

10. Toboso F. Methodological developments in the old and the new Institutional economics. *History of Economic Ideas*, 2013, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 77–116.
11. Hodgson G. M. On fuzzy frontiers and fragmented foundations: Some reflections on the original and new institutional economics. *Journal of Institutional Economics*, 2014, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 591–611.
12. Hay C. *Political Analysis*. Hampshire and N.Y.: Palgrave, 2002, 329 p.
13. Фролов Д. П. Постинституционализм: за пределами институционального мейнстрима // *Вопросы экономики*. М., 2020. № 5. С. 107–140.
14. Biryukov V. V. Post-institutionalism: formation features through a change in the research paradigm. *The Science of Person: Humanitarian Researches*, 2020, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 158–165.
15. Alesina A., Giuliano P. Culture and Institutions. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 2015, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 898–944.
16. Трубицын Д. В. Институты, индивиды и отношения в процессе модернизации // *Вопросы экономики*. М., 2020. № 12. С. 125–140.
17. Тевено Л. Множественность способов координации: равновесие и рациональность в сложном мире // *Вопросы экономики*. М., 1997. № 10. С. 69–84.
18. Норт Д. Институты, институциональные изменения и функционирование экономики. М.: Фонд экономической книги «Начала», 1997. 190 с.
19. Шваб К., Дэвис Н. Технологии Четвертой промышленной революции. М.: Эксмо, 2016. 208 с.
20. Rodrik D. When Ideas Trump interests: Preferences, Wordviews, and Policy Innovations. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 2014, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 189–208.

Информация об авторе

Бирюков Виталий Васильевич

Доктор экономических наук, профессор кафедры экономики и управления персоналом. Омская гуманитарная академия (644105, РФ, г. Омск, ул. 4-я Челюскинцев, 2а). ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3385-3603>. Scopus Author ID: 56808949700. E-mail: sciencebv@gmail.com

V. V. Biryukov¹

¹Omsk Humanitarian Academy, Omsk, Russian Federation

Paradigmatic framework of modern economic research strategies: features of formation and revision

Abstract. The article is devoted to the problems of the formation of modern trends in the economic theory development. The purpose of the article is to substantiate the logic constructing a paradigm framework for the development of economic mainstream theories and the features of their revision based on the development of an alternative research strategy. The research is based on the use of constructivist methodology, which allows us to study the processes of economic development as a complex system with emergent properties and corresponding to the intersubjective nature of the economy. The emergence of modern paradigmatic frameworks of research strategies is interpreted as the result of the use of a dualistic model based on an eclectic combination of elements of individualism and holism methodologies. The paper deals with the transition to a new research paradigm of studying the relationship of economic relations, values and institutions, taking into account the diversity of economic motives and interests of subjects who have the ability to create collective forms of economic activity that meet the challenges of reality, depending on the achieved value-normative compromise. The proposed paradigm allows us to abandon the interpretation of the evolution of the economy based on the reproduction of the established type of connection between old and new institutions (path dependency) and to use a wide class of models of endogenous changes in values and institutions (path determinacy), within which a qualitatively new causal chain is formed, associated with the reproduction of economic and cultural codes.

Keywords: economic methodology, constructivism, institutionalism, economic value, economic institutions.

Paper submitted: January 25, 2021.

For citation: Biryukov V. V. (2021). Paradigmatic framework of modern economic research strategies: features of formation and revision. The Science of Person: Humanitarian Researches, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 157–164. DOI: 10.17238/issn1998-5320.2021.15.1.17.

References

1. Krugman P. Arguing with zombies: Economics, politics, and the fight for a better future. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 2020, 412 p. (In English).
2. Hands D. W. Orthodox and Heterodox Economics in Recent Economic Methodology. Erasmus Journal for Philosophy and Economics, 2015, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 61–81. (In English).
3. Kolander D. The Revolutionary Significance of Complexity Theory and the Future of Economic science. Voprosy Ekonomiki, 2016, no. 1, pp. 84–100. (In Russian).
4. Avtonomov V. S. Human model in economic science. St. Petersburg: Ekonomicheskaya shkola, 1998, 229 p. (In Russian).
5. Biryukov V. Values, institutions and economic development. Society and economy, 2020, no. 4, pp. 5–24. (In Russian).
6. Hands U. Normative theory of rational choice: past, present, future. Voprosy Ekonomiki, 2012, no. 10, pp. 52–75. (In Russian).
7. J. Hodgson. Institutions and individuals: interaction and evolution. Voprosy Ekonomiki, 2008, no. 8, pp. 45–61. (In Russian).
8. Arrow K. J. Methodological individualism and social knowledge. American Economic Review (Papers and Proceedings), 1994, vol. 84, no. 2, pp. 1–9. (In English).
9. Aoki M. Toward a comparative institutional analysis. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2001, 467 p. (In English).
10. Toboso F. Methodological developments in the old and the new Institutional economics. History of Economic Ideas, 2013, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 77–116.
11. Hodgson G. M. On fuzzy frontiers and fragmented foundations: Some reflections on the original and new institutional economics. Journal of Institutional Economics, 2014, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 591–611. (In English).
12. Hay C. Political Analysis. Hampshire and N.Y.: Palgrave, 2002. 329 p. (In English).
13. Frolov D. P. Post-institutionalism: beyond the institutional mainstream. Voprosy Ekonomiki, 2020, no 5, pp. 107–140. (In Russian).
14. Biryukov V. V. Post-institutionalism: formation features through a change in the research paradigm. The Science of Person: Humanitarian Researches, 2020, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 158–165. (In English).
15. Alesina A., Giuliano P. Culture and Institutions. Journal of Economic Literature, 2015, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 898–944. (In English).
16. Trubitsyn D. V. Institutions, individuals and relations in the process of modernization. Economic issues, 2020, no. 12, pp. 125–140. (In Russian).
17. Teveno L. Multiplicity of ways of coordination: balance and rationality in a complex world. Voprosy Ekonomiki, 1997, no. 10, pp. 69–84. (In Russian).
18. North D. Institutions, institutional changes, and the Functioning of the economy. Moscow: Foundation of the Economic Book Beginnings, 1997, 190 p. (In Russian).
19. Schwab K., Davis N. Technologies of the Fourth Industrial Revolution, Moscow, Eksmo, 2016, 208 p. (In Russian).
20. Rodrik D. When Ideas Trump interests: Preferences, Wordviews, and Policy Innovations. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 2014, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 189–208. (In English).

Information about the author

Vitaly V. Biryukov

Dr. Sc. (Econ.), Professor of the Department of Economy and Personnel Management. Omsk Humanitarian Academy (2a 4th Cheluskintsev st., Omsk, 644105, Russian Federation). ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3385-3603>. Scopus Author ID: 56808949700. E-mail: sciencebv@gmail.com

© В. В. Бирюков, 2021