

13. Galushka, Z., 2019. Influence of social innovations on modernization of economic relations. Bulletin of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. Economy, 2 (203), pp. 6-11. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17721/1728-2667.2019/203-2/1>
14. Kolot, A. M., 2013. Corporate Social Responsibility: The Evolution and Development of Theoretical Views. Economic Theory, 4, pp. 5-26.
15. Marushchak, N. V., 2012. The evolution of the concept of corporate social responsibility. European perspectives, 2 (1), pp. 213-221.
16. The Cleveland Foundation. Goff's Vision. Retrieved from: <https://www.clevelandfoundation100.org/foundation-of-change/invention/goffs-vision/>
17. Friedman, M., 1970. The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits. New York Times Magazine, 13 (32-33), pp. 122-124.
18. Committee for economic development. 1971. Social responsibilities of business corporations. Retrieved from: https://www.ced.org/pdf/Social_Responsibilities_of_Business_Corporations.pdf
19. Davis, K., 1973. The Case for and against Business Assumption of Social Responsibilities. Academy of Management Journal, 16, pp. 312-323.

Bulletin of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. Economics, 2019; 5(206): 28-33

УДК 330.88

JEL classification: B 29

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17721/1728-2667.2019/206-5/4>

O. Nesterenko, PhD in Economics, Associate Professor

ORCID ID 0000-0003-0886-8173,

M. Zdvizova, economist

ORCID ID 0000-0003-1838-1115

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Kyiv, Ukraine

BEHAVIORAL ECONOMIC THEORY: A METHODOLOGICAL BREAKTHROUGH OR EXTENSION OF THE BOUNDARIES OF DOMINANT ORTHODOXY?

The article is devoted to the analysis of the place of behavioral approach in the structure of modern economic study. The evolution of views on the essence of economic behavior of individuals is described and the peculiarities of approaches to its definition of different economic schools are analyzed. The comparative analysis of behavioral and neoclassical approaches is presented; the peculiarity of the used method is the presentation of the neoclassical direction not in the aggregate, but as two main branches – cardinal and ordinal, which allowed for a more detailed analysis. The analysis revealed differences and some similarity of these directions of research. According to the findings, it is concluded that the behavioral approach is not the complete opposite of the neoclassical, but has a significant number of features close to the ideas of ordinary people, so it can be considered as a natural continuation of established ideas deepened through the use of an interdisciplinary approach. The article also outlines possible options for the development of neoclassical and behavioral approaches and the current issues for further research.

Key words: behavioral economics; economic behavior; rationality; individual decision-making process.

Introduction. The problem of determining the nature of economic behavior remains one of the most relevant areas of economic research today, as each individual makes many economic decisions every day and chooses among several alternatives. It is such a daily choice of each person that shapes the specificity of consumption at the macro level, which has a significant impact on both the national economy and the global economy.

Studies of individual behavior began a long time ago, the first substantial concept of economic behavior was the model "Homo economicus" by A. Smith, which has long been the basis of many further studies. Subsequently, many anomalies and inconsistencies were identified in the consumer choice process, which could not be explained by this approach. This led to the emergence of other concepts of economic behavior that took into account social, religious or mental factors and studied the consumer in various aspects. However, the most profound questions about consumer behavior and economic decision-making have been explored by behavioral school representatives, who have taken into account not only economic but also psychological factors, finding that in practice consumers are overwhelmingly irrational.

Behavioral economic theory has always been defined as an alternative to the neoclassical direction, a fundamentally opposite approach. However, at the present stage, more and more scientists are assuming the possibility of synthesis of two directions in the near future. Despite all the differences in methodology, views on rationality and economic behavior, behaviorism has every chance of integrating with the teachings of the neoclassicists and contributing to the development of the economic mainstream.

Literature review. Supporters of the cardinal approach (including A. Marshall [1]) and supporters of the ordinal approach worked on the development of the neoclassical model of individual behavior. The basis of the behavioral direction was the research of H. Simon [2] and G. Catona [3], which were developed by D. Kahneman and A. Tversky [4]. Modern researchers of the human model in economics are K. Binmore [5], R. Thaler [6], D. Ariely [7]. Among Ukrainian scientists who have been researching economic choice and behavior, S. Slukhay [8], P. Illiashenko [9], O. Dluhopolsky [10].

The purpose of the paper is exploring the neoclassical and behavioral approaches, their common and distinctive features, as well as linking directions in the context of developing views on the nature of economic behavior, and analyzing possible ways of developing and further interacting approaches.

Research methodology. To achieve the purpose of the paper and solve certain problems, we used general scientific and special methods of scientific knowledge: comparative analysis – to identify the strengths and weaknesses of neoclassical and behavioral approaches; historical method – for a retrospective analysis of approaches to determine the features of individual choice; cluster analysis – to identify features of ordinal, cardinal and behavioral approaches, establish commonality and distinctive features; analysis and synthesis – to develop suggestions for further interaction of directions. An interdisciplinary approach is used to determine the nature of behavioral economic theory and to explain the characteristics of individual decisions.

The main results. Economists for centuries have been searching for the answer to the question of the role of individual in the economy, offering new hypotheses about

the nature of its economic behavior. However, there is still no definite opinion. The attitude to determining the role of the consumer in the economy is formed in accordance with the basic assumptions made within each direction or school of economic theory.

The classical concept of the human behavior model was based on the theoretical concept of "Homo economicus", proposed by Adam Smith, which became one of the first attempts to study the nature of economic behavior and was established as a basic model for a long period. According to its model, the individual is endowed with such innate qualities: rationality, selfishness, individual economic interest, propensity to exchange and independence from the actions of other individuals. A. Smith also believed that each person clearly defined and followed their own interests. That is, the classical school of political economy views a person as an active economic subject, whose behavior is dependent on his own selfishness and satisfaction of his own needs in condition of the free choice. A. Smith's theory was the basis of many further developments, but it should be noted that it had a number of disadvantages and did not cover the full range of factors that influence the economic decision-making process.

An interesting fact is that the "father" of the concept of economic man A. Smith is also considered one of the first behavioral economists. Analyzing the earlier work of the scientist, "The Theory of Moral Sentiments" (1759), researchers N. Ashraf, K. Camerer, and J. Loewenstein write: "Adam Smith's actors in The Theory of Moral Sentiments are driven by an internal struggle between their impulsive, fickle and indispensable passions, and the impartial spectator. They weigh out-of-pocket costs more than opportunity costs, have self-control problems and are overconfident. They display erratic patterns of sympathy but are consistently concerned about fairness and justice. They are motivated by ego more than by any kind of direct pleasure from consumption and, though they don't anticipate it, ultimately derive little pleasure from either. In short, Adam Smith's world is not inhabited by dispassionate rational purely self-interested agents, but rather by multidimensional and realistic human beings" [11]. Such ideas of A. Smith were too progressive for the scientific community of the time, and the factors that he considered in explaining the economic behavior of man, were again investigated by economists only two hundred years later.

At the beginning of the XIX century, within the doctrine of utilitarianism became famous the teachings of English philosopher and sociologist I. Bentham, which is based on the study of utility. Exploring the principles of usefulness, the scientist not only sought an explanation for human behavior, but also gave it a normative value. The Bentham Man is guided by the principles of selfishness and oriented toward consumption rather than labor, unlike the economic man A. Smith. The usefulness of any decision is defined as an assessment of the degree of its morality, and the level of positive or negative results of the decision as the level of happiness or suffering of the individual.

Representatives of the new history school considered it necessary to take into account psychological factors in the study of economics, considering the person as a capitalist entrepreneur, seeking self-determination and power. M. Weber, exploring different spheres of social life, concluded that religious and ethical values are the cause, and economic behavior of man is the consequence. It is ethical values that are an important factor in economic development. It should be noted that the representatives of the German historical school of Economics were sharp opponents of the concept of economic man.

A fundamentally new approach to explaining human behavior is applied to the theory of marginalism that emerges in the last third of the XIX century. There is a new method – the method of "Robinson economy", according to which the simulation of the situation where the individual is a solitary economic entity with a limited number of goods. That is, for the first time in economic science, the personal desires and needs of the consumer are studied, and a combination of psychology and economic theory is formed, which becomes the first step to a deeper study of both the needs of the individual and the essence of his choice and behavioral motives.

An important step in making sense of the economic decision-making process is the theory of rational expectations, formulated by J. Muth in 1965 and later developed by R. Lucas. Unlike adaptive expectations, which are based on past experience, rational expectations are based on scientific assumptions that take into account the functioning of the real economic model. According to proponents of the theory of rational expectations, economic agents can predict the consequences of influence on the economy, based on knowledge of the laws of its functioning, accordingly, shaping economic behavior. They predict their activity, and these forecasts are usually closer to reality than those obtained through modeling.

Each step of the previous research has become an important component in the formation of two predominant directions that study individual economic choice and economic behavior – *neoclassical and behavioral*. To analyze the interaction and possible integration of the achievements of two alternative directions, let us consider each of them.

The methodology of *neoclassical economic theory*, as well as the basis of classical political economy, is based on the concept of rational behavior of economic subjects, although compared to the classics, they view individual as the subject of study of economic science. The neoclassical school of economic theory has made a significant contribution by formalizing the concept of "economic man" for use in mathematical models. In the future, a simplified version is used – a comparison of a person with a factor of production. However, neoclassicals made some attempts to make the consumer model more convincing.

For example, A. Marshall, the founder of the neoclassical school, believed that habits and irrational behavior underlie many human actions, and noted that not only economic but also religious factors influence the decisions of the individual [12]. The scientist has brought the human model closer to the behavior model of real economic agents – managers. A. Marshall wrote that attempts were made to construct a certain abstract science of the actions of an "economic man", free from moral principles, which earns money methodically and selfishly [1]. The model of human behavior, created by A. Marshall, became the basis of the model of modern economic man in neoclassical economic theory.

In exploring the problem of consumer choice, proponents of neoclassical theory are guided by the principles of utilitarian doctrine, meaning that every consumer, when making a choice, distributes the budget in such a way as to maximize utility. However, in order for the consumer to decide which choice maximizes utility, it must be measured. That is why, within the neoclassical approach, two concepts of utility have emerged – the cardinal and the ordinal.

A cardinal (quantitative) approach to determining utility was proposed in the last third of the nineteenth century by W. Jevons, K. Menger, and L. Walras. The theory is based

on the hypothesis that the utility of various benefits can be measured [13]. Adherents to this approach also became A. Marshall, but theory received much criticism from F. Edgeworth, W. Pareto, and I. Fisher, who later developed their own alternative utility theory. In addition, the research of cardinal utility theory was based on the following hypotheses: the consumer distributes the budget so as to obtain maximum satisfaction (utility); the consumer is able to quantify the measure of satisfaction of his own needs with a specific economic benefit in special utility units – utilities; in the consumption of each good can be calculated total and marginal utility [13]. In addition, the approach provides an explanation of the individual's attitude to the value of a particular good, depending on the change in its quantity, as well as an explanation of the wishes of the participants of the exchange. With the satisfaction of the needs of certain goods, their value falls; each participant strives to maximize the benefits by distributing their funds between different purchases. He intends to receive the same satisfaction from each amount of money spent on each of the goods he wants to buy. The cardinal approach has received much criticism because the basis of the theory – the assumption of the possibility of measuring utility, which is in fact subjective, cannot be universally calculated for every good and cannot be objectively assessed by the individual.

The main difference between the ordinal and the cardinal approaches is the assumption that the individual does not need to quantify the usefulness of each good, but to order the good according to the degree of usefulness received. Proponents of the ordinal approach were F. Edgeworth, W. Pareto, S. Fisher, J. Hicks, and E. Slutsky. According to this approach, the consumer seeks to maximize utility and make choices based on axioms of complete orderliness, transitivity, saturation, and independence. Rationality of the consumer over time has caused some inconsistencies in practice and has proven the imperfection of the model. As we can see, the ordinal approach has many advantages over the cardinal – it is less subjective. However, the ordinal approach has significant drawbacks, because it does not take into account the influence of external factors that influence the formation of consumer choice, as proved later. In general, the behavior of individuals is considered quite generalized, the main factors that affect it are the price of the product and budget constraints, personal preferences and the influence of external factors are virtually unknown.

The imperfection of neoclassical theory has led to the emergence of a new direction in the study of economic behavior and consumer choice – behavioral economics, which is the result of the combination of the achievements of economic science, psychology, sociology and cognitive science. The new trend was not accepted by most of researchers of that time, because it completely contradicted the canons of the economic mainstream.

Behavioral scientists believe that consumers are predominantly irrational subjects, which is constantly manifested in their economic behavior. H. Simon, who proposed the theory of bounded rationality, laid the basis for research in this direction. According to this theory, in the minds of every consumer there is a certain "level of requirements" or a bar, which is a conditional standard and with which he compares every possible option. To make a decision, only an idea of the location of the goods relative to the "bar" is sufficient [2]. Simon was the first who pointed out that economic entities seek to satisfy desire, not maximize utility. That is, most individuals will stop by finding an option that satisfies their desires and will not continue to search for the most useful option.

Significant contribution to the development of the direction was made by D. Kahneman and A. Tversky.

Scientists have developed a theory of perspectives that has greatly expanded understanding of consumer choice and decision-making. According to the theory of prospects, the choice depends on the initial conditions, consumers often try to avoid costs instead of receiving greater benefits and are prone to distortions of probability [4]. The Prospect Theory is a continuation of research in economic theory of choice, which includes the use of psychology in economic science. In it, D. Kahneman and A. Tversky rely on 4 basic properties of risk assessment processes that are characterize individuals when choosing between alternatives:

- *Dependency on the initial state* – shows that the value of all future "winnings" and "losses" is estimated relative to the starting point.

- *Loss avoidance* – proves that people are more afraid of negative changes in their own wealth than wanting positive ones. For example, the experience of losing a certain amount of money seems more significant than the experience of receiving or winning the same amount.

- *Decreasing sensitivity* – indicates that the marginal value of wins and losses decreases as their size increases.

- *Probability distortion* – it is common for people to give incorrect estimation of probability of occurrence of certain phenomena in conditions of uncertainty and risk [4].

The theory of perspectives explains the large number of behavioral phenomena that have been identified through research and cannot be substantiated within the framework of standard theories. The theory has been based on years of research into heuristics – individual judgments and deviations from the standard adopted in economic theory. D. Kahneman and A. Tversky completely denied the accepted model of classical economic theory *Homo economicus* – a creature of rational and hyperreflective, which is not only endowed with the ability to order benefits, phenomenal memory and other positive qualities of "machine for consumption", but also such, unable to act "by suggestion" [14]. In practice, people behave differently, guided not by rational but intuitive considerations, as defined by D. Kahneman and A. Tversky as "behavioral heuristics." Therefore, the main conclusion of this theory is that in the decision-making process, individuals tend to repel the risk of a potential loss than for a potential gain. Such a feature can be successfully used in practice as one of the levers of influence on consumer choice.

The laureate of the Nobel Prize in Economics in 2017 is once again a representative of behavioral direction – R. Thaler, who was awarded "for his contribution to the behavioral economics". His main area of research is behavioral finance. An American scientist argues that a person is not endowed with the ability to act reasonably (rationally) when making an economic decision. Particular attention in studies of Thaler pays attention to motives that induce a person to choose one of the alternatives what he calls nudge [6]. An important contribution of R. Thaler is not only the development of behavioral economic theory, but also the study of the application of his "impulses" studied in various fields: the real estate market, insurance, reform, etc. In addition, R. Thaler used behavioral factors for more global phenomena. For example, a scientist considered the possibility of avoiding the economic crisis of 2008 through the influence of properly applied "shocks" [15].

D. Ariely also explored the problems of irrational behavior and consumer choice. Applying the experimental method, the scientist examined the actual behavior of people in the market and compared their behavior with how they would behave if they were completely rational. The subject of his research has been such everyday situations and actions such as the purchase of goods and refusal, savings and waste, ordering food in restaurants, savings,

dishonesty and decision-making under the influence of various emotional states, etc. Modern behavioral scientists' works are characterized mainly by descriptive nature, lack of complex scientific terminology, case studies. That is, teaching becomes more accessible to non-scientific community, and there is popularization of direction.

Behavioral economists have been able to "softly" abandon the model of "economic man" in favor of studying the real economic behavior of individuals. Realism and an interdisciplinary approach allowed to implement the revealed deviations from rational behavior (behavioral errors, biases, inclinations, social effects, frames) to the modern economic theory. Behavioral economists do not stop at the stage of ascertaining the facts of irrational economic behavior, which is widely represented in the writings of predecessors. They attempt to fruitfully use the deviations found in order to predict the future actions of individuals, to search for incentives for economic behavior, to introduce specific measures of economic impetus (so-called libertarian paternalism) to actions in which individuals themselves are interested. The recurrent consequences of individual actions have been identified, which in turn systematically influence individuals' decision-making and performance in the market. Therefore, the influence of cognitive, social, psychological, emotional factors on the process of choice and decision-making is not

only stated, but also actively used for directing the activity of economic entities.

On the other hand, the works of behavioral economists end the era of rational economic subject, undermining the foundations of the dominant neoclassical paradigm. After all, not only the "protective belt" is modified, but also the key elements of the "hard core" of the neoclassic, in particular the model of rational choice and stability of individual preferences. Full rationality usually involved a mechanistic consideration of the maximizing behavior of the economic entity on the basis of an orderly endogenous set of sustainable benefits. That is why this premise was and remains the most vulnerable element of the "hard core" of the neoclassical research program.

Proponents of behavioral economics have drawn attention to factors that were not taken into account when studying consumer choices: culture, society, traditions, religion, stereotypes, imitation, behavior of other consumers, individual interests and preferences, etc. Comparing behavioral and neoclassical approaches, scientists argue that behavioral economics is a direction that is fundamentally different from the neoclassical one. However, if one compares the behavioral trend separately with the ordinal approach and the cardinal approach, one can see both differences and some similarities. This comparison is presented in table 1.

Table 1. Comparison of cardinal, ordinal and behavioral approach

Characteristics	Neoclassical economic theory		Behavioral economic theory
	Cardinal approach	Ordinal approach	
Utility measure	Quantitative	Qualitative	Qualitative
The moment of decision making	An immediate point of choice, later research takes into account expectations		Previous experience and context of the selection are taken into account
Evaluation of goods	Quantitative	Ranging	Analysis of the place of the good relative to the "level of requirements" according to irrational behavioral factors
Profits and losses analysis	Total and marginal utility analysis	Utility analysis using indifference curves	Analysis of profits and losses depending on baseline
Analysis of individual actions	Abstracted from previous circumstances		According to baseline, previous experience
Properties of goods	There are sets of goods with the same level of utility, goods can replace each other		The decision is made on the basis of the properties of a particular product
Factors influencing choice	Subjective quantitative evaluation	Personal preference	A significant number of factors (advertising, mass behavior, fashion, stereotypes)
Characteristics of consumer evaluation	The consumer is able to adequately (rationally) assess the level of utility of the good		Consumer estimates are predominantly irrational
Consumer dependence level	Consumers are completely independent entities		Consumers are dependent on the behavior of other entities
The presence of deviations in economic behavior	It is not recognized, the study of standardized situations prevails		It is recognized, anomalies, paradoxes and more are being studied
Research methods	Mostly mathematical		Empirical, statistical (experiment, survey)

Source: compiled by the authors.

Comparing both of approaches, it should be noted that, within behavioral theory, the subject of research is not only the result of economic choice, but also the process and factors that influence it. An in-depth interdisciplinary analysis of the psychological basis of economic decision-making has been conducted, the results of which challenge the hypotheses of rationality and independence of economic actors. Such a difference in approaches may also be due to the historical events and economic conditions that accompanied the development of these economic schools. The behavioral approach is more reflective of the current situation: the diversity of product range, the intensification of competition between

manufacturers (as result is numerous promotional campaigns, deep discounts, aggressive marketing, etc.), the development of technologies for deeper research, etc.

Obviously, the behavioral approach is generally different from the neoclassical one, but it should be noted that it has some similarities to the ordinal approach. The basic similarity is that ordinalists assume that the consumer can streamline sets of goods, and behaviorists believe that the individual can determine the location of goods relative to the "level of requirements" and make a decision in accordance with what is similar to the principle of ranking. However, the difference is the desire to satisfy needs, not to maximize utility. It should also be noted that for the first time since the

era of the marginal revolution, the study of consumer motivation and psychology has been generalized to the level of methodologically relevant and practically applied provisions of economic theory.

An important component of research is the benefit and losses analysis. Within the framework of the cardinal approach, the notion of marginal utility – the additional utility of each successive unit of good – is explored. Since marginal utility can also be negative, consumption of each subsequent good can be seen as both a benefit and a loss. Ordinalists tend to analyze the location of sets of goods on indifference curves, using the fundamental principle of direction – ranking. It should be noted that both cardinals and ordinalists are guided by the quantitative characteristics of benefits and losses, as well as by operating the concept of "utility". Behavioral scientists analyze the losses and benefits of the individual not in isolation, but starting from the initial state of the individual and through the lens of psychological characteristics of individuals' perception of certain changes. Through this analysis, they argue that people are more afraid of losing existing resources rather than seeking new ones. Therefore, they are often afraid to take risks, do not receive possible benefits, and therefore behave irrationally.

In addition, in the ordinal approach, the usefulness of good is determined on the basis of consumer preferences, which are broadly analyzed by representatives of behavioral economic theory. Of course, the behavioral approach is broader and takes into account a much larger number of psychological and cognitive factors that influence consumer behavior; however, it complicates generalization. The behavioral approach can be considered as a natural continuation of the doctrines arising from the development of psychology and cognitive science, as well as the application of an interdisciplinary approach.

There are several options for developing neoclassical and behavioral theory at this stage of economic doctrine development. First, a further parallel development in which each direction develops as an alternative to the other. Second, integration, a combination of both directions, is a neoclassical analytic apparatus, complemented by cognitive research. Third, the displacement of the neoclassical direction by behavioral approach. However, this variant is rather unlikely, since behavioral economic theory does not have a developed categorical and methodological apparatus, mostly examines specific cases, does not produce generalized unified results.

Conclusions and discussion. Modern economic science, the further movement of which is an indeterminate single isolated scientific advancement, is now the search for the most successful and acceptable solutions to current problems in the theory and practice of scientific knowledge of economics. The behavioral school has made a significant contribution to the study of consumer behavior and decision-making through the integration of multiple disciplines. Thus, the old problem of reconciling economic theory and the psychological process of making individual decisions has partly found its solution.

Behavioral studies demonstrate a new approach to the study of decision-making, which is why most researchers consider them to be the exact opposite of established views on the problem of economic choice and economic behavior, noting their inability to enter the economic mainstream. However, according to research, behavioral approach can be considered (to some extent) as a continuation of the idea of an ordinal approach,

deepened by the use of an interdisciplinary approach and the achievements of psychology.

At this stage, the question arises: can the behavioral approach completely replace the neoclassical approach to modeling human behavior? Behaviorism is, for the most part, a positive approach and not too mathematized, which makes it possible to apply it in a rather limited number of cases and determines a complexity of generalization. Therefore, in our view, the behavioral approach requires further development and a certain synthesis of the neoclassical approach in order to refine the methodological framework and strengthen the hypotheses. Further areas of research include identifying the degree of integration of modified behavioral prerequisites into the dominant neoclassical "disciplinary matrix", which would give a more in-depth understanding of the economic behavior of individuals embodied in specific mathematical models.

We suppose that the most productive but also the most difficult way for the economic mainstream is to combine the two conflicting trends. After all, representatives of both directions have deep expertise in various complementary fields: neoclassics are able to provide a reasoned basis for a new direction, to hypothesize and to build appropriate mathematical models, generalizations, etc; behaviorists are known for conducting experiments, investigating the psychological characteristics of individual choice, motivation, and so on.

Another argument for the unification of directions is that in the history of economic science there was already a combination of neoclassics with its alternative direction – Keynesianism, which resulted in the emergence of Keynesian-neoclassical synthesis, which at one time greatly enriched economic science and still has a large number of followers.

Thus, the problem of integration/disintegration of economic theories, including neoclassical and behavioral ones, will remain relevant and debatable over a period of time. It seems to us that the synthesis of the pioneering explorations in the theory of economic behavior and the developed and refined methodological tools of neoclassical theory is capable of producing a significant synergistic effect in further economic research. The combination of studies of rational and irrational economic choices, the impact on it of economic and psychological factors, the study of the relationship of processes of subjectivization and objectification of economic life as a whole, will determine the further need for joint application of the achievements of neoclassical and behavioral economic theories.

References:

1. Marshall A., 1890. Principles of Economics. 8th ed. London: MacMillan and Co.
2. Simon H., 1978. Rationality as Process and as Product of Thought. *American Economic Review*, 68(2), pp. 1-16.
3. Katona G., 1951. Psychological analysis of economic behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill.
4. Kahneman D., Tversky A., 1979. Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision under Risk. *Econometrica*, 47(2). pp. 263-292.
5. Binmore K. 2009., *Rational Decisions*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
6. Thaler R., Sunstein C., 2009. *Nudge: Improving Decisions About Health, Wealth, and Happiness*. New York: Penguin.
7. Ariely D., 2012. *Predictably Irrational: The Hidden Forces That Shape Our Decisions*. 2nd ed. New-York: HarperCollins.
8. Slukhaya S., 2012. Behavioral economic theory as an alternative to the neoclassical paradigm in consumer choice theory. In: Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, 3rd International Scientific-Practical Conference: Paradigm Shifts in Economic Theory of the 21st Century. Kyiv, Ukraine, 15-16 November 2012. Kyiv: Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv.
9. Illiashenko P., 2016. Behavioral finance: A historical overview and basics. *Bulletin of the National Bank of Ukraine*, 239, pp. 30-57.

10. Dluhopolsky O., Ivashuk Y., 2014. Experimental and behavioral economics: from Vernon Smith to Daniel Kahneman. Bulletin of the Ternopil National Economic University, 1, pp. 180-193.

11. Ashraf N., Camerer C., Loewenstein G., 2005. Adam Smith, behavioral economist. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 3(19). pp. 131-145.

12. Seligman B., 1962. Main Currents in Modern Economics. Glencoe: Free Press of Glencoe.

13. Halperin V., Ignatiev S., Morgunov V., 1999. Microeconomics. Saint Petersburg: Economic school.

14. Belianin A., 2003. Daniel Kahneman and Vernon Smith: An Economic Analysis of Human Behavior. Issues of Economy, 1, pp. 4-23.

15. Fletcher N., 2017. chard Thaler wins 2017 Nobel prize in economics – as it happened. The Guardian [online] 1 October. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/business/live/2017/oct/09/nobel-prize-in-economics-due-to-be-unveiled-business-live> [Accessed 20 October 2019].

Received: 08/09/19

1st Revision: 10/10/19

Accepted: 20/10/19

Author's declaration on the sources of funding of research presented in the scientific article or of the preparation of the scientific article: budget of university's scientific project

О. Нестеренко, канд. екон. наук, доц.

ORCID ID 0000-0003-0886-8173,

М. Здвізова, економіст

ORCID ID 0000-0003-1838-1115

Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, Київ, Україна

ПОВЕДІНКОВА ЕКОНОМІЧНА ТЕОРІЯ: МЕТОДОЛОГІЧНИЙ ПРОРИВ ЧИ РОЗШИРЕННЯ МЕЖ ПАНУЮЧОЇ ОРТОДОКСІЇ?

Присвячено аналізу місця поведінкового підходу в структурі сучасних економічних учень. Досліджено еволюцію поглядів на сутність економічної поведінки та проведено порівняльний аналіз поведінкового й неокласичного підходів до економічної поведінки, причому останній представлено окремо ординалістською та кардиналістською версіями. Виявлено їх відмінності та спільні риси, а також окреслено можливі варіанти розвитку і взаємодії неокласичної та поведінкової економічних теорій.

Ключові слова: поведінкова економіка; економічна поведінка; раціональність; процес ухвалення рішень.

Е. Нестеренко, канд. екон. наук, доц.

ORCID ID 0000-0003-0886-8173,

М. Здвізова, економіст

ORCID ID 0000-0003-1838-1115

Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, Київ, Україна

ПОВЕДЕНЧЕСКАЯ ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКАЯ ТЕОРИЯ: МЕТОДОЛОГИЧЕСКИЙ ПРОРЫВ ИЛИ РАСШИРЕНИЕ ГРАНИЦ ГОСПОДСТВУЮЩЕЙ ОРТОДОКСИИ?

Посвящено анализу места поведенческого подхода в структуре современных экономических учений. Исследована эволюция взглядов на сущность экономического поведения, проведен сравнительный анализ поведенческого и неоклассического подходов к экономическому поведению, причем последний представлен отдельно ординалистской и кардиналистской версиями. Выявлены их различия и общие черты, а также определены возможные варианты развития и взаимодействия неоклассической и поведенческой экономических теорий.

Ключевые слова: поведенческая экономика; экономическое поведение; рациональность; процесс принятия решений.

Bulletin of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. Economics, 2019; 5(206): 33-40

УДК 338

JEL classification: C01, F6

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17721/1728-2667.2019/206-5/5>

Н. Чала, д-р наук держ. упр., проф.

ORCID ID 0000-0002-0356-9003

Національний університет "Києво-Могилянська академія", Київ, Україна,

Г. Харламова, канд. екон. наук, доц.

ORCID ID 0000-0003-3614-712X

Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, Київ, Україна,

Д. Маркішев, магістр

ORCID ID 0000-0002-3328-1238

Національна академія державного управління при Президенті України, Київ, Україна

ИНДЕКС СУВЕРЕННОСТИ ДЕРЖАВИ ЯК ІНДИКАТОР ПРИЙНЯТТЯ ДЕРЖАВНО-УПРАВЛІНСЬКИХ РІШЕНЬ

Світова спільнота та уряди країн постійно перебувають у пошуку дієвого мірила для країн: мірила їх успішності чи неуспішності, захищеності та вразливості, якості життя в них, відкритості тощо. Усі індекси за своєю природою є об'єктивними інтеграторами суб'єктивно-об'єктивних показників, і довіра до індексу базується саме на врівноваженості цих категорій. У цьому дослідженні автори зробили спробу оцінити за допомогою об'єктивності, яку може внести в розрахунок потужний економетричний апарат, ступінь суверенності країн світу, і України зокрема. Підбір, нормалізація, оцінка стаціонарності та кореляційний аналіз дозволили звести базу з більш ніж 40 статистичних показників для країн світу до узагальненого індексу та прогнозу розвитку його динаміки на майбутнє. Пропонується, що Індекс суверенності країни є інтегральним і має шкалу від 0 до 100. Для більш наочного представлення результатів запропоновано шкалу індексу суверенності для країн, із визначенням країни умовно відносно незалежної від впливу і рекомендацій зовнішніх міжнародних організацій чи суб'єктів. Виявилось, що загалом усі досліджувані країни мали схожу тенденцію розвитку явища, що підтверджує ефект глобалізації та синергію в зовнішній активності цих країн. Даний індекс у подальшому може стати мірилом успішності та неуспішності урядової політики та інструментом обрання напряму розвитку країни.

Ключові слова. Індекс, рейтинг, прогноз, Україна.

Вступ та постановка проблеми. Використання індексів для оцінки та порівняння різних аспектів діяльності країн, регіонів і міст є доволі привабливим інструментом для аналізу та прийняття управлінських рішень, у т. ч. і державних [1]. На сьогодні існує велика кількість

різних індексів та рейтингів: глобальних і локальних; комплексних та спеціалізованих. Більшість індексів мають публічний характер, а їх автори самі зацікавлені у просуванні своїх напрацювань.