

УДК 330.101
JEL B4, B5

DOI: 10.17238/issn1998-5320.2020.14.3.19

V. V. Biryukov¹

¹Omsk Humanitarian Academy, Omsk, Russian Federation

Post-institutionalism: formation features through a change in the research paradigm

Abstract. The article is devoted to the consideration of problems of developing the theory of institutional economics. The purpose of the article is to substantiate promising areas of post-institutional research, making it possible to develop research approaches that are adequate to the realities based on rethinking the economic mainstream paradigm. To overcome the limitations of the methodology of individualism and holism of the institutional mainstream, it is proposed to use modern scientific methodology, which allows one to study economics as a multidimensional and nonlinearly developing complex system that corresponds to the intersubjective nature of economic reality. The article substantiates the need for a transition to the post-institutional stage of economic science development and also considers promising areas of post-institutional research that contribute to the development of research approaches that are adequate to the increasingly complex reality, taking into account the features of formation of inter-level links in the modern economy. Today, on the periphery of the attention of post-institutionalists, there are issues of changing the economic mainstream paradigm. The proposed research program can give a more meaningful interpretation of economic processes based on a systemic analysis of complex interrelationships of endogenous economic values and institutions that determine the civilizational features of development of national economies.

Keywords: neo-institutionalism, post-institutionalism, constructivism, institutional mainstream, national economy, economic values, economic institutions.

Paper submitted: July 6, 2020 r.

For citation: Biryukov V. V. (2020). Post-institutionalism: formation features through a change in the research paradigm. The Science of Person: Humanitarian Researches, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 158–165. DOI: 10.17238/issn1998-5320.2020.14.3.19.

Problem and purpose. The consequences of the coronavirus pandemic have put humanity in the face of difficult socio-economic problems that have coincided with the problems of a shift in the technical-economic paradigm and the unfolding fourth industrial revolution. In the context of the formation of a new economic reality, the established approaches are losing their former significance in the study of modern processes. In the last two decades, there has been the formation of a new wave of economic research related to the identification of ever-larger flaws in the neo-institutional mainstream and the need to move to a post-institutional stage in the economic science development. At the same time, the key issues of constructing a new paradigm of considering economic reality based on a change in the economic mainstream methodology that emerged a century and a half ago are currently outside the proper attention of supporters of

the post-institutional theory, focused on the development of various heterodox approaches to the institutional analysis of the economy. The purpose of the article is to substantiate promising areas of post-institutional research, touching upon a wide range of issues beyond the economic mainstream paradigm and allowing the development of research approaches that meet the new challenges of economic reality.

Methods. To go beyond the paradigmatically limited framework of research approaches of the institutional mainstream, based on the methodology of individualism and holism, it is proposed to move to the post-institutional stage of economic theory development, relying on the modern scientific methodology for studying the economy as a multidimensional and nonlinearly developing complex system corresponding to the intersubjective nature of changing economic reality. This makes it possible to overcome the fundamental shortcomings of the existing

theories and develop a satisfactory program for studying the economy, taking into account its multidimensional and dynamic nature and based on adequate ideas about economic actors, their qualitative properties, the nature and types of relations between them. The proposed methodology is based on constructivist logic and allows one to go beyond dogma, axiomatics, and the established discourse of the institutional mainstream in general.

Results. In the context of the formation of a new economic reality associated with the consequences of the coronavirus pandemic, as well as with the problems of changing the technical-economic paradigm and the unfolding fourth industrial revolution, traditional research approaches are losing their significance. In the last two decades, more and more flaws of the neo-institutional mainstream have been revealed [1, 2, 3]. In this regard, there is a need to rethink the current cognitive situation and, based on this, develop the main areas of formation of the post-institutional stage in the economic theory development associated with the transition to a new paradigm. It seems that it is expedient to include the following among such directions.

1. Reliance on the principle of methodological dualism in the analysis of intersubjective economic reality. Today, critics point to the lack of attention of neo-institutionalism to the role of actors in the institutional change, to the interpretation of institutions as static and not related to the context of people's economic activity, as well as to the use of universalist approaches to the study of various socio-economic processes. In this regard, the number of studies focused on the development of a post-institutional vision of modern economic development in the framework of various approaches to the institutional analysis is increasing. At the same time, the dominance of neo-institutional discourse reinforced the "empirical turn" in economic research, which was so enthusiastically welcomed by the most authoritative specialists in the methodology of economic analysis. However, this turn coincided with the decay of the flow of major theoretical innovations at the turn of the 1980s and 1990s [4, p. 120].

At present, researchers often implicitly work in the field of post-institutionalism, developing

certain concepts that go beyond the framework of neo-institutionalism. However, the cognitive situation is complicated by the fact that post-institutionalists start from the importance of pluralism of theoretical positions in the context of ongoing competition in the sophistication of formal models [5, p. 138]. At the same time, the issues of constructing a post-institutional paradigm on the basis of changing the long-outdated research program of the economic mainstream remain on the periphery of attention. The formation of a realistic understanding of the picture of economic reality, which is formed as a result of a complex connection of collective and individual actions, presupposes going beyond the boundaries of the cognitive potential of the structural and agency paradigms dominating in the economic mainstream, in accordance with which collective phenomena (cultural values, norms, institutions, etc.) act as exogenous factors outside the limits of human decisions and actions. At the same time, it is important to take into account that agents and structures are not two independent complexes of phenomena, but are a dual whole. The structural properties of social systems must be considered both as a means and as a result of practice [6, p. 25]. Consideration of the economy as a special class of a complex self-developing system implies taking into account that its specific properties are determined by the interactive nature of relations.

Clarification of the relationship between economic structures and economic actions is facilitated by the emergence of a modern wave of research in the framework of the turn to culture [1]. In this regard, there are prerequisites for a change in the research paradigm based on the use of constructivist logic, which presupposes a break with the dominant positivism in the field of cognition throughout most of the 20th century. In accordance with this logic, in contrast to the logic of the theories of methodological individualism and holism, value-rational subjects enter into interaction; in the course of communicative practices, they reach agreement on values and institutions [7]. Recognition of the intersubjective nature of economic reality presupposes the study of all processes of reproduction and changes in the increasingly complex economic reality based on the principle of methodological dualism due to the presence of system-wide and unique

elements in the culture of economic thinking and behavior of subjects, which gives rise to the duality of their values, goals, and behavior models.

2. Consideration of economic values and institutions as endogenous regulators of human economic activity. The paradigmatic limitations of neo-institutional theory, conditioned by individualistic methodology, gave rise to the central dogma of the neo-institutional approach – the provision on the exogenous nature of collective phenomena of economic culture and reality – economic values, traditions, norms, institutions, etc. In this regard, the neo-institutional approach has caused a wide range of contradictory interpretations of culture (cultural values) and institutions, as well as their interrelationships, various dilemmas of the theory of institutions and institutional change.

Today there are big doubts about the explanatory power of the concept of “institution”, which is fundamental for neo-institutional theory. As a result of the exogenous interpretation of the nature of economic institutions, supporters of this theory have a need to choose some of its reductionist interpretations based on the specifics of the analyzed aspect of economic reality. The growth of interpretations of institutions leads to the fact that this concept increasingly loses its substantive definiteness; anything becomes an “institution”: from a handshake to a corporation, from a legal form to Western concepts of personality, from a family company to a reporting procedure [8, p. 124].

Due to the complexity of institutions, researchers usually reduce their content to separate types – rules, norms, patterns of behavior, orders, beliefs, values, social structures, etc. Institutions are often interpreted on the basis of one (institutions – “rules of the game”) or several their types (institutions – rules, beliefs, and organizations). Post-institutionalism is supposed to move towards depressurization of the concept of “institution”, towards expansive definitions that integrate reductionist approaches. The developed interpretations of institutions should, if possible, combine all the main approaches to their understanding – regulatory (institutions as rules, norms, conventions, customs, etc.), behavioral (institutions as behavioral regularities,

formats, practices of actions, routines, etc.), status-functional (institutions as status functions with deontic logic that determine statuses, roles, identities, rights, obligations, etc.), cognitive (institutions as general beliefs, stereotypes, heuristics, typifications, narratives, ideologies, etc.), structuralist (institutions as models of organizational forms/structures/architectures) and technological ones (institutions as social/transactional technologies). These approaches are considered as the main dimensions of the content of institutions as a multidimensional continuum of intangible social factors in the ordering of human activity [9, p. 114–115].

The persistent stereotypes that have developed within the framework of the neo-institutional approach associated with an exogenous interpretation of economic values and institutions inevitably give rise to significant shortcomings in views of their nature and co-evolution. In this regard, Sorokin noted that in all spheres of society (and, consequently, in the economic sphere), each significant process of human interaction included “meanings, values and norms, due to which individuals interact, realizing and exchanging them” [10, p. 429]. Recognition of the intersubjective nature of economic reality and reliance on the principle of methodological dualism orients towards rethinking the problem area of research based on its expanded vision and a more meaningful study of economic values and institutions as special endogenous regulators of people’s economic activity.

The change of the research paradigm within the framework of post-institutionalism provides for overcoming the value-neutral interpretations of economic structures inherent in the economic mainstream theories, and is intended to focus on the study of economic structures that regulate people’s behavior as formed on the basis of the creation of shared economic values by economic actors in the course of economic practices of value-behavioral structures. These structures act as economic institutions that coordinate economic interactions and human behavior by means of informal and formal institutional regulators. Institutional forms of links are formed as a result of establishing norms when they are recognized as justified and are supported by incentive and compulsory motives. They express the achieved level of general agreement and are regulated by

means of moral values, since “only those norms that express the general will are accepted as effective” [11, p. 100]. Therefore, the processes of construction and transformation of economic institutions are associated with the legitimization processes, which provide for the assessment by the economic actors of the level of trust in institutions as fair and effective.

3. The study of features of economic processes implementation at different levels of economic reality. The reliance of neo-institutionalism on methodological individualism and traditional (old) institutionalism on the methodology of holism leads to a focus on considering superficial-empirical links and the use of reductionist ideas. To overcome the fundamental flaws of competing theories and develop a satisfactory research program, it is necessary to consider economic reality taking into account its multidimensional and dynamic nature and based on adequate ideas about the qualitative properties of economic entities and complex mechanisms for the formation of relationships between them.

For a realistic description of the systemic changes that are taking shape in modern conditions at different levels of economic reality, it is necessary to proceed from the fact that they are carried out as a result of contradictory and often conflicting interactions of individual and collective subjects, which differ in the economic and cultural perception of reality, as well as power, material and other types of influence resources. In this regard, in order to form a favorable and relatively stable development of economic processes, they are forced to develop and approve the preferred model as a generally accepted one on the basis of a compromise. For this purpose, in the national economy, it is important to distinguish three main structural levels at which system-related processes evolve. Contrary to the theories developed in line with cultural and institutional determinism, the construction of economic practices at the superficial level of reality is determined by the processes occurring at the deep and intermediate levels of this reality – value-regulatory and institutional-instrumental ones, which determine the emergence of the corresponding subject areas of research and interpretation of the world economic picture [12].

At the value-regulatory level, different interacting groups substantiate the priorities and the most important areas of the national economy development, taking into account the trends of the business environment, and are forced to rely on moral categories when they seek to approve the desired system of value-economic preferences as universally recognized. In this context, the discussion of economic ideas, projects, and programs inevitably turns into a clash of ideologies that characterize differences in the economic worldview and are an important component of economic life. These ideologies express some of its generalized images, in which cognitive, regulatory, and symbolic components are interwoven. Depending on the features of economic interactions in the national economy, a value-economic compromise is formed, corresponding mainly to the ideology of the dominant groups in the form of shared national “lenses” and the ones that are generally distorted to a certain extent. As a result, the dominant model of understanding economic reality and constructing general priorities for the national economic development and its areas, corresponding to realities to a certain extent, is established.

At the institutional-instrumental level, on the basis of the existing compromise, the state creates tools to influence people’s economic behavior through formal institutions, under the influence of which informal institutions are also formed. At the same time, economic values, ideas, and mythological representations of an established economic ideology act as key endogenous factors of constructing and legitimating regulators of changes in economic institutions and relations, economic-cultural orientations, and models of the economic behavior of economic actors. However, it should be taken into account that the legitimization and institutionalization of the introduced economic rules and regulations are carried out with a sufficient level of trust in them, and when trust is lost, their erosion and deinstitutionalization occur. This determines the features of formation of the processes occurring in various spheres of the national economy – value-regulatory, organizational-managerial, production-technological, financial-economic, foreign economic,

and other spheres; their interconnection is not rigid, different types and forms of contradictions may arise in the real economy.

4. Development of a post-institutional vision of civilizational features of national economies development. The formation of the post-institutional economic theory requires a revision of the fundamental postulate of the neo-institutional approach about the statics and inertia of institutions [13]. The need to recognize the existence of a two-way causal relationship between economic values and institutions and its contradictory impact on economic development has not become generally accepted, since this recognition cannot be correctly incorporated into the narrow framework of the economic mainstream. Neo-institutional studies of the evolution of economic institutions are implicitly based on the neo-Darwinian paradigm; in the neo-institutional models developed in this regard, the economic development is determined by the quality of institutions, and the influence of values is ignored or underestimated [12; 14]. Attempts to change the cognitive situation based on the traditional paradigm have not led and cannot lead to positive results.

For a realistic description of the driving forces and mechanisms of long-term development of the national economy, it is important to take into account that at each of its stages, due to the specifics of implementation of ethical values on the basis of the compromise reached, a kind of value-economic matrix arises; this determines the variety of national forms of implementation of the general laws of civilizational changes. As a result of the reproduction of this matrix, national features of access to the resources of various interacting groups and models of the construction of economic institutions are formed. In models of national economies with a high level of imbalance of interests, limited opportunities and incentives for economic activity are created, the rent orientations of dominant groups are enhanced and the role of coercive methods in regulating the economy increases; this leads to the emergence of mechanisms for slowing down economic and technological development. Each national economy, depending on the features of its development, has its own scope of legitimate variation of imbalances of interests; at the

same time, the decline in trust in the authorities and economic institutions to a critical level is accompanied by deinstitutionalization processes with unpredictable consequences. Therefore, it is important for the state to maintain at least a minimum of good and justice, otherwise, chaos will come [15, p. 172]. However, depending on the features of the interaction of social forces, changes in national economies can take place in various forms and be carried out either within the framework of the existing value-economic matrix and development model or through their change.

The development trajectories of national economies are determined by a complex relationship between different life cycles of cultural, institutional, and technological structures. The study of long waves of the technical-economic development by Kondratyev, Glazyev, and Peres and the study of world-system processes by Wallerstein, Braudel, Frank, Amin, Arrigi, and Modelski convincingly indicate the presence of specific patterns of the transformation of the global center-peripheral system, arising from the uneven technical-economic development. Besides, it should be taken into account that modern mechanisms for the world economy development are formed on the basis of contradictory interactions of global players, as a result of which dominating supranational value-economic orientations and global economic institutions are established, focused on maintaining peculiar models of national economies of dependent capitalism using incentive and coercive motives, and influential groups in peripheral countries. In this regard, a complex system of building the world economy is being formed, expressing the contradictory interconnection of subsystems at all its levels: global, national, local ones, etc. [12].

In the past three decades, the main trend in the world economy transformation has been determined by the implementation of a neoliberal project associated with the spread of illusions about building a world order of general well-being. However, the implementation of this project caused an increase in injustice, poverty, and inequality in the world, profound changes in public consciousness and massive protests in 2019–2020, triggering global processes of deinstitutionalization. Thus,

according to authoritative studies at the end of 2019, more than half of the world's population, including in many developed countries of Europe, as well as in Russia, assumed that capitalism in its current form did more harm than good [16]. Opponents of the neoliberal project argue that it allows for the systematic manipulation of rules in the interests of billionaires and key players in the financial markets. In peripheral societies, this project is often carried out in the form of neoliberal authoritarianism and tools for the formation of authoritarian consciousness [17]. Even before the pandemic, the crisis of the neoliberal project and its limited ability to solve the problems created by the changing global situation were clearly observed. The pandemic with its far-reaching consequences is superimposed on the megatrends associated with a change in the technical-economic paradigm, acted as a detonator of the crisis [18].

In the context of the systemic crisis of the global economy, the formation of new trends will be determined by the changing balance of power due to the fact that the Third World countries are becoming more and more significant actors in the world economy. More than 85% of the world's population lives in these countries today, and they produce more than 60% of the world's production. When developing a model of a new world order and implementing it, the central countries will have

to take into account the fact that today, largely under the influence of China's breakthrough from the periphery to the dominant countries, a new global reality with new opportunities and new threats is being formed. In dozens of countries struggling with the pandemic, the temporarily imposed restrictions on civil liberties may persist even after it has been overcome [19]. This may be accompanied by the attempts to increase the role of information, digital and epidemiological technologies in strengthening control over people.

Conclusions. Supporters of post-institutional theory consider it important to develop a pluralistic program of research approaches, but they pay little attention to the issues of constructing a post-institutional paradigm of considering the modern economy, which makes it possible to overcome the systemic flaws of mainstream institutionalism. The proposed directions of the research program of post-institutionalism imply a transition to a deeper level of study of the increasingly complex economic reality and contribute to obtaining its more meaningful interpretation based on the rejection of reductionist and monocausal approaches, the development of a conceptual framework and tools, taking into account the diversity and contradictory relationship of endogenous economic values and institutions determining the features of the civilizational development of national economies.

References

1. Biryukov V. Cultural paradigm of the vision of economic reality. Society and economy. 2018, no. 9, pp. 91-101 (In Russian)
2. Polterovich V. M. To the General theory of socio-economic development. Part 1. Geography, institutions or culture? Voprosy Ekonomiki. 2018, no. 11, pp. 5-26 (In Russian)
3. Kapelyushnikov R. I. Contra paninstitutionalism. Part I. Voprosy Ekonomiki. 2019, no. 7, pp. 119-146 (In Russian)
4. Kapelyushnikov R. I. On the current state of economic science: semi-sociological observations. Voprosy Ekonomiki. 2018, no. 5, pp. 110-128 (In Russian)
5. Whaley L. (2018). The critical institutional analysis and development (CIAD) framework. International Journal of the Commons. Vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 137-161. (In English)
6. Giddens A. (1984). The Constitution of Society. Cambridge : Politty Press. 402 p. (In English)
7. Finnemore M., Sikkink K. (2001). Taking Stock: The Constructivist Research Program in International Relations and Competitive Politics. Annual Review of Political Science, no 4, pp. 391-416. (In English)
8. Alvesson M., Hallett T., Spicer A. (2019). Uninhibited institutionalisms. Journal of Management Inquiry, Vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 119-127 (In English)

9. Frolov D. P. Post-institutionalism: beyond the institutional mainstream. *Voprosy Ekonomiki*. 2020, no 5, pp. 107–140 (In Russian)
10. Sorokin P. *The Man. Civilization. Society*. Moscow, Politizdat Publ. 1992. 543 p. (In Russian)
11. Habermas Yu. *Moral consciousness and communicative action*. Saint-Petersburg, Nauka Publ., 2001, 380 p. (In Russian)
12. Biryukov V. Values, institutions and economic development. *Society and economy*, 2020, no. 4, pp. 5–24 (In Russian)
13. Olsen J. P. Change and continuity: An institutional approach to institutions of democratic government. *European Political Science Review*, 2009, Vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 3–32 (In English)
14. Chang H.-J. Reply to the comments on «Institutions and economic development: Theory, policy and history». *Journal of Institutional Economics*, 2011, Vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 595–613 (In English)
15. Berdyaev N. A. *About the appointment of a person*. Moscow, MGU Publ., 1993, 212 p. (In Russian)
16. Edelman web – Edelman Trust Barometer 2020 [Electronic resource] // URL: <https://www.edelman.com/sites/g/files/aatuss191/files/2020-01/2020%20Edelman%20Trust%20Barometer%20Global%20Report.pdf> (accessed on : 01.06.2020). (In English)
17. Hanafi S. Global sociology: towards new directions. *Sociological research*, 2019, no. 8, pp. 3–7
18. Kolodko G. V. The Consequences. Economics and politics in the post-tandem world. *Voprosy Ekonomiki*, 2020, no. 5, pp. 25–44 (In Russian)
19. Everything's under control. The state in the time of covid-19. *The Economist*, 2020, March 26 (In English)

Information about the author

Vitalij 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. Бирюков¹

¹Омская гуманитарная академия, г. Омск, Российская Федерация

Постинституционализм: особенности формирования на основе смены исследовательской парадигмы

Аннотация. Статья посвящена рассмотрению проблем развития теории институциональной экономики. Целью статьи является обоснование перспективных направлений постинституциональных исследований, позволяющих на основе переосмысления парадигмы экономического мейнстрима разрабатывать адекватные реалиям исследовательские подходы. Для преодоления ограниченности методологии индивидуализма и холизма институционального мейнстрима предлагается использовать современную научную методологию, которая позволяет изучать экономику как многомерную и нелинейно развивающуюся сложную систему, соответствующую интерсубъективной природе экономической реальности. В статье обосновывается необходимость перехода к постинституциональному этапу развития экономической науки, а также рассмотрены перспективные направления постинституциональных исследований, которые способствуют разработке адекватных усложняющейся реальности исследовательских подходов, учитывающих особенности формирования в современной экономике межуровневых связей. Предложенная исследовательская программа способна дать более содержательную интерпретацию экономических процессов на основе системного анализа сложных взаимосвязей эндогенных по своей природе экономических ценностей и институтов, определяющих цивилизационные особенности развития национальных экономик.

Ключевые слова: неоинституционализм, постинституционализм, конструктивизм, институциональный мейнстрим, национальная экономика, экономические ценности, экономические институты.

Дата поступления статьи: 6 июля, 2020 г.

Для цитирования: Бирюков В. В. (2020). Постинституционализм: особенности формирования на основе смены исследовательской парадигмы // Наука о человеке: гуманитарные исследования. Т. 14. № 3. С. 158–165. DOI: 10.17238/issn1998-5320.2020.14.3.19.

Источники

1. Бирюков В. В. Культурологическая парадигма видения экономической реальности // Общество и экономика. М. : РАН, 2018. № 9. С. 91–101.
2. Полтерович В. М. К общей теории социально-экономического развития. Часть 1. География, институты или культура? // Вопросы экономики. М., 2018. № 11. С. 5–26.
3. Капелюшников Р. И. Contra панинституционализм. Часть I // Вопросы экономики. М., 2019. № 7. С. 119–146.
4. Капелюшников Р. И. О современном состоянии экономической науки: полусоциологические наблюдения // Вопросы экономики. М., 2018. № 5. С. 110–128.
5. Whaley L. (2018). The critical institutional analysis and development (CIAD) framework. International Journal of the Commons, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 137–161.
6. Giddens A. (1984). The Constitution of Society. Cambridge: Politty Press. 402 p.
7. Finnemore M., Sikkink K. (2001) Taking Stock: The Constructivist Research Program in International Relations and Competitive Politics. Annual Review of Political Science, No 4, pp. 391–416.
8. Alvesson M., Hallett T., Spicer A. (2019). Uninhibited institutionalisms. Journal of Management Inquiry, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 119–127.
9. Фролов Д. П. Постинституционализм: за пределами институционального мейнстрима // Вопросы экономики. М., 2020. № 5. С. 107–140.
10. Сорокин П. Человек. Цивилизация. Общество. М. : Политиздат, 1992. 543 с.
11. Хабермас Ю. Моральное сознание и коммуникативное действие. СПб. : Наука, 2001. 380 с.
12. Бирюков В. Ценности, институты и экономическое развитие // Общество и экономика. М. : РАН, 2020. № 4. С. 5–24.
13. Olsen J. P. (2009). Change and continuity: An institutional approach to institutions of democratic government. European Political Science Review, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 3–32.
14. Chang H.-J. (2011). Reply to the comments on “Institutions and economic development: Theory, policy and history”. Journal of Institutional Economics, Vol. 7, No. 4, pp. 595–613.
15. Бердяев Н. А. О назначении человека. М. : МГУ, 1993. 212 с.
16. Edelman web – EdelmanTrustBarometer 2020 [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.edelman.com/sites/g/files/aatuss191/files/2020-01/2020%20Edelman%20Trust%20Barometer%20Global%20Report.pdf> (дата обращения 01.02.2020).
17. Ханафи С. Глобальная социология: навстречу новым направлениям // Социологические исследования. М. : РАН, 2019. № 8. С. 3–7.
18. Колодко Гж. В. Последствия. Экономика и политика в постпандемическом мире // Вопросы экономики. М., 2020. № 5. С. 25–44.
19. Everything's under control. The state in the time of covid-19. The Economist, March 26.

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