



**UDC 316.354**

**Gavkalova Nataliia Leonidivna,**

*Doctor of Economics, Professor, Head of Public Administration and Regional Economy Department, Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics, 61166, Kharkiv, Nauky Prospekt, 9-a, tel.: + 38 (050) 622 61 48, e-mail: ngavl@ukr.net*

*ORCID: 0000-0003-1208-9607*

**Гавкалова Наталія Леонідівна,**

*доктор економічних наук, професор, зав. кафедри Державного управління, публічного адміністрування та регіональної економіки Харківського національного економічного університету ім. С. Кузнеця, 61166, м. Харків, просп. Науки, 9а, ХНЕУ, I корпус, ауд. 401–402, тел.: + 38 (050) 622 61 48, e-mail: ngavl@ukr.net*

*ORCID: 0000-0003-1208-9607*



**Гавкалова Наталья Леонидовна,**

*доктор экономических наук, профессор, зав. кафедры Государственного управления, публичного администрирования и региональной экономики Харьковского национального экономического университета им. С. Кузнеця, 61166, г. Харьков, просп. Науки, 9а, ХНЭУ, I корпус, ауд. 401–402, тел.: + 38 (050) 622 61 48, e-mail: ngavl@ukr.net*

*ORCID: 0000-0003-1208-9607*

**Amosov Oleg Yuriyovich,**

*Doctor of Economics, Professor, Head of Economic Theory and Finances Department, Kharkiv Regional Institute of Public Administration National Academy of Public Administration attached to the Office of the President of Ukraine, 61075, Kharkiv, Moskovskyyi Prospekt, 75, tel.: + 38 (050) 237 97 25, e-mail: amosovoleg@ukr.net*

*ORCID: 0000-0001-8718-6343*

**Амосов Олег Юрійович,**

*доктор економічних наук, професор, зав. кафедри економічної теорії та фінансів Харківського регіонального інституту державного управління Національної академії державного управління при Президентові України, 61001, Україна, м. Харків, просп. Московський, 75, тел.: + 38 (050) 237 97 25, e-mail: amosovoleg@ukr.net*

*ORCID: 0000-0001-8718-6343*

**Амосов Олег Юрьевич,**

*доктор экономических наук, профессор, зав. кафедры экономической теории и финансов Харьковского регионального института государственного управления Национальной академии государственного управления при Президенте Украины, 61001, Украина, г. Харьков, просп. Московский, 75, тел.: + 38 (050) 237 9725, e-mail: amosovoleg@ukr.net*

*ORCID: 0000-0001-8718-6343*

*DOI <https://doi.org/10.31618/vadnd.v1i14.99>*

---

## **THE INFLUENCE OF ARCHETYPES ON SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS**

**Abstract.** The vision of social transformations, which is a component of the stage of modernization of society, is presented. It is proposed to consider the influence of archetypes on social transformations through the formation of an archetypal and institutional mechanism for regulating socio-economic relations, which is proposed to be considered as an ordered set of institutional levers, incentives and measures aimed at ensuring the effective use of archetypes on the basis of a combination of factors of the micro- and macroeconomic environment by means of public administration. The emphasis is placed on the strengthening of the role of state and supra-national regulatory archetypal-institutional entities in the design of social transformations. Based on the existing theoretical and conceptual provisions for determining the content of the process of institutionalization of archetypes, it has been determined that the mechanism of regulation of institutional transformations of the national market should be considered in three main aspects, corresponding to the economic and social nature of the inter-subjective interaction of market participants. It is noted that the system-reflexive paradigm of regulation of the development and management of transformational changes of complex open socio-economic systems is based on the definition of the active nature of the influence of archetypes, subjects, as well as the reflexive procedures of their interaction, both on the choice of directions and ways of implementation, and on the dynamics of the flow of these processes. The composition of the main provisions that determine the feasibility of using a system of reflexive paradigm in the field of regulation of socio-economic relations, includes a set of assumptions. The main provisions defining the expediency of using the system-reflexive paradigm in the sphere of regulation of socio-economic relations are determined. It is established that the main institutional conflicts are manifestations of inconsistency between archetypes and elements of institutional environment.

**Keywords:** archetypes, archetype-institutional mechanism, social transformations, socio-economic relations.

### **ВПЛИВ АРХЕТИПІВ НА СУСПІЛЬНІ ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЇ**

**Анотація.** Презентовано бачення суспільних трансформацій, які є складовою сучасного етапу модернізації суспільства. Запропоновано розгляда-

ти вплив архетипів на суспільні трансформації як засіб формування архетипно-інституціонального механізму регулювання соціально-економічних відносин, який пропонується розглядати як упорядковану множину інституціональних важелів, стимулів і заходів, спрямованих на забезпечення ефективного використання архетипів на основі поєднання дії факторів мікро- та макроекономічного середовища за допомогою засобів публічного адміністрування. Зроблено наголос на посиленні ролі державних і наддержавних регулятивних архетипно-інституціональних утворень у проектуванні суспільних трансформацій. Узагальнено наявні теоретичні та концептуальні положення стосовно визначення змісту процесу інституціоналізації архетипів і визначено, що механізм регулювання інституціональних трансформацій національного ринку має розглядатися в трьох основних аспектах, що відповідають економічній та соціальній природі міжсуб'єктної взаємодії учасників ринку. Зазначено, що системно-рефлексивна парадигма регулювання розвитку й управління трансформаційними змінами складних відкритих соціально-економічних систем ґрунтується на визначенні активного характеру впливу архетипів, суб'єктів, а також рефлексивних процедур їх взаємодії як на вибір напрямів і шляхів здійснення, так і на динаміку перебігу цих процесів. До складу основних положень, що визначають доцільність використання системно-рефлексивної парадигми у сфері регулювання соціально-економічних відносин, віднесено сукупність припущень. Виокремлено основні положення, що визначають доцільність використання системно-рефлексивної парадигми в особливій сфері — сфері регулювання соціально-економічних відносин. З'ясовано, що до складу інституціональних конфліктів належать вияви неузгодженості між архетипами й елементами інституціонального середовища.

**Ключові слова:** архетипи, архетипно-інституціональний механізм, суспільні трансформації, соціально-економічні відносини.

## **ВЛИЯНИЕ АРХЕТИПОВ НА ОБЩЕСТВЕННЫЕ ТРАНСФОРМАЦИИ**

**Аннотация.** Представлено видение общественных трансформаций, которые являются составляющей этапа модернизации социума. Предложено рассматривать влияние архетипов на общественные трансформации посредством формирования архетипно-институционального механизма регулирования социально-экономических отношений, который предлагается расценивать как упорядоченное множество институциональных рычагов, стимулов и мер, направленных на обеспечение эффективного использования архетипов на основе сочетания действия факторов микро- и макроэкономической среды с помощью средств публичного администрирования. Сделан упор на усилении роли государственных и надгосударственных регулятивных архетипно-институциональных образований в проектировании общественных трансформаций. На основе имеющихся теоретических и концептуальных положений по определению содержания процесса институ-

ционализации архетипов определено, что механизм регулирования институциональных трансформаций национального рынка должен рассматриваться в трех основных аспектах, соответствующих экономической и социальной природе межсубъектного взаимодействия участников рынка. Отмечено, что системно-рефлексивная парадигма регулирования развития и управления трансформационными изменениями сложных открытых социально-экономических систем базируется на определении активного характера влияния архетипов, субъектов, а также рефлексивных процедур их взаимодействия как на выбор направлений и путей осуществления, так и на динамику протекания данных процессов. Определены основные положения, определяющие целесообразность использования системно-рефлексивной парадигмы в особой сфере — сфере регулирования социально-экономических отношений. Установлено, что к основным институциональным конфликтам относится проявления несогласованности между архетипами и элементами институциональной среды.

**Ключевые слова:** архетипы, архетипно-институциональный механизм, общественные трансформации, социально-экономические отношения.

---

**Target setting.** An integral part of the modern stage is the modernization and updating of both production and technological base, promoting the competitiveness of domestic business entities and increasing the welfare of population, the implementation of a number of large-scale changes based on the archetypes of social relations. As part of this kind of change, the gradual formation of new and improved existing elements of social environment in accordance with the latest conditions of social existence is not only a significant component of transformation of the system of industrial relations, but also serves as an extremely important requirement for the successful implementation of the rest of the reforms in all areas of life without exception. However, the natural long-term and extremely complex content of the processes of formation of elements of the archetypal environment of social relations, conditioned prima-

rily by the collective and consensual and compromise nature of coordination of interests of their participants, in the context of large-scale and fleeting social transformations characteristic of modern conditions of a transformational society may lead to the emergence of transitional and temporary institutions, the functioning of which can lead to even braking vital reforms for society. A prerequisite for ensuring the stability of the process of institutional transformation, preventing the emergence of this process of contradictions and traps, as well as aggravation of conflicts is the formation of a holistic archetypal-institutional mechanism for the regulation of social development, the essence of which is an ordered set of institutional levers, incentives and measures aimed at ensuring effective development and use of archetypes on the basis of a combination of factors of micro- and macroeconomic environment. In the case

of institutional administration, the institutional mechanism should be considered as a complement to the mechanism of the interaction of archetypes, the specificity of structural construction and the nature of its action is associated with the peculiarities of the institutional formations that are part of it, as well as with the characteristic features of a particular object of institutional regulation (sphere, field of human activity) based on archetypes.

**Analysis of recent research and publications.** Despite the fact that the problem of social transformations has been studied by institutional scholars, among which are Bromley D. Commons J., Ostrom E., Rodrik D. and others [1–18], the issue of institutional regulation of social transformations, taking into account the influence of archetypes, the scientific basis of which was created by the scholars led by Afonin E. in Ukrainian science, is almost uninvestigated by the national scientific community.

**Formulation of the purpose of the article.** The substantiation of the scientific and theoretical foundations of institutional regulation of social transformations taking into account the influence of archetypes.

**Presenting main material.** In studying the essence of the archetypical-institutional mechanism of regulation of socio-economic relations, two approaches can be distinguished:

- structural (the institutional mechanism is considered as a component of the mechanism of reforms in general, which is determined, however, by its own structure and peculiarities of functioning);
- institutional (the study of reflexive aspects of the interaction of archetypes

on the basis of the application of certain institutional formations).

It should be noted that it is the institutional interpretation of the nature of this mechanism as the responsibility of structural and organizational nature of the formation of institutional mechanism of transformation, which components are the state (carries out macroeconomic regulation), trade unions (representing the interests of employees), associations (advocate for the protection of business interests of employers); mass media (exercise public oversight and control functions). However, in this case, the complex institutional nature of this mechanism and the reflexive basis of the interaction of different actors are ignored. In addition, the public interest in such a system can not be presented properly, since it is almost entirely reliant on the state, which also does not correspond to the complex and ambiguous institutional nature of archetypes.

On the one hand it is possible to consider the archetypical-institutional mechanism of transformation of society as a set of interconnections between the elements of the institutional environment, carried out on the principles of democracy, coordination of interests and cooperation of participants in social and labor relations (structural and static aspects), and, on the other hand, as a system of instrumental and methodological provision of formalized influence on the subjects of society, an alternative (counterbalance) to the processes of self-organization (i. e. dynamically-situational spectra). With the necessity of distinguishing the dynamic component of this mechanism, the absence of built-in mechanisms for balancing interests

(based on the concerted action of institutional restraints and counterbalances) is immanent for the system of approval of formal norms, which prevent the routinization of stimulating impulses of positive changes and transformations based on archetypes.

The specificity of functional content of this mechanism is that it must effectively perform the following functions:

- subject-oriented integration of agents to maintain interaction on the basis of common norms, statuses (in accordance with the archetypes);

- social differentiation of actors and agents according to the institutional criteria; regulation of interaction between institutional actors and economic agents;

- routinization of new norms and reproduction of institutional innovations;

- subordination and coordination of interrelationships between different institutional actors; control of observance of norms and rules.

Institutional transformations based on archetypes become the core element of institutional mechanism of social transformations, reflecting the dynamic aspect of its functioning, and change not only of the structure and mode of functioning of institutional environment, but also have a significant impact on the system of social relations in general. The generalization of terminological descriptions and scientific views on the definition of economic essence of the concept of “institutional-archetypal transformations” (changes) has allowed to distinguish the following main approaches:

- public, in which archetypal-institutional transformations are identified with social transformations, that

is, internal changes in the institutional environment and the corresponding regulatory mechanism are not given relevant significance, and therefore these phenomena are considered to be an organic component of an object that is in a state of transformation;

- archetypal-institutional-transformational, according to which the archetypal-institutional changes are a kind of super-structural transformation, oriented towards creating such conditions around the object of regulation (corresponding sphere of social relations) that would ensure the transformation of this object in a certain purposefully selected direction on the basis of adjusting the behavior of subjects, supporting and disseminating relevant models and strategic.

In this case, changes in the archetypal-institutional environment are a separate object of regulation and reform.

In addition, it should be noted that the implementation of institutional transformations on the basis of archetypes clearly distinguishes between two basic models of transformations of the institutional environment: evolutionary (organic changes, most often due to the inertia of the previous trajectory of development; and revolutionary (based on the replacement and import of institutions that are not rooted in conservative social traditions and whose implementation is usually associated with the significant transformations of the constituent institutional environment).

Consequently, the two variants of institutional transformation described, to a certain extent, correspond to two models of institutional genesis based on archetypes, namely: the institutionaliza-



tion of changes (more oriented towards the evolutionary transformation of institutional environment); institutional design (in the context of consciousness and purposefulness of the actions of actors — the initiators and participants of the reform processes — determined by the focus on revolutionary changes).

One of the key elements of economic mechanism, which is determined by the greatest sensitivity to the influence of institutional changes, is a labor market, within the framework of which the interaction of interests of the overwhelming majority of economic agents takes place and the formation of the fundamental principles of ensuring the sustainable growth of the national economy is formed.

Consequently, the existing imperfection of structural construction and the ineffectiveness of the functioning of the constituent institutional environment should be considered as one of the main causes of the spread of negative phenomena, which, in particular, are manifestations of the growth of unregulated employment and the limitation of opportunities for realizing the potential of productive activity of population, weakened social protection of employees and the deterioration of working conditions, increasing unjustified differentiation in the level of remuneration by industry and region, reducing real incomes and spreading poverty, etc.

The generalization of provisions of theoretical approaches, which describes the content and nature of the process of institutionalization of socio-economic transformations, has allowed to identify several basic approaches, namely:

- interactive-dynamic (proceeds from the sociological interpretation

of institutionalization as a process of formation of a legal-rational system of institutes as an individual level, which includes a dynamic interaction of actors of certain relationships during the creative generation of certain institutional norms, rules and procedures for the coordination of local interests, and on a system-wide level, which defines the structural parameters of the relevant institutional environment);

- structurally functional (based on the almost complete exclusion of the relevance of the impact of individual acts of interaction on the formation of institutions and emphasizes the interactive nature of this process, in which the integration of any local interests and expectations of the participants serves only as a prerequisite for the generalization and unification of the complex of social roles and features that are common and relevant);

- evolutionary-value (considers institutionalization as a coherent process in which the archetypically-institutional space is originally formed, that is, the individual elements that make it on the macro-, mezo-, and micro levels are subjected to a gradual transformation under the influence of the transformation of notions of actors about the most important for them values and interests);

- dynamic (formation of the institutional environment is considered as a consequence and form of response of a social system to an objective).

Summarizing the existing theoretical and conceptual positions regarding the definition of the content of the process of institutionalization of archetypes, it should be noted that the mechanism for regulating institutional transforma-

tions of the national market should be considered in three main aspects that are in line with the economic and social nature of the inter-subjective interaction of market participants: structural and substantive (ordering about objectively existing, but amorphous, unstructured and chaotically used acts of interaction of participants of this market in a certain system of relations); functional (definition of roles and functions corresponding to a recognized socially necessary and socially useful models of behavior of actors whose individual interests are not considered relevant at the same time); adaptive-dynamic (providing a flexible response to changes in employment conditions through updating the elements of institutional environment of social and labor relations, capable to both self-reproduction and internal coherence, and to adapt to any economic changes).

Institutional design is a specialized modeling activity on the basis of archetypal entities for conscious and purposeful implementation in the field of regulation of social relations. Institutional changes as a kind of planned archetype-socio-cultural innovations, the success of distribution in a crucial measure are determined by the compliance with the archetype-institutional and cultural context. Achieving such compliance allows institutional innovation to enter into a kind of meta-competition (which implies not only competition but also synergistic support for various elements of institutional environment) with existing institutional entities (“substitute institutions”), a key factor in the success of which is comparable economic efficiency (first of all, in the sphere of influence on transformation costs).

It should be noted that the importance of measures to counteract archetypal institutional inertia is naturally increasing with the scale of reforms, which ultimately can make it impossible to simply copy effective institutional practices and import of institutions. It will determine the inevitable need for a social and genetic approach to improve the existing components of institutional environment.

It is necessary to insist on the regular strengthening of the role of a state and supra-state regulatory institutional formations in the design of social changes. The high role of the state in the institutional design should also be noted because of its responsibility for maintaining a stable state of the main social preconditions for institutional changes (supporting the action of existing institutional formations), which should ensure a non-conflict in the implementation of the appropriate social transformations.

Effectiveness of institutional planning measures (first of all – in the context of the introduction of formal rules and regulations) directly depends on the prevailing archetypes, as well as on the effectiveness of mechanisms (including – state regulation) of cooperation of interests of groups of interests.

The diversity of agents’ roles in the institutionalization process is primarily due to the internal laws of the process of formation and development of the constituent archetypal environment, the stages of which are the perinatal phase, the phase of structuring, the institutional exhaustion, the phase of institutional transformations.

The main roles performed by actors during institutional design should in-



clude the following: initiator, adapter, innovator, advocate, controller, distributor, communicator, proselyte, recipient, statistician, antagonist. The role of an initiator during the institutional development are accumulation, awareness and certain formalization of existing expects (expectations) in the society, the emergence of which is usually associated with the accumulation of contradictions between the mechanisms used to ensure the effective interaction of market participants.

In modern conditions, the most notable contradictions of this kind should include the following: between the existing structure of employment and the requirements for intensifying economic growth; between the existing model of wage formation and the need to ensure the growth of domestic demand as the driving force of economic development; the existing system of hiring of employees and the possibilities of fulfilling social guarantees and obligations of the state; between the backward model of the formation of human capital and the requirements regarding the generation of competencies of workers, adequate to the post-industrial mode of production, etc. Actuating initiators (namely, state bodies, trade unions and associations, representatives of scientific and educational community), through the comprehension and streamlining of public perceptions about the unsatisfactory state of the institutional environment, based on the activation of their own initiative-ideological guides and creative abilities, the necessary properties of the new elements of the institutional environment, as well as the search for options for combining these properties

into a particular prototype of a new or transformed institution.

The developed prototype, the expediency of which, after reaching a certain level of awareness of it among a wide range of market participants becomes the subject of attention and subject of discussion. It is necessary to undergo verification and (in case of recognition of the realities of the advantages of such a prototype) revision (adaptation). The functions of actors-adapters (first of all, the expert and consulting community, representatives of the state) are also subject to verification of adequacy by the initiators of perception, reception and interpretation of public representations associated with the recognition of the need for institutional regulation.

The formed positive social attitude to the new institutional formation naturally attracts the attention of advanced innovators (first of all – entrepreneurs and mediators of a labor market, as well as individual employees, whose competence is unique), who, by making attempts to implement the created prototype in economic life, translate it from conception in the form of a new specific social practice. Such a practice can not be considered as a new element of institutional environment (in fact, institutional innovation), since it has not yet become widespread in a plurality of certain socio-economic relations in the market, but rather allows for a comparative analysis of the potential productivity of the use of an archetype.

The success of the implementation of institutional innovation naturally determines the growth of the activity of disseminating positive information about the institution, in which the propagandistic actors (state authori-

ties, media, intermediaries in the market professional organizations and associations) demonstrate commitment to the institution and to some extent lobby for its dissemination, opposing the existing traditions and customs that hinder (deny) the dissemination of a new institutional formation. A prerequisite for checking information about the new institutional practice is monitoring of its functioning and distribution, response to violations of established norms, conflict resolution, prevention of manifestations of selfish opportunist behavior of economic agents, etc., carried out by bodies and organizations authorized by the state and society (professional state institutions, scientific and educational institutions, professional associations).

Another aspect of the dissemination of new institutional practices is the creation of a distribution system supporting its dissemination, to the tasks of its actors (public authorities, labor market intermediaries, professional associations, expert and consulting community) to provide assistance in the form of a transfer to members of the national the labor market of knowledge or specific assets necessary for adaptation to the operation of the institution, clarification of the particularities of the use of this form of institutional education. Thus, in the course of public adoption of new institutional practices for the realization of the interests of groups of actors, they provide possible individual differences between them in terms of their participation in the implementation of reforms, in particular, their role in the creation and dissemination of new archetypes, as well as in providing opportunities for adaptation of social and economic agents.

The system-reflexive paradigm of regulation of development and management of the transformational changes of complex open socio-economic systems is based, first of all, on the observation of the active nature of the influence of the subjects, as well as the reflexive procedures of their interaction, both on the choice of directions and ways of implementation, and on the dynamics of these processes, the composition of the main provisions that determine the feasibility of using a system of reflective paradigm in the field of regulation of socio-economic relations, should include such assumptions:

Firstly, the systemic-reflexive approach which is based on the recognition of the essential difficulties (or even the impossibility) of the formation of completely and uniquely objective (that is, those that do not carry subjective evaluative judgments) preconditions for making decisions aimed at regulation development or change management.

Secondly, the basis of the reflexive subject-subject interaction determines system representations (“information models”) of agents about their own properties and relevant characteristics of partners, environment conditions, within which the indicated interaction is deployed, etc.

Thirdly, the reflexive approach to the regulation of development and management of changes in socio-economic relations, first of all, in the establishment of forms of purposeful inter-entity interaction, in which the efforts of subjects should focus on the formation of an information space (the hierarchy of ideas, representations, images, correspond to the vector of the

target orientation of the interests of these entities), in the context of the perception of which other agents will be oriented towards the provision of these interests.

Fourthly, the systemic-reflexive paradigm is based on the existence of an extremely complex mechanism for maintaining the relations of agents with the poly-subject environment of their functioning and development, which also represents a reflection of working conditions through a set of formed information models that take into account not only the notion of the state of certain phenomena and processes (in the complex determine the parameters of the object of management), but also value-purpose guidelines of other actors, the actions of which can have a relevant impact on the transformation of this will, that is, also able to find reflections on the success of the implementation of the formed agents models and selected behavior strategies.

Fifthly, the ordering and systematization of information models (bringing in a kind of holistic hierarchy of images and representations reflecting the basic value-purpose guides and corresponding behavior patterns of most subjects), which in a complex define the parameters of the poly-subject environment activity, carried out on a collective-reflexive basis, that is, has the institutional nature of the procedures for the adoption of group decisions.

**Conclusions and perspectives of further research.** Thus, the main institutional conflicts in the national labor market should include the following manifestations of inconsistency between archetypes and elements of the institutional environment that prevent

the effective resolution of inter-entity contradictions:

- between institutions that have a unified form of existence (formal or informal), as well as functional and objective orientations (for example, differences between normative acts governing relations or traditions existing in a particular industry or professional field);

- between institutions and institutional norms that have a unified functional and objective orientation, but different form of existence or manifestation in time (e. g. contradictions between business practice of employment and state social employment standards);

- between institutions and institutional norms of a different or homogeneous form of existence (an institutional conflict arises through the institutional design of new rules by import or substitution).

In general, an integral part of ensuring the successful implementation of a wide range of tasks in the field of reform is the development of an institutional environment and an appropriate mechanism for institutional regulation of relations based on the archetypes focused on the formation and development of human capital appropriate and adequate to the requirements of modern stage of social development, which is determined by the complication of the content and growth of creativity and creative nature of work, the globalization of scale and the internationalization of migration flows, increase the needs of production in highly skilled personnel and diverse in the professional orientation of the competencies of the staff.

## REFERENCES

1. *Bromley D. W.* Economic Interests and Institutions: The Conceptual Foundations of Public Policy / D. W. Bromley. — New York and Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989. — 274 p.
2. *Buchanan J. M.* Economics from the Outside In: “Better than Plowing” and Beyond / J. M. Buchanan. — Texas A&M University Press: Texas A&M University Economics Series, 2007. — 254 p.
3. *Commons J. R.* Institutional Economics: Its Place in Political Economy. — Vol. I. / J. R. Commons. — Transaction Publishers, 1990. — 648 p.
4. *Davis L.* Institutional Change and American Economic Growth / L. Davis, D. North. — Cambridge, 1971. — P. 5–6.
5. *Gavkalova N.* The paradigm of the state regulatory policy / N. Gavkalova, K. Wackowski // Економіка розвитку. — X.: ХНЕУ ім. С. Кузнеця, 2016. — № 2. — С. 40–44.
6. *Hanisch M.* Institutional analysis and institutional change: What to learn from the case of Bulgarian land reform? / M. Hanisch, A. Schlüter // in P. Tillack and E. Schulze (eds) Land Ownership, Land Markets and their Influence on the Efficiency of Agricultural Production in Central and Eastern Europe. — Vauk. — Kiel, 2000. — P. 152–170.
7. *MacLeod G.* Globalizing Parisian thought-waves: recent advances in the study of social regulation, politics, discourse and space / G. MacLeod // Progress in Human Geography, (1997) Vol. 21, № 4. — P. 530–553.
8. *Mainwaring S.* Party system institutionalization and party system theory after the third wave of democratization / S. Mainwaring, M. Torcal // R. S. Katz and W. Crotty (eds) Handbook of Party Politics, London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi: Sage, 2006. — P. 204–227.
9. *Ostrom E.* Understanding Institutional Diversity / E. Ostrom. — Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005. — 376 p.
10. *Rodrik D.* Goodbye Washington Consensus, Hello Washington Confusion? / D. Rodrik // Journal of Economic Literature. — 2006. — № 44 (December). — P. 973–987.
11. *Savchuk N.* Institutional budget architectonics in the structure of budget system of Ukraine / N. Savchuk // The New economy. Scientific Journal. — Bratislava. — 2014. — № 1, vol. 7. — P. 109–116.
12. *Schotter A.* The economic theory of social institutions / A. Schotter. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981. — 192 p.
13. *Simon H.* Rationality in Psychology and Economics / H. A. Simon // The Journal of Business. — 1986. — Vol. 59, № 4, Part 2: The Behavioral Foundations of Economic Theory. — P. 209–224.
14. *Stiglitz J. E.* The economic role of the state / J. E. Stiglitz. — Blackwell Pub, 1989. — 128 p.
15. *The Global Competitiveness Report 2016–2017* [Електронний ресурс]. — Режим доступу: <https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-global-competitiveness-report-2016-2017-1>
16. *The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development*, 2007. — 92 p.
17. *Tversky A.* Advances in prospect theory: cumulative representation of uncertainty / A. Tversky, D. Kahneman // Journal of Risk and Uncertainty. — 1992. — № 5. — P. 297–232.
18. *Understanding the Process of Economic Change* / D. C. North. — Princeton University Press: The Princeton Economic History of the Western World. — 2010. — 200 p.

## СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

---

1. *Bromley D. W.* Economic Interests and Institutions: The Conceptual Foundations of Public Policy / D. W. Bromley. — New York ; Oxford : Basil Blackwell, 1989. — 274 p.
2. *Buchanan J. M.* Economics from the Outside // “Better than Plowing” and Beyond / J. M. Buchanan. — Texas : Texas A&M University Press; Texas A&M University Economics Series, 2007. — 254 p.
3. *Commons J. R.* Institutional Economics: Its Place in Political Economy. Vol. I. / J. R. Commons. — Б/м : Transaction Publishers, 1990. — 648 p.
4. *Davis L.* Institutional Change and American Economic Growth / L. Davis, D. North. — Cambridge, 1971. — P. 5–6.
5. *Gavkalova N.* The paradigm of the state regulatory policy / N. Gavkalova, K. Wackowski // Економіка розвитку. — Харків : ХНЕУ ім. С. Кузнеця, 2016. — № 2. — С. 40–44.
6. *Hanisch M.* Institutional analysis and institutional change: What to learn from the case of bulgarian land reform? / M. Hanisch, A. Schlüter // Land Ownership, Land Markets and their Influence on the Efficiency of Agricultural Production in Central and Eastern Europe / P. Tillack and E. Schulze (eds) ; Vauk ; Kiel, 2000. — P. 152–170.
7. *MacLeod G.* Globalizing Parisian thought-waves: recent advances in the study of social regulation, politics, discourse and space / G. MacLeod // Progress in Human Geography. — 1997. — № 4 : Vol. 21. — P. 530–553.
8. *Mainwaring S.* Party system institutionalization and party system theory after the third wave of democratization / S. Mainwaring, M. Torcal // Handbook of Party Politics / R. S. Katz and W. Crotty (eds). — London : Thousand Oaks ; CA and New Delhi : Sage, 2006. — P. 204–227.
9. *Ostrom E.* Understanding Institutional Diversity / E. Ostrom. — Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005. — 376 p.
10. *Rodrik D.* Goodbye Washington Consensus, Hello Washington Confusion? / D. Rodrik // Journal of Economic Literature. — 2006. — № 44 (December). — P. 973–987.
11. *Savchuk N.* Institutional budget architectonics in the structure of budget system of Ukraine / N. Savchuk // The New economy. Scientific Journal. — Bratislava. — 2014. — № 1 : vol. 7. — P. 109–116.
12. *Schotter A.* The economic theory of social institutions / A. Schotter. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1981. — 192 p.
13. *Simon H.* Rationality in Psychology and Economics / H. A. Simon // The Journal of Business. — 1986. — № 4 : Vol. 59 : Part 2: The Behavioral Foundations of Economic Theory. — P. 209–224.
14. *Stiglitz J. E.* The economic role of the state / J. E. Stiglitz. — Б/м : Blackwell Pub, 1989. — 128 p.
15. *The Global Competitiveness Report 2016–2017* [Електронний ресурс]. — Режим доступу: <https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-global-competitiveness-report-2016-2017-1>
16. *The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.* — 2007. — 92 p.
17. *Tversky A.* Advances in prospect theory: cumulative representation of uncertainty / A. Tversky, D. Kahneman // Journal of Risk and Uncertainty. — 1992. — № 5. — P. 297–232.
18. *Understanding the Process of Economic Change* / D. C. North. — Princeton, NJ : Princeton University Press ; The Princeton Economic History of the Western World, 2010. — 200 p.