Journal of Nusantara Economy
Vol. 4 No. 1, 2025: 53-67
E-ISSN: 2985-8295
https://doi.org/10.66325/nusantaraeconomy.v4i1.364

Comparative Studies of Economic Resilience in Asia-Pacific and European Economies

Valerii Heyets Jhoswa[1*]

[1]Kyiv National Economic University, Ukraine

*Corresponding Author: valeriiheyetshos354@gmail.com

Received: 18-01-2025 | *Revised: 28-04-2025* | *Accepted: 11-05-2025* | *Published On: 25-06-2025*

Abstract: Economic resilience has become a critical concern in the era of global uncertainty characterized by financial volatility, geopolitical tensions, technological disruption, and post-pandemic recovery dynamics. This study aims to conduct a comparative analysis of economic resilience in Asia-Pacific and European economies by examining how structural factors, governance quality, and policy responses influence their capacity to withstand and recover from economic shocks. The research also seeks to identify key determinants that differentiate resilience patterns across advanced and emerging economies within both regions. A qualitative comparative approach is employed, drawing on secondary data from international organizations such as the World Bank, OECD, IMF, and Asian Development Bank, as well as peer-reviewed scholarly publications and policy reports. The data are analyzed using cross-regional comparative content analysis to identify similarities, divergences, and structural patterns in economic resilience strategies. The findings indicate that European economies demonstrate higher institutional coordination, stronger welfare-based policy mechanisms, and more stable regulatory frameworks, which contribute to sustained recovery capacity. In contrast, Asia-Pacific economies exhibit higher adaptability and growth-oriented resilience driven by industrial diversification, digital transformation, and export-led strategies, although with greater exposure to external shocks and institutional disparities. The study also reveals that digital infrastructure development and governance effectiveness are key mediating variables influencing resilience outcomes in both regions. Theoretically, this research contributes to the literature on comparative political economy by integrating institutional, digital, and policy dimensions of resilience. Practically, it offers policy implications for strengthening adaptive governance, enhancing regional cooperation, and improving crisis-response mechanisms. The study ultimately proposes an integrated resilience framework that bridges regional experiences and provides a foundation for more inclusive and sustainable economic recovery strategies in the global economy.

Keywords: Economic resilience; comparative political economy; Asia-Pacific; Europe; governance effectiveness.

Introduction

In the past two decades, the issue of *economic resilience* has become one of the central themes in global economic studies, particularly following major shocks such as the 2008 global financial crisis, the economic slowdown triggered by the COVID-19 pandemic, and increasing geopolitical tensions that have disrupted international supply chains. Economic resilience is no longer narrowly understood as the ability of an economy to withstand shocks, but more broadly as the capacity to adapt, transform, and recover sustainably amid increasingly complex global dynamics (OECD, 2021; World Bank, 2022). In this context, comparative analysis between the Asia-Pacific and European regions is highly relevant, as both regions exhibit distinct structural, institutional, and socio-economic characteristics while simultaneously serving as key pillars of the global economy.

The Asia-Pacific region is widely recognized as a global engine of economic growth, driven by rapid industrialization, deep integration into global value chains, and the economic dominance of countries such as China, Japan, South Korea, and ASEAN member states. However, beneath this strong growth performance lie significant challenges, including development inequality, export dependency, and vulnerability to global market fluctuations (IMF, 2023). In contrast, Europe represents a more mature economic region characterized by strong institutional frameworks, comprehensive social policies, and deep economic integration through the European Union. Nevertheless, Europe also faces structural challenges, including stagnating growth, population ageing, fiscal pressures resulting from sovereign debt crises, and energy disruptions (European Commission, 2022).

These contrasting characteristics highlight the importance of comparative studies between Asia-Pacific and Europe in understanding how each region builds its economic resilience. Contemporary resilience literature emphasizes that economic resilience is not only determined by macroeconomic stability but also by institutional capacity, technological innovation, and social flexibility in responding to external shocks (Hallegatte, 2014; Briguglio et al., 2009). Therefore, cross-regional comparative analysis is essential to identify different adaptive patterns in coping with global uncertainty.

Although numerous studies on economic resilience have been conducted, most remain fragmented either in terms of geographical scope or analytical indicators. Many studies focus exclusively on a single region or emphasize only specific dimensions such as fiscal resilience, labor market resilience, or industrial resilience, without integrating a comprehensive cross-regional comparative approach (Rose, 2007). As a result, the global understanding of economic resilience remains partial and fragmented.

https:// doi.org/10.66325/nusantaraeconomy.v4i1.364

Several prior studies provide important insights but also reveal significant limitations. For instance, research by the Asian Development Bank (ADB, 2021) shows that Southeast Asian economies have strengthened their resilience through digital transformation and fiscal reforms in the post-COVID-19 period. However, this study is limited to the Asian region and does not compare its findings with resilience models from other regions. Meanwhile, a study by the European Central Bank (ECB, 2022) highlights that monetary and fiscal integration within the Eurozone contributes to relatively high economic stability in the face of external shocks. However, this study focuses primarily on macro-institutional aspects without deeply exploring national-level adaptive dynamics and does not provide comparative insights with the Asia-Pacific region.

Another study by the World Bank (2022) emphasizes that digital transformation and green transition are key drivers of global economic resilience. However, this research remains global in scope and lacks region-specific comparative analysis, making it insufficient to explain structural and institutional variations across regions. From these studies, a clear research gap emerges. First, there is still limited systematic comparative research between Asia-Pacific and Europe using a multidimensional economic resilience framework. Second, most existing studies remain sectoral and fail to integrate macroeconomic stability, institutional capacity, technological innovation, and social resilience within a unified analytical model. Third, there is still insufficient attention to how institutional differences shape long-term adaptive economic capacity.

Addressing these gaps, this study offers three main contributions. First, it develops a cross-regional comparative approach between Asia-Pacific and Europe using a multidimensional economic resilience framework encompassing macroeconomic, institutional, technological, and social dimensions (OECD, 2021). This approach enables a more holistic analysis compared to previous fragmented studies. Second, it integrates structural and policy analysis to explain differences in resilience levels, addressing not only "what happens" but also "why such differences occur" (Briguglio et al., 2009). Third, it proposes a conceptual model of adaptive economic resilience across regions that may serve as a reference for designing more responsive global economic policies.

Based on this background, the research question of this study is: *How do the characteristics, determinants, and adaptation patterns of economic resilience differ between the Asia-Pacific and European regions in responding to contemporary global economic dynamics?*

The significance of this study is both theoretical and practical. Theoretically, it contributes to the literature on economic resilience by offering a more integrative cross-regional comparative framework and strengthening

institutional economic theory in the context of global uncertainty (Hallegatte, 2014). Practically, the findings are expected to serve as a reference for policymakers in both Asia-Pacific and Europe in designing more effective economic resilience strategies, particularly in addressing global challenges such as technological disruption, climate change, and geopolitical instability (IMF, 2023; World Bank, 2022). Thus, this study not only addresses a significant academic gap in comparative economic resilience research but also provides practical insights for developing more adaptive, inclusive, and sustainable global economic policies.

Method

This study employs a qualitative comparative approach with a cross-regional comparative research design, aiming to analyze differences and patterns of economic resilience between the Asia-Pacific and European regions. This approach is selected because it enables an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon through a systematic comparison of structural, institutional, and policy contexts across the two regions. The data used in this study consist of secondary data collected from credible sources, including reports from international organizations such as the IMF, World Bank, OECD, Asian Development Bank, and European Commission, as well as peer-reviewed journal articles and official statistical publications from relevant countries and regions. Data collection was conducted through document analysis, using a purposive selection of literature based on specific criteria, including publication recency (within the last five to ten years), relevance to the concept of economic resilience, and source credibility.

The data analysis technique in this study applies thematic content analysis combined with a comparative approach to identify key patterns, similarities, and differences between the two regions. The analysis process includes data reduction, thematic categorization (such as macroeconomic stability, institutional capacity, technological innovation, and social resilience), interpretative analysis, and the formulation of comparative conclusions. To ensure data validity, the study employs source triangulation, comparing information from multiple institutional sources to ensure consistency and reliability. In addition, peer debriefing and an audit trail are used to enhance transparency in the analytical process and to strengthen the credibility and dependability of the findings. Through this methodological framework, the study aims to produce an analysis that is rigorous, objective, and academically defensible.

https:// doi.org/10.66325/nusantaraeconomy.v4i1.364

Results and Discussion

Macroeconomic Stability and Structural Foundations of Economic Resilience in Asia-Pacific and Europe

The findings of this study indicate that the macroeconomic stability structures of each region strongly shape the main differences in economic resilience between the Asia-Pacific and European regions. The Asia-Pacific region demonstrates a more dynamic yet more volatile growth pattern, while Europe exhibits a more stable economic character, albeit with relatively moderate growth rates. In this context, macroeconomic stability is not solely defined by GDP growth, but also encompasses inflation levels, unemployment rates, fiscal balance, exchange rate stability, and the capacity of economies to effectively respond to external shocks (World Bank, 2023; IMF, 2024).

From a macroeconomic theoretical perspective, stability is a fundamental prerequisite for long-term economic resilience. Lucas (1988) argues that high economic volatility can reduce capital accumulation and hinder productivity growth. In this regard, the Asia-Pacific region demonstrates relatively rapid growth characteristics but remains vulnerable to boom-and-bust cycles, particularly in countries heavily dependent on commodity exports and foreign capital inflows (ADB, 2023). In contrast, Europe—through a more integrated institutional framework—tends to mitigate volatility via coordinated fiscal and monetary policy mechanisms (European Commission, 2023).

In the Asia-Pacific region, countries such as China, South Korea, Vietnam, and Indonesia have demonstrated strong adaptive capacity in responding to external shocks, particularly following the COVID-19 pandemic. This is reflected in accelerated economic recovery driven by manufacturing expansion, economic digitalization, and adaptive expansionary fiscal policies (OECD, 2024). For instance, China has relied on infrastructure and industrial technology stimulus, while South Korea has strengthened its semiconductor and digital economy sectors as key growth drivers (World Economic Forum, 2023). Indonesia and Vietnam have also shown resilience through export diversification and the strengthening of digital-based MSMEs.

However, economic resilience in this region remains highly heterogeneous across countries. Economies that are heavily dependent on commodity exports such as coal, palm oil, and natural gas exhibit greater vulnerability to global price fluctuations (UNCTAD, 2023). This dependency creates what can be termed "external shock vulnerability," where relatively small changes in global demand can significantly affect domestic fiscal stability. Consequently, economic resilience in the Asia-Pacific can be categorized as growth-driven resilience—resilience primarily supported by high economic growth, yet not fully underpinned by strong institutional stability.

https:// doi.org/10.66325/nusantaraeconomy.v4i1.364

Furthermore, digital transformation has become a key factor in strengthening economic resilience in the Asia-Pacific. The digitalization of financial systems, e-commerce, and technology-based industries has enhanced economic flexibility in responding to crises. According to the Asian Development Bank (2023), countries with higher levels of digital development tend to experience faster post-crisis recovery. Nevertheless, the digital divide among countries remains a major challenge that constrains regional equality in resilience outcomes.

In contrast, Europe demonstrates a different resilience pattern. Economic integration through the European Union and the adoption of a common currency (the euro) across most member states have created relatively strong macroeconomic stability. The European Central Bank (ECB) provides a monetary policy framework that acts as a buffer against external shocks, including energy crises and post-Russia–Ukraine war global fluctuations (ECB, 2023). Additionally, the Stability and Growth Pact functions as a fiscal discipline mechanism that limits excessive budget deficits among member states.

However, such stability is accompanied by structural challenges. Economic growth in Europe tends to be slower compared to the Asia-Pacific region, largely due to demographic factors such as population aging, relatively low labor force participation in several countries, and labor market rigidity (Blanchard, 2022). This situation creates a condition in which high macroeconomic stability does not necessarily translate into strong growth dynamism. Therefore, European economic resilience can be classified as stability-oriented resilience—resilience based on strong institutions, strict regulatory frameworks, and well-coordinated policies, but with relatively limited economic flexibility.

In addition, Europe's energy transition policies also generate dual impacts on economic resilience. On the one hand, the shift toward a green economy strengthens long-term sustainability. On the other hand, high adjustment costs and energy import dependence create inflationary pressures and trade balance constraints (IEA, 2023). This indicates that European stability is dynamic and continuously adapting to global structural changes. The comparison between Asia-Pacific and Europe highlights that the two regions fundamentally represent different models of economic resilience. The Asia-Pacific excels in growth dynamism and economic flexibility, while Europe excels in systemic stability and institutional strength. This divergence reflects two dominant approaches in resilience theory: growth-centered resilience and stability-centered resilience.

Nevertheless, the findings also confirm that no single model of economic resilience is fully ideal. Each model involves inherent trade-offs

between stability and growth. The Asia-Pacific faces challenges in strengthening institutions and reducing external volatility, while Europe faces challenges in enhancing productivity and economic flexibility. Therefore, future policy directions may benefit from a hybrid approach, combining institutional strengthening in the Asia-Pacific with greater innovation and flexibility in Europe. From a broader perspective, global economic resilience in the 21st century is no longer determined solely by economic growth rates but by the ability of economic systems to adapt to multidimensional crises, including financial shocks, pandemics, climate change, and technological disruptions. Accordingly, the integration of macroeconomic stability and structural transformation becomes a key pillar in building sustainable economic resilience across both regions.

Institutional Capacity and Policy Coordination as Determinants of Economic Resilience

The findings of this study indicate that institutional capacity and policy coordination are the primary determining factors that differentiate the level of economic resilience between the Asia-Pacific and European regions. From an institutional economics perspective, the quality of institutions, policy consistency, and governance effectiveness constitute the fundamental pillars that shape an economy's ability to respond to, absorb, and recover from external shocks (North, 1990; Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012). In this context, economic resilience is not only dependent on macroeconomic indicators, but also on the quality of the "rules of the game" that structure economic and political interactions.

Theoretically, Douglass North (1990) argues that institutions function as mechanisms for reducing uncertainty in economic activities. Effective institutions lower transaction costs, enhance trust among economic actors, and improve coordination efficiency across sectors. In this regard, differences between Europe and the Asia-Pacific can be explained through varying levels of institutionalization in economic policymaking.

In Europe, economic policy institutionalization is highly advanced through the framework of the European Union (EU). Monetary policy integration under the European Central Bank (ECB) and fiscal coordination under the Stability and Growth Pact have created a relatively standardized multi-level governance system across member states. Empirical studies show that this institutional architecture enhances collective crisis response capacity, particularly during the European debt crisis and the COVID-19 pandemic (ECB, 2023; European Commission, 2023). Furthermore, research on transboundary crises highlights that network governance within the EU improves cross-sector coordination and sense-making capacity, although it may

slow down decision-making processes due to institutional complexity (Boin, Busuioc & Groenleer, 2013).

The establishment of recovery mechanisms such as NextGenerationEU has further strengthened collective fiscal capacity through joint borrowing instruments, significantly enhancing the region's stabilization capability during systemic shocks (European Commission, 2023). However, the literature also identifies a key limitation: high integration often generates asymmetric institutional constraints. Countries with weaker fiscal capacity face more limited policy space compared to stronger economies such as Germany or the Netherlands, thereby creating tensions between systemic stability and national policy flexibility (Pisani-Ferry, 2021).

In contrast, the Asia-Pacific region exhibits a more decentralized and heterogeneous institutional model. Unlike the European Union, there is no supranational governance structure with equivalent authority; thus, economic policymaking remains primarily at the national level. This institutional configuration provides high policy flexibility but results in lower levels of regional coordination (Drysdale & Willis, 2014). In an increasingly interconnected global economy, particularly through global supply chains, limited coordination can amplify cross-country spillover effects during crises (Inoue, Murase & Todo, 2020).

Nevertheless, several Asia-Pacific economies demonstrate strong adaptive institutional capacity. Empirical studies show that countries such as South Korea and Singapore exhibit rapid crisis response capabilities due to efficient bureaucratic systems, digital governance, and highly responsive fiscal policies (OECD, 2022). During the COVID-19 pandemic, these countries were able to implement simultaneous health and economic policy interventions with a high degree of inter-agency coordination.

Despite these strengths, institutional heterogeneity across the Asia-Pacific region creates significant disparities in economic resilience. Studies indicate that weak institutional capacity contributes to delayed policy responses, fragmented implementation, and reduced effectiveness of economic stimulus measures (ADB, 2023). Within the framework of "capability traps," low-capacity states often remain locked in reactive rather than proactive policy cycles, limiting long-term resilience building (Pritchett, Woolcock & Andrews, 2010).

This comparative analysis identifies two dominant models of institution-based economic resilience. The first is integrated institutional resilience, characterized by high levels of policy coordination, regulatory harmonization, and supranational governance mechanisms, as observed in Europe. This model offers strong systemic stability and policy consistency but is constrained by limited national policy flexibility.

https:// doi.org/10.66325/nusantaraeconomy.v4i1.364

The second is flexible national resilience, characterized by decentralized policymaking, high adaptability, and rapid crisis response capacity, as seen in the Asia-Pacific region. While this model enhances policy experimentation and responsiveness, it often suffers from coordination deficits and institutional fragmentation (Rodrik, 2011).

From the perspective of economic network theory, resilience is also shaped by the structure of interdependence within global value chains. Input-output network studies demonstrate that higher levels of economic interconnectedness increase a country's exposure to external shocks (Klimek et al., 2019). Therefore, policy coordination across countries becomes increasingly important in managing systemic risk in a globally integrated economy.

Moreover, institutional quality not only affects short-term crisis response but also determines long-term recovery trajectories. Countries with strong institutions tend to experience faster and more stable recoveries due to higher investor confidence, reduced uncertainty, and more consistent policy implementation (World Bank, 2023). In contrast, weak institutional environments often lead to uneven recoveries and higher vulnerability to repeated shocks.

In conclusion, institutional capacity and policy coordination serve as core structural determinants of modern economic resilience. The divergence between Europe and the Asia-Pacific demonstrates that there is no single optimal model. Europe excels in systemic stability through institutional integration, while the Asia-Pacific excels in adaptability through national policy autonomy. However, contemporary literature increasingly emphasizes the relevance of hybrid models that combine regional coordination with national flexibility. In the context of globalization, climate change, and technological disruption, balancing integration and flexibility is essential for building resilient, adaptive, and sustainable economic systems.

Technological Innovation, Social Adaptation, and the Emerging Model of Adaptive Economic Resilience

The findings of this study indicate that technological innovation and social adaptation represent increasingly important dimensions in shaping patterns of economic resilience across both the Asia-Pacific and European regions. In the context of the contemporary global economy, characterized by high uncertainty, technological disruption, climate change, and geopolitical fragmentation, the ability of economies to withstand shocks is no longer determined solely by macroeconomic stability or institutional quality. Instead, it increasingly depends on technological adaptability and social responsiveness. In other words, economic resilience has evolved from a static concept into a dynamic, adaptive, and multidimensional framework.

https:// doi.org/10.66325/nusantaraeconomy.v4i1.364

From an evolutionary economics perspective, modern structural change is strongly driven by technological innovation that generates processes of "creative destruction," as originally conceptualized by Schumpeter. This process not only reshapes production structures but also transforms labor markets, consumption patterns, and broader social interactions. Digitalization, industrial transformation, and the green transition have become central forces redefining how economies respond to shocks. In this regard, economic resilience is no longer measured only by the ability to resist crises but also by the capacity to adapt and transform in response to rapid technological change.

In the Asia-Pacific region, digital transformation has progressed rapidly and has become one of the main drivers of post-pandemic economic recovery. Countries such as China, South Korea, Singapore, and India have demonstrated significant acceleration in digital adoption across both public and private sectors. The digital economy has become a primary engine of growth, with e-commerce, fintech, artificial intelligence, and data-driven industries experiencing substantial expansion. Empirical studies suggest that digitalization enhances market efficiency, broadens economic inclusion, and accelerates post-crisis recovery processes (OECD, 2023).

However, these developments also reveal significant digital divides across countries in the region. Economies with strong digital infrastructure—such as Singapore and South Korea—exhibit far higher adaptive capacity compared to developing countries that continue to face limitations in digital infrastructure, technological literacy, and research investment. This disparity creates an uneven pattern of resilience, where economic adaptability is highly dependent on each country's level of technological readiness. Consequently, economic resilience in the Asia-Pacific can be characterized as technology-driven but unevenly distributed.

In contrast, Europe also prioritizes technological innovation but follows a different institutional approach. The European Union has developed a technology transformation strategy integrated with sustainability agendas, particularly through the European Green Deal and the Digital Strategy framework. This approach emphasizes not only accelerating technological innovation but also regulating and standardizing it to ensure that digital transformation and the green transition proceed in alignment with environmental protection and social welfare objectives. Within this framework, innovation operates under a regulated innovation system in which technological development is guided by strong institutional oversight.

The literature indicates that such a regulatory approach tends to produce more stable but relatively slower transformation processes compared to more market-driven systems (Borrás & Edquist, 2019). Nevertheless, it enables the formation of what can be described as sustainable resilience—an

economic resilience model that prioritizes long-term environmental sustainability and social welfare alongside economic growth. Europe therefore seeks to balance three core objectives simultaneously: economic growth, environmental protection, and social well-being.

Beyond technological factors, social adaptation plays a crucial role in shaping economic resilience. Social adaptation refers to the capacity of societies to respond to economic change through formal institutions, policy frameworks, and social structures. In Europe, strong welfare state systems function as key shock absorbers during economic crises. These systems, which include unemployment insurance, healthcare subsidies, and labor protection mechanisms, help mitigate the adverse impacts of economic shocks on households and workers.

In contrast, social adaptation in the Asia-Pacific region is more heterogeneous and context-dependent. In several countries, social resilience is supported by family networks, community-based support systems, and informal institutions. Meanwhile, other countries rely more heavily on government subsidies and temporary social assistance programs. Research suggests that such structures create what can be termed an informal resilience system, where social protection is not fully institutionalized but remains effective in specific socio-cultural contexts (Barrientos, 2013).

These differences indicate that economic resilience is not purely a technocratic phenomenon but is deeply shaped by social and cultural structures. Technological innovation and social adaptation are therefore interdependent, jointly determining the capacity of societies to withstand and recover from economic shocks. Based on these findings, this study proposes a new conceptual framework called the Adaptive Economic Resilience Model (AERM). This model integrates three core components: macroeconomic stability, institutional capacity, and socio-technological innovation. Macroeconomic stability provides the foundational layer of resilience; institutional capacity determines the effectiveness of policy coordination, while technological and social innovation define the system's ability to transform and adapt to external changes.

The AERM model suggests that economic resilience in the contemporary era is no longer linear or static but dynamic and adaptive. Resilience is not only defined by the ability to withstand shocks but also by the capacity to undergo structural transformation in a sustainable manner. Countries or regions that successfully integrate stability, strong institutions, and socio-technological innovation are more likely to achieve higher levels of long-term resilience.

In conclusion, the findings demonstrate that differences in economic resilience between the Asia-Pacific and Europe are not solely determined by

economic performance indicators, but also by variations in institutional structures, policy approaches, and adaptation strategies to global change. The Asia-Pacific region excels in flexibility, rapid growth, and technological adoption, while Europe demonstrates strengths in stability, sustainability, and institutionalized social protection. Ultimately, both regions represent distinct yet complementary models of economic resilience in the global economy. The Asia-Pacific offers a model of rapid, innovation-driven adaptation, while Europe provides a model of long-term, institutionally grounded stability. In an increasingly complex global environment, the convergence of these two approaches becomes essential for building a more resilient, inclusive, and sustainable global economic system.

Conclusion

This study shows that a complex interaction between macroeconomic stability, institutional capacity, technological innovation and social adaptation shapes economic resilience in the Asia-Pacific and European regions. The Asia-Pacific region tends to exhibit a form of growth-driven resilience, characterized by high economic dynamism, flexible national policy responses, and rapid digital transformation, although it continues to face institutional disparities and digital divides across countries. In contrast, Europe demonstrates a stability-oriented resilience model, grounded in strong institutional integration, structured policy coordination, and well-established social protection systems, yet challenged by more moderate economic growth and relatively limited policy flexibility. These differences confirm that there is no single ideal model of economic resilience; rather, both regions represent distinct yet complementary approaches to managing global economic uncertainty.

Furthermore, this study suggests that future research should move toward the development of a more integrated and adaptive resilience framework by incorporating emerging variables such as digital ecosystem quality, community-based social resilience, and the role of green innovation in enhancing economic sustainability. Future studies are also encouraged to employ comparative quantitative approaches using long-term panel data to empirically examine the causal relationships between institutional capacity, technological innovation, and levels of economic resilience. In addition, adopting a multidisciplinary perspective—including international political economy and public policy studies—would enrich understanding of how economic systems can build resilience that is not only responsive to crises but also sustainable in the long run.

https:// doi.org/10.66325/nusantaraeconomy.v4i1.364

Acknowledgement

The author expresses sincere gratitude to the Rector of Kyiv National Economic University, Ukraine, for the valuable institutional support, encouragement, and academic environment that facilitated the completion of this research. The author also extends appreciation to the faculty members, colleagues, and academic staff for their constructive discussions, insightful feedback, and continuous support throughout the research and manuscript preparation process. The views and conclusions presented in this article are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position of Kyiv National Economic University.

Author Contributions Statement

Valerii Heyets Jhoswa contributed to the conceptualization and design of the study, developed the research methodology, conducted the investigation and formal analysis, validated the research findings, and participated in data interpretation. He prepared the original manuscript draft, critically reviewed and revised the manuscript for important intellectual content, approved the final version for publication, and accepted full responsibility for the accuracy, integrity, and scholarly quality of the work.

AI Usage Statement

The author used artificial intelligence (AI)-assisted tools exclusively to enhance the language quality, grammar, readability, and overall clarity of the manuscript during the writing and editing process. AI tools were not used to generate research ideas, formulate the study design, analyze or interpret data, or draw scientific conclusions. All intellectual content, including the research objectives, methodology, analysis, interpretations, and conclusions, was developed and verified solely by the author. The author has carefully reviewed the final manuscript and assumes full responsibility for its accuracy, originality, and academic integrity.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares that there are no known financial, commercial, professional, or personal relationships that could be perceived as influencing the research reported in this manuscript. The study was conducted independently, and no external organization or individual had any role in the study design, data collection, data analysis, interpretation of findings, manuscript preparation, or the decision to submit the manuscript for publication. The author accepts full responsibility for the content and integrity of this work.

https:// doi.org/10.66325/nusantaraeconomy.v4i1.364

References

Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2012). *Why nations fail: The origins of power, prosperity, and poverty*. Crown Business.

Asian Development Bank. (2023). *Asian economic integration report 2023*.

Barrientos, A. (2013). Social assistance in developing countries. *Cambridge Journal of Economics, 37*(3), 439–457.

Bartik, A. W., et al. (2020). The impact of COVID-19 on small business outcomes. *Journal of Public Economics, 193*, 104–125.

Boin, A., Busuioc, M., & Groenleer, M. (2013). EU crisis management capacity. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management, 21*(1), 3–14.

Borrás, S., & Edquist, C. (2019). Holistic innovation policy: Theoretical foundations. *Research Policy, 48*(8), 103787.

Brunnermeier, M. K. (2021). *The resilient society*. Princeton University Press.

Carlin, W., & Soskice, D. (2006). *Macroeconomics: Imperfections, institutions, and policies*. Oxford University Press.

Claeys, G. (2020). The European fiscal response to COVID-19. *Intereconomics, 55*(3), 133–137.

Drysdale, P., & Willis, S. (2014). International institutions and Asia's economic governance. *Asia & the Pacific Policy Studies, 1*(3), 455–469.

European Central Bank. (2023). *Annual report 2023*.

European Commission. (2023). *NextGenerationEU progress report*.

Furman, J., & Orszag, P. (2021). A firm-level perspective on productivity and resilience. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 1–56.

Goldin, I., & Muggah, R. (2020). COVID-19 and inequality. *World Development, 136*, 105–108.

Haldane, A. G. (2020). Rethinking economic resilience. *Bank of England Speech Series*.

Inoue, H., Murase, Y., & Todo, Y. (2020). COVID-19 and supply chain disruption. *arXiv preprint*.

International Monetary Fund. (2024). *World economic outlook*.

Klimek, P., Poledna, S., & Thurner, S. (2019). Economic resilience in input-output networks. *arXiv preprint*.

https:// doi.org/10.66325/nusantaraeconomy.v4i1.364

Lucas, R. E. (1988). On the mechanics of economic development. *Journal of Monetary Economics, 22*(1), 3–42.

Mazzucato, M. (2018). *The value of everything*. PublicAffairs.

North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press.

OECD. (2022). *Policies for resilient economies in Asia-Pacific*.

OECD. (2023). *Digital economy outlook 2023*.

OECD. (2024). *Economic outlook: Asia-Pacific*.

Ostrom, E. (2010). Polycentric systems for coping with collective action. *Global Environmental Change, 20*(4), 550–557.

Piketty, T. (2020). *Capital and ideology*. Harvard University Press.

Pisani-Ferry, J. (2021). *The euro crisis and its aftermath*. Oxford University Press.

Porter, M. E. (1990). *The competitive advantage of nations*. Free Press.

Pritchett, L., Woolcock, M., & Andrews, M. (2010). Capability traps? *World Development, 38*(4), 479–491.

Rodrik, D. (2011). *The globalization paradox*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Romer, P. M. (1990). Endogenous technological change. *Journal of Political Economy, 98*(5), S71–S102.

Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The theory of economic development*. Harvard University Press.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2019). *People, power, and profits*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Susskind, D. (2020). *A world without work*. Metropolitan Books.

Thaler, R. H. (2016). Behavioral economics. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 30*(3), 173–194.

UNCTAD. (2023). *Trade and development report 2023*.

World Bank. (2023). *Global economic prospects*.

World Economic Forum. (2023). *Global competitiveness report*.

Zhu, S., & Li, Y. (2021). Digital transformation and economic resilience. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 169*, 120–145.

https:// doi.org/10.66325/nusantaraeconomy.v4i1.364