

A NEW APPROACH TO DEFINING THE INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE OF SOCIETY

Contemporary economic crisis is not only a manifestation of the cyclic nature of the economic system but a symptom of deeper contradictions affecting society. This contradiction based on violation of the structure of economic relations, namely, on absolutization single driving force - individual interest. This absolutization is typical not only for economic science but for economic policy and for economic education. At the same time other significant powers - coercion and social norms - moved outside the focuses and considered mostly as some "artifacts" that introduce dissonance into an orderly "economic view of the world."

The reason for this, in our opinion, key advantage of the economics based on the primacy of private interests, which can't overcome none of the alternative theories. This advantage is in the simplicity of answers to the most important questions of economic life: the production, distribution, exchange and consumption. The alternative (heterodox) theories will stay in the underground of economic knowledge until they come down from the "scientific tops" and be able to explain economic behavior simply and logically and offer instruments convenient for modeling and estimation.

We propose to discuss the methodological framework for the integration of fragmented knowledge about society, including economics, sociology, political science, cultural studies, history, in order to build a common "social view of the world." At the bases of our approach is an understanding of society as an institutional system as a set of interlocking types of institutions.

We propose to consider the institutional structure of the society in the context of two levels: the level of institutions and the level of routines forming these institutions. An institution we are considering (in continuation of traditions laid by G. Hodgson) as totality of economic relations that structuring the specific type of social interaction. Based on the existence of three basic motives of social action: coercion, social norms and individual interests, we offer to allocate the triad of institutions: institution of the force, institution of the assistance and institution of the opportunism respectively. The routine is the norm of interaction between the agents entrenched in repeated team skills.

The routines are an institutional "atoms" of society, and at the same time they form the link between institutions. Meanwhile, each institution is formed by routines of different types, in the base of its allocation are different reasons for their actualization. Thus, the institution of force consists of routines of violence (based on fear of direct physical coercion), routines of pressure (based on economic coercion) and routines of conviction (based on ideological violence). The institution of assistance is formed by routines of involvement (based on a commitment to joint work), the routines of communion (based on the pursuit of a common culture), and the routines of creation (based on the desire to co-create a new one). The institution of opportunism is formed by routines of rationalization (based on rooting retribution), the routines of concealment (based on rooting opportunism in interpretation O. Williamson) and the routines of fraud (based on rooting explicit forms of secret assignment of income and assets).

Ultimately the variety of social relations, including the policy management, dictatorship, corporate culture, and contractual relationships can be described and formalized in a unified cognitive frame. It will help to create the necessary foundation for

building the harmonious scientific theory, which will integrate all the social sciences, serve as a solid foundation for the new "heterodox" economic education, and will structure and explain policy decisions in a new way.