

УДК 005:001.8

JEL Classification: B40; O30

Kyzym M.¹, Doronina M.², Doronin A.³

PREREQUISITES FOR UPDATING THE METHODOLOGY OF ECONOMICS

DOI: 10.32620/cher.2020.3.01

Formulation of the problem. The systemic crisis of society and its economic component has shown the need to revise the methodology of economics. *The purpose of the article* is to generalize the prerequisites for the formation and development of methodological support for removing the critical situation of domestic economics and practice. *The methodological basis of the study* is based on the ideas of prominent scientists and practitioners, methods of dialectics, system-synergetic and interdisciplinary approaches to the analysis of the methodology of economics. *The main hypothesis* of the study was the assumption that the clarification of the functions and elemental composition of the methodology of economics will provide constructive discussions on its development and adaptation to domestic conditions. *Presenting main material.* The loss of control over the system of economics and practice requires a revision of technologies for their study based on methodological pluralism, focused on identifying opportunities for transformation of the economy focused on production of goods in the economy of expanded reproduction of potential human capacity to respond to unconventional situations. *The originality and practical significance of the study* lies in identifying the limitations and contradictions of the proposed ways to update individual scientific paradigms and their systems in the format of a metaparadigm, providing a systematic justification of the theoretical foundations of the methodology of economics and practice by defining the essence of , specifically. The offered list of functions and elemental structure of methodology of economic science creates an initial basis of their discussion and specification in discussions and educational processes. *Conclusions and prospects of further researches.* The effectiveness of the methodology of economics depends on the constructive dialogue of stakeholders in its renewal. The initial stage of the dialogue should be to agree on the interpretation of its functions and content. Prospects for further research are related to the development of reforms, building their logical matrix, which will contribute to the reform of society in general and its economic subsystem in particular.

Key words:

systemic crisis of society, economic basis, contradictions in the renewal of paradigms, functions and elements of economic methodology.

ПЕРЕДУМОВИ ОНОВЛЕННЯ МЕТОДОЛОГІЇ ЕКОНОМІЧНОЇ НАУКИ

Постановка проблеми. Системна криза суспільства і його економічної складової засвідчили необхідність перегляду методології економічної науки. *Метою статті є* узагальнення передумов формування і розвитку методологічного забезпечення виведення з критичної ситуації вітчизняної

¹ **Кизим Микола Олександрович**, д-р екон. наук, професор, директор, Науково-дослідний центр індустріальних проблем розвитку Національної Академії наук України, м. Харків, Україна.

Kyzym Mykola, Doctor of Economic Science, Professor, Director of the Research Center for Industrial Development Problems of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kharkiv, Ukraine.

e-mail: ndc_ipr@ukr.net

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8948-2656

² **Дороніна Майя Степанівна**, д-р екон. наук, професор, старший науковий співробітник, Науково-дослідний центр індустріальних проблем розвитку Національної Академії наук України, м. Харків, Україна.

Doronina Maya, Doctor of Economic Science, Professor, Senior Research Fellow, Research Center for Industrial Development Problems, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kharkiv, Ukraine.

e-mail: doroninamas@gmail.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8074-375X

³ **Доронін Андрій Віталійович**, д-р екон. наук, професор, завідувач кафедри менеджменту, Національний аерокосмічний університет ім. М. С. Жуковського «Харківський авіаційний інститут», м. Харків, Україна

Doronin Andrew, Doctor of Economic Science, Professor, Head of Management Department, National Aerospace University "Kharkiv Aviation Institute", Kharkiv, Ukraine.

e-mail: andrej.doronin@khai.edu

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2257-4278



економічної науки і практики. *Методологічна основа дослідження* створена з ідей видатних вчених і практиків, методів діалектики, системно-синергетичного і міждисциплінарного підходів до аналізу методології економічної науки. *Основною гіпотезою дослідження* стало припущення, що уточнення функцій і елементного складу методології економічної науки забезпечить конструктивні дискусії щодо її розвитку і адаптації до вітчизняних умов. *Виклад основного матеріалу.* Втрата контрольованості системи економічної науки і практики вимагає перегляду технологій їх дослідження на основі методологічного плюралізму, зорієнтованого на визначення можливостей трансформації економіки, зосередженої на виробництві товарів, в економіку розширеного відтворення потенціальних здібностей людини реагувати на збільшення нетрадиційних ситуацій в житті. *Оригінальність та практична значимість* дослідження полягає у визначенні обмежень і суперечностей запропонованих у публікаціях шляхів оновлення окремих наукових парадигм і їх системи у форматі метапарадигми, забезпеченні системного обґрунтування теоретичних підстав дослідження методології економічної науки і практики за рахунок визначення сутності поняття «методологія» на рівні загальне, особливе, конкретне. Запропонований перелік функцій і елементного складу методології економічної науки створює вихідний базис їх обговорення і уточнення в дискусіях і навчальних процесах *Висновки та перспективи подальших досліджень.* Ефективність побудови методології економічної науки залежить від конструктивності діалогу зацікавлених в її оновленні сторін. Вихідним етапом діалогу необхідно обрати узгодження тлумачення її функцій і змісту. Перспективи подальших досліджень пов'язані з розвитком реформ, побудовою їх логічної матриці, яка сприятиме реформуванню суспільства в цілому і його економічної підсистеми зокрема.

Ключові слова:

системна криза суспільства, економічний базис, протиріччя в оновленні парадигм, функції і елементи економічної методології.

ПРЕДПОСЫЛКИ ОБНОВЛЕНИЯ МЕТОДОЛОГИИ ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКОЙ НАУКИ

Постановка проблемы. Системный кризис общества и его экономической составляющей показали необходимость пересмотра методологии экономической науки. *Целью статьи* является обобщение предпосылок формирования и развития методологического обеспечения вывода из критической ситуации отечественной экономической науки и практики. *Методологическая основа исследования* создана из идей выдающихся ученых и практиков, методов диалектики, системно-синергетического и междисциплинарного подходов к анализу методологии экономической науки. *Основной гипотезой исследования* стало предположение, что уточнение функций и элементного состава методологии экономической науки обеспечит конструктивные дискуссии по ее развитию и адаптации к отечественным условиям. *Изложение основного материала.* Потеря контролируемости системы экономической науки и практики требует пересмотра технологий их исследования на основе методологического плюрализма, ориентированного на определение возможностей трансформации экономики, сосредоточенной на производстве товаров, в экономику расширенного воспроизводства потенциальных способностей человека реагировать на увеличение нетрадиционных ситуаций в жизни. *Оригинальность и практическая значимость исследования* заключается в определении ограничений и противоречий предложенных в публикациях путей обновления отдельных научных парадигм и их системы в формате метапарадигмы, обеспечении системного обоснования теоретических оснований исследования методологии экономической науки и практики за счет определения сущности понятия «методология» на уровне общее, особенное, конкретное. Предложенный перечень функций и элементного состава методологии экономической науки создает исходный базис их обсуждения и уточнения в дискуссиях и учебных процессах *Выводы и перспективы дальнейших исследований.* Эффективность построения методологии экономической науки зависит от конструктивности диалога заинтересованных в ее обновлении сторон. Исходным этапом диалога нужно выбрать согласования толкования ее функций и содержания. Перспективы дальнейших исследований связаны с развитием реформ, построением их логической матрицы, которая будет способствовать реформированию общества в целом и экономической подсистемы в частности.

Ключевые слова:

системный кризис общества, экономический базис, противоречия в обновлении парадигм, функции и элементы экономической методологии.

Problem statement. World practice shows that a country's activity is largely deter-

mined by its economic potential. In Ukraine, under current conditions, it remains a problem to





find out ways for its preservation and enhancement. To resolve the situation, representatives of science need to develop methodological support based on the latest technologies. Although the tasks of and possibilities for developing methodologies have already been described in many publications, this problem remains very urgent today. It is due to the fact that the modern world is rapidly changing. Models of society are dynamically developing. Channels of communication are being intensively updated. The depth and unpredictability of these processes have posed a challenge to economics. Its representatives often continue to research the latest processes and phenomena using outdated technologies. Ukrainian economics needs radical updating. The practical effectiveness of its recommendations, their adaptation to large-scale changes in society depend on the transformation of its methodological basis.

The aim of the article is to generalize the prerequisites for the formation and development of methodological support to resolve the critical situation with Ukrainian economic science and practice.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The source material for the article is taken from publications that present the vision of distinguished scientists and practitioners on modern problems of economics, topical problems of this science, ways for updating its methodology. The ideas of these authors need clarification, adaptation to the new conditions prevailing in Ukraine. They should be supplemented with an analysis of the state of the methodology of domestic science and possibilities for its development. Significant differences, inconsistency of the existing approaches to the methodology indicate an insufficient elaboration of the system approach to its research. The essence, content, conditions for the formation and development of the economic methodology do not have a generally accepted interpretation. The possibility and expediency of attracting achievements of sciences that are similar in the subject of study to solve its problems is not fully presented. In studying methodology, an orientation towards the unity of its two characteristics – functions and structure – is not always observed. The problem is professional and at the same time comprehensible presentation of new knowledge that contributes to its dissemination in society and assimilation by the younger generation in the education system.

The efforts of scientists working in the field of economics are traditionally aimed at

studying productive forces, production relations. Today, it should be borne in mind that their nature is changing in connection with the acquisition and practical development of new knowledge about their qualitative and quantitative state, their growing dependence on the politics and culture of society. The processes taking place in Ukraine require revising the basic techniques of economics, its subject. For this purpose, it is advisable to consider the signs of methodological crisis of social science formulated by the famous scientist S. Bulekbaev in the context of challenges of our time [1, p. 44-56].

In this respect, the following new trends have emerged in foreign economic science:

- studying the connection between scientific revolutions and world crises;
- enhancing the dynamism of the development of theoretical concepts, schools of scientific thought and areas of the science;
- searching for opportunities for cooperation between schools of scientific thought;
- intensifying research at the intersection of disciplines (behavioral economics, economic psychology, etc.)
- studying the characteristics of economic systems in countries with emerging markets;
- developing a paradigmatic analysis of the history of economics and economic thought.

Presenting main material. Doctor of Economic Sciences S. Ivakhnenkov, having studied the approaches to the methodology of science by US scientists, recommends analyzing their experience in researching business problems [2, p. 37]. However, when conducting the analysis, it makes sense to consider the warnings of the academician M. Zveryakov. He advises, firstly, to determine, as the starting point of the movement of the country's science, a specific point on the historical axis where it is located. This point will allow to select a set of sequential actions to modernize its economy. Secondly, when determining the starting point, it is advisable to abandon obsessive stereotypes [3, p. 24]. This means that foreign approaches should be perceived exclusively as a source of ideas for transforming domestic science and not as techniques that are ready to implement. Ukraine needs to diagnose its own problems in the economy and find ways to solve them with consideration for the peculiarities of the existing and emerging trends in the development of society. In this regard, we can agree with the opinion of O. Stryzhak, "The crisis in the economy of Ukraine affects all areas of its society without

exception, primarily, causing a negative impact on the sphere of production and social sphere. Under conditions of economic collapse, the solution of problems of stabilization of social and economic sphere is impossible without applying methodological tools of economics updated according to the demands of time, whose main task at present is searching for ways to exit from the protracted crisis" [4, p. 130].

This is not an easy task. Modern methodological problems of domestic economics are due to the following reasons:

- complication of obtaining new knowledge requiring the development of theoretical and practical research of cognition methods;
- lack of experience in forming methodological attitudes of research based on the rules of philosophy;
- need to systematize and streamline research methods of various schools of scientific thought;
- limited opportunities to obtain objective information about the real state of the economy;
- recognition by the majority of researchers of the need to develop and use a multilevel concept of scientific method;
- lack of a generally accepted vocabulary of scientific texts, their saturation with non-trivial terms that limit their understanding.

Further in the text, we present the vision of some distinguished scientists on topical problems of the economy and society, indicating the need to increase the attention of science to them and develop a proper scientific method.

Professor of the Kyiv National Economic University named after Vadim Hetman I. Malyi in a report at an international conference identified the most pressing practical problems of economics as follows, "The development of society in the 21st century is a complex and determined system, which is characterized not only by common market laws but also by the growing influence of psychological, mental, genetic, political, and other components that condition the specifics, pace and adaptability of each national economic system to new realities" [5, p. 59-60].

At the same conference, N. Tomchuk-Ponomarenko expressed the belief that the system of market relations (price, monetary, financial, competitive ones, etc.) created in Ukraine over the last decade is only similar in form to those operating in developed market economies. They are often directly opposed or significantly distorted. The author is concerned about the paradoxes of the domestic economy, which have no

analogues in the world. One of them, for example, is that, according to world practice, a country's spending of 25 % of GDP during one or two years inevitably leads to a national catastrophe. In Ukraine, the consumption is more than 60 % of GDP, but the catastrophe is hardly observed [6, p. 151].

A Russian academician S. Glazyev sees the economy as a particular source of problems. He believes that many of them are due to the nature of the government's response to scientific recommendations. According to him, "Theories that question the claims of the ruling elite to their dominance in society as well as the right to a monopoly of absolute truth do not receive approval by authorities, or the public consciousness, or the system of mass education" [7, p. 8]. The author recommends to pay attention to the fact that in the nascent economy, called the knowledge economy, the results of economic activity are exchanged neither according to the law of marginal utility nor according to the law of value [7, p. 13].

To solve the practical problems of the economy, it is necessary to change the attitude of society to science. Constructive development and dissemination of scientific knowledge will increase the reliability of decision-making, ability to control critical situations and solve problems of anticipation of the future and its conscious formation.

In 2015, Head of the Chair of Economics and Finances of the Altai Academy of Economics and Law, Doctor of Economics, Professor Yu. Shvetsov wrote that the available theoretical research in the field of economics is almost useless since it is based on a set of knowledge that is, firstly, morally obsolete, and, secondly, detached from universal values. The author believes that economic laws should be inextricably linked with the inner world of a personality and his/her spiritual and moral guidelines [8, p. 54]. Based on this, we can conclude that economic theory in its current form has lost its status and requires not just a revision of individual elements but a complete rethinking of all its methodological principles. In the article published in 2016, the author writes, "The internal content of a market economy in the form of a holistic and coherent scientific theory is lacking, and there is only a pseudo-scientific concept of organizational mechanism for maintaining the viability of the capitalist system, together with a recipe for the treatment of its key chronic weak spots. Of





course, such a shaky methodological basis cannot be sound...” [9, p. 286].

Professor of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv A. Galchynskyi believes that the time has come to radically improve the orientation of economics, “If the canonical theory focuses on development as an increase in material wealth, the new interpretation of the corresponding problem suggests going beyond a purely material determinancy of economic reality, dominance of the entire complex of processes associated with the development of the human personality, his/her intellectual wealth, creative spiritual potential. The economy that produces goods is being transformed into the economy of expanded reproduction of human capital, the human economy” [10, p. 8]. The idea of A. Galchynskyi is supported by E. Balatskyi, Chief Researcher of the Central Economics and Mathematics Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, who has been studying practical problems of the economy for almost 20 years. In his opinion, the number of factors (including non-economic ones) influencing its state has increased, economic theory being not able to cope with the task [11, p. 158]. The author believes that today’s economic systems are characterized by four major features: multifactoriality, high dynamism, significant role of information resource and mentality of business entities [12, p. 75].

Doctor of Philosophy at the Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages S. Bulekbaev sees the cause of the crisis in modern science in the absence of its metaparadigm. Today, many traditional fundamental concepts of consciousness, man, society do not quite adequately reflect reality. The world has changed so radically that it is quite natural that many old concepts lose their explanatory potential and methodological status. The understanding of this fact is already becoming widespread today. Indeed, many distinguished academic economists could neither predict the economic crises that broke out in the world nor explain their true causes. In trying to explain the causes of a crisis, scientists restrict themselves to recognizing the weakness of the explanatory potential of the branch of science they study. However, this problem goes beyond a separate discipline. It is associated with the general metaparadigm of modern science, which is outdated and does not meet the demands of time [1, p. 45].

Dealing with problems of economic theory and practice, most scientists arrive at to a conclusion that it is necessary to increase attention

to the philosophical level of the methodology of economics. The widespread dialectical method of research needs to be supplemented by other philosophical and methodological ideas that can strengthen the scientific substantiation of the guidelines for the development of this branch of science.

The dependence of economics on links with philosophy is emphasized by V. Kolpakov, Head of the Sector of Social Philosophy at the Russian Academy of Sciences. In 2008, he drew attention to the fact that until the middle of the XX century economists’ interest in philosophy was sporadic. Today, economic research is increasingly becoming an area for applying ideas of philosophy of science, a kind of applied epistemology [13, p. 83]. V. Kolpakov warns that the revolutionary transformations of economics have distinctive features. According to him, “The theoretical understanding of the economic foundations of society corresponds to the model of not one paradigm but several theories that are in complex relations with each other. Evolutionary transformations of the economic organism of society at each of its qualitatively new stages do not completely destroy all previous forms of management. Various ontological foundations of scientific paradigms can exist simultaneously, complementing each other. Thus, passing from one paradigm to a kind of matrix of paradigms, we use a more realistic model for the development of scientific knowledge about such complex objects as economic systems. The leading factors in the change of paradigms are socio-cultural influences and the desire to orient the economy towards a man who is not reducible to economic one” [13, p. 86].

Thus, methodology as a field of knowledge has a paradigmatic basis that forms a conceptual scheme for posing and solving urgent problems. In all periods of development of economics, there observed a gradual transformation and change of concepts, hypotheses, assumptions. In this science, many approaches and trends that accompany the evolution of the economic system of society and are realized in the corresponding paradigms are developing. New hypotheses are being formulated; methods for their verification are being elaborated; concepts and categories, information support are being updated. The ideas about the resource potential of a person in the economic environment and its model are changing, the motivation of labor activity is becoming more complicated. In practice, the distributed-cooperative organization of labor,

regulated by job descriptions, is complemented by a cooperative-distributed organization, focused on the full use of the collective creative potential of employees.

This allows to draw the most important conclusion: it is necessary to reach a deeper level in considering the relationship between economic paradigms. It is advisable to recognize the need for a metaparadigm, which makes it possible to create an integral picture of economic reality as a single common basis for a dialogue between representatives of particular paradigms but, nevertheless, allows for differences in assessing the situation on their basis. The purpose of the metaparadigm is to present a generalizing theoretical characteristic of a number of related paradigms. This means that the object of its research is paradigms and theories taken in interconnection. The practical implementation of a metaparadigm depends on the presence of certain political and economic prerequisites.

A proper unification of paradigms is possible provided that an appropriate methodological support is created. In 2006, V. Ryazanov, Doctor of Economics, Professor, Honored Worker of Higher Education, stated that the crisis situation in the science contributes to increasing the attention of academic economists to its methodology. As an argument, he cited the results of a study by M. Blaug, according to which, during the crisis of 1980-1991, 28 individual and collective monographs on economic methodology were published [14, p. 3]. At the same time, V. Ryazanov believes that economic theory must be turned towards the real economy, in every possible way encouraging scientific research based on analysis of real economic practices, no matter what difficulties arise in this case [14, p. 18].

Members of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine V. Bazylevich and V. Iliin, as a result of their research, conclude, "Only methodological reflection is capable of solving the grandiose problems related to overcoming the crisis of modern economic theory. Economics has no future without a systematic and conscious and not only intuitive, sporadic use of philosophical methodology since only it allows revealing the complex systemic nature of both the structure and the interrelationships (essential and functional) of economic processes and phenomena" [15, p. 59].

In the study guide (2018) edited by Head of the Department of Philosophy and Methodology of Science, Doctor of Economics

I. Dobronravova, the necessity of orientation in the development of the methodology of science to its worldview-based model is argued. Philosophical substantiation of worldview ensures the adaptation of new scientific ideas to the existing system of knowledge [16, p. 20].

But, so far, the epistemological and methodological crisis in economics continues to deepen, which causes a discrepancy between the real state of the economy and the actual level of the practical value of economic knowledge. Many scientists believe that one of the reasons for the obsolescence of the theoretical provisions of economics is the ignoring of changes in the role of a person, his/her intellectual and moral potential by its representatives.

A Ukrainian scientist Professor V. Bilotserkivets has been exploring the possibilities of introducing an innovative model of a new economy in Ukraine for several years. He believes that the solution of methodological problems can become a reliable basis of mechanisms for enhancing innovation [17, p. 7].

Vice-Rector of the Kyiv National Economic University A. Kolot draws attention to the fact that the new economic model uses a specific structure and hierarchy of factors. In this regard, he writes, "Let's pay attention to the following fundamental circumstance. In the traditional economy, man is, so to speak, in the possession of technology, serves it. In the new economy, which is developing rapidly, man and technology change places, i.e., technology already serves a person, and often even substitutes him/her in a technological process. At the same time, knowledge and other intangible assets, the reproduction of which (production, functioning, and sale) is carried out according to other laws, acquire considerable importance" [18, p. 20]. The author believes that under these conditions, economic sciences will be able to fully fulfill their mission only if their methodological basis is updated. An integral part of the updating is using the potential of an interdisciplinary approach [18, p. 21].

This idea is supported by O. Stryzhak. She draws attention to the fact that crisis situations are observed in all spheres of Ukrainian society. In this situation, it is necessary to consider that economics, in fact, is an organic unity of economic theory and economic methodology. In connection with the change in the subject field of research in economic science, its development can be ensured by applying the principle of methodological pluralism [19, p. 143].





A person's attempts to solve his/her problems, including in the field of economics, influence his/her thoughts. Professional psychologists are actively engaged in studying possibilities for directing a person's thoughts towards finding reasons of the discrepancy between his/her ideas about the real source of a life problem. It concerns both the sphere of cognition and that of transforming reality. They study thinking processes using a tool for regulating human activity, which is called "methodology". The command of applying methodology ensures continuous improvement of the search for ways out of unregulated incomprehensible situations. Methodology as a practice of thinking is actively studied by representatives of the school of scientific thought of A. Furman [20]. The intentions of psychologists are developing towards the creation of a special profession of a methodologist. A professional methodologist is delegated the function of directing the flow of a person's thoughts into a meaningful activity. However, this thesis raises doubts. The fact is that the change in the situation is directly related to its real practical nature, which has a disciplinary description. It is unlikely that a specialist in changing the financial flows of the economic system will be able to resolve contradictions in the labor motivation of personnel. In addition, the terminological support of the recommendations of psychologists is quite specific. It will be difficult to use for people from other disciplines. Moreover, even among psychologists the content of the terms is interpreted ambiguously.

Based on the above information, we can draw a conclusion. The ongoing changes in the state require filling economics with research in the field of methodology. On this path, it is necessary to encourage methodological research not only in dissertations, monographs, and articles. The crucial moment in solving the methodological problems of economics is the introduction of relevant disciplines into education curriculum.

In modern science, there are many methodological approaches concerning various areas of research and reflecting the specifics of a certain research activity. Therefore, it is very important to determine the starting positions, methods of studying and transforming the object under investigation in order to obtain a holistic view of its state and development opportunities.

This problem can be successfully solved if the following conditions are met. Firstly, methodological approaches must be consistent with the goals and objectives of the study. Secondly,

it is advisable to use several approaches corresponding to one or several levels of methodology: philosophical, general scientific and specific scientific ones. Moreover, it is necessary to ensure the coordination of the applied methodological approaches in order to investigate a particular object comprehensively, in all its interconnections.

Effectiveness of the discussion of methodological issues in the scientific world can be greatly facilitated by solving the following problems. Firstly, the formulation of generally acceptable versions of the concepts "methodology" and "methodology of economics". Secondly, the definition of the essence (list of functions) of methodology. Thirdly, the specification of its content (list of constituent elements). These tasks are directly related to the refinement of the structural elements of a particular research paradigm.

As for the task of clarifying the concepts, it is usually solved by analyzing the ways proposed in the literature, with consideration for the goals and subject of research. But, with regard to methodology, the analysis showed a lot of contradictions. For example, in the study of two philosophers of the Sumy Pedagogical University, V. Tsykin and Yu. Tarelkin, the following conclusion was obtained, "In modern scientific circulation, the terms "methodology", "methodological foundations" of science, "methodological functions" of science, "methodological problem", etc., are widely used. Their application is completely ambiguous, and these words often have different meaning. From the available definitions presented by scientists and subjects of their research, it is clear that some authors understand methodology as theory considering a certain method, others – as a method itself, in particular, a general philosophical method. Some researchers interpret it as the totality of all methods used in science, the rest of them see it as the totality of philosophical and non-philosophical sciences, which provide the initial principles for solving complex theoretical and practical problems. Authors read different meaning into this concept and often change it explicitly or implicitly in the process of thinking. That is why some clarifications and development of ideas that correspond to the maximum to the actual content and objectives of the methodology are required" [21, p. 5].

We offer to discuss in the scientific world the interpretations of the definition of the concept "methodology", obtained as a result of the analysis of the publications. At the general level:

“The doctrine of the structure, logical organization, methods, and tools of activity”. At the particular level: “A conceptual presentation of the purpose, content, research methods, ensuring the receipt of the most objective, accurate, systematized information about processes and phenomena”. At the singular level: “The scheme (algorithm) or plan for solving the tasks of scientific research”. Methodology as a field of knowledge about research techniques and methods, study of ways for attainment of truth and exact knowledge is based on a scientific paradigm that forms a conceptual scheme for posing and solving urgent problems.

As for the task of clarifying the functions of methodology, its solution is practically not suggested in the publications, the work of M. Klymenko [22, p. 42] being an exception. In other publications, the functions of methodology are sometimes given without setting this problem.

The situation with the structural composition of methodology is no simpler. Based on a sample of 15 publications by reputable scientists, it was found that the set of characteristics of methodology is called the aggregate in 50 % and the system in 65 % of them. One fourth of the publications uses the concept of aggregate with a further regard to systematization. In the list of elements of methodology, almost all authors distinguish methods and techniques as the basic ones. Sometimes other elements (e.g., principles) are singled out. Some authors suggest considering such elements as the history of economics, the study of ideals and standards of economic knowledge, the study of worldview guidelines and values of economists, and much more.

There observed a difference in the subordination of such elements of methodology as methods and techniques. Sometimes techniques are defined as basic elements with the subsequent clarification that techniques are an analogue of the method. Sometimes the opinion is expressed that only new, special or particular methods and techniques can be added to the list of elements of methodology. About 20 % of scientists consider the determination of the object and subject of research to be a function of methodology. Almost 40 % of them consider the sequence of actions, selection of stages to be part of methodology. The authors of half of the publications draw attention to the need for parallel formation and development of both methodology for studying the problem and methodology for transforming practice. Unfortunately, well-known and distinguished scientists either do not

present a convincing analysis of the structural composition of the methodology proposed by their colleagues or criticize it in their own favor.

The presence of schools of scientific thought in the scientific environment contributes to the formation of specific methodological concepts. This fully applies to economic science. The Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine has developed standards for the registration of research results by authors qualifying for scientific degrees. The standards envisage such a component as methodological support of research. The analysis of dissertation abstracts has shown differences in the presentation of information in the corresponding subsection. Sometimes it only provides a list of methodological tools. The works in which these tools are tied to the subject of their use can be considered more valuable.

With regard to our own experience in researching economic problems, we propose a possible list of the functions of the economic methodology proposed by M. Klymenko to be discussed by the scientific community. It includes determining the methods for obtaining scientific knowledge, reflecting dynamic processes and phenomena; defining the way in which the research goal is achieved; ensuring comprehensiveness of obtaining information about the process or phenomenon under study; clarifying, enriching, systematizing terms and concepts of economic science; organizing the use of new knowledge in practice.

Further in the text, elements of the methodology and definitions of their content are presented.

Problem, which is a task the method for solving which has not yet been proposed. Scientific problem – the state of “knowledge of ignorance” of qualitative and quantitative changes, development trends of a certain phenomenon or process. Problematic situation of practice (problem of practice) – contradictions that actually exist in socio-economic reality the methods and algorithms for solving which are currently unknown, incomprehensible.

Object of research, which is any aspect, level, or stratum of reality, phenomenon or process, explicitly or implicitly containing socio-economic contradictions and generating a problematic situation towards which the process of cognition is directed.

Subject of research, which includes the properties and characteristics of the object that most vividly reflect the contradictions hidden in





it, the problem being investigated. The subject displays the relationship between the problem and the object of research.

Goal, which implies obtaining still unknown knowledge about a phenomenon or process and further useful application of this knowledge in practice.

Paradigm, which includes certain explanatory theories and concepts, on the basis of which models can be formed, the main concepts of research are determined, the system of thought is formed.

Task, which is a problem that has once been solved, but the methods for solving it require clarification.

Method, which is a way for searching, developing, constructing, substantiating, transferring new knowledge, skills, the aggregate of procedures and operations related to theoretical and empirical knowledge, cognizing reality, transforming and using all things.

Technique, which is sometimes associated with method. But there are also opinions focused on singling out technique as a separate element of methodology. There are no logical interpretations of the content of this element of methodology in the literature.

Principle, which is the most abstract definition of an idea (the initial form of systematizing knowledge), a rule that arose as a result of the subjectively meaningful experience of people. The list of such principles can include purposefulness, objectivity, integrity, dynamism.

Approach, which is a more general category than method is. It provides the methodological orientation of research in situations where the subject area of science is still methodologically imperfect. Within the framework of one approach, a certain set of methods is used.

Model, which is a limited list of essential characteristics of the subject under study. There are many ways to represent models: schematic ones, which have the form of a scheme, technology map, diagram, block diagram; structural ones, which are presented in the form of a matrix, graph, vector, reflecting the relative position of elements in the system; functional ones, which reflect the processes of functioning of the simulated object.

Methodology, which is a set of methods, ways for appropriate performance of a certain work including research.

Notion, which is a symbolic reflection of essential properties of objects of the surrounding world, identified as a result of analytical work.

Category, which is a maximally general fundamental (generic) concept that reflects the most essential, regular connections and relationships between reality and cognition.

Concept, which denotes a category that corresponds to a real phenomenon and process of the surrounding reality.

Construct, which is a theoretical category of a hypothetical nature that is subject to empirical testing.

Term, which is a word or phrase that is the name of a notion. Each specific science has its own system of terms.

Conclusions and prospects of further researches. In general, based on the above materials, the following conclusions can be drawn. The world in which a person lives is constantly changing, it requires updating the techniques for adapting a person to it. In this process, the role of methodology of economics, ensuring the development of both the productive forces of society and its spiritual culture, is very important. The efforts of scientists working in the field of economics are traditionally aimed at studying the productive forces, production relations. Both of them change due to the acquisition and practical development of new knowledge about their qualitative and quantitative state. The processes taking place in Ukraine require revising the techniques for studying the economy using methodological pluralism, which can ensure the transformation of the economy that produces goods into the economy of expanded reproduction of human capital. Its effective implementation is possible if scientists come to an agreement on the interpretation of the content and essence of the methodology of science in general and the methodology of economics, in particular. The effectiveness of discussing the problems of methodology in the scientific world can be greatly facilitated by formulating generally acceptable interpretations of the concepts “methodology” and “methodology of economics”, the definition of the essence (list of functions) of methodology, and the specification of its content (list of constituent elements). Prospects for further research on the topic of the article are opening due to the forthcoming development of reforms. The most important is the issue of creating a holistic description of the methodological matrix of reforms, which will contribute to the development of clearly defined reform tools.

References

1. Булекбаев С. Б. О методологическом кризисе общественной науки в контексте вызовов современности. *Знание. Понимание. Умение*. 2016. №1 С. 44–56.
2. Івахненко С. В., Конбер Дж. Підходи вчених США до методології науки: план вивчення з метою реформування досліджень бізнесу в Україні. *Наукові записки НаУКМА. Економічні науки*. 2015. Т. 172. С. 33–38.
3. Зверяков М. І. Економічна теорія в умовах нових історичних викликів. *Логіко-історичні основи парадигмальних зрушень в економічній теорії XXI ст.* Матеріали II Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції. Київ: Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, 2015. Т. 1. С. 18–22.
4. Стрижак О. О. *Онтологічні передумови дослідження соціально-економічної реальності.* Матеріали II Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції. Київ: Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, 2015. Т. 1. С. 130–132.
5. Малий І. Й. Вплив інформаційної та глобалізаційної експансії на дифузю економічної науки. *Парадигмальні зрушення в економічній теорії XXI ст.* Матеріали II Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції. Київ: Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, 2015. Т. 1. С. 59–62.
6. Томчук-Пономаренко Н. В. Сучасні напрями теоретико-практичних досліджень в економічній теорії. *Парадигмальні зрушення в економічній теорії XXI ст.* Матеріали II Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції. Київ: Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, 2015. Т. 1. С. 150–153.
7. Глазьев С. Ю. О новой парадигме в экономической науке. *Экономическая наука современной России*. 2016. №3. С. 7–16.
8. Швецов Ю. Г. Научная несостоятельность современной экономической теории. *Проблемы современной экономики*. 2015. Вып. № 2 (54). С. 53-57
9. Швецов Ю. Г. Духовно-нравственная несостоятельность современной экономической теории. *Вестник Томского Государственного университета. Экономика*. – 2016. № 2 (34) С. 262–288.
10. Гальчинський А. Економічний розвиток: методологія оновленої парадигми. *Економіка України*. 2012. № 5. С. 4–17.
11. Балацкий Е. В. Антропогенный фактор «регресса» экономической науки. *Науковедение*. 2003. № 4. С. 142–163.
12. Балацкий Е. Диалектика познания и новая парадигма экономической науки. *Мировая экономика и международные отношения*. 2006. №7. С. 73–79.
13. Колпаков В. А. Экономическая теория в поисках новой парадигмы. Гуманитарные науки: теория и методология. *Знание. Понимание. Умение*. 2008. №1. С. 79–88.
14. Рязанов В. Т. Проблема верификации в экономической теории. *Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета*. 2004. №4. С. 3–21.
15. Базилевич В., Ильин В. *Экономико-философская мысль современного мира*. Київ: Знання, 2015. 821 с.
16. Добронравова І. С., Руденко О. В., Сидоренко Л. І. *Методологія та організація наукових досліджень*: навч. посіб. Київ: ВПЦ "Київський університет", 2018. 607 с
17. Білоцерківець В. В., Завгородня О. О. Еволюція методологічних засад дослідження нової економіки: від стохастичної перцепції до алгоритмізації пізнання. *Економічний вісник Національного гірничого університету*. 2009. № 4. С. 6–13.
18. Колот А. Міждисциплінарний підхід як передумова розвитку економічної науки та освіти. *Вісник Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка Економіка*. 2014. № 5(158). С. 18–21.
19. Стрижак Е. О. Методологический плюрализм в современной экономической теории. *Вісник НТУ «ХПИ»*. 2013. № 53(1026). С. 143–149.
20. Фурман А. В. *Ідея і зміст професійного методологування*: монографія. Тернопіль: ТНЕУ, 2016. 378 с.
21. Тарелкін Ю. П., Цикін В. О. *Методологія наукових досліджень*: навч. посіб. Суми: Видавництво СумДПУ ім. А. С. Макаренка, 2010. 196 с.
22. Клименко М. О., Фещенко В. П., Вознюк Н. М. *Основи та методологія наукових досліджень*: навч. посіб. Київ: Аграрна освіта, 2010. 351 с.

References

1. Bulekbaev, S. B. (2016). On the methodological crisis of social science in the context of modern challenges. *Knowledge. We understand. Skill*, 1, 44–56.
2. Ivakhnenkov, S. V., Conber, J. (2015). Approaches of US scientists to the methodology of science: a study plan to reform business research in Ukraine. *Scientific notes of NaUKMA. Economic sciences*, 172, 33-38.



3. Zveryakov, M. I. (2015). Economic theory in terms of new historical challenges. *Logical and historical foundations of paradigmatic shifts in economic theory of the XXI century*. Proceedings of the II International Scientific and Practical Conference. Kyiv: Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, 1, 18-22.
4. Stryzhak, O. O. (2015). *Ontological pre-conditions for the study of socio-economic reality*. Proceedings of the II International Scientific and Practical Conference. Kyiv: Kyiv National Taras Shevchenko University, 1, 130-132.
5. Malyi, I. Y. (2015). *The influence of information and globalization expansions on the diffusion of economics*. Paradigmatic shifts in economic theory of the XXI century. Proceedings of the II International Scientific and Practical Conference. Kyiv: Kyiv National Taras Shevchenko University, 1, P. 59-62.
6. Tomchuk-Ponomarenko, N. V. (2015). *Modern directions of theoretical and practical research in economic theory Paradigmatic shifts in economic theory of the XXI century*. Proceedings of the II International Scientific and Practical Conference. Kyiv: Kyiv National Taras Shevchenko University, 1, 150-153.
7. Glazyev, S. Yu. (2016). About a new paradigm in economics. *Economic Science of Modern Russia*, 3, 7-16.
8. Shvetsov, Yu. G. (2015). Scientific insolvency of modern economic theory. *Problems of modern economy*, 2(54), P. 53-57.
9. Shvetsov, Yu. (2016). Spiritual and moral insolvency of modern economic theory. *Bulletin of the Tomsk State University. Economics*, (34), 262-288.
10. Galchynsky, A. (2012). Economic development: the methodology of the updated paradigm. *Economy of Ukraine*, 5, 4-17.
11. Balatsky, E. V. (2003). Anthropogenic factor of "regression" of economic science. *Science*, 4, 142-163.
12. Balatsky, E. (2006). Dialectics of knowledge and a new paradigm of economic science. *World Economy and International Relations*, 7, 73-79.
13. Kolpakov, V. A. (2008). Economic theory in search of a new paradigm. Humanities: theory and methodology. *Knowledge. Understanding. Skill*, 1, 79-88.
14. Ryazanov, V. T. (2004). The problem of verification in economic theory. *Bulletin of St. Petersburg University*, 4, 3-21.
15. Bazilevich, V., Ilyin, V. *Economic and philosophical thought of the modern world*. Kyiv: Knowledge, 821.
16. Dobronravova, I. S., Rudenko, O. V. & Sidorenko, L. I. (2018). *Methodology and organization of scientific research*. Kyiv: Ukrainian Orthodox Church "Kyiv University", 607.
17. Bilotserkivets, V. V., Zavgorodnya, O. O. (2009). *Evolution of methodological bases of research of new economy: from stochastic perception to algorithmization of knowledge*. *Economic Bulletin of the National Mining University*, 4, 6-13.
18. Kolot, A. (2014). Interdisciplinary approach as a prerequisite for the development of economic science and education. *Bulletin of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv Economics*, 5(158), 18-21.
19. Stryzhak, E. O. (2013). Methodological pluralism in modern economic theory. *Bulletin of NTU "KhPI"*, 53(1026), 143-149.
20. Furman, A. V. (2016) *Idea and content of professional methodology*: monograph. Ternopil: THEY, 378.
21. Tarelkin, Y. P., Tsykin, V. O. (2010). *Methodology of scientific research*: Sumy: Sumy-PU Publishing House named after AS Makarenko, 196.
22. Klimenko, M. O., Feshchenko, V. P. & Voznyuk, N. M. (2010). *Fundamentals and methodology of scientific research*. Kyiv: Agriculture education, 351.

Стаття надійшла
до редакції : 20.08.2020 р.

Стаття прийнята
до друку: 28.09.2020 р.

Бібліографічний опис для цитування :

Kyzym M. Prerequisites for updating the methodology of economics / M. Kyzym, M. Doronina, A. Doronin // Часопис економічних реформ. – 2020. – № 3 (39). – С. 6-16.

