

6. Viner, J. (1937). *Studies in the Theory of International Trade*. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers.
7. Robbins, L. (1958). *Robert Torrens and the Evolution of Classical Economics*. London: Macmillan.
8. Chipman, J. S. (1965). A Survey of the Theory of International Trade. *Econometrica* 33(3), 477-519. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1911748>
9. Schumpeter, J. (1954). *History of Economic Analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.
10. Ruffin, R. J. (2002). David Ricardo's Discovery of Comparative Advantage. *History of Political Economy*, 34(4), 727-748. doi:10.1215/00182702-34-4-727
11. Ruffin, R. J. (2005). Debunking a Myth: Torrens on Comparative Advantage. *History of Political Economy*, 37(4), 711-722. doi:10.1215/00182702-37-4-711
12. Thweatt, W. O. (1976). James Mill and the Early Development of Comparative Advantage. *History of Political Economy*, 8(2), 207-234. doi:10.1215/00182702-8-2-207
13. Rothbard, M. N. (1996). *Classical Economics: An Austrian Perspective on the History of Economic Thought. Volume II*. Auburn: Ludwig von Mises Institute.
14. Pullen, J. (2006). Did Ricardo Really Have a Law of Comparative Advantage? A Comparison of Ricardo's Version and the Modern Version. *History of Economics Review*, 44(1), 59-75. Retrieved from [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=963276](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=963276)
15. Gomes, L. (1987). *Foreign trade and the national economy: mercantilist and classical perspectives*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
16. Grancay, M., & Szikorova, N. (2013). History of the principle of comparative advantage revisited: what makes a satisfactory definition? *History of Economic Ideas*, 21(3), 43-68.
17. Torrens, R. (1826). *An Essay on the External Corn Trade* (3rd ed.). London: Brettell.
18. Ricardo, D. (1817). *On the Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*. London: J. Murray.
19. Maneschi, A. (1998). *Comparative Advantage in International Trade: a Historical Perspective*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Pub.
20. Boyd, H. (1795). *The Indian Observer*. Calcutta: Joseph Cooper.
21. Anderson, W. (1769). *The history of France, during the reigns of Francis II. and Charles IX*. London: T. Cadell.
22. [Anon.] (1789). *Forms of prayer, for the use of a congregation of Protestant Dissenters, in Manchester*. Birmingham: J. Thompson.
23. Ferguson, A. (1792). *Principles of moral and political science*. Edinburgh: Greech.
24. Duncan, A. (1790). *Heads of lectures on the theory and practice of medicine*. Edinburgh: Watson, Elder and Company.
25. Hanway, J. (1781). *Distributive justice and mercy*. London: J. Dodsley.
26. Norris, J. (1701). *An essay towards the theory of the ideal or intelligible world*. London: S. Manship.
27. Jebb, F. (1731). *Thoughts on the discontents of the people last year, respecting the sugar duties*. Dublin: William Wilson.
28. Bath and West of England Society (1780). *Letters and papers on agriculture, planting, & c*. Bath: R. Cruttwell.
29. Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce (1788). *Transactions of the Society, Instituted at London for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce. Vol VI*. London: T. Wilkins.
30. McCulloch, J. R. (1818). *Contributions to the Edinburgh Review*. [S.n.]: [s.l.].
31. [Anon.] (1824, April 23). Ricardo Lecture. *The Morning Chronicle*.

Received 12.10.2014

UDC 303.4:339.13



### Oleg Zagurskiy

PhD (Economics), Associate Professor, D.Sc. (Economics) Degree Seeker,  
Academy of Financial Management of the Ministry of Finance of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine  
38-44 Dehtiarivska Str., Kyiv, 04119, Ukraine  
zagurskiy\_oleg@ukr.net

## SYSTEMATIC AND EVOLUTIONARY APPROACH TO MARKET RESEARCH

**Abstract.** *Problem statement.* The evolution of views on the functioning of the market and its relationship with the state and society necessitates development of an approach that would meet the requirements of post-industrial society. *Purpose of the article* is on the basis of systematic and evolutionary analyses, to

summarize the approaches to the definition of the category «market»; to identify the main characteristics of the markets of transition countries and the mechanisms of balance of market power on them. *The main results of the study.* The definition of the «market» category has been generalized as an economic and social structure of relationships in which there are mutually beneficial and voluntary exchanges between economic agents, which are governed by institutional rules and cultural structures. The author has analyzed the main characteristics of the transition countries markets and the mechanisms of market power balancing by the state and civil society. *Conclusion.* The model of economic-socio-organizational market mechanism, built on the ideology of social partnership between community, government and business, has been proposed. It is based on institutional compromise between efficient allocation of resources and the fair distribution of goods.

**Keywords:** market; market power; social partnership; state regulation; transition countries.

**JEL Classification:** B40, D12, D40

### O. M. Загурський

кандидат економічних наук, доцент,  
докторант ДННУ «Академія фінансового управління» Міністерства фінансів України, Київ, Україна

#### СИСТЕМО-ЕВОЛЮЦІЙНИЙ ПІДХІД У ДОСЛІДЖЕННІ РИНКУ

**Анотація.** У статті проаналізовано сучасні погляди на категорію «ринок». На основі системно-еволюційного підходу сформульовано узагальнене визначення цієї дефініції. Окреслено головні характеристики ринків транзитивних країн та механізми врівноваження ринкової влади на них. Запропоновано модель економіко-соціально-організаційного механізму ринку, що побудована на ідеології соціального партнерства між суспільством, державою і бізнесом.

**Ключові слова:** ринок; ринкова влада; соціальне партнерство; державне регулювання; транзитивні країни.

### O. H. Загурский

кандидат экономических наук, доцент,  
докторант ГНУ «Академия финансового управления» Министерства финансов Украины, Киев, Украина

#### СИСТЕМО-ЕВОЛЮЦИОННЫЙ ПОДХОД В ИССЛЕДОВАНИИ РЫНКА

**Аннотация.** В статье проанализированы современные взгляды на категорию «рынок». На основе системного и эволюционного методов сформулировано обобщенное определение данной категории. Очерчены характеристики рынков и механизмы сбалансирования рыночной власти на них. Предложена модель экономико-социально-организационного механизма рынка, основанная на идеологии социального партнерства между обществом, государством и бизнесом.

**Ключевые слова:** рынок; рыночная власть; социальное партнерство; государственное регулирование; транзитивные страны.

**Introduction.** One of the main elements of the economy along with the production, distribution and consumption is the market in which through the exchange, competition, and information signals are formed for individuals on the value of this or that good. The evolution of views on the functioning of the market and its relationship with the state and society had changed

considerably depending on the specific conditions of the development of the world economy. It was based of approaches based on economic liberalism, according to which the free market is able to automatically achieve macroeconomic equilibrium without government intervention. Keynesian methods of fiscal policy, involving the active state intervention in market relations

through mechanisms discretionary fiscal policy and state dirigisme based on the indicative planning of the economy. Institutional methods of formation of market economy, which take into account the complex relationship between society and the economy and provide for the existence of individual institutional development model for each country. Various characteristics of the market and some controversy regarding the mechanisms of its regulation necessitate the development of a new approach that would meet the requirements of post-industrial society.

**Brief Literature Review.** The directions in which you are trying synthesis economic and sociological perspectives to the analysis of markets with the use of various analytical methods have become an evolutionary approach. Among its supporters, should be noted foreign scientists M. Abolafia (1998) [1], T. Nakano and R. Douglas (2006) [2], N. Fligstein, (2013) [3]; Russian V. Radaev [4], A. S. Sukharev [5], and Ukrainian V. V. Dementiev [6], O. I. Soskin [7]. However, this area requires further research of market relations in post-industrial society especially for transition countries and in the assessment of the impact on them of the power business, bureaucracy and society.

**Purpose of the article** is on the basis of systematic and evolutionary analyses to summarize the approaches to the definition of the category «market», in which there is conflict between classical, neoclassical and institutional views; to define the main characteristics of the markets in transition countries and the mechanisms to balance market power there.

**Results.** From the economic point of view, the market represents the interaction of buyers and sellers regarding the sale and purchase of the goods. By definition of O. Williamson (1996), the market is «the arena in which autonomous parties enter into relations of exchange ...it is characterized by a large number of buyers and sellers on each of the parties to the transaction» [8, p. 689], that in order to reduce costs by ordering their relations through contracting. However, economists have always recognized that the analysis of the market throughout its existence has never been confined to the cooperation of producers of goods and services and their consumers. The state, trade unions, enterprises, different social structures is a subject of study in the writings of theorists in recent decades. Accordingly, in a broad sense, the market is a system of socio-economic relations in the sale of goods, indirect pricing, institutions, mechanisms and regulatory policy of the state. In various embodiments of modern economic and sociological concepts, the following approaches to determine the market have been distinguished:

- ecological, according to which the market appears as a set of niches occupied by different populations of organizations;
- structural, analyzes the market as a set of network ties among its members;
- neoinstitutional that focuses on defining the role of rules in the functioning of the market;
- politico-economic, which examines the role of power relations in interaction between market participants;
- sociocultural, representing the market as a cultural construct;
- phenomenological, that determines the market from the point of view of the set of values produced by its members;
- politico-cultural, associated with the market understanding as organizational fields [4, p. 26].

Systematizing certain approaches, in our view, a more comprehensive definition in which «the market» is an economic and social structure of relationships in which there are mutually beneficial and voluntary exchanges between economic agents, which are governed by institutional rules and cultural structures and depend not only on the power of leading players, but also from more general rules, introduced in the society. In fulfilling its primary function in the economy is the coordinator of the exchange market is not independent and perfect, and is both an organizing and destabilizing factor, which with equal success enhances the effect of positive and negative externalities in the economy. It is not for everyone is equal, and the effects of its mechanisms do not always lead to predictable results, from time to time forming immanent «failures» related to the nature of the markets.

In the economic literature, there are four types of inefficiencies, the evidence of the «failures» of the market:

- 1) monopoly;
- 2) imperfect (asymmetric) information;
- 3) external effects;
- 4) public goods [9, p. 10].

To this list for developing countries (and Ukraine), it is advisable to add market power (organizational, political, bureaucratic), individual economic agents' informal and shadow economy. According to D. North, J. Wallis, S. Webb, and B. Weingast (2012), «In most countries that develop individuals and organizations actively use (or threaten to use) violence to concentrate in their hands the wealth and resources» [10, p. 5]. Then, the market of developing countries can be represented in the form of a «totality of these interactions, involving the implementation of power of some actors over others» (A. Sukharev, 2012) [5]. It is subject to certain institutions that control the economy and define the basic rules of sharing and equality and perfect competition is conditional abstractions that are used only for the construction of theoretical models, which in real economic processes do not have any relationship. To represent the market as an impersonal process an exchange or transfer of ownership is possible only from a theoretical point of view, in practice it represents a system of economic and social relations, mediated by certain institutions – the Institute, in which like other social institutions, organizations have the power, form rules that limit or create new opportunities for interaction. Moreover, the notion of «market» and only exists in the institutional sense. According to A. S. Sukharev (2007), «market is possible to realize and to feel his actions, because it is a social order, in other words, the structure of rules, procedures, individual strategies that control and define the act of sale of any goods, the contacts between agents and mechanisms to coordinate decisions» [11, p. 68-69].

N. Fligstein (2013) distinguished four types of rules that relate to the rules for creating social structures of markets:

- 1) property rights (rules that determine who has claim on the profits of enterprises);
- 2) control structures (rules, which define the relationship of competition or cooperation, as well as determine how it should be organized entities);
- 3) exchange rules (determine who with whom can do business and what are the conditions of transactions);
- 4) the concept of control (rules that reflect the nature of this market agreement between actors within companies about how they internal organization (i.e. forms of hierarchy), methods of competition or cooperation (i.e. strategies) and external hierarchy (tier arrangement) companies in this market) [3, p. 68-72].

In stable periods of the development of society, where the rules are known and implicitly performed by the majority of economic agents, the results of market interactions usually mutually beneficial and predictable for all market participants. Another situation is formed on the market in periods of political or economic changes. In these times of market agents engaging in new forms of interactions for the production of other economic or social order are trying to develop new rules that meet their own interests and yet being unknown to other market participants become ineffective for most market participants. As a result of such actions of market interaction are extremely unstable and unpredictable, and the market itself as an institution loses its regulatory functions, which are in a difficult social and economic conditions are transferred to the state. Therefore, agreeing with the economic point of view with the definition of the category of the market as primarily economic and then social systems [12, p. 53.], note the importance of the influence of social factors. And we must say that the economic system, all the way by no means limited to the market, even in conjunction with organizations of its origin. After complete «submission of the economic system of the market entails enormous consequences for social organization: no less than the transformation of society into an appendage of the market» (Polanyi, 2002) [13]. Accordingly, the company, which is the main consumer of goods and services produced by organizations and sold on the market should continue to develop and implement mechanisms

for institutional coercion to balance the market power of individual organizations.

In our opinion, the dualistic model of the market has always existed. Even during the formation of capitalist relations, when the market was functioning without state intervention, it was not absolutely free and was under the external influence of certain powerful circles. Later in the adaptation process of economic systems to changes in the institutional environment of the market cannot exist without the state, includes it in their system, thereby losing the properties of neutrality and universality and gets symptoms of the Institute. However, in recent years, along with the penetration of the state into the market, is being observed an inverse transformation, namely the implementation of the activities of the Institute of the state of market mechanisms for the effective use of public resources. With the spread of the economy knowledge, information, on the one hand, expanding market scale and makes it more freely, on the other formalizes and limits its activities, because the basic market institutions (money, price, demand and supply) are calculated. There is the introduction of horizontal network management model, which requires strengthening planning principles at the micro level and the integration of centralized and market mechanisms at the macro level. While each approach in the management of the economy loses its main features planned – command-administrative and market – natural.

However, despite some convergence, two interrelated social order necessary for the organization of society with a large number of members of the market and the state are inherently different social base, the first individual, the second is public and therefore in contradiction to each other. This contradiction, according to A. Grytsenko (2011), is only the Union's own combat potential contradiction individual and social foundations of economic activity, which is expressed in the most generalized, developed and adequate forms [14, p. 62]. Accordingly, the market is usually considered a source of mobility, and the state is the source of inertia. The state fixes the «failures» of the market, and the market eliminates the negative effects of state regulation. In this regard, the economic theory has been extended approach, which is based on a dichotomy, when markets are «free», and the institutions (mainly the government) act as «limiters of market freedom». The dichotomy of «market-state» is always associated with another dichotomy «efficiency-equity», which in our opinion can be resolved by combining the concept of «appropriateness» from the point of view of development of the society. And that relevance to society should define a close relationship» market-state». Economic freedom agents within acceptable limits contact and coordination of agency decisions for the good of society is a possible model of the relationship of the market and the state. In this sense, there is a thought, regarding the inappropriateness of the use on the market of the term «state regulation» and replace it with the term «state effect», because «apriori» it is not desirable to regulate what should be free and neutral. However, as noted above us, the limitations on individual actions of market agents, which lead to a deterioration of public goods is a necessary instrument of public policy in modern conditions it is not possible to apply indirectly, as a certain kind of «influence» one institute to another, it requires the development and implementation of targeted state programs market regulation in the public interest. It is the state that should be the organizational factor that creates an enabling environment for the transformation of market relations, it is the state that developing the market, social and institutional infrastructure enhances the action of market mechanisms, and in terms of the development of globalization protects the internal market, thereby contributing to its development.

However, neither self-regulating mechanism of the market, nor the influence of the state itself, will be able to solve the problem of sustainable growth. Economics of transition countries and require a combination of their actions with the action open civil society, «whose power is the total amount of the influences on the market from consumers» (Dementiev, 2012) [6, p. 111], which presents individual and group (national, ethnic, cultural) preferences. The role of civil society according to R. Boyer, E. Brousseau, A. Caille, and O. Favereau (2008), is more impor-

tant than coordination and regulation of the implemented market-state communications [15, p. 20]. After all, armed with the knowledge and culture of the economic behavior of previous generations, civil society, the process of repeated interactions taking place on the market during the exchanges, selects processes and develops a huge flow of information thereby accumulating new knowledge on the basis of which new cultural constructions of institutionalized relations and value systems. They in turn change and model the behavior of both producers and consumers, encouraging them not only to maximize their own utility at a higher level pleasure, and until the level of consciousness of the desire to maintain social values, interests and standards of conduct. In fact, today, both global and national habitat occurred and there is a growing demand for this economic development model, adopting a healthy functioning system of capitalism, namely the post-industrial model of national capitalism (Soskin, 2013) [7, p. 5]. It is the growth of self-awareness leads to the unification of all market participants in the search for general rules and forms for their support and encourages them to social partnership. The new model of behavior shifts the interest of producers and consumers from short term to long terms, which are based on institutional compromise between efficient distribution of resources and fair distribution of goods, thereby stimulating the market to increased orientation toward the public interest, and public influence to partnerships with market.

**Conclusions.** According to the proposed model, economic and socio-institutional mechanism of the market, its constituent institutions do not emerge spontaneously, but as a result of a carefully planned activity with the participation and under the supervision of the state. Its consumers take an active part in the creation of values, the organizations pay attention to the quality of together created values, not only the quality of the products and processes of the firm. The market promotes free exchange of these values, and the state and society affect social justice, regulating the distribution of values and the preservation of public goods. Moreover, the market is an economic and social structure of relationships (the Institute) in which there are mutually beneficial and voluntary exchanges between economic agents, governed by institutional rules and cultural structures, are taking place, and it depends not only from the power of leading players, but also from more general rules, introduced in the society.

The result of such processes should be the system of social partnership between community, government and business, and its ideology to form the basis of all economic development programs of the country. The limits of the ratio of the market, the state and public regulation should be determined by the level of economic, political, social, environmental, cultural condition of the country and the significance from the point of view of the civil society's development.

## References

1. Abolafia, M. (1998). Markets as Cultures: An Ethnographic Approach. In M. Callon (Ed.). *The Law of Markets* (pp. 69-85). Oxford: Blackwell.
2. Nakano, T., & Douglas, R. (2006). *The «Visible Hand» in a Production-Chain Market: A Market Equilibrium from Network Analytical Perspective*. Santa Fe Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.santafe.edu/media/workingpapers/06-05-015.pdf>
3. Fligstein, N. (2013). *The Architecture of Markets: An Economic Sociology of Twenty-First-Century Capitalist Societies*. In A. Kurakin (Trans.). Moscow: GU VSHE (in Russ.).
4. Radaev, V., & Dobryakova, M. (2008). *Analysis of the markets in contemporary economic sociology* (Trans. from Eng.). Moscow: GU VSHE Press (in Russ.).
5. Sukharev, O. (2012). The theory of contracts by O. Williamson and institutional change: the contemporary vision of the Agency interactions. *Zhurnal ekonomicheskoi teorii (Journal of Economic Theory)*, 3, 84-95. Retrieved from [http://inecon.org/docs/suharev/JET\\_2012\\_3.pdf](http://inecon.org/docs/suharev/JET_2012_3.pdf) (in Russ.).
6. Dementiev, V. (2012). *Institutions, behavior, power*. Donetsk: DonNTU (in Russ.).
7. Soskin, O. (2013). Role of state regulation in formation of modern economic model: changing imperative in the conditions of chaos. *Ekonomichnij Casopis-XXI (Economic Annals-XXI)*, 1-2(1), 3-7 (in Ukr.).
8. Williamson, O. (1996). *The Economic Institutions of Capitalism. Firms, Markets, Relational Contracting*. St. Petersburg: Lenizdat, SEV Press (in Russ.).
9. Nureev, R. (2006). *The post-Soviet institutionalism: Government and business*. Rostov/D: Nauka-Press (in Russ.).
10. North, D., Wallis, J., Webb, S., & Weingast, B. (2012). In the shadow of violence: lessons for companies with limited access to political and economic activity. In M. Dobkowska, E. Leontieva (Trans.). *Voprosy ekonomiki (Issues of Economics)*, 3, 4-31 (in Russ.).
11. Sukharev, O. (2007). *Institutional theory and economic policy: Toward a new theory of the transmission mechanism in macroeconomics*. Moscow: Ekonomika (in Russ.).
12. Shpykuliak, A. (2009). *The Institutions of the agricultural market*. Kyiv: NICE (in Ukr.).
13. Polani, K. (2002). *The Great transformation: the political and economic origins of our time*. In A. A. Vasiliev (Trans.). St. Petersburg: Aletia. Retrieved from [http://royalib.ru/book/polani\\_karl/velikaya\\_transformatsiya\\_politicheskie\\_ekonomicheskie\\_istoki\\_nashego\\_vremeni.html](http://royalib.ru/book/polani_karl/velikaya_transformatsiya_politicheskie_ekonomicheskie_istoki_nashego_vremeni.html) (in Russ.).

14. Grytsenko, A. (2011). *Jointly-separated relations: institutions, state-power*. Donetsk: DonNTU (in Russ.).
15. Boyer, R., Brousseau, E., Caille, A., & Favereau, O. (2008). Towards an Institutional Political Economy. *Ekonimicheskaia sotsiologia (Economic Sociology)*, 9(3), 17-23. Retrieved from <http://www.ecsoc.hse.ru> (in Russ.).

Received 09.10.2014

### References (in language original)

1. Abolafia M. Markets as Cultures: An Ethnographic Approach / M. Abolafia; edited by M. Callon // *The Law of Markets*. – Oxford : Blackwell, 1998. – P. 69–85.
2. Nakano T. The «Visible Hand» in a Production-Chain Market: A Market Equilibrium from Network Analytical Perspective / T. Nakano, R. Douglas. – Santa Fe : Santa Fe Institute, 2006. Retrieved from: <http://www.santafe.edu/media/workingpapers/06-05-015.pdf>
3. Флигстин Н. Архитектура рынков: экономическая социология капиталистических обществ XXI века / Н. Флигстин; пер. с англ. А. А. Куракина; под науч. ред. В. В. Радаева. – М. : Изд. дом Высшей школы экономики, 2013. – 392 с.
4. Анализ рынков в современной экономической социологии; отв. ред. В. В. Радаев, М. С. Добрякова; пер. с англ. – М. : ГУ-ВШЭ, 2008. – 423 с.
5. Сухарев О. С. Теория контрактов О. Уильямсона и институциональные изменения: современное видение агентских взаимодействий [Электронный ресурс] / О. С. Сухарев // Журнал экономической теории. – 2012. – № 3. – С. 84–95. – Режим доступа : [http://ineson.org/docs/suharev/JET\\_2012\\_3.pdf](http://ineson.org/docs/suharev/JET_2012_3.pdf)
6. Дементьев В. В. Институты, поведение, власть : монография / В. В. Дементьев. – Донецк: ДонНТУ, 2012. – 310 с.
7. Соскін О. І. Роль державного регулювання у формуванні сучасної економічної моделі: зміна імперативу в умовах хаосу / О. І. Соскін // Науковий журнал «Економічний часопис-XXI». – 2013. – № 1–2(1). – С. 3–7.

8. Уильямсон О. И. Экономические институты капитализма: фирмы, рынки, «отношенческая контракция» / О. И. Уильямсон; научн. ред. В. С. Каткало. – СПб. : Лениздат, 1996. – 702 с.
9. Постсоветский институционализм : Власть и бизнес : монография; под ред. Р. М. Нуреева. – Ростов-н/Д : Наука-Пресс, 2006. – 512 с.
10. В тени насилия: уроки для обществ с ограниченным доступом к политической и экономической деятельности / Д. Норт, Дж. Уоллис, С. Узэб, Б. Вайнгаст; пер. с англ. М. Дондуковского, Е. Леонтьевой // Вопросы экономики. – 2012. – № 3. – С. 4–31.
11. Сухарев О. С. Институциональная теория и экономическая политика: К новой теории передаточного механизма в макроэкономике / О. С. Сухарев; РАН, Ин-т экон. – М. : Экономика, 2007. – Кн. I: Институциональная теория. Методологический эскиз. – 516 с.
12. Шпикуляк О. Г. Інституції аграрного ринку : монографія / О. Г. Шпикуляк. – К. : ННЦІАЕ, 2009. – 480 с.
13. Поланы К. Великая трансформация: политические и экономические истоки нашего времени [Электронный ресурс] / К. Поланы; пер. с англ. А. А. Васильева и др.; под общ. ред. С. Е. Федорова. – СПб. : Алетейя, 2002. – 314 с. – Режим доступа : [http://royallib.ru/book/polani\\_karl/velikaya\\_transformatsiya\\_politicheskie\\_i\\_ekonomicheskie\\_istoki\\_nashego\\_vremeni.html](http://royallib.ru/book/polani_karl/velikaya_transformatsiya_politicheskie_i_ekonomicheskie_istoki_nashego_vremeni.html)
14. Гриценко А. А. Совместно-разделенные отношения: институты-государство-власть / А. А. Гриценко // Институциональные проблемы эффективного государства; под ред. В. В. Дементьева, Р. М. Нуреева. – Донецк : ДонНТУ, 2011. – 372 с.
15. Буайе, Р. К созданию институциональной политической экономики [Электронный ресурс] / Р. Буайе, Э. Буссо, А. Кайе, О. Фавро // Экономическая социология. – 2008. – Т. 9. – № 3. – С. 17–23. – Режим доступа : <http://www.ecsoc.hse.ru>

Стаття надійшла до редакції 09.10.2014

УДК 330.837.1

I. I. Tarasova

кандидат економічних наук, доцент кафедри економіки підприємства та міжнародної економіки, Вінницький торговельно-економічний інститут, Україна  
tarasovaii@mail.ru

## ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ ТЕОРІЇ ІНСТИТУЦІОНАЛІЗМУ В УПРАВЛІННІ ЕКОНОМІЧНИМИ ТА СУСПІЛЬНИМИ ІНСТИТУТАМИ



**Анотація.** У статті визначено видово-функціональні характеристики й основні складові суспільного та економічного інститутів, сформульовано завдання інституційного аналізу. Виділено ряд сукупних ознак суспільних інститутів. Окреслено складові категорії «суспільний інститут». Проаналізовано природу понять «суспільний інститут» та «економічний інститут» на базі методології наукового дискурсу. Отримані автором результати дослідження можуть бути використані для налагодження ефективної роботи суспільних інститутів країни.

**Ключові слова:** інституціоналізм; суспільний інститут; економічний інститут; економічна поведінка; транзакція; інтеракція.

Iryna Tarasova

PhD (Economics), Associate Professor, Vinnytsia Trade and Economic Institute, Ukraine  
87 Soborna Str., Vinnytsia, 21050, Ukraine

### STUDY THEORY INSTITUTIONALISM IN MANAGEMENT OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS

**Abstract.** *Introduction.* The main problem of institutionalism is biased assessment of social and economic institutions, the complexity of effective sustainable operation. *Purpose.* Research and analysis of the theory of institutionalism in the context of economic and social institutions will find some ways to overcome it. *Results.* Identified as the main problem of institutional analysis – nature of the interaction between formal and informal norms within formal institutions. Identify a number of features of social institutions, namely the goal of social institutions is to meet the specific needs of the society, or of a particular social group; public institution – a system that is individual and has its own structure and logic of development; institutionalization of the institute, it has a certain structure and a set of individual functions to achieve this goal activity. It is concluded that the «public institution» – a category that exhibit the following interrelated constituent elements: formal rules and regulations (administrative, legal, organizational); mechanisms of state and public control over the implementation of formal rules and regulations; informal customary social and cultural norms of society. *Conclusions.* The analysis of the nature of the concepts of «public institution» and «economic institute» on the methodology of scientific discourse. Our results of research can be used to establish effective operation of various public institutions of the country.

**Keywords:** public institution; economic institute; economic behavior; transaction; interaction.

**JEL Classification:** B25, A14, D23

I. I. Tarasova

кандидат економічних наук, доцент кафедри економіки підприємства та міжнародної економіки, Вінницький торговельно-економічний інститут, Україна

### ИССЛЕДОВАНИЕ ТЕОРИИ ИНСТИТУЦИОНАЛИЗМА В УПРАВЛЕНИИ ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКИМИ И ОБЩЕСТВЕННЫМИ ИНСТИТУТАМИ

**Аннотация.** В статье определены видово-функциональные характеристики и основные составляющие общественного и экономического институтов, сформулированы задачи институционального анализа. Выделен ряд совокупных признаков общественных институтов, а также составные элементы этой категории. Проанализирована природа понятий «общественный институт» и «экономический институт» по методологии научного дискурса. Полученные автором результаты исследования могут быть использованы для налаживания эффективной работы общественных институтов страны.

**Ключевые слова:** институционализм; общественный институт; экономический институт; экономическое поведение; транзакция; интеракция.