of the most obvious signs of the development of productive forces at present [3]. These new factors are not the same as the old factors, and the difference is large. Among them, data is especially prominent. Data can be copied, and people can hardly be excluded from it; its marginal returns will rise instead of fall, and this means that data breaks through the diminishing returns constraint that has pressed on traditional factors for a long time, and thereby provides a new source of growth. Meanwhile, advanced technology can upgrade old factors and can even replace some of them completely, thereby pushing the efficiency frontier of the whole factor combination to a higher level.

This factor restructuring directly changes the way in which traditional factors are allocated and combined. Once the new factors take root in the existing system, the synergy between different factors will become obviously stronger. When data are combined with the traditional factors of capital, labor, and land, new production functions will appear, and new ways of creating value will also appear [3,8]. This reshuffling of the factor system rebuilds at its core the entire factor foundation on which economic growth stands, and this makes it possible in practice, not only in theory, for the growth paradigm to move away from the piling up of factors and move toward making all the factors work together in a coordinated and optimized way.

4.3 The Mechanism of Structural Change

The third part of this growth paradigm shift

occurs at the structural level and is deep. As new quality productive forces continue to develop, the industrial system is pushed into systematic transformation and upgrading; there is no way around it. Strategic emerging industries and future industries grow faster and faster, while traditional industries, after they finish tech renovation, carry out intelligent and green upgrading, and the whole industrial sector slowly climbs toward the middle and higher reaches of the value chain [1]. Once the industrial structure is optimized and upgraded, it directly drives the iterative construction of the supply structure, so that the supply system can better adapt to and create emerging demand, and reshape the dynamic balance between supply and demand at a higher level.

Why should structural change be pushed? This is because it fixes the supply demand mismatch problem that the old paradigm left behind. If the supply system can keep up with the demand structure as it continues to upgrade and achieve higher supply efficiency and better supply quality, then the internal structure of economic growth will slowly move toward coordination. Within aggregate demand, the share of consumption, especially final consumption, will steadily increase, and the relationship between investment and consumption will be restored. These structural improvements pull macroeconomic equilibrium out of the low-level state of aggregate balance and steer it toward a high-quality dynamic balance that is sustained by structural upgrading.

4.4 The Mechanism of Institutional Adaptation

The fourth major level along which the change of growth paradigm moves forward is how institutions are adjusted and adapted to match it. The basic idea of political-economic thought holds that productive forces determine relations of production, and relations of production must stay fitted to the needs of productive forces as they develop [7]. In the process of cultivating and expanding new quality productive forces, the parts inside the relations of production that no longer fit must be transformed, and this pushes institutional arrangements such as the macroeconomic governance system and the market system to adjust along with it.

How institutional adaptation works can be examined from several angles. On the side of macroeconomic governance, governance must

align with the development of new quality productive forces: the macroeconomic governance system should be innovated and improved, and the forward-looking, targeted, and coordinated character of policy should get stronger. On the side of the market system, market-oriented reform of factors should be pushed deeper, and the institutional and mechanistic barriers that block the flow and allocation of new factors should be removed [7]. On the side of innovation system, corresponding institutional adjustments must be carried out to improve the institutional arrangements that support original innovation and the tackling of key and core technologies. Institutional adaptation is an endogenous demand of new quality productive force development and a core guarantee that the growth paradigm transformation is completed smoothly. To form a stable and sustainable new growth paradigm, the substance of engine conversion, factor restructuring, and structural change must all be consolidated and supported through institutional adaptation.

5. Structural Institutional Constraints on the Transformation of the Growth Paradigm Driven by New Quality Productive Forces

5.1 Institutional and Mechanistic Constraints on the Allocation of Innovation Factors

Innovation is the core support of new quality productive forces, and the efficiency of innovation factor allocation directly affects the quality of their development. At present, China still faces prominent institutional and mechanistic constraints in the allocation of innovation factors. Scientific and technological resources are scattered in fragments across different actors, the mechanism of collaborative innovation among enterprises, universities, and research institutes is still not perfect, and the "island effect" along the innovation chain has not yet been eliminated. There are blockages in the chain where innovation outcomes are converted into real productive forces, and the incentive mechanism for achievement transformation, risk-sharing mechanism, and system of intellectual property protection all need to be improved [2,3]. Low allocation efficiency of innovation factors not only constrains the vitality of individual innovation actors but also weakens the degree to which innovation drives the transformation of the overall growth paradigm.

5.2 Path Dependence and Transformation Friction in the Shift between Old and New Growth Engines

The process of shifting between old and new growth engines is contradictory. The traditional growth paradigm, built up over many years, has created a fairly firm path dependence at the levels of institutions and mechanisms, the pattern of interest distribution, thought, and perception. The current industrial layout, modes of local competition, and assessment and evaluation systems may all tend to lock in the old paradigm, creating considerable transformation friction in the shift between old and new engines [1]. This friction appears in one way as the risk of a hiatus when the old engine gradually declines while the new one does not take over smoothly, and in another way as the rule conflicts and coordination costs that are generated when old and new institutions run side by side. Breaking through path dependence and smoothly dissolving transformation friction is a real practical problem that the drive of new quality productive forces toward growth paradigm transformation must face head-on.

5.3 Insufficient Compatibility between the Macroeconomic Governance System and the New Growth Paradigm

For a growth paradigm to run smoothly, its core institutional support must be based on the macroeconomic governance system. The new growth paradigm, which is driven by innovation and focuses on structural optimization and quality improvement, objectively requires the macroeconomic governance system to adjust in sync with it. At present, the macroeconomic governance system still carries inertia fitted to the old growth paradigm: the existing policy instruments lean mostly toward aggregate stimulus, there is still room to improve the precision of structural regulation, the role of novel governance tools such as expectation management and risk prevention has not been fully used, and the mechanism of cross-departmental and cross-domain policy coordination also needs more refinement [5,9]. The low compatibility between the macroeconomic governance system and the new growth paradigm directly weakens policy efficacy during implementation, making it difficult to provide adequate support for the transformation.

5.4 Lagging Factor Market Reform Constrains the Flow and Allocation of New Factors

The efficiency of factor allocation is directly tied to the development level of the factor market. In developing new quality productive forces, new factors, such as data, technology, and talent, must be able to flow freely across a broader scope to be efficiently allocated. Yet domestic factor market reform has moved fairly slowly: the institutions around data property rights definition, trading rules, and security governance are still at an exploratory stage; market-based allocation in technology factors and the achievement transformation mechanism await further improvement; and a unified and open factor market system has not been fully established, so the barriers to factor flows among different regions and departments keep persisting [7]. The difficulty of achieving full circulation and effective allocation of new factors is considerably dragged down by the lag in factor market reform, which is the principal institutional bottleneck of growth paradigm transformation.

6. Theoretical Pathways and Institutional Construction for Advancing the Transformation of the Macroeconomic Growth Paradigm

6.1 Adhering to Innovation Leadership and Improving the Innovation Institutions and Mechanisms Adapted to New Quality Productive Forces

The allocation of innovation factors currently faces many constraints. To overcome these obstacles, the key lies in establishing innovation as the primary developmental orientation and building innovation institutions and mechanisms that are fitted to the development of new quality productive forces. The reform of the science and technology system should be moved forward steadily, the technological innovation system with enterprises as the main body, the market as the orientation, and deep integration of industry, academia, and research should be improved, the blockages along the innovation chain should be cleared, and various innovation resources should be concentrated on the key links of the innovation chain [2][3]. Investment in original innovation and basic research should increase, a long-term stable support mechanism should be improved, and an innovation ecosystem that encourages exploration and tolerates failure should be

fostered. The incentive and risk-sharing mechanisms for transforming innovation outcomes should also be refined, and intellectual property protection should be strengthened so that innovation outcomes can be converted smoothly into real productive forces, thereby supplying sustained momentum for growth paradigm transformation.

6.2 Deepening Market-Oriented Reform of Factors and Realizing the Optimized Allocation of New Factors of Production

The core method for breaking through the various restrictions on factor mobility lies in deepening market-oriented reforms. The system of data factor property rights should be improved promptly, trading rules and governance frameworks should be clarified, and feasible pathways for the market-based allocation of data factors should be explored in depth so that the multiplier effect of data factors is fully released [3,8]. The market-oriented reform of technology factors should be accelerated, the system of technology trading markets should be improved, and the achievement transformation mechanism should be perfected. The construction of a unified national market should be accelerated, local protectionism and market segmentation should be broken down, and the smooth flow of factors such as labor, capital, and land across a broader scope should be guaranteed. In-depth market-oriented reform of factors can support the full circulation of new factors, provide institutional guarantees for their optimized allocation, and consolidate the foundation of growth paradigm transformation.

6.3 Building a Macroeconomic Governance System with Chinese Characteristics Adapted to the New Growth Paradigm

To eliminate the constraints arising from insufficient governance adaptation, the core lies in constructing a macroeconomic governance system that is fitted to the new growth paradigm. The institutional framework of macroeconomic governance should be improved; the mode of governance should be pushed to shift from relying mainly on administrative means toward greater use of market- and law-based means; and the scientific, forward-looking, and coordinated character of governance should be further enhanced [9]. Expectation management should be emphasized, the mechanism for assessing the consistency of macro-policy orientations should be improved, and the stability and predictability

of policy should be strengthened, which provides market actors with a stable institutional environment. Risk prevention and resolution should also be handled well, development and security should be coordinated as one, and the bottom line of avoiding systemic risks should be held fast. Modernizing the macroeconomic governance system can match the transformation needs of the new growth paradigm and create a stable macroenvironment.

6.4 Coordinating Industrial Transformation and Upgrading and Promoting a Dynamic Balance between Supply and Demand at a Higher Level

To overcome the developmental constraints of structural mismatch and path dependence, the key lies in genuinely advancing industrial transformation and upgrading. The layout of strategic emerging and future industries should be accelerated to seize the initiative in developing future industries. Traditional industries should be transformed with advanced technology, and the industrial system should be upgraded in the direction of greater sophistication, intelligence, and greenness [1]. Supply-side structural reform should be the main thread, while demand-side management is also carried out, the blockages in the domestic grand cycle should be cleared, and a dynamic balance between supply and demand should be achieved at a higher level. Industrial upgrading should drive improvements in the structure of employment and income distribution, which boosts the capacity and willingness of residents to consume, so that consumption plays its foundational role in driving economic growth. Through the coordinated advancement of industrial transformation and supply-demand balance, a structural foundation is consolidated, and the developmental space for the transformation of the growth paradigm is broadened.

7. Conclusion

Speaking of the transformation of the macroeconomic growth mode, it is ultimately a qualitative leap of productive forces colliding with the relations of production, and both have to re-adapt to each other, and this is the entire process. If contemporary political economy is used to examine it, then when new quality productive forces push the growth paradigm to transform, the internal mechanism, going down to the bottom, comes down to one thing: between the

old paradigm's momentum sources, its factor combinations, its operation mode, and the institutions it rests on, and the new form of productive forces that new quality productive forces stand for, a tension has objectively and truly come into being. To dissolve this tension, patching up bit by bit and adjusting here and there will not do; all four dimensions must leap forward as a whole and move simultaneously. This is exactly why new quality productive forces are no longer only a concept at the industrial level, have been given a theoretical weight that commands the overall situation, and have become a new coordinate for grasping the economic side of Chinese-style modernization.

Whether this transformation of the growth paradigm can truly take hold depends on how institutions unfold in practice and is also conditioned by a set of factors tangled together: changes in the international environment, the pace of technological progress, and the behavior of market players. Micro-level operating mechanisms, quantifiable policy effects, and comparative experiences across different countries await further empirical testing. However, as the theory of new quality productive forces deepens in practice, the theoretical contours of the transformation of China's macroeconomic growth paradigm will come into sharper relief, and its long-term contribution to Chinese-style modernization and even to global economic development will progressively show itself.

References

- [1] Xiang Qiulan, Cai Shaohong, Zhang Zaijie. Evolution of Industrial Structure and China's High-Quality Economic Transformation and Development. *Journal of Guizhou University of Finance and Economics*, 2023.
- [2] Fu Minjie, Li Xuheng. The Policy Context, Policy Logic, and Policy Priorities of New Quality Productive Forces. *Journal of Hebei University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)*, 2024.
- [3] An Tongliang, Wei Jie. Where Is Chinese Economics Headed: The Reconstruction of Chinese Economics by the New Economy from the Perspective of Complexity Economics. *China Industrial Economics*, 2023.
- [4] Jia Genliang. Evolutionary Economics: The Synthesis and Innovation of a Third Economic System. *Academic Monthly*, 2011.
- [5] Li Defu, Tang Xuemei. The "Chinese Counterexamples" to Mainstream Macroeconomics and a Macroeconomics with Chinese Background. *New Economy*, 2025.
- [6] Huang Qunhui. The Theoretical Value and Realization Path of Chinese Path to Modernization. *Journal of Beijing University of Technology (Social Sciences Edition)*, 2023.
- [7] Yuan Lei. Synergy Between Institutional Foundations and Operating Mechanisms: A Study of Production Relations Oriented Toward New Quality Productive Forces. *Contemporary Economic Research*, 2026.
- [8] Xia Jiechang. Digital-Real Integration Driving High-Quality Economic Development: Driving Mechanisms and Optimization Paths. *Research*, 2023.
- [9] Chen Yutian, Yang Zihui, Wen Xuelian. Expectation Guidance, Economic Resilience, and Macroeconomic Governance. *Journal of Management World*, 2024.