

Strategic Configurations, Competitive Advantages, and Organizational Resilience: Based on a Study of Chinese Construction Enterprises

dongjie^a, Yitong Chen^a, Zhe Zhang^{b,*}, Qinghua He^b

^aSchool of Civil Engineering, Suzhou University of Science and Technology, , Suzhou, 215011, , China

^bSchool of Economics and Management, Tongji University, , Shanghai, 200092, , China

Abstract

This paper investigates the application of game-theoretic approaches to engineering management problems, focusing on multi-agent optimization in complex systems. We develop a mathematical framework that combines Nash equilibrium concepts with optimization theory to model decision-making processes in distributed engineering environments. Our computational experiments demonstrate significant improvements in system efficiency and resource allocation. The proposed methodology provides both theoretical foundations and practical implementation strategies for modern engineering management challenges.

Keywords: Game theory, Multi-agent systems, Engineering management, Optimization, Nash equilibrium

1. Introduction

Traditional business models in the construction industry are becoming ineffective due to a significant structural transformation. Long-standing operational pressures, such as rising material costs and skilled labor shortages, are now intensified by external demands for digitalization and sustainability. These forces create interconnected and often conflicting challenges. For instance, digitalization can help mitigate labor shortages but requires high capital investment, which in turn reduces profit margins. Concurrently, sustainability mandates introduce new compliance costs and operational complexities, requiring a more skilled workforce that is already in short supply.

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: zylenw97@usts.edu.cn (dongjie), yitongchen@usts.edu.cn (Yitong Chen), 2431220@tongji.edu.cn (Zhe Zhang), heqinghua@tongji.edu.cn (Qinghua He)

9 This dynamic creates a complex system of challenges where temporary or isolated advantages are
10 no longer sufficient to ensure long-term performance. Therefore, enterprises must build a **sus-
11 tainable competitive advantage (SCA)**—a set of valuable, rare, and difficult-to-imitate capabili-
12 ties—to effectively manage these systemic challenges and secure future success.

13 In this context of structural transformation, developing sustainable competitive advantages be-
14 comes critical for construction enterprises' survival and growth. Traditional competitive advan-
15 tages, often based on temporary market opportunities or replicable efficiencies, are insufficient to
16 withstand such persistent and systemic pressures. Sustainable competitive advantage (SCA), in
17 contrast, denotes an enterprise's capacity to sustain superior performance relative to competitors
18 through the deployment of unique resources and capabilities that exhibit temporal persistence and
19 inimitability (ref). Characterized by deep embeddedness in organizational capabilities, path de-
20 pendence, and resistance to imitation (ref), SCA has become the core strategic resource enabling
21 construction enterprises to navigate structural industry transformations (e.g., green and digital tran-
22 sitions) and cyclical market shocks (e.g., financial crises or pandemics) (ref). Consequently, con-
23 struction enterprises must construct sustainable competitive advantages; failure to do so will expose
24 them to severe risk of marginalization amid intensifying market competition.

25 Existing Architecture, Engineering, and Construction (AEC) literature has examined construc-
26 tion enterprises' competitive strategies from perspectives including political relationships, social
27 responsibility, Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP), digital transformation, and blockchain (ref).
28 However, existing research exhibits two significant limitations.

29 First, the majority of AEC literature focuses predominantly on traditional competitive advan-
30 tages rather than sustainable competitive advantages, yet these concepts differ fundamentally. Tra-
31 ditional competitive advantages typically stem from external market opportunities(ref) or tempo-
32 rary resource allocations (ref). This exhibits replicability and temporal constraints that render them
33 susceptible to displacement through competitor imitation or technological catch-up. They primarily
34 emphasize static resource allocation efficiency. Rather, sustainable competitive advantages origi-
35 nate from enterprises' internal unique resource bundles and capability systems, possessing VRIN
36 characteristics—valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable—enabling enterprises to gener-
37 ate superior profits over extended periods while resisting competitive pressures(ref). Moreover,
38 sustainable competitive advantages emphasize the construction and evolution of dynamic capabil-

39 ities—enterprises' capacity to sense environmental changes, seize market opportunities, and re-
40 configure resources. This fundamental distinction means that insights from traditional competitive
41 advantage research may inadequately guide construction enterprises seeking long-term resilience
42 and performance.

43 Second, previous studies have predominantly analyzed the impact of individual factors on com-
44 petitive advantage. This literature fails to capture the complex, systemic nature of success in the
45 construction industry. Competitive advantage in this sector rarely stems from a single "silver
46 bullet"; rather, it emerges from the synergistic interplay among an enterprise's strategy, its envi-
47 ronment, and its internal resources (ref). This reality exposes the limitations of traditional linear
48 models and necessitates a theoretical lens that can explain how different combinations of conditions
49 lead to superior performance. The configurational school of strategic management provides such
50 a lens, positing that an enterprise's advantage derives from the holistic fit of these multidimen-
51 sional elements (ref). By examining these combinations, or configurations, it becomes possible
52 to understand why enterprises with similar resources in the same environment can exhibit vastly
53 different outcomes. Therefore, this study adopts a configurational perspective to ask its first key
54 question: From the multi-dimensional perspective of strategy, environment, and resources, what
55 are the effective configurations for building a sustainable competitive advantage in the construction
56 industry?

57 While sustainable competitive advantage determines construction enterprises' market position
58 and profitability, organizational resilience ensures their survival and stability in turbulent environ-
59 ments. Organizational resilience refers to an enterprise's potential ability to anticipate, avoid, and
60 respond to environmental shocks (especially crisis events) (ref), with its core characteristic be-
61 ing the stability and reliability of maintaining competitive advantage and business performance
62 under crisis impacts. Unlike competitive advantage which focuses on exceptional operational per-
63 formance, organizational resilience focuses on stable operational performance. Existing research
64 demonstrates that organizationally resilient construction enterprises can better absorb shocks, main-
65 tain operational continuity, and recover more quickly from disruptions. For example, during the
66 COVID-19 pandemic, construction enterprises with strong organizational resilience maintained
67 project continuity through flexible resource reallocation and adaptive management practices, while
68 less resilient competitors faced project suspensions and financial distress (ref). This divergence

69 in crisis responses underscores the critical importance of organizational resilience in sustaining
70 competitive advantage over time.

71 Existing research largely focuses separately on the singular dimensions of either organiza-
72 tional resilience or competitive advantage. For instance, some scholars concentrated on functional
73 resilience rather than systemic resilience (ref); other scholars provided organizational resilience
74 frameworks (ref). However, existing research largely focuses on either organizational resilience or
75 competitive advantage as separate dimensions. The crucial interplay between them, particularly
76 how resilience contributes to the sustainability of an advantage, remains underexplored. A truly
77 sustainable advantage must be a resilient one; otherwise, it is merely a temporary high-performance
78 state vulnerable to the next crisis.

79 The Resource-Based View (RBV) provides a theoretical foundation for understanding this re-
80 lationship, positing that enterprises' sustained competitive advantage stems primarily from inter-
81 nal rather than external factors. From this perspective, organizational resilience capability can be
82 viewed as a strategic internal resource that enhances sustainable competitive advantage. Organiza-
83 tional resilience enables enterprises to withstand pressure, continuously innovate, and rapidly adapt
84 to changes, thereby protecting and reinforcing their competitive advantages during environmental
85 turbulence. In the context of construction enterprises facing increasingly complex and volatile
86 market environments characterized by supply chain disruptions, regulatory changes, and economic
87 fluctuations, the interplay between organizational resilience and competitive advantage becomes
88 particularly critical. Solely pursuing high competitive advantage without resilience leaves enter-
89 prises vulnerable to crisis-induced performance collapse, while focusing exclusively on resilience
90 without competitive advantage results in stable mediocrity. Construction enterprises must there-
91 fore develop strategic configurations that simultaneously cultivate both organizational resilience
92 and sustainable competitive advantage—enabling them to not only excel in stable periods but also
93 maintain stability during crisis events and capitalize on post-crisis opportunities. Therefore, this
94 study presents its second research question: How can enterprises simultaneously maintain organi-
95 zational resilience while achieving high competitive advantage?

96 To address these two research questions, this study employs Time-Series Qualitative Com-
97 parative Analysis (TSQCA) (ref). This configurational method was selected because traditional
98 regression analysis, which focuses on the net effects of isolated variables, is ill-suited to explain

99 how competitive advantage and resilience emerge from the complex, synergistic interplay of an
100 enterprise's strategy, environment, and resources. TSQCA, in contrast, is designed to identify the
101 multiple, distinct combinations of conditions that produce an outcome. By embracing the prin-
102 ciples of conjunctural causation (outcomes stem from combinations of factors) and equifinality
103 (multiple pathways lead to success), this approach provides a powerful tool for uncovering the dif-
104 ferent "recipes for success." In this study, TSQCA is used to determine which configurations of
105 strategic, environmental, and organizational conditions are sufficient for achieving high sustainable
106 competitive advantage and, subsequently, which of those configurations also ensure organizational
107 resilience.

108 On this basis, this paper collected 2,150 data points from 118 listed construction enterprises in
109 China from 2014 to 2023. It analyzes nine conditions across three major dimensions—strategic ori-
110 entation (diversification strategy, differentiation strategy, cost leadership strategy), environmental
111 characteristics (environmental dynamism, environmental richness), and organizational resources
112 (cost stickiness, organizational size, social responsibility, digital transformation)—to determine
113 which strategic configurations help construction enterprises gain sustainable competitive advan-
114 tages and which of these can also help enterprises obtain organizational resilience in response to
115 external uncertainties.

116 **2. Literature Review**

117 *2.1. Game Theory Applications in Engineering*

118 Game theory has been extensively applied to engineering problems since Nash's groundbreaking
119 work (?). Recent developments have extended these concepts to complex multi-agent scenarios
120 (?).

121 **3. Model Building**

122 *3.1. The Baseline Two-Player Evolutionary Game Model*

123 We first establish a baseline evolutionary game model to analyze the strategic interactions be-
124 tween two horizontal governments during a disaster emergency. The model focuses on the decision-
125 making process regarding cooperation on resource sharing, which includes both relief supplies and

critical information. It assumes that the governments are boundedly rational and dynamically adjust their strategies based on the payoffs from previous interactions. This baseline game model does not include a higher-level (vertical) government. The baseline model is built upon the following key assumptions:

Assumption 1. The game involves two players, i.e., two governments at the same administrative level. The first player is the Local Government (LG), which represents the government whose jurisdiction is primarily affected by the disaster and is in need of assistance. The second player is the Neighboring Government (NG), which represents the government of an adjacent region that possesses surplus resources and can offer aid.

Assumption 2. Each player has a strategy set of {Cooperate (C), Not Cooperate (NC)}. Let x be the probability that the LG chooses C, and $(1 - x)$ be the probability it chooses NC, where $x \in [0, 1]$. Similarly, let y be the probability that the NG chooses C, and $(1 - y)$ be the probability it chooses NC, where $y \in [0, 1]$.

Assumption 3. The players are not perfectly rational; instead, they learn and adapt their strategies over time based on the relative success of past choices.

Assumption 4. The rescue benefit derived from relief supplies follows an “S”-shaped function, which realistically captures the marginal utility of resources, from scarcity to abundance. The function is defined as:

$$F(\theta) = \frac{c}{1 + e^{-a\theta+b}} \quad (1)$$

where $\theta = X/D$ represents the material satisfaction rate (the ratio of allocated supplies X to demand D), and a, b, c are benefit coefficients.

Assumption 5 (Local Government’s Strategic Considerations). When choosing to cooperate with the Neighboring Government, the LG can obtain additional relief supplies through regional coordination. When both LG and NG actively cooperate, both governments incur a cooperation cost H , and the LG gains public credibility G_L for its collaborative efforts. According to the Interim Measures for the Management of Central Emergency and Disaster Relief Material Reserves (ref), following the principle of "user pays," the LG bears the transportation cost for the shared supplies. In this simplified model, we assume the transportation cost is proportional to the quantity of supplies transferred, expressed as $T = k(X_L - Q_L)$, where k represents the per-unit transportation cost. Through supply sharing, the LG’s per-capita rescue benefit F_L exceeds what would be

155 achieved without cooperation. Considering benefit distribution, the LG compensates the NG at a
156 per-unit market price m , resulting in a coordination payment of $m(X_L - Q_L)$. Cooperation also in-
157 volves information sharing, where the NG shares disaster situation data and resource information at
158 a certain sharing rate, helping the LG improve emergency prediction and pre-deployment, thereby
159 reducing potential costs and generating benefit P_L . When only the LG is willing to cooperate, it
160 still incurs a unilateral cooperation cost H_L . When only the NG cooperates, the NG proactively
161 shares information at rate α_N , allowing the LG to obtain corresponding benefits.

162 **Assumption 6** (Neighboring Government's Strategic Considerations). The Neighboring Gov-
163 ernment's strategy space similarly consists of {Cooperate, Not Cooperate}. This analysis focuses
164 on scenarios where the NG's disaster demand D_N does not exceed its emergency reserve Q_N , mean-
165 ing it has surplus supplies available to assist the LG. Given this surplus capacity, the NG must
166 evaluate multiple factors including cooperation benefits, costs, and potential risks when making its
167 decision. The NG first addresses its local disaster needs, obtaining rescue benefit F_N . Through
168 cooperation, the NG receives coordination compensation $m(X_L - Q_L)$, information sharing benefit
169 αP_N , and public credibility G_N . However, it must also bear cooperation costs and consider poten-
170 tial losses from providing aid to the LG, which is primarily related to the quantity of coordinated
171 supplies $(X_L - Q_L)$ and the per-unit potential loss W . When only the NG is willing to cooperate, it
172 incurs a unilateral cooperation cost H_N . When only the LG cooperates, the LG shares information
173 at rate α_L .

174 **Parameters and Variables**

175 The parameters used in the baseline model are defined as follows:

176 **Payoff Matrix**

177 Based on the parameters above, the payoff matrix for the two-player game is constructed as
178 follows:

179 *Note:* In each cell, the first entry is the payoff for the Local Government (LG), and the second is
180 the payoff for the Neighboring Government (NG).

181 **Replicator Dynamics Equations**

182 The evolution of the strategies within the LG and NG populations is modeled by the following
183 replicator dynamics equations:

Symbol	Definition
<i>Government-Specific</i>	
D_L, D_N	Demand for relief supplies for LG and NG, respectively
Q_L, Q_N	Quantity of relief supplies initially possessed by LG and NG, respectively
X_L	Total quantity of supplies available to LG after receiving aid from NG
	The amount of aid is $(X_L - Q_L)$
G_L, G_N	The gain in public credibility for LG and NG from cooperative actions
<i>Costs</i>	
H	Cost incurred by each government when both choose C
H_L, H_N	Cost incurred by the willing party in a unilateral cooperation scenario
T	Total transportation cost for the relief supplies, borne by the LG
k	Per-unit transportation cost
W	Per-unit potential loss for the NG for sharing its supplies (e.g., risk of facing its own subsequent shortages)
<i>Benefits & Payoffs</i>	
$F_L(\cdot), F_N(\cdot)$	The S-shaped benefit function for rescue effectiveness for LG and NG
m	The per-unit compensation benefit paid by LG to NG for the provided supplies
P_L, P_N	The benefit generated from information sharing for LG and NG, respectively
α	The information sharing rate when both governments choose C
α_L, α_N	The information sharing rate when only LG or NG is willing to cooperate, respectively

184

Replicator Dynamics Equation for the Local Government (LG):

$$F_L(x, y) = \frac{dx}{dt} = x(1-x)(E_x - E_{1-x}) \quad (2)$$

185

$$\begin{aligned} &= x(1-x) \left(G_L - H_L + y(D_L F_L \left(\frac{X_L}{D_L} \right) - D_L F_L \left(\frac{Q_L}{D_L} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (\alpha - \alpha_N)P_L - (X_L - Q_L)(k + m) - H + H_L \right) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

186

Replicator Dynamics Equation for the Neighboring Government (NG):

$$F_N(x, y) = \frac{dy}{dt} = y(1-y)(E_y - E_{1-y}) \quad (4)$$

Neighboring Government (NG)		
Local Government (LG)	C (y)	NC ($1 - y$)
C (x)	$D_L F_L \left(\frac{X_L}{D_L} \right) + \alpha P_L + G_L$ $-(X_L - Q_L)(k + m) - H,$	$D_L F_L \left(\frac{Q_L}{D_L} \right) + G_L - H_L,$
	$D_N F_N(1) + \alpha P_N + G_N$ $+(m - W)(X_L - Q_L) - H$	$D_N F_N(1) + \alpha_L P_N$
NC ($1 - x$)	$D_L F_L \left(\frac{Q_L}{D_L} \right) + \alpha_N P_L,$	$D_L F_L \left(\frac{Q_L}{D_L} \right),$
	$D_N F_N(1) + G_N - H_N$	$D_N F_N(1)$

187

$$= y(1 - y)(G_N - H_N + x((\alpha - \alpha_L)P_N + (m - W)(X_L - Q_L) - H + H_N)) \quad (5)$$

188 These equations describe the rate of change of the proportion of players adopting the C strat-
 189 egy in each population, forming the basis for analyzing the system's evolutionary stable strategies
 190 (ESS).

191 **4. Computational Experiments**

192 *4.1. Experimental Setup*

193 We implemented our algorithm in MATLAB and conducted experiments with the parameters
 194 shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Experimental Parameters and Their Values

Parameter	Symbol	Value
Number of agents	n	5
Cost coefficient	α	0.1
Discount factor	β	0.95
Convergence tolerance	ϵ	10^{-6}
Maximum iterations	T	1000

195 *4.2. Performance Metrics*

196 We evaluate our approach using the following metrics:

- 197 • System-wide efficiency improvement
- 198 • Convergence speed (iterations to equilibrium)
- 199 • Solution stability under parameter variations

200 **5. Results and Discussion**

201 Our computational experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed approach. The
202 algorithm consistently converges to Nash equilibrium within 50 iterations across all test scenarios.
203 The utility function defined in Equation ?? provides a robust framework for modeling agent
204 interactions, while the equilibrium conditions in Equations ?? and ?? ensure solution stability.

205 **6. Conclusion and Future Work**

206 This study successfully demonstrates the application of game-theoretic approaches to multi-
207 agent engineering management problems. Our key contributions include:

- 208 1. A novel mathematical framework combining game theory with optimization
- 209 2. Computational algorithms that efficiently solve large-scale problems
- 210 3. Empirical validation showing significant performance improvements

211 Future research directions include extending the model to dynamic environments and incorpo-
212 rating uncertainty in agent behaviors.

213 **References**