

PUBLIC FINANCE SUSTAINABILITY AND COMMUNITY RESILIENCE DURING ECONOMIC CRISES: A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

DOBROTĂ GABRIELA

PROF. PhD. CONSTANTIN BRÂNCUȘI UNIVERSITY OF TARGU JIU, ROMANIA

e-mail: gabriela.dobrota@e-ucb.ro

ZDÂRCU IONELA

Ec. Cabinet Expertiz Sibiu

e-mail: ionela.zdarcu@gmail.com

POPA DANIELA

LECT. PhD., "LUCIAN BLAGA" UNIVERSITY OF SIBIU

e-mail: daniela.popa@ulbsibiu.ro

DAN NICOLETA

LECT. PhD., "LUCIAN BLAGA" UNIVERSITY OF SIBIU

e-mail: nicoleta.dan@ulbsibiu.ro

Abstract

Economic crises place substantial pressure on public finances while simultaneously increasing the need for government intervention to protect households, firms, and essential public services. Fiscal sustainability is therefore not only a matter of maintaining manageable debt and deficit levels but also a condition for preserving the capacity of governments to respond effectively to future shocks. Against this background, the study develops a conceptual framework linking public finance sustainability with community resilience during periods of economic uncertainty. Particular attention is given to three interconnected dimensions: fiscal capacity, the effectiveness of fiscal intervention, and the social and distributional consequences of crisis-management measures. The discussion integrates evidence from the literature on fiscal multipliers, public debt, fiscal consolidation, public investment, inequality, and institutional quality. The analysis emphasizes that the effects of fiscal policy depend on economic conditions, the composition of government expenditure, institutional capacity, and the distribution of adjustment costs across households and communities. Public investment and well-targeted social protection can contribute to resilience when supported by adequate fiscal capacity, whereas poorly designed or excessively procyclical consolidation may weaken economic activity and exacerbate social vulnerabilities. The resulting framework highlights the need to consider fiscal sustainability and community resilience as complementary policy objectives rather than competing priorities. This perspective provides a basis for further empirical research on how fiscal capacity, expenditure composition, institutional quality, and distributional effects interact in shaping community resilience across countries and during different types of crises.

Keywords: public finance sustainability; fiscal policy; public debt; fiscal multipliers; public investment; community resilience; inequality; institutional quality; economic crises

JEL Classification: E62; H62; H63; H54; I38; O23

1. Introduction

The sustainability of public finances has become a central concern for policymakers, particularly in the context of recurring economic and social crises. Events such as the global financial crisis, the COVID-19 pandemic, and recent geopolitical tensions have placed significant pressure on government budgets and public institutions (IMF, 2022; OECD, 2021; Blanchard, 2019). Public finance sustainability refers to the ability of governments to maintain fiscal policies

over the long term without compromising economic stability or future generations' welfare (Auerbach & Gorodnichenko, 2017; Blanchard, 2019). In times of crisis, this objective becomes even more challenging, as governments are required to increase spending while managing limited resources and rising debt levels (IMF, 2022; Alesina et al., 2019). At the same time, crises have significant effects at the community level, influencing employment, income, access to services, and overall well-being (Stiglitz, 2012; Marmot, 2005). The ability of communities to cope with such shocks depends not only on local conditions but also on the effectiveness of public policies, institutional capacity, and fiscal interventions (OECD, 2021; Fatás & Summers, 2018).

The relationship between public debt and economic growth is not necessarily linear or uniform across countries. Eberhardt and Presbitero (2015), using a large international panel, identify heterogeneity in the relationship between public debt and long-run growth and do not find evidence for a common debt threshold applicable across countries. Their findings suggest that the relationship between debt and growth depends on country-specific circumstances and should not be reduced to a single numerical debt-to-GDP threshold (Eberhardt & Presbitero, 2015). Chudik et al. (2017) similarly find no evidence of a universally applicable threshold effect once the heterogeneous and cross-country dimensions of the relationship are considered.

The interaction between fiscal policy and economic activity is particularly important during recessions. Auerbach and Gorodnichenko (2012) show that government spending multipliers can be substantially larger during recessions than during expansions, suggesting that the effectiveness of fiscal intervention depends on the phase of the economic cycle. This finding is relevant to the present conceptual framework because the same fiscal intervention may generate different economic and social outcomes depending on the circumstances under which it is implemented.

At the same time, fiscal consolidation can have effects that extend beyond the immediate reduction in government expenditure or budget deficits. Fatás and Summers (2018) provide evidence of persistent effects of fiscal consolidations on economic output and identify strong hysteresis effects. Their findings indicate that fiscal adjustment can have consequences extending beyond the period in which the adjustment is implemented. This does not imply that fiscal consolidation is necessarily inappropriate, but rather that its timing and macroeconomic consequences need to be considered when assessing fiscal sustainability.

The community dimension is equally important. Economic crises affect employment, household income, access to healthcare and education, local businesses, and social well-being. These effects are not distributed equally across the population. Low-income households and other groups with limited financial resources may have fewer opportunities to absorb temporary income losses or disruptions in access to essential services (Stiglitz, 2012; Marmot, 2005). Consequently, fiscal sustainability should not be interpreted exclusively as a matter of maintaining acceptable debt and deficit indicators. It should also involve maintaining the state's capacity to provide essential public services and protect vulnerable groups during periods of severe economic disruption.

The COVID-19 crisis provides an important illustration of this relationship. Fiscal intervention during the pandemic was exceptionally large, but its effectiveness depended partly on the restrictions imposed on economic activity and on local economic conditions. Auerbach et al. (2022) find that government spending effects during the COVID-19 recession varied according to local restrictions, with stronger effects in locations that were not subject to strong stay-at-home orders. Their findings illustrate that the effectiveness of fiscal policy depends not only on the amount of fiscal support but also on the economic environment in which that support is implemented.

These considerations suggest that fiscal sustainability and community resilience should not be treated as separate policy objectives. Fiscal capacity provides governments with room to respond to shocks, while effective fiscal intervention can reduce economic and social losses. Conversely, fiscal policies that are poorly timed or poorly designed may weaken economic activity and increase social vulnerabilities.

The aim of this paper is therefore to explore the relationship between public finance sustainability and community-level responses in times of crisis. The study adopts a conceptual perspective and focuses on three major channels: fiscal capacity, policy effectiveness, and social impact. The central argument is that sustainable public finances should not be understood simply as a constraint on government intervention. Rather, fiscal sustainability represents an important condition for maintaining the capacity of governments to stabilize the economy, protect vulnerable groups, maintain essential services, and support community resilience during periods of uncertainty. The contribution of the study lies in bringing together fiscal sustainability and community resilience within a common conceptual framework, emphasizing the links between fiscal capacity, policy effectiveness, public investment, institutional quality, and the distributional effects of crisis responses. Rather than treating fiscal sustainability solely as a debt-management objective, the analysis highlights its broader role in preserving governments' capacity to sustain essential public services and support community resilience during periods of economic uncertainty.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the relevant literature and develops the conceptual framework, with particular attention to fiscal sustainability, community-level impacts, and the role of institutional capacity. Section 3 discusses the main fiscal policy channels through which governments can influence community resilience during crises, including countercyclical fiscal policy, public investment, social protection, and institutional quality. Section 4 presents the main policy implications and directions for future research, while Section 5 concludes.

2. Literature review and conceptual framework

2.1 Public Finance Sustainability

The concept of fiscal sustainability is closely linked to government debt dynamics, budget deficits, interest rates, economic growth, and the government's capacity to generate future revenues. In a conventional framework, the sustainability of public debt depends on whether the evolution of revenues and primary balances is compatible with the cost of servicing existing liabilities. However, the practical assessment of sustainability is more complex because interest rates and economic growth are uncertain, fiscal revenues fluctuate over the business cycle, and governments may face unexpected expenditure pressures during crises.

Blanchard (2019) emphasizes the importance of the relationship between interest rates and economic growth when evaluating the costs associated with public debt. In an environment in which safe interest rates remain below economic growth rates, debt dynamics may be less restrictive than suggested by analyses based solely on the level of debt. At the same time, Blanchard stresses that this does not imply that public debt is costless or that governments can increase debt without limits. The welfare consequences of debt also depend on its effects on capital accumulation, risk, and the broader macroeconomic environment. This perspective is important because fiscal sustainability is often reduced to the question of whether the debt-to-GDP ratio is high or low. Such an approach may be insufficient. Two countries with similar debt ratios can face different fiscal risks depending on their interest rates, growth prospects, tax capacity, institutional quality, debt maturity structure, and credibility of fiscal institutions. The present paper therefore treats fiscal sustainability as a multidimensional concept rather than a single numerical condition. Empirical research also challenges the idea that a universal debt threshold exists. Eberhardt and Presbitero (2015) find that the relationship between public debt and growth is heterogeneous across countries and that there is no evidence supporting a common debt threshold. Chudik et al. (2017) likewise find no universally applicable threshold effect, although their estimates indicate negative effects of debt accumulation on output growth. These findings support the interpretation adopted in this paper that fiscal sustainability should be understood in relation to broader macroeconomic and institutional conditions. More recent research further develops this broader perspective by emphasizing the interaction between public debt, economic growth, interest rates, and fiscal

institutions. Economides et al. (2025) argue that assessments based exclusively on debt arithmetic may overlook important structural aspects of fiscal sustainability, particularly the relationship between the interest rate and economic growth and the role of fiscal rules in addressing public debt imbalances.

During crises, governments frequently adopt expansionary fiscal policies in order to stabilize economic activity. These policies may include increased public expenditure, tax reductions, transfers to households, wage subsidies, support for businesses, and increased investment in healthcare and infrastructure (IMF, 2022; OECD, 2021). Such interventions can temporarily increase budget deficits and public debt. Nevertheless, such measures should be assessed in terms of their potential effects on output, employment, private investment, and future fiscal revenues.

The effectiveness of fiscal expansion is particularly dependent on economic conditions. Auerbach and Gorodnichenko (2012) find that spending multipliers are substantially different between recessions and expansions, with fiscal policy generally being more effective during recessions. This suggests that the fiscal cost of intervention should be compared not only with the immediate increase in expenditure, but also with the economic losses that could result from insufficient stabilization.

An important distinction should also be made between current expenditure and public investment. Public investment can influence aggregate demand in the short run while simultaneously increasing productive capacity in the longer term. Evidence for European countries indicates that public investment can have persistent effects on output and that multipliers may vary according to the function of investment (Saccone et al., 2022). Therefore, the composition of fiscal expenditure is an essential component of sustainability. An increase in debt used to finance productive investment may have different long-term implications from an increase in debt used to finance temporary or inefficient expenditure.

Fiscal consolidation represents the opposite side of the policy debate. Although consolidation can be necessary when debt dynamics become problematic, its timing and composition are important. Fatás and Summers (2018) show that fiscal consolidations can have persistent negative effects on economic output, creating the possibility that attempts to reduce debt through fiscal adjustment may weaken the denominator of the debt-to-GDP ratio. Alesina et al. (2019) also show that the macroeconomic effects of consolidation differ according to whether adjustment is based primarily on expenditure or taxation. This does not imply that consolidation is always inappropriate. Rather, consolidation strategies need to consider the state of the economic cycle, the composition of expenditure and taxation, and potential long-term effects on productive capacity.

2.2 Community-Level Impacts

Fiscal policies play a crucial role in shaping socio-economic outcomes at the community level. Public spending on healthcare, education, social protection, infrastructure, and employment support can influence household welfare directly and can also affect the capacity of local economies to recover from shocks (OECD, 2021; Stiglitz, 2010). Economic crises tend to affect population groups differently. Households with low and unstable incomes may have limited savings and therefore face immediate difficulties when employment or wages decline. Small enterprises may experience liquidity constraints, while workers in sectors particularly exposed to economic restrictions may face prolonged unemployment. Consequently, an identical macroeconomic shock can generate significantly different outcomes across households, sectors, and regions.

The distributional consequences of fiscal policy are supported by empirical evidence. Furceri et al. (2022), examining 103 developing countries, find that unexpected fiscal consolidations were associated with persistent increases in income inequality, whereas fiscal

expansions tended to reduce inequality. Their results also indicate that transfers play an important role in the distributional effects of government expenditure.

This evidence is particularly relevant to community resilience because inequality can influence the ability of households to absorb shocks. Households with limited financial resources are less able to maintain consumption when income declines or to compensate privately for disruptions in essential services. Fiscal policies that protect these groups can therefore have effects extending beyond short-term income support.

Social protection systems represent an important mechanism through which fiscal policy can strengthen community resilience. Unemployment benefits, targeted transfers, pensions, healthcare support, and temporary income-replacement schemes can stabilize household demand and reduce the immediate welfare consequences of crises. These mechanisms can also contribute to macroeconomic stabilization because income support can help households maintain consumption.

The role of fiscal policy is not limited to income redistribution. Public expenditure can also influence the availability and quality of essential services. During crises, healthcare systems may experience increased demand, while education systems may be disrupted, and local authorities may face additional responsibilities. Maintaining adequate public financing can therefore help prevent temporary shocks from producing longer-term deterioration in human capital and social welfare.

Public investment is particularly relevant in this respect. Infrastructure, digital connectivity, healthcare capacity, and education facilities can increase the ability of communities to absorb future shocks. Evidence for European countries shows that public investment has persistent output effects, particularly when resources support human capital, economic affairs, and public services (Saccone et al., 2022).

However, fiscal intervention does not automatically generate positive outcomes. The efficiency of spending depends on institutional capacity, administrative quality, transparency, and the ability to target resources toward groups and activities where they generate the greatest social return. Weak institutions can reduce the effectiveness of fiscal interventions and increase the risk that resources are allocated inefficiently. Regional disparities are another important dimension. Communities differ in economic structure, employment opportunities, infrastructure, demographic composition, and access to public services. A national fiscal policy may therefore have heterogeneous effects across regions. This suggests that fiscal policy should combine national stabilization with sufficient flexibility to address local conditions. Place-based approaches may be particularly important when shocks are geographically concentrated. The community dimension therefore strengthens the argument that fiscal sustainability should not be considered independently from social outcomes. A fiscal strategy that improves short-term budget indicators but substantially reduces access to essential services or increases long-term inequality may weaken the adaptive capacity of communities and create additional economic costs in the future.

2.3 Conceptual Framework

This paper proposes a conceptual framework linking public finance sustainability with community-level outcomes through three principal channels. Fiscal capacity refers to the ability of governments to mobilize revenues, access financing, allocate resources, and maintain fiscal operations during periods of stress. Strong fiscal capacity provides governments with greater room to respond to unexpected shocks.

Policy effectiveness refers to the extent to which fiscal measures achieve their intended economic and social objectives. Effectiveness depends on policy design, timing, targeting, implementation capacity, and the economic environment. Social impact refers to the effects of fiscal policies on household income, employment, inequality, access to public services, and overall welfare.

These three dimensions are interconnected. Fiscal capacity creates the possibility of intervention, but it does not guarantee effective policy. Policy effectiveness determines how

efficiently fiscal resources are transformed into economic and social outcomes. Social outcomes, in turn, affect the resilience of communities and may influence future fiscal conditions through employment, tax revenues, public expenditure needs, and economic growth.

The framework can therefore be represented as a dynamic relationship: Fiscal Capacity → Policy Effectiveness → Community Outcomes → Adaptive Capacity.

At the same time, the relationship is not strictly one-directional. Strong community outcomes can contribute to economic recovery, higher employment, stronger tax revenues, and reduced demand for emergency social expenditure. Consequently, community resilience can reinforce fiscal sustainability over time. An additional dimension concerns the quality of fiscal intervention. Two governments with similar fiscal capacity may generate different outcomes if their policies differ in terms of targeting, timing, transparency, and administrative efficiency. Fiscal sustainability therefore requires not only sufficient financial resources but also institutional mechanisms capable of converting these resources into productive economic and social outcomes.

3. Fiscal policy and community resilience during crises

3.1 Countercyclical Fiscal Policy and Economic Stabilization

Countercyclical fiscal policy is one of the main mechanisms through which governments can respond to economic downturns. During a recession, declining private consumption and investment can reduce aggregate demand, employment, and government revenues simultaneously. Fiscal expansion can counteract this process through increased public expenditure, transfers, tax reductions, or temporary support for firms. The effectiveness of such measures depends on the size of the fiscal multiplier, which varies according to economic conditions. Auerbach and Gorodnichenko (2012) provide evidence that fiscal spending multipliers are larger during recessions than during expansions. This result has important implications for fiscal sustainability. A temporary increase in expenditure during a severe downturn may generate a relatively large increase in economic activity and therefore help stabilize employment and household income.

The COVID-19 experience further illustrates this conditional nature of fiscal policy. Auerbach et al. (2022) find that the effectiveness of government spending during the pandemic depended partly on local restrictions. Spending had stronger effects in areas where economic activity was not severely constrained by stay-at-home orders. This evidence suggests that fiscal policy cannot be evaluated independently of the institutional and economic environment. A measure that is effective under normal recessionary conditions may have a smaller impact when firms are legally unable to operate, or households are unable to consume certain services.

For communities, countercyclical fiscal policy can therefore serve as a bridge between the macroeconomic and microeconomic dimensions of a crisis. By mitigating excessive declines in employment and income, fiscal intervention can reduce the depth of the recession and help preserve local productive capacity.

3.2 Public Investment as a Source of Long-Term Resilience

Public investment represents an important link between fiscal sustainability and community resilience. Unlike temporary transfers, infrastructure and human-capital investments can produce benefits over several years. Investment in transportation infrastructure can improve regional connectivity, while digital infrastructure can increase access to education, healthcare, and employment opportunities. Similarly, investments in healthcare capacity can improve preparedness for future health emergencies. Deleidi et al. (2020), using data for eleven euro-area countries, find that public investment multipliers are close to one on impact and larger in subsequent periods, with persistent effects on output. This evidence reinforces the view that the contribution of public investment to fiscal sustainability should be assessed not only through its immediate budgetary cost but also through its effects on productive capacity. Deleidi, Iafrate and Levrero (2023), for example, find positive and persistent effects of government investment on GDP in selected euro-

area countries, with multipliers close to one on impact and increasing in subsequent years. Saccone et al. (2022), using data for 31 European countries, also find persistent effects of public investment, with stronger effects for investments related to human capital, economic affairs, and public services. However, public investment is not automatically productive. The economic return depends on project selection, implementation quality, institutional capacity, and the degree to which investments respond to genuine economic and social needs. Poorly designed projects can increase public debt without generating equivalent improvements in productive capacity. Consequently, fiscal sustainability requires a distinction between the aggregate level of expenditure and its composition and quality. This distinction is particularly important for governments operating under tight fiscal constraints.

3.3 Social Protection and Inequality

The capacity of fiscal policy to protect vulnerable groups is another central component of community resilience. During crises, households with limited financial buffers may rapidly experience reductions in consumption and access to essential services. Social transfers can mitigate these effects and help maintain a minimum level of economic security. The interaction between inequality and fiscal policy became particularly visible during the COVID-19 crisis. Auerbach et al. (2021) show that inequality can affect both aggregate output and the effectiveness of demand-side fiscal stimulus, while COVID-19 restrictions can amplify the economic effects of existing inequalities. The distributional effects of fiscal consolidation demonstrate why the social dimension should be incorporated into fiscal sustainability assessments. Furceri et al. (2022) find that unexpected fiscal consolidations can increase income inequality over an extended period, while fiscal expansions can reduce inequality. Their results also indicate that transfers have an important redistributive role. From a policy perspective, this suggests that the composition of fiscal adjustment matters. Reductions in transfers or essential public services can have different effects from measures aimed at improving tax collection or reducing inefficient expenditure.

The objective should therefore be to design fiscal consolidation, when necessary, in a manner that minimizes damage to vulnerable groups and preserves expenditures that support long-term productivity. Such an approach can help avoid a situation in which short-term fiscal improvement creates long-term social and economic costs.

3.4 Institutional Quality and the Effectiveness of Fiscal Intervention

Institutional quality represents an additional element that connects fiscal sustainability with community adaptation. Fiscal resources can generate social benefits only when governments possess sufficient administrative capacity to design, implement, monitor, and evaluate policies. Recent literature also emphasizes that fiscal sustainability should be assessed within an institutional framework capable of reconciling short-term flexibility with longer-term debt discipline. Beetsma (2022) highlights the role of fiscal rules in supporting debt sustainability while recognizing the need to preserve sufficient room for stabilization. The institutional design of fiscal rules is particularly relevant in the European Union. Căpraru et al. (2025), using data for 27 EU Member States over 2000–2021, find a non-linear relationship between the number of fiscal rules and compliance with fiscal targets: additional rules can improve compliance up to a point, after which greater complexity may reduce effectiveness. Weak institutions may result in delayed implementation, poor targeting, duplication of programs, or inefficient allocation of resources. During crises, these problems become particularly significant because policy responses often need to be implemented rapidly. Institutional capacity should therefore be considered alongside financial fiscal capacity. A government may have access to financial resources but still be unable to convert those resources into effective crisis responses. Transparency and accountability are also important. Transparent allocation of public resources can reduce uncertainty and strengthen institutional

legitimacy. From the perspective of the present paper, these institutional mechanisms form part of the conditions under which fiscal capacity can be translated into effective policy outcomes.

4. Policy implications and directions for future research

The conceptual framework developed in this paper has several policy implications. First, fiscal sustainability should be evaluated dynamically rather than through isolated debt indicators. Debt levels, interest rates, economic growth, expenditure composition, revenue capacity, and institutional quality should be considered jointly. The absence of a universal debt threshold, documented by Eberhardt and Presbitero (2015) and Chudik et al. (2017), supports this broader approach.

Second, fiscal policy should be responsive to the economic cycle. Evidence that fiscal multipliers tend to be larger during recessions suggests that governments may obtain greater stabilization effects from temporary fiscal expansion when economic activity is weak. This does not eliminate the need for fiscal discipline, but it indicates that the timing of consolidation is an important component of fiscal sustainability.

Third, governments should protect productive public expenditure during periods of consolidation. Public investment in infrastructure, healthcare, education, and digital capacity can contribute to long-term productivity and resilience. Evidence from European countries supports the importance of expenditure composition when assessing the economic effects of public investment (Saccone et al., 2022; Deleidi et al., 2023).

Fourth, social protection should be considered an element of macroeconomic stabilization rather than solely a redistribution mechanism. By protecting household incomes and consumption during crises, targeted transfers can contribute to economic recovery while reducing the social costs of recessions (Furceri et al., 2022).

Fifth, fiscal policy should take regional differences into account. Communities with weaker economic structures and lower administrative capacity may require different forms of support. Place-based approaches can therefore complement national fiscal policies by directing resources toward regions where the economic and social effects of shocks are strongest.

Future empirical research could operationalize the framework proposed in this paper through measurable indicators. Fiscal capacity could be assessed using government revenue-to-GDP ratios, debt-service costs, fiscal balances, and access to financing. Policy effectiveness could be examined through fiscal multipliers, employment responses, investment effects, and implementation indicators. Social impact could be assessed through changes in poverty, inequality, employment, household income, and access to healthcare and education.

A comparative analysis of European countries would be particularly relevant. Such a study could investigate whether countries with stronger fiscal institutions were able to provide more effective support during recent crises and whether the composition of fiscal interventions influenced the speed of economic and social recovery.

Another possible direction would be to examine the interaction between fiscal sustainability and regional disparities. Regional panel data could be used to investigate whether fiscal transfers and public investment contribute to reducing differences in economic resilience between regions. The proposed framework could also be extended through econometric analysis. Panel-data models, local projections, structural vector autoregression models, or difference-in-differences approaches could be used to investigate the relationship between fiscal interventions and community-level outcomes. Such approaches would allow the conceptual relationships proposed in this paper to be transformed into empirically testable hypotheses.

5. Conclusions

The research examined the relationship between public finance sustainability and community resilience during periods of economic and social crisis. The analysis indicates that fiscal sustainability should not be understood exclusively as the maintenance of low deficits or public debt. It also concerns the capacity of governments to maintain essential public services, stabilize economic activity, protect vulnerable groups, and preserve productive capacity over time. From this perspective, fiscal sustainability represents not only a constraint on government intervention but also a condition for maintaining the capacity to respond to future shocks.

The literature reviewed in this study shows that the effects of fiscal policy are strongly dependent on economic and institutional conditions. Government spending multipliers tend to be larger during recessions, while the effectiveness of fiscal intervention during extraordinary crises such as COVID-19 depends partly on the extent to which economic activity is constrained. Similarly, the relationship between public debt and economic growth is more complex than the application of a universal debt threshold would suggest. Cross-country evidence points to substantial heterogeneity and indicates that debt sustainability should be assessed in relation to economic growth, interest rates, fiscal capacity, institutional conditions, and the structure of public expenditure.

The community dimension further broadens the assessment of fiscal sustainability. Fiscal policy can affect employment, household income, inequality, access to healthcare and education, local economic activity, and the capacity of communities to absorb and adapt to shocks. The distributional consequences of fiscal consolidation demonstrate that fiscal adjustment can generate social effects that extend beyond the immediate budgetary period. Consequently, the timing, composition, and distributional incidence of fiscal measures are relevant not only for short-term stabilization but also for longer-term social and economic resilience.

Public investment represents an important link between short-term stabilization and long-term development. Investment in infrastructure, healthcare, education, and digital capacity can support economic activity and strengthen future productive capacity when projects are appropriately selected and efficiently implemented. At the same time, the potential benefits of public investment and social protection depend on institutional and administrative capacity. Fiscal rules and other institutional arrangements may contribute to debt discipline, but their effectiveness depends on their design and on the ability to preserve sufficient flexibility for countercyclical intervention. These considerations reinforce the central proposition of the conceptual framework: fiscal sustainability and community resilience should not necessarily be treated as competing policy objectives.

The framework developed in this study connects these dimensions through three principal channels: **fiscal capacity, policy effectiveness, and social impact**. Fiscal capacity determines the extent to which governments can mobilize resources during periods of stress; policy effectiveness determines whether those resources generate meaningful economic and social outcomes; and social impact captures the distribution of both the benefits and costs of fiscal intervention. These channels interact with the adaptive capacity of communities, while successful adaptation can subsequently contribute to economic recovery, employment, tax revenues, and, ultimately, fiscal sustainability. The relationship should therefore be understood as dynamic and potentially reinforcing rather than as a simple one-directional relationship from fiscal policy to community outcomes.

From a policy perspective, the findings suggest that fiscal consolidation should not be evaluated solely according to its immediate effect on the deficit or debt ratio. Policymakers should also consider its potential effects on economic activity, employment, public investment, access to essential services, and vulnerable population groups. Similarly, crisis-related fiscal expansion should be assessed not only in terms of its short-term stabilization effects but also according to the quality and sustainability of the expenditure involved. The practical implication is the need for a

differentiated fiscal strategy that combines medium- and long-term debt discipline with sufficient flexibility to respond to severe economic and social shocks. Strengthening expenditure efficiency, protecting productive public investment, improving the targeting of social protection, and maintaining effective fiscal institutions may therefore contribute simultaneously to fiscal sustainability and community resilience.

The conceptual nature of the study also imposes several limitations. First, the analysis does not provide an original econometric estimation of the relationships identified in the framework. The conclusions therefore depend on evidence reported in the existing literature and should not be interpreted as causal estimates generated by the present study. Second, the concept of community resilience is multidimensional and difficult to capture through a single indicator. Differences in institutional capacity, regional development, demographic structure, and exposure to shocks may produce substantially different outcomes even under similar fiscal interventions. Third, the analysis considers several types of economic and social crises together, although financial crises, pandemics, energy shocks, and geopolitical disruptions can differ considerably in their transmission mechanisms and fiscal implications. These limitations indicate the need for caution when generalizing the conceptual relationships across countries, regions, and crisis episodes.

The framework nevertheless provides several directions for future empirical research. Country-level and regional panel datasets could be used to examine whether fiscal capacity, public investment, social protection, and institutional quality systematically influence community resilience during different types of crises. Future research could also investigate whether the composition and timing of fiscal consolidation matter more than the size of consolidation alone, and whether the effects differ according to the initial level of public debt, the interest rate-growth differential, and the quality of fiscal institutions. Regional analysis would be particularly valuable for identifying differences in the effects of national fiscal policies across communities with different levels of income, infrastructure, employment, and institutional capacity. Finally, future studies could develop composite indicators of community resilience and combine them with fiscal and macroeconomic indicators to test the relationships proposed by the conceptual framework more directly.

Overall, the analysis supports the view that fiscal sustainability and community resilience are mutually connected dimensions of long-term economic stability. Sustainable public finances provide governments with the fiscal space required to respond to crises, while well-designed fiscal interventions can protect productive capacity, essential services, and vulnerable communities in ways that support future economic recovery. The policy challenge is therefore not simply to minimize public debt or maximize short-term fiscal support, but to design fiscal institutions and expenditure strategies that preserve the state's capacity to act when it is most needed. In this sense, fiscal sustainability can be understood not merely as an objective of budgetary discipline, but as an essential component of the capacity of societies to withstand, adapt to, and recover from future shocks.

6. References

- [1] Alesina, A., Favero, C., & Giavazzi, F. (2019). Effects of austerity: Expenditure- and tax-based approaches. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 33(2), 141–162. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.33.2.141>
- [2] Auerbach, A. J., & Gorodnichenko, Y. (2012). Measuring the output responses to fiscal policy. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 4(2), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1257/pol.4.2.1>
- [3] Auerbach, A. J., & Gorodnichenko, Y. (2017). *Fiscal stimulus and fiscal sustainability* (NBER Working Paper No. 23789). National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w23789>

- [4] Auerbach, A. J., Gorodnichenko, Y., & Murphy, D. (2021). Inequality, fiscal policy and COVID-19 restrictions in a demand-determined economy. *European Economic Review*, 137, 103810. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroecorev.2021.103810>
- [5] Auerbach, A. J., Gorodnichenko, Y., McCrory, P. B., & Murphy, D. (2022). Fiscal multipliers in the COVID-19 recession. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 126, 102669. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jimonfin.2022.102669>
- [6] Beetsma, R. (2022). The economics of fiscal rules and debt sustainability. *Intereconomics*, 57(1), 11–15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10272-022-1021-1>
- [7] Blanchard, O. (2019). Public debt and low interest rates. *American Economic Review*, 109(4), 1197–1229. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.109.4.1197>
- [8] Bohn, H. (1998). The behavior of U.S. public debt and deficits. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 113(3), 949–963.
- [9] Căpraru, B., Pappas, A., & Sprincean, N. (2025). Fiscal rules in the European Union: Less is more. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 63(1), 320–334. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcms.13628>
- [10] Chudik, A., Mohaddes, K., Pesaran, M. H., & Raissi, M. (2017). Is there a debt-threshold effect on output growth? *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 99(1), 135–150. https://doi.org/10.1162/REST_a_00593
- [11] Deleidi, M., Iafrate, F., & Levrero, E. S. (2020). Public investment fiscal multipliers: An empirical assessment for European countries. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, 52, 354–365. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.strueco.2019.12.004>
- [12] Deleidi, M., Iafrate, F., & Levrero, E. S. (2023). Government investment fiscal multipliers: Evidence from euro-area countries. *Macroeconomic Dynamics*, 27(2), 331–349. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1365100521000419>
- [13] Eberhardt, M., & Presbitero, A. F. (2015). Public debt and growth: Heterogeneity and non-linearity. *Journal of International Economics*, 97(1), 45–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinteco.2015.04.005>
- [14] Economides, G., Koliouisi, G., Miaouli, N., & Philippopoulos, A. (2025). From debt arithmetic to fiscal sustainability and fiscal rules: Taking stock and policy lessons. *The Journal of Economic Asymmetries*, 31, e00393. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeca.2024.e00393>
- [15] Fatás, A., & Summers, L. H. (2018). The permanent effects of fiscal consolidations. *Journal of International Economics*, 112, 238–250. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinteco.2017.11.007>
- [16] Furceri, D., Ge, J., Loungani, P., & Melina, G. (2022). The distributional effects of government spending shocks in developing economies. *Review of Development Economics*, 26(3), 1574–1599. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rode.12888>
- [17] Horne, J. (1991). *Indicators of fiscal sustainability* (IMF Working Paper No. 91/05). International Monetary Fund.
- [18] International Monetary Fund. (2022). *Fiscal monitor: Helping people bounce back*. International Monetary Fund.
- [19] International Monetary Fund. (2023). *Fiscal monitor: On the path to policy normalization*. International Monetary Fund.
- [20] Marmot, M. (2005). Social determinants of health inequalities. *The Lancet*, 365(9464), 1099–1104. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(05\)71146-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(05)71146-6)
- [21] OECD. (2021). *Government at a glance 2021*. OECD Publishing.
- [22] OECD. (2024). *OECD economic outlook, Volume 2024 Issue 1*. OECD Publishing.
- [23] OECD. (2025). *Sustainability of public finances in OECD countries: From fiscal consolidation to state redesign?* OECD Publishing.
- [24] Saccone, D., Della Posta, P., Marelli, E., & Signorelli, M. (2022). Public investment multipliers by functions of government: An empirical analysis for European countries. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, 60, 531–545. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.strueco.2022.01.006>

- [25] Stiglitz, J. E. (2010). *Freefall: America, free markets, and the sinking of the world economy*. W. W. Norton.
- [26] Stiglitz, J. E. (2012). The price of inequality. *American Economic Review: Papers & Proceedings*, 102(3), 1–16.
- [27] World Bank. (2023). *Global economic prospects*. World Bank.