

ECONOMIC SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT PARADIGM

Serhii Serhieiev¹

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-050-6-37>

One of the central problems of economics is the limited and incomplete (partial) knowledge accumulated in recent decades, the lack of a clear methodological basis on which to build a system of logically related and consistent economic knowledge [1]. Such knowledge provides an opportunity to explain the complex processes that occur in the national economic systems of individual countries and in the global economic space and become a reliable basis for studying the evolution of the system, practical actions to organize the economic life of societies. The problems of evolution of modern society require economic theory as a science of new methodology, development of specific concepts and models that will be the basis for the transition of economic systems to a new level of effective development in the face of ever-increasing social needs. Empirical studies show that the factors and conditions of the genesis of the system have changed, and previous methods and models no longer provide effective solutions to current problems

¹ Donbass State Engineering Academy, Ukraine

of economic policy. As a result, there is a need to develop new methodological approaches to the study of modified economic processes and research prospects become pluralistic and broader.

An important prerequisite for solving these problems in this study is the use of modern scientific approaches, the use of the principles of the civilizational paradigm of social science, which allow to justify a new vision of the scientific object, subject and methods of cognition of economic processes. Without the creation of a modern methodological matrix of scientific research of economic systems, which organically combines modern scientific approaches, scientific object, subject, research methods should not hope to successfully overcome the limitations of economic knowledge, solve other pressing problems facing economics, including and recommendations not only for theory but also for business practice.

The scientific problem of the research is the consistent systematic disclosure of the formation and evolution of the economic system in world economic thought through the prism of the main currents and leading scientific schools of the period studied in the dissertation; in substantiating the practical significance of the theoretical and methodological heritage of economics for the analysis of the modern market system, performed from the standpoint of the civilizational paradigm of social development. Economic development is cumulative, so the study of the «track of previous development» is crucial in understanding the content and problems of the current state of the economic system. Accordingly, a thorough analysis of the modern national economy and the choice of the vector of its further development is impossible without taking into account the achievements of the leading schools of world economic thought in the systematic study of the evolution of economic systems. Central to solving this problem is to reveal the causes and nature of the changes that have taken place in the scientific study of the economic system of society. The starting point should be considered to clarify some significant changes in the methodology of modern economics and the transition from the classical principles of scientific analysis of nature and society, which were substantiated by scientists [2, p. 250–296; 3, p. 5; 4, p. 7], to the principles of system-synergetic research, characteristic of most modern scientists.

The desire to build a general scientific picture of the world requires a synthesis of knowledge aimed at forming a holistic vision of historical changes that have taken place in science in the context of the formation of human culture. Researchers of the history of science have in their arsenal such research guidelines as presentism (explanation of the past in the language of the present) and antiquarianism (restoration of a holistic picture of the past without any reference to the present) [5, p. 6]. Scientists have proposed

models for the development of science – cumulative (P. Duham), scientific revolutions (T. Kuhn), competing research programs (I. Lakatos), «falsification» (K. Popper), the multiplicity of scientific discoveries (R. Merton), «Methodological pluralism» (B. Condwell, W. Bowland, P. Feyerabend), «rhetoric of economics» (D. McCloskey), cyclical development (S. Gide, S. Rist), discussions about the advantages and disadvantages of each model stimulated the study of history science, its current state and problems of methodology.

In the modern world, three models of historical reconstruction of science coexist: first, as a cumulative, progressive, progressive process; second, as development through scientific revolutions; third, as a set of individual, individual situations (casestudy). Under the influence of the scientific revolution, the understanding of science changes (experimentation, the result of which is true knowledge of the world), it fits into the world of nature. The cumulative idea of development of knowledge by accumulation and specification is formed. At the present stage of development of world thought, a monadic understanding of history is gradually being established, the characteristic feature of which is the interpretation of the world-historical process as a unity formed by a multitude of great socio-historical subjects. This understanding of history takes into account and realizes the possibilities of a civilizational approach to the study of the historical process.

The paradigm determines the issues, methodology, categorical apparatus and the final result of the study. It evolves by detailing problems, and has two properties: it is perceived by the scientific community as a basis for further work and contains modifiable questions, thus opening space for researchers. That is, the paradigm is a term that means a scientific achievement recognized by all, which for some time gives the scientific community a model of problem statement and solution. Hence the need to develop new theories and approaches that would absorb all the advanced methodological achievements of scientific knowledge and would adequately reflect the essence of modern processes. «Disciplinary matrix» (paradigm), according to T. Kuhn, includes four types of the most important components: symbolic generalizations, conceptual models (general statements), values (which manifest themselves in the choice of research, in assessing the results and condition science in general) and samples of solutions to specific problems and tasks. When problems accumulate that cannot be solved within the old paradigm, there is a crisis and a scientific revolution – a process of paradigm shift. T. Kuhn's paradigm is approximately the same as the solid core of I. Lakatos.

At one stage of the development of «normal science» inevitably there is a mismatch of observations and forecasts of the paradigm, there are anomalies. When such anomalies accumulate quite a lot, the normal development of science

stops and a state of crisis (scientific revolution) occurs, which leads to the breaking of the old and the creation of a new scientific theory – the paradigm.

Productive for the analysis of the content and structure of the historical development of the methodological apparatus of economic theory is the involvement and creative application of such an acquisition of modern philosophy of science as the classification of the following historical types of scientific rationality, first introduced into scientific use by V. Stepin. The latter defined the system of norms and standards of scientific research as a certain historical type of scientific rationality that dominates at a certain historical stage of maturity of science. The defining types of scientific rationality, the researcher included the following: classical, non-classical and post-non-classical, which mark the following stages of scientific maturity: classical science or modern science (late XVII century – 70's of the XIX century), non-classical science (70s of the XIX century – 70s of the XX century), post-classical science (70s of the XX century to the present). Each of these historical forms of development of economic science has dominant methodological features.

Each stage (classical, non-classical and post-classical science) of science development is characterized by a special state of scientific activity aimed at the constant growth of objective-true knowledge and has its own paradigm, its own picture of the world, its own fundamental ideas. In order to highlight the advantages of the civilizational approach in the study of the genesis of economic systems, it is advisable to compare the main provisions of those paradigms that can be used in studying and analyzing the development of economic systems from their emergence to our time.

References:

1. Kolupaieva I., Shevchenko O. (2019) Justification of scenarios of state regulatory policy of Ukraine. *Proceedings of the International conference of Innovation in Science and Education*. March 20-22. Prague Czech Republic.
2. Soskin O. (2014). Narodnyj kapitalizm: ekonomichna modelj dlja Ukrajiny [Narodnyi kapitalizm: ekonomichna modely dlya Ukrainy]. Kyiv: IST Publishing House, 396 p.
3. Bodrov V. (2002). Transformacija ekonomichnykh system: koncepciji, modeli, mekhanizmy reguljuvannja ta upravlinnja [Transformation of economic systems: concepts, models, mechanisms of regulation and management]: textbook. way. 104 p.
4. Zhalilo J. (2016). Osoblyvosti realizaciji ekonomichnoji polityky derzhavy v umovakh suchasnykh tendencij suspil'nogho rozvytku [Peculiarities of realization of economic policy of the state in the conditions of modern tendencies of social development]. *Economic theory*. Vol. 1, pp. 39-52.
5. Shevchenko O. (2017) Evoljucija ghospodarsjkoi systemy: metodologhija analizu u svitovij ekonomichnij dumci (kinecj XIX – pochatok XXI st.) [Evolution of economic system: methodology of analysis in world economic thought (end of XIX – beginning of XXI century)]: monograph. Kyiv: Center for Educational Literature. 304 p.