Tetiana Pushkar, Candidate of Economic Sciences, Professor
O.M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv
Kharkiv, Ukraine

DOI: https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-650-8-11

ECONOMIC RESILIENCE OF THE CONSTRUCTION SECTOR IN POST-CRISIS RECOVERY: SUSTAINABILITY-DRIVEN APPROACHES

Post-crisis recovery has become a decisive factor shaping national economic trajectories under conditions of heightened uncertainty, structural disruption, and constrained resources. In this context, recovery extends beyond restoring pre-crisis output levels and increasingly involves addressing structural weaknesses and ensuring long-term stability. The construction sector plays a strategically significant role in these processes by contributing to infrastructure restoration, employment generation, and capital formation, while its multiplier effects support broader economic reactivation.

Despite its systemic importance, post-crisis construction activity is frequently driven by short-term imperatives focused on rapid reconstruction and immediate output gains. Such approaches often overlook long-term economic sustainability and structural resilience, reinforcing inefficiencies and increasing vulnerability to future shocks. This contradiction between recovery speed and long-term stability underscores the need for sustainability-driven approaches that integrate economic resilience into post-crisis construction strategies.

Recent systematic reviews conceptualize economic resilience as a multidimensional capacity of economic systems to absorb shocks, adapt to structural change, and recover under crisis conditions. While these studies provide a strong theoretical foundation, they predominantly focus on macroeconomic and system-wide perspectives, offering limited insight into sector-specific mechanisms of resilience formation [1]. Empirical research within the European Union further highlights the structural dimension of resilience, emphasizing the role of intersectoral linkages and production network topology in shaping shock transmission and absorption. Although largely conducted at the regional level, this literature underscores the importance of sectoral positioning within production systems and provides a conceptual basis for analyzing system-forming sectors in post-crisis recovery [2]. Firm-level studies grounded

in production theory demonstrate that investments in resilience can be economically efficient, significantly reducing business interruption losses relative to their costs. While such analyses are mainly confined to manufacturing and disaster-related contexts, they support the relevance of resilience-oriented strategies in capital-intensive activities where continuity of operations and investment stability are critical during recovery phases [3]. In parallel, evidence from OECD regions indicates that spatial configurations and interregional interactions influence resistance and recovery trajectories following recessionary shocks. Nevertheless, despite extensive macro- and regional-level analysis, sector-specific resilience mechanisms remain insufficiently explored. In particular, the construction sector – despite its central role in infrastructure restoration and capital formation – has received limited focused attention in post-crisis resilience research [4].

Economic resilience is defined as the capacity of a sector to withstand external shocks, adapt to structural changes, and preserve functional economic performance over time. In the construction sector, resilience extends beyond short-term financial stability and reflects the ability to sustain investment activity, maintain production continuity, and adjust institutional and organizational mechanisms under crisis conditions. Given the capital-intensive and cyclically sensitive nature of construction, sectoral resilience depends on stable financing structures, flexible production processes, and effective institutional coordination during recovery phases, determining the sector's contribution to macroeconomic stabilization beyond immediate reconstruction needs.

Sustainability-driven approaches provide a structural basis for strengthening economic resilience by shifting the focus from short-term output restoration toward long-term efficiency and balanced development. In the construction sector, sustainability is associated with investment continuity, productivity dynamics, and the mitigation of structural vulnerabilities intensified by crisis conditions. Sustainability-oriented recovery aims to reduce inefficiencies resulting from accelerated reconstruction, limit repeated capital losses, and lower exposure to cyclical volatility. Within this framework, sustainability is interpreted as an intrinsic component of economic resilience, enabling the construction sector to contribute to stable post-crisis economic development.

The construction sector plays a central role in post-crisis recovery by generating multiplier effects beyond direct output growth. Construction activity stimulates related industries, supports employment, and contributes to income stabilization during periods of economic disruption.

Owing to its labor-intensive and capital-forming nature, the sector accelerates the reactivation of production chains and the normalization of economic interactions.

Beyond short-term stabilization, construction investment supports infrastructure renewal and capital formation, creating a foundation for long-term economic growth. However, the effectiveness of this contribution depends on the structure and time horizon of recovery strategies. Policies focused exclusively on rapid output expansion may lead to inefficient resource allocation and limited productivity gains, thereby weakening economic resilience. Consequently, the contribution of the construction sector should be assessed not only through immediate output indicators but also through its capacity to support sustainable capital accumulation and structural stability.

The study is based on a qualitative economic analysis of post-crisis recovery processes, with a specific focus on the construction sector as a system-forming element of economic stabilization due to its role in infrastructure restoration and investment activity. The methodological approach relies on the conceptual framework of economic resilience and sustainability, which guides the interpretation of sectoral recovery mechanisms.

Sustainability-driven approaches imply a structural shift in post-crisis recovery models from emergency reconstruction toward strategic frameworks oriented at economic efficiency and long-term resilience. In the construction sector, this shift requires aligning recovery investments with medium- and long-term development objectives rather than short-term output expansion. Strategic recovery emphasizes rational allocation of limited resources, coordination between public and private investment, and avoidance of repeated reconstruction cycles that undermine economic efficiency, thereby strengthening the stability of construction activity.

The integration of sustainability principles into construction sector recovery has direct economic implications for enhancing sectoral resilience. Sustainability-oriented recovery stabilizes investment flows, improves capital utilization, and supports productivity growth, increasing the adaptive capacity of the sector and limiting exposure to cyclical volatility and crisis-induced disruptions.

The construction sector thus plays a decisive role in post-crisis economic recovery by restoring infrastructure, stimulating investment activity, and generating multiplier effects across the economy. However, its stabilizing potential depends not on the scale of reconstruction but on the structural quality and time horizon of recovery strategies. Recovery

models focused solely on short-term output expansion weaken economic resilience, whereas sustainability-driven approaches strengthen sectoral resilience through improved capital utilization, stabilized investment flows, and long-term productivity support.

References:

1. Capoani, L., Fantinelli, M. and Giordano, L. (2025) The concept of resilience in economics: a comprehensive analysis and systematic review of economic literature. *Continuity & Resilience Review*, vol. 7 (2), pp. 121–145. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/CRR-11-2024-0045
2. Giannakis, E., Tsiotas, D. and Papadas, C.T. (2024) Unveiling the relationship between regional economic resilience and input-output network topology: Evidence from the European Union. Regional Science Policy & Practice, vol. 16(5), 100018. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rspp.2024.100018
3. Dormady, N.C., Rose, A., Roa-Henriquez, A. and Morin, C.B. (2022) The cost-effectiveness of economic resilience. *International Journal of Production Economics*, no. 244, 108371. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2021.108371
4. Kim, S. and Kim, E. (2025) The role of spatial structures in shaping regional economic resilience: Evidence from OECD regions based on urban core configurations. *Papers in Regional Science*, vol. 104 (6), 100116. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pirs.2025.100116