

UDC 316.42:330.59(477)

Sova Olena¹

¹ PhD in Economics, Associate Professor,

Mykhailo Ptoukha Institute for Demography and Life Quality

Research of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine

THE IMPACT OF STRUCTURAL SHIFTS IN UKRAINE ON THE RESILIENCE OF THE QUALITY OF LIFE

The current stage of Ukrainian society's development is characterized by large-scale structural shifts encompassing economic, social, demographic, ecological, and educational-labour spheres. Structural shifts are understood as long-term transformations in the proportions of the components of the national system that alter its internal balance, employment structure, models of social interaction, and formats of resource distribution. As a result of these changes, the very architecture of society is transformed, directly influencing the resilience of the population's quality of life – that is, the ability of communities and individuals to adapt to crisis conditions while maintaining basic standards of well-being and social stability. The focus is placed on the integrative model SER–SUS–QOL, which combines three dimensions: Resilience, Sustainability, and Quality of Life [1]. This model helps to assess the capacity of systems not merely to recover but to function sustainably within long-term environmental and social constraints.

In Ukraine, structural shifts have intensified due to deep economic and social crises caused by war. The economic structure has undergone radical transformations – relocation of industrial centers, reduction of energy-intensive sectors, and the growing role of small and medium-sized businesses, especially in services, logistics, and IT. Social structures, in turn, have evolved through the formation of new types of association – volunteer, educational, and professional networks – that have assumed part of the state's functions in social support and local development. In this context, the resilience of quality of life is determined not only by macroeconomic indicators but also by the flexibility of social institutions, the responsiveness of the education and labour systems to challenges, the level of solidarity within territorial communities, and access to basic services..

Structural shifts may both enhance societal resilience (through innovation, mobility, and decentralization) and threaten stability (through inequality, loss of human potential, and depopulation). Therefore, their analysis is essential for understanding the mechanisms of social resilience formation and for developing strategies to improve quality of life in Ukraine in the long term.

The “dominants of structuring” are understood as key factors shaping the structure of the socio-economic space and directly affecting the resilience of quality of life. These dominants can be classified according to the nature of their influence: socio-ecological, socio-economic, demographic, educational-labour,

societal, and social-capital-related. A dominant's core characteristic is its capacity to modify access to resources (material, financial, human) and recovery mechanisms. Analytically, it is important to distinguish between dominants acting through infrastructure (e.g., energy or transport) and those forming a "social buffer" (trust, cohesion, professional networks). A systemic approach enables identification of not only the direct but also the multiplicative effects of dominants on quality of life and its recovery after shocks [2].

Socio-ecological dominants integrate the interaction of ecological stability, access to natural resources, and the ability of communities to adapt infrastructure to external risks. In wartime and post-war contexts, infrastructure disruptions (energy and water supply, housing stock) exert a direct negative impact on everyday quality of life and community empathy. At the resilience level, not only reconstruction works are important but also the provision of ecosystem services supporting hygiene, health care, and food security. Studies show that socio-ecological factors significantly increase the resilience of individuals and youth after catastrophic events [3].

Socio-economic dominants such as the economic structure, employment level, access to income sources, and ownership define not only the basic standard of living but also the potential for rapid recovery after crises. Structural shifts leading to job losses or severe depreciation of assets reduce households' financial safety cushions, thereby weakening overall resilience. At the macro level, changes in the sectoral structure of the economy reshape the population's risk profile and vulnerability. Systemic research emphasizes that policies supporting income stability, access to credit, and investment in micro-infrastructure significantly enhance communities' self-recovery capacity [2].

Demographic dominants – ageing, internal migration, and depopulation of certain territories – determine the long-term structure of service demand and the human resource potential of communities. In Ukraine, the war has accelerated internal migration and altered the geography of human capital: young professionals tend to concentrate in safer cities, while frontline communities experience labour outflow and reduced reproductive potential. Demographic dominants also influence social support networks: in communities where family networks are disrupted, vulnerability increases and external aid becomes more necessary. Empirical studies emphasize that age and family characteristics are significant predictors of both individual and community resilience [4].

Educational and labour dominants (access to education and quality of workforce training) determine the long-term adaptive capacity of the economy. Interruptions in the educational process, relocation of universities, and reduced practical training have created a mismatch between skill demand and supply in the labour market. However, investments in digital infrastructure and hybrid learning formats can compensate for part of these losses and enhance system flexibility.

Research on displaced universities indicates that maintaining educational continuity and developing distance learning methods considerably mitigate negative effects on the quality of life of student groups and local communities [5].

Societal dominants refer to trust in institutions, social cohesion, civic engagement, and willingness to provide mutual support. They form the “social capital,” a key buffer during crises: high levels of trust and cooperation networks accelerate the recovery of public services and reduce costs associated with vulnerabilities. Recent studies in war-affected regions show that morale, hope, and collective expectations serve as significant predictors of resilience [6].

To strengthen the resilience of the quality of life, a coordinated policy is needed that combines infrastructure modernization, social protection for vulnerable groups, investment in education and digitalization, and the empowerment of local civil society institutions. It is also recommended to implement integrated impact assessments (SER–SUS–QOL) in recovery and reform planning so that policymakers not only restore lost living standards but also enhance long-term sustainability.

REFERENCES

1. Estoque R. C., Wu J. The resilience-sustainability-quality of life nexus. *The Science of the total environment*. 2024. Vol. 912, 169526. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.169526>
2. Brinkhof L. P., et al. The Interplay Between Quality of Life and Resilience Factors in Later Life: A Network Analysis. *Frontiers in psychology*. 2021. Vol. 12, 752564. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.752564>
3. McDonald-Harker C., et al. Social-Ecological Factors Associated With Higher Levels of Resilience in Children and Youth After Disaster: The Importance of Caregiver and Peer Support. *Front. Public Health*. 2021. Vol. 9, 682634. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2021.682634>
4. Kimhi S., et al. Impact of the war in Ukraine on resilience, protective, and vulnerability factors. *Frontiers in public health*. 2023. Vol. 11, 1053940. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1053940>
5. Andrushko Y., Lanza S. T. Exploring Resilience and Its Determinants in the Forced Migration of Ukrainian Citizens: A Psychological Perspective. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*. 2024. Vol. 21, 1409. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph21111409>
6. Koubová A., Kimhi S. Prediction of individual, community and societal resilience in the Czech Republic compared to Slovakia during the war in Ukraine. *BMC Public Health*. 2024. Vol. 24, 583. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-024-18075-y>