

UDC: 316.354

DOI: [https://doi.org/10.32689/2617-2224-2020-1\(21\)-17-26](https://doi.org/10.32689/2617-2224-2020-1(21)-17-26)

Amosov Oleg Yuriiyovych,

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, Prospekt Moskovskii, 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, Харківський регіональний інститут державного управління Національної академії державного управління при Президентові України, Харків, 61075, пр. Московський, 75, тел.: +38 (050) 237 97 25, e-mail: amosovoleg@uk.net

ORCID: 0000-0001-8718-6343

Амосов Олег Юрьевич,

соискатель кафедры политологии и философии, Харьковский региональный институт государственного управления Национальной академии государственного управления при Президенте Украины, 61075, г. Харьков, пр. Московский, 75, тел.: +38 (050) 237 97 25, e-mail: mbubliiy@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0001-8718-6343

Gavkalova Nataliia Leonidivna,

Doctor of Economics, Professor, Head of Public Administration and Regional Economy Department, Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics, 61166, Kharkiv, Str. Nauky, 9-a +38 (050) 622 6148, 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, 61166, м. Харків, пр. Науки, 9-а, 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 ре-
гиональной экономики, 61166 г. Харьков,
пр. Науки, 9-а, тел.: +38 (050) 622 61 48,
e-mail: ngavl@ukr.net

ORCID: 0000-0003-1208-9607

Rozumnyuk Iryna Viktorivna,
PhD, Egypt, Cairo, Maadi, El Khames, block
1, bld. 50, +201223048877, [irynaroz28@
gmail.com](mailto:irynaroz28@gmail.com)

ORCID: 0000-0002-3081-7703

Розумнюк Ірина Вікторівна,
PhD, Єгипет, Каїр, Мааді, Ель Хамс, блок
1, буд. 50, +201223048877, [irynaroz28@
gmail.com](mailto:irynaroz28@gmail.com)

ORCID: 0000-0002-3081-7703

Розумнюк Ирина Викторовна,
PhD, Египет, Каир, Маади, Ель Хамс,

блок 1, дом 50, +201223048877, irynaroz28@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-3081-7703

ARCHETYPAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE DOMESTIC ECONOMY TRANSFORMATION

Abstract. The author's vision of the institutional nature of social transformations taking into account the influences of existing archetypes is presented. The conceptual and categorical analysis of an institute, institutionalism, and societal transformations is offered to prove the ideas. In particular, theoretical and methodological institutional aspects that directly influence on the course of social transformations in Ukrainian society are considered, taking into account the influence of archetypes. According to the results of a conceptual-categorical analysis, the basic properties of institutionalism which include time lag, system, set of rules – formal, informal, determined by social archetypes are identified. The purpose is to form a structure of social interaction, under which the mechanisms are laid and social transformations can take place. Based on the generalization of theoretical approaches, it was found that the institute, creating a symbiosis with archetypes, is a system of formal and informal socio-economic rules, which are determined by the powerful duality of both long and short-term goals, limiting the relationship between individuals in economic, legal, socio-eco-

conomic, innovation spheres and help to identify the historical conditions under which the socio-economic mechanisms of social transformation are created. It is suggested to consider the Institutional-archetypal approach as a ruling one in distinguishing the general and special path of country's development, since there is an individual national matrix, which was formed under the influence of archetypes. It is concluded that the problem of ensuring the sustainability of socio-economic processes in society at the existence of public transformations implying the existence of an institutional-archetypal matrix but the consideration of problems of institutional influence on transformational processes, occurring in Ukraine lacks a comprehensive vision taking into account the impact of social archetypes, providing timely establishment of thorough scientific concepts relating to institutional theory that defines the archetypal social transformation under the influence.

Keywords: institutions, institutionalism, social transformations, archetypes.

АРХЕТИПНІ ОСНОВИ ІНСТИТУЦІОНАЛЬНОЇ ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЇ ВІТЧИЗНЯНОЇ ЕКОНОМІКИ

Анотація. Представлено інституціональну природу суспільних трансформацій з урахуванням впливів існуючих архетипів. Для доведення думок запропоновано понятійно-категоріальний аналіз інституту, інституціоналізму, суспільних трансформацій. Зокрема, визначено теоретико-методологічні інституціональні аспекти, що прямо впливають на хід суспільних трансформацій в Українському суспільстві з урахуванням впливу архетипів. За результатами понятійно-категоріального аналізу визначено основні властивості інституціоналізму, а саме: часовий лаг; систему, сукупність правил — формальних, неформальних, які визначаються суспільними архетипами; мету — формування структури соціальної взаємодії, за якої можуть закладатися механізми та здійснюватися суспільні трансформації. На основі узагальнення теоретичних підходів з'ясовано, що інститут, створюючи симбіоз із архетипами являє собою систему формальних та неформальних соціально-економічних правил, які визначаються потужною двоєдністю як довготермінових, так і короткочасних цілей, що обмежують відносини між індивідами в економічній, соціальній, правовій, соціально-економічній, інноваційній сферах та сприяють визначенню історичних умов, за яких створюються соціально-економічні механізми суспільних трансформацій. Запропоновано розглядати Інституціонально-архетипний підхід як визначальний при визначенні загального і особливого шляху розвитку країни, оскільки передбачається існування індивідуальної національної матриці, що сформувалася під впливом архетипів. Доведено, що проблема забезпечення сталості соціально-економічних процесів у суспільстві при існуванні суспільних трансформацій передбачає існування інституційно-архетипної матриці. Розгляду проблеми інституціонального впливу на трансформаційні процеси, які відбуваються в Україні, бракує комплексного бачення, за якого враховується вплив

супільних архетипів, що передбачає своєчасність створення ґрунтовної наукової концепції, яка стосується інституціональної теорії, що визначає суспільні трансформації під впливом архетипів.

Ключові слова: інститути, інституціоналізм, суспільні трансформації, архетипи.

АРХЕТИПНЫЕ ОСНОВЫ ИНСТИТУЦИОНАЛЬНОЙ ТРАНСФОРМАЦИИ ОТЕЧЕСТВЕННОЙ ЭКОНОМИКИ

Аннотация. Представлено авторское видение институциональной природы общественных трансформаций при учете влияния существующих архетипов. В качестве доказательной базы предложен категориальный анализ понятий, связанных с институтами, институционализмом, общественными трансформациями. В частности, определены теоретико-методологические институциональные аспекты, которые прямо влияют на ход общественных трансформаций в украинском обществе с учетом влияния архетипов. В результате понятийно-категориального анализа определены основные свойства институционализма, а именно: временной лаг; система, совокупность правил — формальных, неформальных, которые определяются общественными архетипами; цель — формирование структуры социального взаимодействия, при котором могут формироваться механизмы и осуществляться общественные трансформации. На основе обобщения теоретических подходов подытожено, что институт, создавая симбиоз с архетипами, представляет собой систему формальных и неформальных социально-экономических правил, определяемых двуединством как долгосрочных, так и краткосрочных целей, ограничивающих отношения между индивидами в экономической, социальной, правовой, социально-экономической, инновационной сферах и способствуют определению исторических условий, при которых формируются социально-экономические механизмы общественных трансформаций. Предложено рассматривать институционально-архетипный подход как определяющий при выделении особого пути развития государства, поскольку предполагается существование национальной матрицы, сформировавшейся под влиянием архетипов. Доказано, что проблема обеспечения устойчивости социально-экономических процессов в обществе при существовании общественных трансформаций предполагает существование институционально-архетипной матрицы. Рассмотрению проблемы институционального влияния на трансформационные процессы, происходящие в Украине, не хватает комплексного видения, при котором учитывается влияние общественных архетипов, что предусматривает своевременность создания научной концепции, касающейся институциональной теории, которая определяет общественные трансформации под влиянием архетипов.

Ключевые слова: институты, институционализм, общественные трансформации, архетипы.

Formulation of the problem. The current state of the domestic economy is determined by the reform, including the evolution of the archetypes, in all the spheres of life, other endogenous and exogenous factors of influence. The implementation of the reform is aimed at providing profound changes in the society, which is impossible without understanding the methodology of institutionalism, which underlies the dominant archetypes, its determinants, evolutionary laws, which allows to clarify the actions of the social laws and determine the course of the social transformations. With the gradual socio-economic transformations taking place in the Ukrainian society in order to accelerate the country's integration into the world economic system, the requirements for methods of analysis and forecasting the consequences of decisions made in the management of the economy are increasing. There is a need to ensure a reliable forecasting of the functioning of the Ukrainian economy in the short and long term, which allows for sound decisions about strategic and tactical challenges. In this connection, it is promising to use the modern economic and mathematical methods and simulation modeling to analyze and evaluate the priorities of the socio-economic policy of Ukraine, with due regard to the influence of the national archetypes. The data used for assessment is astounding in diversity. In particular, most scholars consider the macroeconomic values to be the most objective starting point for analysis, but it is rather limited to account for institutional tendencies, archetypal manifestations, and use of factual material, without which predictions are less

likely and socio-economic processes occurring, the social archetypes that determine the existence of a system of institutional matrices, and thus affect the social transformations, are subject to less adjustment and influence. This determines the relevance and timeliness of the topic stated by the authors.

Analysis of the recent publications. In the writings of foreign and domestic researchers one can find scientific work devoted to the methodology of institutionalism. In particular, D. North [1] analyzes the institutional changes and functioning of the economy; O. A. Gritsenko [2] determines the place of the state in the institutional environment; O. O. Prutska [3] considers the economic behaviour based on an institutional approach, indirectly touching the archetypes and analyzing deregulation as a way of improving the quality of the archetypal-institutional environment, and others. The issue of actualization of the institutional and archetypal provision of the state regulation of the economy needs further investigation.

The purpose of the article. Substantiation of the archetypal foundations of the institutional transformation of the domestic economy as a scientific-theoretical basis of transformational changes, taking into account the influence of the social archetypes.

Presentation of the main material. Recent research has attracted interest in the study of the institutional and related archetypal influences on the level of the social development. It cannot be said that the issue of institutionalism has not been addressed by scientists, on the contrary, the number of them is increasing every year, but the magni-

tude of the questions, the use of mainly foreign theoretical evidence, makes the problem open for further research in the national knowledge space. In particular, the foundations of the institutional-archetypal were detailed in the writings of the well-known scientists who considered themselves to be the followers of three waves: classical institutionalism (Veblen T., Gelbraith J. K., Polanyi K., etc.); neoinstitutionalism (Buchanan J., Coase R., McNeill J., North D., Peyovic S., Poser R., Stigler J., Williamson O., etc.); and modern institutionalism (Bouye R., Nash J., Teveno L., Favro O., etc.).

In terms of the institutional approach, understanding how the economic system works, how the social transformations take place requires account of the very complex relationships between the society and the economy, that are determined by the existence and influence of the social archetypes. The relationship between them is determined by a set of institutional constraints, that are a form of ensuring the functioning of the economic system. Institutions in relation to the archetypes are the key to understanding the relationship between the society and the economy and the key to the impact of these relationships on the economic growth (or stagnation and decline). Ultimately, institutions are fundamental factors in the functioning of the economic systems in the long run, determining the social transformation. It should be emphasized that the continuous influence of the social archetypes, which may change the institutional matrices, is constantly taken into account.

Under the institute A. Oliynyk means “a set of formal, fixed in the law

and informal, fixed in the common law, boundaries that structure the interaction of the individuals in the economic, political and social spheres” [4, p.188].

A more common and methodologically sound definition can be found in J. Lafta: “Institutions are understood to mean a set of socio-economic rules that operate under historical conditions, over which individuals or groups of individuals are largely unremarkable, both in the short and medium term. From an economic point of view, these rules are intended to determine the conditions under which the individual or collective choice of the allocation and use of the resources may be exercised. In this sense, institutions, unlike markets or organizations, do not become mechanisms of coordination; they help to determine the socio-historical conditions under which such mechanisms can be laid” [5, P. 12].

Interesting is J. Lafta’s argument about the understanding of the economic institutions as mechanisms — regulators of the economic functions. The characteristic of such institutions is “the relations that include, as appropriate, components of the power, force interactions between the individuals or their groups” [6, P. 13].

One of the founders of the institutional economic theory, Veblen T. interpreted institutions as units of selection in the evolutionary process of the Darwinist type [7, p. 13]. These researchers are close to identifying the impact of the archetypes, but do not take them into account.

In defining institutions, J. Hodgson considers the last long-term systems of rules that have been established and entrenched and that give structure to

the social interactions [8, p. 11]. That is, the definition focuses on the essence of the system of the social rules.

Many features in common with the preceding have the definition of Searle J.: institute — a special type of social structure, which includes codified rules of interpretation and behaviour. Some of the rules are related to the conventional symbols or values, such as in the case of money, etc. [8, P. 12].

Thus, these definitions make it possible to determine the basic properties of institutionalism, to which we attribute a time lag — long-term or short-term; system, set of rules — formal, informal, socio-economic; the goal — the formation of the structure of the social interaction, a special type of social structure, contribute to the definition of the socio-historical conditions under which such mechanisms that regulate economic functions can be laid.

Based on the generalization of the theoretical approaches, we conclude that the institution, creating a symbiosis with the archetypes is a system of formal and informal socio-economic rules, which are determined by the powerful unity of both long-term and short-term, limiting the relations between the individuals in the economic, social, legal, socio-economic, innovation spheres and help to determine the historical conditions under which the socio-economic mechanisms of the social development are created.

The institutional-archetypal approach involves considering the economy not as a static system, but as a dynamic process that is constantly in motion, changed and transformed. “Technological and institutional changes (transformations) are the keys

to understanding the general and economic evolution, which is appropriately dependent on its path...”, — noted D. North [1, P. 198].

The institutional-archetypal approach eliminates the question of the general and particular path of the development of a country, since it assumes the existence of an individual institutional matrix in each country formed under the influence of the archetypes, namely, the interlocking of the interconnected formal rules and informal constraints that guide the country’s economy, different from the path of development of another country.

The commonality of the borrowed rules of the game in the countries with different institutional systems leads to significantly different consequences. Although the rules are the same, but the mechanisms and practices for monitoring the compliance with these rules, the rules of conduct and subjective models of the actors are different. Therefore, the real incentive system and the subjective assessment by the actors of the consequences of the decisions made are the others.

The abstract concept of “institutional matrix” logically summarizes the various real links of the archetypes and institutions that can be observed in real life. These are legal and social norms, rules and sanctions, conciliation procedures and laws, traditions and customs, organizations and legal acts, etc. [7]. The specific characteristics of each national model are defined in the overall relationship in their structure of the basic and complementary additional institutional matrices. Thus, in the U-matrix coordinates the economic institutions of the market, political

institutions of the federation (building society, starting from the bottom of the individual independent territorial communities) and subsidiary values (subsidiarity as a principle means the priority of the individual relative to the community of which he stands), in which the priority of the Self over We is fixed [8]. Here we see a sufficiently well-defined influence of the social archetypes.

Public administration can also identify some of the problems of Ukraine's institutional recovery:

1. creation of conditions for the development of "decent" public institutions that can ensure the socio-economic development of the state;

2. formation of favourable conditions for the functioning of all the branches of the power.

The bearer of the power is the people, but in order to realize this, institutional conditions are needed, that is, it is necessary:

3. an extensive stable system of law;

4. a powerful human rights protection system;

5. an extensive system of informing the people.

6. law — protection of the state structure, is: The Security Service of Ukraine; The State Bureau of Investigation; Anti-Corruption Court; The National Agency for the Prevention of Corruption; the National Guard; Ministry of International Affairs;

7. institutional conditions for the functioning of the institution of the judiciary: legal protection of the rights of the judges.

Public institutions interact with the system of the public institutions. The President, by virtue of his function and

role as guarantor of the Constitution, becomes the focus of the both systems. The President is the guarantor of the institutional invariant of the society. All the activities of the guarantor of the constitution should be aimed at ensuring the effective, efficient and active functioning of the branches of the power, as fundamental archetypal principles of the society. The role and status of the President as the guarantor of the Constitution must be secured institutionally and be based on the archetypes.

It should be noted that an institutional structure has been formed in Ukraine that does not always fit the matrix of its socio-economic traditions and does not take into account the archetypes. It also does not fit either the Anglo-Saxon model of the institutional structure of the society or the continental one.

The characteristic features of the institutional structure of the Ukrainian society include: the institute of anti-law. That is, the rules of the law, if used, are very selective.

Directing the transformation of the institutions or resisting those that have already formed and exerting appropriate influence on the whole (space) continuum of the society. The presence of the institutes and the links between them creates a society invariant. This invariant provides the self-reproduction of the system. A special place is taken by the judiciary. All the institutions are interconnected and closely intertwined. Loss of the influence of some of them will certainly cause degradation of the others. Institutions influence the social transformations and distort the archetypes [9, 10].

Conclusions. The generalizations of the research suggest that the problem of ensuring the sustainability of the socio-economic processes in the society and the correct direction of the social transformation, firstly, is the difficult determination of the matrix priorities with respect to the institutional-archetypal matrix in the country; secondly, the domination in Ukraine during a certain time of the command-administrative system has influenced the formation of the communitarian property not only as a public, but as archetypal despite the fact that the mental factors are one of the most influential in initiating the processes of different nature; thirdly, when considering the problem of the institutional impact on the transformation processes occurring in Ukraine, domestic scientists are limited to separate works, sections in monographs, which detracts from the consideration of institutionalism from the standpoint of a complex, systematic, process-based approach in compulsory consideration of influences of the society that is, from the creation of a thorough domestic scientific concept that relates to the institutional theory that determines the social transformations under the archetypal influence.

REFERENCES

1. Nort D. & Dzyub I. I. (2000). Instytutsi, instytutsiyna zmina ta funktsionuvannya ekonomiky [Institution, institution of change and functioning of economy]. Kyiv: Osnovy [in Ukrainian].
2. Gryshchenk O. A. (2004). Mistse derzhavy v instytutsiynimu prostori transformatsiynoi ekonomiky [The place of the state in the institutional space of a transformational economy]. Problemy I perspektyvy rozvitku bankivskoi systemy Ukrainy – Problems I am a promising development of the banking system of Ukraine, 11, Sumy: VVP “Mriya-1” LTD, U ABS, 76-82 [in Ukrainian].
3. Prutska O. O. (2003). Instytutsionalizm I problemy ekonomichnoi povedinry v perehidnyi ekonomitsi [Institutionalization is a problematic economic issue in the transition economy]. Kyiv: Logos [in Ukrainian].
4. Oliynyk O. M. (2005). Instytutsionalna ekonomika [Institutional Economics]. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
5. Lafta Dzh. K. (1999). Effektivnost menedzhmrnta organizatsii [Organization management effectiveness. Moscow [in Russian]
6. Hodzhons Dzh. (2003). Ekonomicheskaya teoriya i instituty: Manifest Sovremennoy institutsionalnoy ekonomicheskoy teorii [Economic Theory and Institute: A Manifesto of Contemporary Institutional Economic Theory] (Trans) Moscow: Delo [in Russian].
7. Coase R. (1988). Firma, rynek i zakon [The Firm, the Market and the Law]. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press
8. Kirdins S. G. (2001). Teoriya institutsionalnyh matrits: v poikah novoy paradigm [Institutional Matrix Theory: In Search of a New Paradigm]. Zhurnal sotsiologii i sotsialnoy antropologii – Journal Sociology and Social Anthropology. (Vols. 1). No 1, 101-115 [in Ukrainian].
9. Afonin E. A. & Martynov A. Yu. (2016). Arhetypni zasady modeluyvannya sotsialnyh protsesiv [Arereptic principles of social process modeling]. Publichne uryaduvannya – Public Governance, 2, 34–47. Retrieved from http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/pubm_2016_2_5 [in Ukrainian].

10. Amosov O. Yu. & Gavkalova N. L. (2018). Vplyv arkhetyviv na suspil'ni transformatsiyi [The influence of archetypes on social transformation]. Publichne uryaduvannya – Public Governance, Kyiv, 3 (13), 56-74 [in Ukrainian].

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Норт Д. Институції, інституційна зміна та функціонування економіки / Даглас Норт / Пер. з англ. І. Дзюб. – К.: Основи, 2000. – 198 с.
2. Гриценко О. А. Місце держави в інституційному просторі трансформаційної економіки / О. А. Гриценко // Проблеми і перспективи розвитку банківської системи України : Збірник наукових праць. Т. 11. – Суми: ВВП “Мрія-1” ЛТД, УАБС, 2004. – С. 76–82.
3. Прутська О. О. Інституціоналізм і проблеми економічної поведінки в перехідній економіці: монографія / О. О. Прутська. – К.: Логос, 2003. – 256 с.
4. Олійник О. М. Інституціональна економіка: Навч. посіб. – К., 2005. – 416 с.
5. Лафта Дж. К. Эффективность менеджмента организации. Учеб. пособие. – М., 1999. – 320 с.
6. Ходжсон Дж. Экономическая теория и институты: Манифест современной институциональной экономической теории: Пер. с англ. – М.: Дело, 2003. – 464 с.
7. Coase R. The Firm, the Market and the Law. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1988. P. 115, 116.
8. Кирдина С. Г. Теория институциональных матриц: в поисках новой парадигмы / С. Г. Кирдина // Журнал социологии и социальной антропологии. – 2001. – Том IV. № 1. – С. 101–115.
9. Афонін Е. А. Архетипні засади моделювання соціальних процесів / Е. А. Афонін, А. Ю. Мартинов // Публічне урядування. – 2016. – № 2. – С. 34–47. – Режим доступу: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/pubm_2016_2_5
10. Амосов О. Ю., Гавкалова Н. Л. Вплив архетипів на суспільні трансформації / О. Ю. Амосов, Н. Л. Гавкалова // Публічне урядування. – Київ, 2018. – № 3 (13). – С. 56–74.