

*Izdavač*

**Centar za izdavačku delatnost Ekonomskog fakulteta u Beogradu**

Kamenička 6, Beograd  
tel. 3021-045, faks 3021-065  
<http://cid.ekof.bg.ac.rs>  
mail: [cid@ekof.bg.ac.rs](mailto:cid@ekof.bg.ac.rs)

*Recenzenti*

**Prof. dr Siniša Zarić, Ekonomski fakultet Beograd**  
**Prof. dr Dragan Petrović, Ekonomski fakultet, Niš**  
**Prof. dr Vlastimir Leković, Ekonomski fakultet, Kragujevac**

*Dekan Ekonomskog fakulteta*  
**Prof. dr Branislav Boričić**

*Direktor i odgovorni urednik*  
**Dr Đorđe Mitrović**

*Dizajn korice*  
MaxNova Creative  
[www.maxnova.rs](http://www.maxnova.rs)

*Štampa*  
**ČUGURA Print , Beograd**  
[www.cugura.net](http://www.cugura.net)

*Godina*  
**2018.**

**ISBN: 978-86-403-1551-7**

© 2018.

Sva prava su zadržana. Nijedan deo ove publikacije ne može biti reprodukovan niti smešten u sistem za pretraživanje ili transmitovanje u bilo kom obliku, elektronski, mehanički, fotokopiranjem, snimanjem ili na drugi način, bez prethodne pismene dozvole autora i izdavača.

**Slavica Manić**

**OGLEDI O EKONOMSKOJ  
METODOLOGIJI**



Centar za izdavačku delatnost  
EKONOMSKI FAKULTET U BEOGRADU

# Sadržaj

**Predgovor** – Ogledi umesto kontroverzi o ekonomskoj metodologiji

## **I deo – NEKA EPISTEMOLOŠKO-METODOLOŠKA PITANJA FILOZOFIJE NAUKE**

<b>1. Umesto uvoda – od filozofije nauke ka ekonomskoj metodologiji.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Filozofija nauke – izbor pristupa.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. Racionalnost nauke i problem izbora teorija .....</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1. (Ne)mogućnost racionalnog izbora teorija: relativističko <i>versus</i> racionalističko stanovište .....	9
3.2. Istinitost i pitanje izbora između teorija.....	11
3.3. Empirijska provera: verifikacija, potvrđivanje ili falsifikacija?.....	14
3.4. Izbor teorija u ekonomiji: od potvrđivanja ka instrumentalizmu .....	22
<b>4. Razvoj nauke – različite koncepcije .....</b>	<b>26</b>
4.1. Popperovo shvatanje rasta nauke .....	28
4.1.1. Kritika induktivnog metoda.....	29
4.1.2. Kriterijum demarkacije – falsifikacionizam <i>(pretpostavke i pobijanja)</i> .....	33
4.1.3. Napredak nauke .....	37
4.1.4. Problemi u primeni falsifikacionizma <i>(neke implikacije)</i> .....	43
4.2. Lakatoševa koncepcija rasta naučnog saznanja .....	46
4.2.1. Naučno-istraživački programi .....	46
4.2.2. Šta je novo u odnosu na Popperovu teoriju naučnog saznanja?.....	51
4.2.3. Metodološki dogmatizam <i>versus</i> pluralizam.....	54

4.3. Kunovo shvatanje rasta nauke.....	59
4.3.1. <i>Opšteprihvaćena paradigma – odnos normalne i revolucionarne (izuzetne) nauke</i> .....	60
4.3.2. <i>Kako napreduje nauka?</i> .....	67
4.3.3. <i>Kun versus Popper versus Lakatoš</i> .....	70
4.4. Fajerabendova koncepcija.....	75
4.4.1. <i>Protiv metodoloških i drugih imperativa</i> .....	75
4.4.2. <i>Za svojevrsni teorijsko-metodološki anarhizam</i> .....	77
4.4.3. <i>Protiv autoriteta</i> .....	82
4.5. Bez konsenzusa: čime se meri napredak nauke? .....	84
<b>5. Tradicionalna nasuprot savremenoj filozofiji nauke.....</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>6. Rehabilitacija tradicionalne filozofije nauke.....</b>	<b>90</b>

## II deo – EKONOMSKA METODOLOGIJA

<b>1. Evolucija odnosa filozofije i ekonomije.....</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>2. Karakter metodoloških rasprava u ekonomiji .....</b>	<b>100</b>
2.1. Tenzije između deduktivizma i empirizma .....	104
2.2. Ekonomija kao empirizam <i>sui generis</i> (falsifikacionizam) .....	108
2.2.1. <i>Istorijska upitnost: nepraktikovanje falsifikacionizma u ekonomiji</i> .....	109
2.2.2. <i>Metodološka nedoslednost: situaciona logika kao imunizirajuća stratagema</i> .....	117
2.2.3. <i>Korekcije Popperove metodologije</i> .....	120
2.3. Ekonomija kao instrumentalizam.....	125
2.4. Nove tendencije u metodologiji .....	131
2.4.1. <i>Ekonomija kao retorika</i> .....	131
2.4.2. <i>Kritički realizam u ekonomiji</i> .....	137
<b>3. Naučni status ekonomije.....</b>	<b>142</b>
3.1. Aproksimacija naučnosti.....	143
3.2. Višestruka upitnost naučnosti ekonomije .....	146
<b>4. Poriv za promenama u ekonomskoj metodologiji.....</b>	<b>155</b>
4.1. Samokriticizam ekonomske nauke.....	158
4.2. Odbrana egzaktnosti ekonomije: medijatorska uloga formalizacije.....	163



4.3. Još jedna odbrana: povratak empiriji uz indukciju .....	166
4.4. Institucionalni autizam ortodoksije? .....	169
<b>5. Protivrečne tendencije (pozitivni i negativni trendovi) u ekonomskoj nauci .....</b>	<b>174</b>
5.1. Metodološki pluralizam u ekonomiji .....	174
5.2. (Ne)monolitnost ekonomske nauke .....	180
5.2.1. <i>Promene istraživačkih standarda</i> .....	181
5.2.2. <i>Mainstream heterodoksija</i> .....	184
5.3. Sinteza versus fragmentacija: transformativni efekti ekspanzionizma ekonomske nauke .....	191
5.3.1. <i>Da li su granice između disciplina irelevantne?</i> .....	194
5.3.2. <i>Modaliteti ekonomskog imperijalizma</i> .....	197
5.3.3. <i>Evaluacija posledica ekonomskog imperijalizma</i> .....	205
5.4. Zašto smo dosledni <i>mainstream-u</i> ? .....	211
<b>6. Metodološka rekonstrukcija društvene i ekonomske nauke .....</b>	<b>217</b>
6.1. Kontekstualna uslovljenost versus kontekstualna nezavisnost.....	218
6.2. Paradoks „nauka u pokušaju” ( <i>would be sciences</i> ).....	222
6.3. Kako do ideala delotvorne društvene nauke? .....	224
6.3.1. <i>Vажnost vrednosne racionalnosti</i> .....	227
6.3.2. <i>Konsenzus versus sukob: bolji argument naspram analitike odnosa moći</i> .....	228
6.4. Kritika koncepta fronetične nauke: genealogija koja to nije....	231
<b>7. Još malo normativizma za kraj.....</b>	<b>236</b>
7.1. Kako prevazići neproduktivno fragmentiranje u nauci? .....	236
7.2. Kakva metodologija je potrebna ekonomiji? .....	240
Literatura .....	245



## **Predgovor - OGLEDI UMESTO KONTROVERZI O EKONOMSKOJ METODOLOGIJI**

*“Bilo bi dobro za sve nas da upamtimo jednom za svagda: različiti smo jer jedni od drugih znamo malo više, ali smo po beskonačnosti onoga što još uvek ne znamo svi jednaki” (Popper, 1963, str. 29)*

*Knjiga koji se nalazi pred vama, uvaženi čitaoci, predstavlja značajno dopunjenje, a u izvesnim segmentima izmenjeno, izdanje monografije pod nazivom „Kontroverze o ekonomskoj metodologiji.” Budući da je od publikovanja iste protekla skoro decenija, nužnost pojavljivanja ovog dela je, barem po dva osnova, objektivno uslovljena: prvo, kao autor „Kontroverzi” bila sam u prilici da svakim danom u tom podugom periodu saznajem na kakvu je recepciju pomenu ti tekst nailazio, te da se konstantno upoznajem sa njegovim vrlinama, a pogotovo manama; takva vrsta spoznaje je blagodat jer mi je podarila objektivni ugao gledanja na stvari (više očiju bolje vide, zar ne?), ali i svojevrsno breme, koje je podrazumevalo da se valja pobrinuti da uzdarje bude svrsishodno – da svako sledeće izdanje bude kvalitetnije od prethodnog, što, s obzirom na materiju koja se proučava, priznaćete, nije lako izvodljiv poduhvat ceteris paribus; drugo, u proteklom intervalu su, kao za inat svima koji se na prethodno navedenu klauzulu svesrdno pozivaju, diljem sveta, pa i na ovim prostorima, objavljene neko-like knjige koje obrađuju sličnu tematiku, rukopisi pažnje i hvale vredni, ne samo zbog eminentnih imena iz čijeg su „pera” potekli, već prevashodno zbog načina na koji su ovu problematiku analizirali, te forme u kojoj su istu predočili i izložili na uvid stručnoj i široj javnosti.*

*I ma koliko gorepomenuta neophodnost publikovanja izgledala objektivno uslovljena i očita, ne mogu se oteti prvom utisku da je takva nužnost, subjektivno posmatrano, probudila pomešana osećanja i nove nedoumice. Kako se motivisati na pisanje kad ste, s jedne strane, osokoljeni bodrenjem da to učinite, a s druge strane svesni sopstvene isposredovanosti izvesnom (a opet nedovoljnom) metodološkom „potkovanošću”, dodatno obeshrabreni činjenicom da su umniji od vas, na manje ili više pitak i čitalačkoj publici prijemčiv način, ponudili dela poput „Filozofije ekonomije” i „Šta objašnjavaju društvene nauke” (da spome-*

*nem samo neka od njih)? Konačno, ako pretpostavimo da se upitnost motivacije može prenebregnuti ili zaobići (svi smo mi, u određenim situacijama, homo economicus, koje sebičnost pokreće na racionalno – čitaj proračunato - delovanje), koje teme bi valjalo obraditi kako bi se „pomirile” forma (broj stranica čijim će se dodavanjem i „umetanjem”, u postojeći rukopis „Kontroverzi”, zadovoljiti birokratskim prohtevima propisani standardi) i suština (opseg promena koje su se dogodile u literaturi iz filozofije nauke i/ili ekonomske metodologije u proteklom desetleću)?<sup>1</sup>*

*Shvativši da bi me pokušaj da razbistrim i otklonim pomenute nedoumice isključivo mogao odvesti u neželjenom smeru (da na primeru sopstvenog teksta uočim dejstvo „zakona o opadajućim prinosima”), opredelila sam se da u izboru tema i načinu njihove analize sledim moto koji je iznedrio Hajdeger: „breza nikad ne prekoračuje svoje mogućnosti”.<sup>2</sup> Toliko mudrosti u jednostavnoj metafori, ovaj put kontekstualno „izmeštenoj”: kad ste, kao breza, „slabi” u snalaženju sa neznanim, nećete imati potrebu da „prkosite gromovima”, jer to ne čine ni stameni, stoletni hrastovi (dakle, nećete se upustiti da zađete tamo gde su i drugi, Blaugovim jezikom izrečeno, nevoljni ili se plaše da kroče), već ćete se, svesni sopstvene „krhkosti”, zaštititi u njihovom „hladu” (držeći se poznatog – terena i tema). Ova metaforička ograda mi se činila uputnom da pokažem da je, uprkos tvrdnjama o osporivosti svakog izbora istraživačkih pitanja, izvodljivo načiniti „odstupnicu” opredeljenjem za izvestan, ali ne i proizvoljan, broj tema koje će biti obrađene bez pretenzija na polaganje prava na njihovu ekskluzivnost i/ili potpunost.<sup>3</sup> Shodno navedenom, neki problemi su izloženi en passant, uz više ukazivanja, a manje eksplicitnih tvrdnji, dok je za druge ostavljeno više prostora. U odeljku koji se bavi filozofijom nauke su, stoga, urađene korekcije i dopune koje tangiraju pitanje izbora teorija, temeljniju razradu (shodno ličnom uve-*

---

<sup>1</sup> Da knjiga ne bi trebalo da teži takvoj obuhvatnosti, već da bi je valjalo posmatrati kao dopunu za „neposredno proučavanje izvornih tekstova” i „vodič” uz pomoć kojeg se lakše krči put kroz opsežnu literaturu, videti u: Guala, 2010, str. 19.

<sup>2</sup> Martin Heidegger, „Overcoming Metaphysics”, citirano prema: Zimmerman, 2002. Iako bi se Hajdeger, kao tvorac originalne filozofije (poznate pod nazivom fundamentalna ontologija) i oličenje fenomenološkog metoda, verovatno oštro suprotstavio primisli da bude upoređivan sa empiričarima, njegova metafora o brezi je, u izvesnom smislu, slična Lokovom stavu da „...neće biti zgoreg ubediti ljudski duh da bude oprezniji, da se ne meša u stvari koje su iznad njegovog shvatanja, da stane kad dođe do kraja svojih mogućnosti, da se pomiri sa neznanjem u onim stvarima za koje se posle ispitivanja utvrdi da su izvan dosega naših sposobnosti” (Lok, 1962, str. 21).

<sup>3</sup> „Naučno istraživanje...se nikad ne završava i ne polaže pravo na konačnost” (Cimer, 2010, str. 245).

renju) pomalo zanemarene i/ili nepravедno zapostavljene Fajerabendove koncepcije nauke, te argumentovane „naputke” u vezi promena kojima je izložena postpozitivistička orijentacija u okolnostima postojanja naznaka o rehabilitaciji tradicionalne filozofije nauke. Obimniji zahvati su načinjeni u drugom odeljku koji se bavi problemima ekonomske metodologije, naročito u pogledu sledećih pitanja: kontroverzности zaključaka u vezi značaja retoričkog pristupa kao novije tendencije u ekonomskoj metodologiji, suptilnosti novog ekonomskog imperijalizma, uspešnog odolevanja ortodoksije stalnim preispitivanjima i odbranom kroz promovisanje koncepta mainstream heterodoksije (oličenog u idejama bihejvioralne ekonomije, eksperimentalizma i nove institucionalne ekonomije), latentnog, ali još uvek neiskorišćenog i u određenim elementima upitnog potencijala koncepta kontekstualno uslovljene društvene nauke.

Osnovna poruka je, neizmenjena, ali sasvim izvesno aktuelnija nego pre deset godina: i mainstreamu i ekonomskoj nauci u celini je pluralizam gledišta preko potreban. A upravo je trenutak iznošenja pomenute generalizacije o ključnoj ideji, pravi momenat da se ukaže zašto je bilo nužno izmeniti i sam naslov monografije. Iako nema ničeg pogrešnog u korišćenju izraza „kontroverze”, budući da je njegova izvorna priroda takva da polemiku, diskusiju ili spor tokom kojih se suprotstavljaju različita, oprečna mišljenja i teorijske koncepcije predočava na način koji može, ali ne mora, ponuditi konačno rešenje, izbor alternativnog termina mi se učinio primerenijim. Ni činjenica da je reč o svakako beskrajno (a možda ponekad i bespotrebno) rabljenom izrazu, nije me obeshrabrila da se, poput većine ekonomista, odlučim za svojevrsni „verifikacionizam”, krenuvši u potragu za tvrdnjom koja potkrepljuje i potvrđuje ispravnost namere da se naziv dela promeni. Istu sam pronašla, u nadasve inspirativnoj argumentaciji Đure Šušnjića: „...ogled nije stroga naučna rasprava gde se nešto dokazuje analizom činjenica koje objašnjava jedna teorija, već književni oblik u kome se više postavljaju probna pitanja nego što se daju sigurni odgovori, gde se pisac raspituje o različitim gledištima, da bi se uobličilo neko rešenje bliže istini, ali i dalje otvoreno za dopunu.” (Šušnjić, 2012, str. 16).<sup>4</sup> Konačni odgovori i definitivna rešenja, čini se, ne poseduju neusidrenost svojstvenu znatiželji i kontinuiranom postavljanju pitanja. I sama ideja pluralizma bi bila potpuno obesmišljena bez otvorenosti za drugačija viđenja o ekonomskoj metodologiji, čije konstantno preispitivanje daje nadu da još uvek ima prostora za napredak ekonomske nauke.

---

<sup>4</sup> Navedeno objašnjenje korespondira Vitgenštajnovom stavu da je zadatak filozofa ne toliko da reši, koliko da „odreši” pitanja, budući da oni uobičajeno inkliniraju ka tome „da pitanja analiziraju umjesto da na njih odgovaraju” (Eagleton, 2008, str. 17 i 13).

*Na kraju ovog, za ukus naučne javnosti verovatno previše ogoljenog i otvorenog, ali svakako krajnje iskrenog obraćanja, želela bih da izrazim svoju zahvalnost onima koji su, svojom neposrednom podrškom, doprineli da ovaj rukopis dobije formu koja je pred vama: profesoru Siniši Zariću, koji je verovao u mene još od studentskih dana, a pogotovo u vreme kad to drugi nisu, profesorima Draganu Petroviću i Vlastimiru Lekoviću koji se na Ekonomskom fakultetu u Nišu i Ekonomskom fakultetu u Kragujevcu stameno opiru svim pokušajima da se proučavanje metodologije ekonomije potisne u drugi plan. Vama, dragi čitaoci, kao i svima onima koji su najčešće indirektno, možda na manje vidljiv (ali nesumnjivo prisutan) način doprinosili mom sazrevanju, prevashodno u vezi sa ekonomskom metodologijom, ali i na profesionalnom i ličnom planu, ću, nadam se, imati priliku da se obratim i zahvalim kad ova knjiga, od koje neskromno očekujem da bude majdan podsticaja za pluralizmu naklonjenije promišljanje ekonomije, „ugleda svetlo dana”.*

---

**Literatura**

1. Ackerman, F. (2003), What we learned in the twentieth century, in: Fullbrook, E. (ed), *The crisis in economics*, pp. 150-154, Routledge, London.
2. Akerlof, G. (1983), Loyalty Filters, *American Economic Review*, Vol. 73, Issue 1, pp. 54-63.
3. Aristotel, (2003), *Nikomahova etika*, Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci – Novi Sad.
4. Avison, D.E., Fitzgerald, B. (1995), *Information systems development: Methodologies, Techniques and Tools*, second edition, McGraw-Hill International, London.
5. Backhouse, R.E. (1992), Should we Ignore Methodology? *Royal Economic Society Newsletter*, 78, pp. 4-5.
6. Backhouse, R. E. (1995), An Empirical Philosophy of Economic Theory, *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Vol. 46, No. 1, pp. 111-121.
7. Backhouse, R. E. (1997), *Explorations in Economic Methodology: From Lakatos to Empirical Philosophy of Science*, Routledge, London.
8. Backhouse, R.E. (1998), If Mathematics is Informal, then Perhaps We Should Accept that Economics Must Be Informal too, *Economic Journal*, Vol. 108, Issue 451, pp. 1848-58.
9. Bauer, P. (1987), Disregard of Reality, *Cato Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 29-42.
10. Baum, W., Gonzalez, K.E. (2007), *Karl R. Popper i kritički racionalizam* (prevod), Zagreb.
11. Baumol, W.J. (1991), Towards a newer economics: the future lies ahead! *Economic Journal*, Vol. 101, No. 404, pp. 1-8.
12. Beath, J. A. (2000), *Economics*, Gloucester, Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education, <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/academicinfrastructure/benchmark/honours/economics.pdf>
13. Beaulier, S.A., Boettke, P.J. (2004), The really real in economics, in: Lewis, P. (ed), *Transforming Economics. Perspectives on the critical realist project*, pp. 187-202, Routledge: London and New York.

14. Becker, G.S. (1976), *The economic approach to human behavior*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
15. Bekon, F. (2009), *Istinita uputstva za tumačenje prirode: Novi organon & Velika obnova*, Službeni glasnik, Beograd.
16. Benabou, R., Tirole, J. (2011), *Laws and Norms*, *NBER Working Paper 17579*.
17. Bernstein, R. (1992), *The New Constellation: The Ethical-Political Horizons of Modernity/Postmodernity*, Cambridge: MIT Press.
18. Biglan, A. (1973), The characteristics of subject matter in different academic areas, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 57, No. 3, pp. 195 -203.
19. Bird, A. (2007), What Is Scientific Progress? *NOUS*, Vol. 41, No. 1, pp. 92-117.
20. Blatt, J. (1983), How economists misuse mathematics, in: Eichner, A. S. (ed), *Why economics is not yet a science*, pp. 166-187, Macmillan Press, London.
21. Blaug, M. (1975), *The Cambridge Revolution: Success or Failure?*, The Institute of Economic Affairs, London.
22. Blaug, M. (1976), Kuhn versus Lakatos on Paradigms versus Research Programmes in the History of Economics, in: Latsis, S.J. (ed.), *Method and Appraisal in Economics*, pp. 149-180, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
23. Blaug, M. (1992), *The Methodology of Economics or How Economists Explain*, second edition, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
24. Blaug, M. (1994), Why I am not a Constructivist: Confessions of an Unrepentant Popperian, u: Backhouse, R. (ed.), *New Directions in Economic Methodology*, pp. 111-140, Routledge, London.
25. Blaug, M. (1996), *Economic theory in retrospect*, fifth edition, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
26. Blaug, M. (1998), Disturbing currents in modern economics, *Challenge*, Vol. 41 No. 3, pp. 11-34.
27. Blaug, M., (2017), *Metodologija ekonomije*, prevod, CID Ekonomski fakultet, Beograd.



28. Boland, L. (1979), A Critique of Friedman's Critics, *Journal of Economic Literature*, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 503-522.
29. Boland, L. (1989), *The Methodology of Economic Model Building: Methodology after Samuelson*, Routledge, London and New York.
30. Boland, L. (1992), *The Principles of Economics: Some Lies my Teachers Told Me*, Routledge: London.
31. Boland, L. (1995), Style vs Substance in Economic Methodology, in: Jarvie, I. C., Laor, N. (eds), *Critical Rationalism, the Social Sciences and Humanities*, Boston Studies in the Philosophy and the History of Science, Vol. 162, pp. 115-128, Springer: Dordrecht.
32. Boland, L. (1997), *Critical Economic Methodology: A Personal Odyssey*, Routledge, London.
33. Boumans, M. (2005), *How economists model the world into numbers*, Routledge, New York.
34. Boyer, R., Rogers Hollingsworth, J. (1998), From National Embeddedness to Spatial and Institutional Nestedness, in: Rogers Hollingsworth, J., Boyer, R. (eds), *Contemporary Capitalism: The Embeddness of Institutions*, pp. 433 – 485, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
35. Braithwaite, R. (1968), *Scientific Explanation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
36. Bridges, D. (2006), The Disciplines and the Discipline of Educational Research, *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, Vol. 40, No. 2, pp. 259-272.
37. Caldwell, B. (1982), *Beyond Positivism: Economic Methodology in the Twentieth Century*, Allen & Unwin, Boston.
38. Caldwell, B. (ed), (1984), *Appraisal and Criticism in Economics: A Book of Readings*, Allen & Unwin, London.
39. Caldwell, B. (1984a), Some Problems with Falsificationism in Economics, *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, Vol. 14, pp. 489-495.
40. Caldwell, B. (1989), Post-Keynesian Methodology: An Assessment, *Review of Political Economy*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 43-64.
41. Caldwell, B. (1990), Does Methodology Matter? How should it be practiced? *Finnish Economic Papers*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 64-71.

42. Caldwell, B. (1991), Clarifying Popper, *Journal of Economic Literature*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 1-33.
43. Caldwell, B. (2003), Popper and Hayek: Who Influenced Whom? [http://www.unites.uqam.ca/philo/pdf/Caldwell\\_2003-01.pdf](http://www.unites.uqam.ca/philo/pdf/Caldwell_2003-01.pdf)
44. Camerer, C.F., Loewenstein, G., (2004), Behavioral Economics: Past, Present, Future, in: Camerer, C.F., Loewenstein, G., Rabin, M. (eds.), *Advances in Behavioral Economics*, pp. 3-51, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.
45. Caneva, K. (2000), Possible Kuhns in the History of Science: Anomalies of Incommensurable Paradigms, *Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science*, Vol. 31, pp. 87-124.
46. Canterbury E.R., Burkhardt, R.J. (1983), What do we mean by asking whether economics is a science?, in: Eichner, A. S. (ed.), *Why economics is not yet a science*, pp. 15-41, Macmillan Press, London.
47. Carlson, M., (2015), Logic and the Structure of the Web of Belief, *Journal for the History of Analytical Philosophy*, Vol. 3, No. 5, <https://jhaponline.org/jhap/article/view/28/2470>
48. Chalmers, A.F. (1982), *What Is This Thing Called Science?*, St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press.
49. Chase, R. (1983), The Kuhnian paradigm thesis as a dialectical process and its application to economics, *Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Economiche e Commerciali*, Vol. 30, No. 9, pp. 809-828.
50. Chase, R. (1983a), The development of contemporary mainstream macroeconomics: vision, ideology, and theory, in: Eichner, A. S. (ed.), *Why economics is not yet a science*, pp. 126-166, Macmillan Press, London.
51. Checkland, P. (1981), *Systems Thinking, Systems Practice*, Wiley, Chichester.
52. Checkland, P. (1985), From optimising to learning: a development of systems thinking for the 1990s, *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, Vol 36, No. 9, pp. 757-767.
53. Cimer, R. (2010), *Kapija filozofa*, Laguna, Beograd.
54. Coase, R.H. (1994), *Essays on Economics and Economists*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

55. Coase, R.H. (2000), Priroda firme – značenje, u: Vilijamson, O.E. i Vinter, S. G., (eds), *Priroda firme*, prevod, str. 71-89, CID, Podgorica.
56. Coase, R.H., (2010), Predavanje iz 1991. prilikom dodjele Nobelove nagrade: Institucionalna struktura proizvodnje, u: Vilijamson, O.E. i Vinter, S.G., (eds), *Priroda firme*, drugo izdanje, str. 321-332, CID, Podgorica.
57. Coleman, J. (1990), *Foundations of Social Theory*, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England.
58. Collander, D., Holt, R., Rosser, J. (2004). The changing face of mainstream economics, *Review of Political Economy*, Vol. 16, Issue 4, pp. 485-499.
59. Coyle, D. (2012). Economics education after the crisis: are graduate students fit for purpose? <http://www.res.org.uk/view/article5apr12Correspondence.html>
60. Davis, J. (2008), The turn in recent economics and the return of orthodoxy. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, Vol. 32, Issue 3, pp. 349-366.
61. Davis, J. (2010), Mäki on economics imperialism, [http://epublications.marquette.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1003&context=econ\\_workingpapers](http://epublications.marquette.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1003&context=econ_workingpapers)
62. Davis, J. (2013). Economics, Neuroeconomics, and the Problem of Identity, [http://epublications.marquette.edu/econ\\_workingpapers/53](http://epublications.marquette.edu/econ_workingpapers/53)
63. Davis, J. (2015), Economics imperialism versus multidisciplinary, 2015 STOREP Conference Plenary Lecture, [http://www.johnbryandavis.net/uploads/2/2/7/3/22734340/econ\\_imperialism.pdf](http://www.johnbryandavis.net/uploads/2/2/7/3/22734340/econ_imperialism.pdf)
64. De Marchi, N., Blaug, M. (eds) (1991), *Appraising Economic Theories*, Edward Elgar, Aldershot.
65. De Montenj, M. (1967), *Ogledi*, Kultura, Beograd.
66. De Krešenco, L. (2009), *Istorija moderne filozofije: od Dekarta do Kanta*, Adresa, Novi Sad.
67. Devine, J. (2003), Pshycological autism, institutional autism and economics, in: Fullbrook, E. (ed), *The crisis in economics*, pp. 212-221, Routledge, London.

68. Diesing, P. (1971), *Patterns of Discovery in the Social Sciences*, Chicago: Aldine Atherton.
69. Dillard, D. (1978), Revolutions in Economic Theory, *Southern Economic Journal*, Vol. 44, No. 4, pp. 705-724.
70. Dow, S.C. (1997), Mainstream economic methodology, *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, Vol. 21, Issue 1, pp. 73-93.
71. Dow, S. (2003), The relevance of controversies for practice as well as teaching, in: Fullbrook, E. (ed), *The crisis in economics*, pp. 132-135, Routledge, London.
72. Dow, S. (2005), *Ekonomska metodologija: istraživanje*, prevod, Politička kultura, Zagreb.
73. Dow, S. (2007), Variety of Methodological Approach in Economics, *Journal of Economic Surveys*, Vol. 21, Issue 3, pp. 447-465.
74. Dow, S. (2013), Formalism, rationality and evidence: the case of behavioural economics, in: Special issue in honour of Mark Blaug, *Erasmus Journal for Philosophy and Economics*, Vol. 6, Issue 3, pp. 26-43.
75. Eagleton, T. (2008), *Smisao života*, Naklada Jesenski i Turk, Zagreb.
76. Earl, P. (1983), A behavioral theory of economists' behavior, in: Eichner, A. S. (ed.), *Why economics is not yet a science*, pp. 90-127, Macmillan Press, London.
77. Edmonds, B. (2003), Against: a priori theory. For: descriptively adequate computational modeling, in: Fullbrook, E. (ed), *The crisis in economics*, pp- 175-180, Routledge, London.
78. Eichner, A.S. (1983), Why Economics is not yet a Science, in: Eichner, A.S.(ed.) *Why Economics is not yet a Science*, pp. 205-241, MacMillan Press, London.
79. Ellison, S. (2014), Attack of the cyborgs: Economic imperialism and the human deficit in educational policy-making & research. *Journal of Educational Controversy*, Vol. 8, Issue 1, pp. 1-15.
80. Emmett, R. B. (2009), History of Economics and History of Science: A Comparative Look at Recent Work in Both Fields, [www.academia.edu/1108264/History\\_of\\_economics\\_and\\_history\\_of\\_science\\_A\\_comparative\\_look\\_at\\_recent\\_work\\_in\\_both\\_fields](http://www.academia.edu/1108264/History_of_economics_and_history_of_science_A_comparative_look_at_recent_work_in_both_fields)

81. Fajerabend, P. (1974), Kako zaštititi društvo od nauke, <https://www.scribd.com/doc/292713131/Kako-Zastititi-Drustvo-Od-Nauke-Pol-Fajerabend>
82. Fajerabend, P. (1987), *Protiv metode: skica jedne anarhističke teorije spoznaje*, Veselin Masleša (Biblioteka Logos), Sarajevo.
83. Feri, L. (2011), *Nauči da živiš: putovanje kroz svet filozofije*, Mono i Manjana, Beograd.
84. Feyerabend, P. (1975), *Against method. Outline of an anarchistic theory of knowledge*, London: New Left Books.
85. Feyerabend, P. (2010), *Against Method*, fourth edition, Verso, London.
86. Field, A. (1979), On the Explanation of Rules Using Rational Choice Models, *Journal of Economic Issues*, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 49-72.
87. Fine, B. (2000), Economics imperialism and intellectual progress: The present as history of economic thought? *History of Economics Review*, Vol. 32, Issue 1, pp. 10-36.
88. Fine, B. (2002), Economics Imperialism and the New Development Economics as Kuhnian Paradigm Shift?, *World Development*, Vol. 30 No. 12, pp. 2057-2070.
89. Fine, B. (2003), An extraordinary discipline, in: Fullbrook, E. (ed), *The crisis in economics*, pp. 147-150, Routledge, London.
90. Fine, B. (2004), Addressing the critical and the real in critical realism, in: Lewis, P. (ed), *Transforming Economics. Perspectives on the critical realist project*, pp. 202-227, Routledge: London and New York.
91. Fine, B., Milonakis, D. (2009), *From economics imperialism to freakonomics: The shifting boundaries between economics and other social sciences*. New York: Routledge.
92. Flivbjerg, B. (2012), *Šta mogu društvene nauke*, Službeni glasnik, Beograd.
93. Fox, G. (1997), *Reason and Reality in the Methodologies of Economics – An Introduction*, Edward Elgar, Lyme US.
94. Fox, J. (2013), The end of economists imperialism, <https://hbr.org/2013/01/the-end-of-economists-imper.html>.

95. Friedman, M. (1953), The Methodology of Positive Economics, in: Friedman, M. (ed.), *Essay in Positive Economics*, pp. 3-43, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
96. Fuko, M. (1971), *Riječi i stvari*, Nolit, Beograd.
97. Fuko, M. (1982), *Istorija seksualnosti, Volja za znanjem*, Prosveta, Beograd.
98. Fullbrook, E. (2003), Real science is pluralist, in: Fullbrook, E. (ed), *The crisis in economics*, pp. 118-125, Routledge, London.
99. Fuller S. (1991), Disciplinary boundaries and the rhetoric of the social sciences, *Poetics Today*, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 301–325.
100. Fuller, S. (2000), *Thomas Kuhn: A Philosophical History for Our Times*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
101. Fuller, S. (2001), A Fuller vision of Thomas Kuhn: Response to Roth and Mirowski, *History of the Human Sciences*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 111-117.
102. Gadamer, H. G. (1978), *Istina i metoda*, Logos, Sarajevo.
103. Galbraith, J. (2003), A contribution on the state of economics in France and the world, in: Fullbrook, E. (ed), *The crisis in economics*, pp. 47-53, Routledge, London.
104. Gerrard, B. (1990), On Matters Methodological in Economics, *Journal of Economic Surveys*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 197-223.
105. Gibbard, A., Varian, H. (1978), Economic Models, *The Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 75, No. 11, pp. 664-677.
106. Glass, J.C., Johnson, W. (1988), Metaphysics, MSRP and Economics, *British Journal of Philosophical Science*, Vol. 39, No. 3, pp. 313-329.
107. Glas, Dž., Džonson V. (1989), *Ekonomija – progres, stagnacija ili degeneracija*, New York, Wheatsheaf, PC prevod (Miomir Jakšić).
108. Godfrey, J., Hodgson, A., Holmes, S. (2000), *Accounting Theory*, fourth edition, John Wiley & Sons Australia, Ltd.
109. Goel, S. (2010), Well rounded curriculum – an insight from Biglan’s classification of disciplines, <https://goelsan.wordpress.com/2010/07/27/biglans-classification-of-disciplines/>
110. Gordić, A. (2002), Filozofija nauke na prelazu vekova, <http://www.filozofija.info/tekstovi/gordic1.htm>

111. Granovetter, M., Swedberg, R. (eds.) (1992), *The Sociology of Economic Life*, Westview Press.
112. Greenland, S. (1998), Induction versus Popper: substance versus semantics, *International Journal of Epidemiology*, Vol. 27, pp. 543-548.
113. Guala, F. (2010), *Filozofija ekonomije*, CID Podgorica, Politička kultura Zagreb.
114. Guerrien, B. (2003), Is there anything worth keeping in standard microeconomics?, in: Fullbrook, E. (ed), *The crisis in economics*, pp. 104-108, Routledge, London.
115. Hacking, I. (2001), *An Introduction to Probability and Inductive Logic*, Cambridge University Press, New York.
116. Hahn, F. (1991), The next hundred years, *Economic Journal*, Vol. 101, No. 404, pp. 47-50.
117. Hahn, F. (1992), Answer to Backhouse: Yes, *Royal Economic Society Newsletter*, Vol. 78, No. 5.
118. Hamilton, M. (2003), *Sociologija religije*, Clio, Beograd.
119. Hands, D.W. (1984), The role of crucial counterexamples in the growth of economic knowledge: Two case studies in the recent history of economic thought», *History of Political Economy*, Vol. 16, Issue 1, pp. 59-67.
120. Hands, D.W. (1985), Karl Popper and economic methodology: a new look, *Economics and Philosophy*, Vol. 1, Issue 1, pp. 83 – 100.
121. Hands, D.W. (1990), Thirteen Theses on Progress in Economic Methodology, *Finnish Economic Papers*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 72-76.
122. Hands, D.W. (1992), Falsification, Situational Analysis and Scientific Research Programs: The Popperian Tradition in Economic Methodology, in: Neil de Marchi (ed.), *Post Popperian Methodology of Economics: Recovering Practice*, pp. 19-53, Boston, Kluwer Academic Publishing.
123. Hands, D.W. (2001), *Reflection without Rules: Economic Methodology and Contemporary Science Theory*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
124. Hands, D.W. (2001a), Economic Methodology is Dead – Long Live Economic Methodology: Thirteen Theses on the New Economic Methodology, *Journal of Economic Methodology*, Vol. 8, Issue 1, pp. 49-64.

125. Hands, D.W. (2004), Transforming methodology. Critical realism and recent economic methodology, in: Lewis, P. (ed), *Transforming Economics. Perspectives on the critical realist project*, pp. 286-302, Routledge: London and New York.
126. Harding, S. (1986), *The Science Question in Feminism*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
127. Hargreaves Heap, S. (2004), Critical realism and the heterodox tradition in economics, in: Lewis P. (ed), *Transforming Economics. Perspectives on the critical realist project*, pp. 152-167, Routledge: London and New York.
128. Hausman, D. (1985), Is Falsificationism Unpractised or Unpracticable?, *Philosophy of Social Sciences*, Vol. 15, Issue 3, pp. 313-319.
129. Hausman, D. (1989), Economic methodology in a nutshell, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 115-127.
130. Hausman, D. (1992), *The Inexact and Separate Science of Economics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
131. Hausman, D. (1992a), The limits of economic science, in: Hausman, D. (ed.), *Essays on Philosophy and Economic Methodology*, pp. 99-105, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
132. Hausman, D. (1994), *The Philosophy of Economics: An Anthology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
133. Hausman, D. (2004), Philosophy of Economics, <http://philosophy.wisc.edu/hausman/papers/67.htm>
134. Hayek, F.A. (1967), The Theory of Complex Phenomena: A Precocious Play on the Epistemology and Complexity, in: Hayek, F.A., *Studies in philosophy, politics and economics*, pp. 22-42, London, UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
135. Hemlin, D.V. (2001), *Teorija saznanja*, Jasen, Nikšić.
136. Heukelom, F. (2014), *Behavioral Economics: A History*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
137. Hicks, J. (1986), Is Economics a Science, in: Baranzini, M. and Scazzieri, R., (eds.), *Foundations of Economics*, pp. 91-101, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.



138. Hirshleifer, J. (1985), The expanding domain of economics, *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 75, No. 6, pp. 53-68.
139. Hjum, D. (1988), *Istraživanje o ljudskom razumu*, Naprijed, Zagreb.
140. Hodgson, G. (2001), *How economics forgot history: the problem of historical specificity in social science*, Routledge, London.
141. Hodgson, G. (2003), How did economics get into such a state?, in: Fullbrook, E. (ed), *The crisis in economics*, pp. 143-147, Routledge, London.
142. Hodgson, G., (2004), Veblen and Darwinism, *International Review of Sociology - Revue Internationale de Sociologie*, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 343-361.
143. Hollis, M., Nell, R. (1975), *Rational Economic Man*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
144. Howell, D. (2000), *The Edge of Now: New Questions for Democracy and the Network Age*, London: Macmillan.
145. Kant, I. (1990), *Kritika čistog uma*, BIGZ, Beograd.
146. Katouzian, H. (1980), *Ideology and Method in Economics*, The MacMillan Press, Ltd., London.
147. King, J. (2013), A case for pluralism in economics, *The Economic and Labour Relations Review*, Vol. 24, Issue 1, pp. 17-31.
148. Kitanović, D., Petrović, D. (2010), *Ogledi o metodološkim problemima savremene ekonomske nauke*, Ekonomski fakultet, Niš.
149. Knight, F. (1956), What is Truth in Economics, reprinted in: Knight, F., *On the History and Methods of Economics: Selected Essays*, pp. 151-178, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
150. Koen, D. (2014), *Homo economicus: (zabludeli) prorok novih vremena*, Clio, Beograd.
151. Koen, M., Nejjel, E. (2006), *Uvod u logiku i naučni metod*, Jasen, Beograd.
152. Kont, O. (1989), *Kurs pozitivne filozofije*, Univerzitetska riječ, Nikšić.
153. Kornai, J. (1983), The Health of Nations: Reflections on the Analogy Between the Medical Science and Economics, *Kyklos*, Vol. 36 No. 2, pp. 191-212.

154. Krugman, P. (1998), Two cheers for Formalism, *Economic Journal*, Vol. 108, Issue 451, pp. 1829-36.
155. Kun, T. (1963), *Struktura naučnih revolucija*, srpsko-hrvatski prevod, Nolit, Beograd.
156. Kuhn, T. (1970), *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, second edition, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
157. Kuiper, E. (2004), Critical realism and feminist economics: how well do they get along?, in: Lewis, P. (ed.), *Transforming Economics. Perspectives on the critical realist project*, pp. 107-132, Routledge: London and New York.
158. Lakatos, I. (1970), Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes, in: Lakatos, I. and Musgrave, A. (eds), *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*, pp. 91-196, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (London).
159. Lakatos, I. (1971), Replies to critics, in: Buck R., Cohen, R. (Eds.), *P.S.A 1970, Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, 8, pp. 174-182, Dordrecht, Holland: Reidel.
160. Lakatos, I. (1976), *Proofs and refutations. The logic of mathematical discovery* (editors: J. Worrall and E. Zahar), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
161. Lakatos, I. (1978), *Mathematics, science and epistemology*, Philosophical Papers Volume 2 (editors: J. Worrall, J. and G. Currie), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
162. Landreth, H., Colander, D.C. (1994), *History of Economic Thought*, third edition, Houghton Mifflin Corporation, New Jersey.
163. Lattuca, L., Terenzini, P., Harper, B.J., Yin, A. (2010), Academic environments in detail: Holland's theory at the sub-discipline level, *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 51, Issue 1, pp. 21-39.
164. Lawson, T. (1994), Why are so many economists opposed to methodology? *Journal of Economic Methodology*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 105-133.
165. Lawson, T. (1997), *Economics and Reality*, Routledge, London.
166. Lawson, T. (1999), What Has Realism Got to Do with it? *Economics and Philosophy*, Vol 15, Issue 2, pp. 269-82.

167. Lawson, T. (2002), Social Explanation and Popper, Popper Anniversary Conference, University of Galway, September 2002, <http://www.econ.cam.ac.uk/faculty/lawson/PDFS/Popper.pdf>
168. Lawson, T. (2003), *Reorienting Economics*, Routledge, London and New York.
169. Lawson, T. (2003a), Back to reality, in: Fullbrook, E. (ed), *The crisis in economics*, pp. 128-132, Routledge, London.
170. Lazear, E. (2000), Economic imperialism, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 115, No. 1, pp. 99-146.
171. Leape, J. (2012), Good economists need more than economics: multidisciplinary LSE 100 course“, in: Coyle, D., (ed.). *What's the use of economics? Teaching the dismal science after the crisis*, pp. 183-192, London, UK: London Publishing Partnership.
172. Lee, F. S. (2007), The Research Assessment Exercise, the state and the dominance of mainstream economics in British Universities, *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, Vol. 31, Issue 2, pp. 309-325
173. Lehtinen, U. (2013), Multidisciplinarity in theory building: possibilities of combining, <http://eujournal.org/index.php/esj/article/viewFile/1225/1234>
174. Leijonhufvud, A. (1973), Life among the Econ, *Western Economic Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 327-337.
175. Leković, V. (2012), Trust as an institutional factor of economic success, *Economic Horizons*, Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 65-78.
176. Leontief, W. (1971), Theoretical Assumptions and Nonobserved Facts, *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 61, No. 1, pp. 1-7.
177. Leontief, W. (1982), Letters: Academic Economics, *Science*, 217, pp. 104-105.
178. Lewis, P. (2004), Transforming economics? On heterodox economics and the ontological turn in economic methodology, in: Lewis, P. (ed), *Transforming Economics. Perspectives on the critical realist project*, pp. 1-33, Routledge, London and New York.
179. Lipsey, R.G. (2001), Successes and Failures in the Transformation of Economics, *Journal of Economic Methodology*, Vol. 8 No. 2, June, pp. 169-201.
180. Loasby, B. J. (1971), Hypothesis and paradigm in the theory of the firm, *Economic Journal*, Vol. 81, Issue 324, pp. 863-885.

181. Lok, Dž. (1962), *Ogled o ljudskom razumu*, Kultura, Beograd.
182. Lyotard, J. M. (1984), *The Postmodern Condition, A Report on Knowledge*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
183. Maas, H. (2014), *Economic Methodology: A Historical Introduction*, Routledge, London.
184. Machlup, F. (1978), *Methodology of Economics and Other Social Sciences*, Academic Press, New York.
185. Mäki, U. (2008), Economics imperialism: Concept and constraints, <http://www.helsinki.fi/tint/maki/materials/ImpCCproofs3.pdf>.
186. Manić, S. (2009), *Kontroverze o ekonomskoj metodologiji*, Admiral Books, Beograd.
187. Manić, S. (2011), Is economics worked itself up to the state of pluralism? in: Spasic, D., Stankovic, Lj. (eds.), *The Challenges of Economic Science and Practice in the 21st century*, pp. 591-603, Faculty of Economics, Nis.
188. Manić, S. (2012), Is economic science pluralistic in a selective way? in: Ming, Z. (ed.), *Economics, Business and Management III*, pp. 204-210, IACSIT Press, Singapore
189. Manić, S. (2014), Has economics lost its own identity? *Asian Economic and Financial Review*, Vol. 4, No. 9, pp. 1190-1200.
190. Manić, S. (2016), Economics imperialism: SWOT analysis, *Asian Economic and Financial Review*, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 151-161.
191. Manić, S. (2018), Evaluacija ekonomskog ekspanzionizma kroz prizmu višestruke disciplinarnosti, *Teme*, Univerzitet u Nišu
192. Marks, K. (1977), *Ekonomsko-filozofski rukopisi iz 1844*, Prosveta-Bigz, Beograd.
193. Martinas, K. (2003), Is the utility maximization principle necessary?, in: Fullbrook, E. (ed), *The crisis in economics*, pp. 203-208, Routledge, London.
194. Maslov, A. (2001), *O životnim vrednostima*, "Žarko Albulj", Beograd.
195. Mayhew, A. (2003), Some old but good ideas, in: Fullbrook, E. (ed), *The crisis in economics*, pp. 172-175, Routledge, London.
196. McCloskey, D. (1983), The rhetoric of economics, *Journal of Economic Literature*, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 481-517.

197. McCloskey, D. (1985), *The Rhetoric of Economics*, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.
198. McCloskey, D., (1990), Storytelling in Economics, in: Don Lavoie (ed.) *Economics and Hermeneutics*, pp. 61-75, London: Routledge.
199. McCloskey, D. (2003), Books of oomph, in: Fullbrook, E. (ed), *The crisis in economics*, pp. 125-128, Routledge, London.
200. Mićunović, Lj. (1988.), *Savremeni leksikon stranih reči*, KZNS, Univerzitetska riječ.
201. Miller, J. (1993), *The Passion of Michel Foucault*, New York: Simon & Schuster.
202. Milutinović, V. (2005), *Kratka istorija filozofije*, Utopija, Beograd.
203. Mirowski, P. (2001), What's Kuhn got to do with it? *History of the Human Sciences*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 98-111.
204. Mirowski, P. (2002), *Machine Dreams: Economics Becomes a Cyborg Science*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
205. Morgan, M. (2001), Models, Stories and the Economic World, *Journal of Economic Methodology*, Vol. 8 No. 3, pp. 361-384.
206. Morrison, M., Morgan, M.S. (1999), Models as mediating instruments, in: Morgan, M.S., Morrison, M. (eds), *Models as Mediators: Perspectives on Natural and Social Sciences*, pp. 10-37, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
207. Moseley, F. (ed), (1995), *Heterodox Economic Theories: True or False?*, Edward Elgar, Aldershot.
208. Motterlini, M. (ed.), (1999), For and against method. Including Lakatos' lectures on method and the Lakatos-Feyerabend Correspondence, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
209. Motterlini, M. (2002), Reconstructing Lakatos: a reassessment of Lakatos' epistemological project in the light of the Lakatos Archive, *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*, Vol. 33, Issue 3, pp. 487-509.
210. Nagel, E. (1963), Assumptions in Economic Theory, *American Economic Review*, Paper and Proceedings, Vol. 53, No. 2, pp. 231-6.
211. Nagel, E. (1974), *Struktura Nauke*, Nolit, Beograd.

212. Nelson, R R., Winter, S. G. (1982), *An Evolutionary Theory of Economic Change*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
213. Nicolaides, P. (1988), Limits to the expansion of neoclassical economics, *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, Vol. 12 No. 3, pp. 313-328.
214. Nightingale, J. (2003), An alternative framework for economics, in: Fullbrook, E. (ed), *The crisis in economics*, pp. 180-183, Routledge, London.
215. Njutr-Smit, V. (2002), *Racionalnost nauke*, Institut za filozofiju Filozofskog fakulteta, Beograd.
216. Norgaard, R.B. (1989), The case for methodological pluralism, *Ecological Economics*, Vol.1, No.1, pp. 37-57.
217. North, D. (1981), *Structure and Change in Economic History*, New York and London: W. W. Norton & Co.
218. North, D. (1993), The New Institutional Economics and Development, <http://econwpa.repec.org/eps/eh/papers/9309/9309002.pdf>
219. Novaković, S. (1972), Teorijsko procenjivanje rivalskih hipoteza, *Filozofske studije*, Beograd.
220. Novaković, S. (1984), *Hipoteze i saznanje*, Nolit, Beograd.
221. Orlean, A. (2003), Humility in economics, in: Fullbrook, E. (ed), *The crisis in economics*, pp. 116-118, Routledge, London.
222. Ormerod, P. (2003), Beyond criticism, in: Fullbrook, E. (ed), *The crisis in economics*, pp. 140-143, Routledge, London.
223. Oswick, C., Feleming, P., Hanlon, G. (2011), From Borrowing to Blending: Rethinking the Processes of Organizational Theory Building, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 36, Issue 2, pp. 318 – 337.
224. Pagano, U. (2004), The economics of Institutions and the Institutions of Economics, in: Lewis, P. (ed), *Transforming Economics. Perspectives on the critical realist project*, pp. 252-268, Routledge, London and New York.
225. Panhans, M.T., Singleton, J.D. (2015), The empirical economist's toolkit: From models to methods, *CHOPE Working Paper*, No. 2015-03, Center for the History of Political Economy, Duke University, <http://hope.econ.duke.edu/node/1126>.

- 
226. Parker, R. (1993), Can Economists Save Economics? *The American Prospect*, Vol. 4 No. 13, pp. 1-10.
227. Pessali, H. (2006), The Rhetoric of Oliver Williamson's Transaction Cost Economics, *Journal of Institutional Economics*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 4-65.
228. Petrisor, A.I. (2013), Multi-, trans- and inter-disciplinarity, essential conditions for the sustainable development of human habitat, <http://uac.incd.ro/Art/v4n2a06.pdf>
229. Pforr, T. (2015), *Meaning construction and the socialisation of economic ideas: an autobiographical approach*, PhD thesis, University of Warwick.
230. Phelps Brown, E.H. (1972), The Underdevelopment of Economics, *Economic Journal*, Vol. 82, No. 325, March, pp. 1-10.
231. Piaget, J. (1977), *The Development of Thought. Equilibration of Cognitive Structures*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
232. Pokrajčić, D. (1995), *Teorije preduzeća – metodološka analiza*, Ekonomski fakultet, Beograd.
233. Pomorina, I., Lait, A. (2012), What post-crisis changes does the economics discipline need? <http://www.res.org.uk/view/article5apr12Correspondence.html>
234. Popper, K. (1963), *Conjectures and Refutations*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London .
235. Popper, K. (1968), *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*, London: Hutchinson.
236. Popper, K. (1970), Normal Science and its Dangers, in: Lakatos, I., Musgrave, A. (eds), *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*, pp. 51-59, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
237. Popper, K. (1973), *Logika naučnog otkrića*, srp-hrv. prevod, Nolit, Beograd.
238. Popper, K. (1982), *The Open Universe: An Argument for Indeterminism*, (edited by W.W. Bartley), Routledge, London.
239. Popper, K. (1983), *Realism and the aim of science – The postscript to the logic of scientific discovery*, first edition, edited by W.W. Bartley, London: Hutchinson.

240. Popper, K. (1994), Models, instruments, and truth: the status of the rationality principle in the social sciences, in: Notturmo, M.A. (ed), *The Myth of the Framework: In Defense of Science and Rationality*, pp. 154-184, Routledge, London.
241. Popper, K. (2002), *Pretpostavke i pobijanja*, Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci – Novi Sad.
242. Rabin, M. (2002), A perspective on psychology and economics, *European Economic Review*, Vol. 46, Issue 4-5, pp. 657 – 685.
243. Raveaud, G. (2003), Teaching economics through controversies, in: Fullbrook, E. (ed), *The crisis in economics*, pp. 62-70, Routledge, London.
244. Rogers Hollingsworth, J., Boyer, R. (1998), Coordination of Economic Actors and Social System of Production, in: Rogers Hollingsworth, J., Boyer, R. (eds), *Contemporary Capitalism: The Embeddness of Institutions*, pp. 1 – 49, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
245. Rosenberg, A. (1992), Economics – *Mathematical Politics or Science of Diminishing Returns*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
246. Roth, A., Prasnikar, V., Okuno-Fujiwara, M., Zamir, S. (1991), Bargaining in Market Behavior in Jerusalem, Ljubljana, Pittsburgh and Tokio, *American Economic Review*, Vol. 81, No. 5, pp. 1068-1095.
247. Roth, P. (2001), Fuller's '18<sup>th</sup> Brumaire of Thomas K', *History of the Human Sciences*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 87-97.
248. Rothschild, K. (1991), Glimpses of a Non-linear Biography, *Banca Nazionale del Lavoro Quarterly Review*, 176, March, pp. 3-13.
249. Rothschild, K. (1995), Micro-Foundations, Ad Hocery, and Keynesian Theory, in: King, J. E. (ed), *Economic method, theory and policy (Selected essays of Kurt W. Rothschild)*, pp. 31-41, Edward Elgar, Aldershot, UK.
250. Rothschild, K. (1995a), Political Economy or Economics? Some Terminological and Normative Considerations, in: King, J.E. (ed), *Economic method, theory and policy (Selected essays of Kurt W. Rothschild)*, pp. 41-53, Edward Elgar, Aldershot, UK.
251. Rothschild, K. (2008), Economic imperialism, [http://www.analyse-und-kritik.net/2008-2/AK\\_Rothschild\\_2008.pdf](http://www.analyse-und-kritik.net/2008-2/AK_Rothschild_2008.pdf).



- 
252. Rutherford, M. (1996), *Institutions in Economics, The Old and the New Institutionalism*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
253. Quattrone, P. (2000), Constructivism and accounting research: towards a trans – disciplinary perspective, *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, Vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 130-155.
254. Samuels, W.J. (1987), Of Lookout Cows and the Methodology of Economics, *Journal of Economic Issues*, Vol. 22 No. 3, pp. 864-867.
255. Samuels, W. (2003), Ontology, epistemology, language and the practice of economics, in: Fullbrook, E. (ed), *The crisis in economics*, pp. 199-203, Routledge, London.
256. Sapor, J. (2003), Realism vs axiomatics, in: Fullbrook, E. (ed), *The crisis in economics*, pp. 58-62, Routledge, London.
257. Savoiu, G. (2014), The impact of inter -, trans – and multidisciplinary on modern taxonomy of sciences, *Current Science*, Vol. 106, No. 5, pp. 685 – 690.
258. Savoiu, G., Dinu, V. (2015), Economic Paradoxism and Meson Economics, *Amfiteatru Economic*, Vol. 17, No. 39, pp. 776-798.
259. Sayer, A. (1992), *Method in Social Science*, Routledge, London.
260. Sharma, S.K. (2014), Multi-disciplinarity of sciences, current economics and business, *International Journal of Multidisciplinarity in Business and Science*, Vol. 1, Issue 1, pp. 1-5.
261. Sindelić, S. (2009), Od tradicionalne do savremene filozofije nauke, *Theoria*, 52, str. 5-35.
262. Soderbaum, P. (2003), Democracy and the need for pluralism in economics, in: Fullbrook, E. (ed), *The crisis in economics*, pp. 94-97, Routledge, London.
263. Solow, R. (1988), Comments from Inside Economics, in: Klammer, A., McCloskey, D., Solow, R. (eds.), *The Consequences of Economic Rhetoric*, pp. 31-37, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
264. Solow, R. M. (2008), The state of macroeconomics, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 22, Issue 1, pp. 243-246.
265. Stiglitz, J. (1994), *Whither socialism?*, MIT Press, Cambridge.

266. Stiglitz, J. (2001), An agenda for the new development economics, <http://www.unrisd.org/engindex/research/rethink.htm>.
267. Strassmann, D. (1994), Feminist Thought and Economics; Or, What do the Visigoths Know? *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings*, Vol. 84, No. 2, str. 153-158.
268. Stretton, H. (2003), Plural education, in: Fullbrook, E. (ed), *The crisis in economics*, pp. 55-58, Routledge, London.
269. Suppe, P. (1977), *The structure of scientific theories*, second edition, University of Chicago Press, Urbana.
270. Swaney, J.A., Premus, R. (1983), Modern empiricism and quantum-leap theorizing in economics, in: Eichner, A. S. (ed.), *Why economics is not yet a science*, pp. 41-61, Macmillan Press, London.
271. Szira, T. (2000), The illusion of exactness, *Journal of Economic Studies*, Vol. 27 No. 4/5, pp. 495-508.
272. Šušnjić, Đ. (2012), *Ogledi o skrivenoj strani stvari*, Službeni glasnik, Beograd.
273. Thaler, R. H., Sunstein, C. R. (2009), *Nudge, Improving Decisions About Health, Wealth, and Happiness*, Penguin Books Ltd, London.
274. Thurow, L.C. (1987), *Opasni tokovi razvoja ekonomske teorije*, Centar za kulturnu djelatnost (CKD), Zagreb.
275. Tomer, J.F. (2007), What is behavioral economics?, *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 36, pp. 463-479.
276. Vitgenštajn, L. (1969), *Filosofska istraživanja*, Nolit, Beograd.
277. Von Wright, G. H. (1975), *Objašnjenje i razumevanje*, Nolit, Beograd.
278. Vorf, B. (1979), *Jezik, misao i stvarnost*, BIGZ, Beograd.
279. Ward, B. (1972), *What's Wrong with Economics?* London, Macmillan.
280. Watts, R.L. (1998), Commemorating the 25th Volume of the Journal of Accounting and Economics, *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, Vol. 25, Issue 3, June, pp. 217-233.
281. WEF (2016), *Global Competitiveness Report 2016-2017*.

- 
282. Weintraub, E.R. (1988), The Neo-Walrasian program is empirically progressive, in: N. De Marchi (ed.), *The Popperian Legacy in Economics*, pp. 213-227, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
283. Weintraub, E.R. (1989), Methodology Doesn't Matter, But the History of Thought Might, *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, Vol. 91 No. 2, pp. 477-493.
284. Weintraub, E.R. (1998), From rigor to axiomatics: the marginalization of Griffith C. Evans, in: Morgan, M.S., Rutherford, M. (eds), *From Interwar Pluralism to Postwar Neoclassicism*, pp. 227-259, Durham: Duke University Press.
285. Weintraub, E. (2002), *How Economics Became a Mathematical Science*, Duke University Press, Durham, NC.
286. Wiles, P. (1983), Ideology, methodology, and neoclassical economics, in: Eichner, A. S. (ed.), *Why economics is not yet a science*, pp. 61-90, Macmillan Press, London.
287. Winter, S. G. (2000), O Coaseu, kompetencijama i korporaciji, u: Vilijamson, O. E., Vinter, S. G. (eds), *Priroda firme*, prevod, str. 253-277, CID, Podgorica.
288. Worswick, G.D.N. (1972), Is Progress in Economic Science Possible, *Economic Journal*, Vol. 82, No. 325, March, pp. 73-86.
289. Zarić, S. (2005), The End of Autistic Economics: The Appraisal of Institutional Economic Theory, in: Mladenova, Z. (ed.), *Ikonomičeskata teorija v načaloto na XXI vek – postizenija, problemi, perspektivi*, str. 143-151, Sbornik: Nauka i ikonomika, Ikonomičeski universitet, Varna.
290. Zarić, S. (2016), Knowledge for Contemporary Values, *Knowledge*, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 19-24.
291. Zimmerman, M. (2002), Heidegger's Phenomenology and Contemporary Environmentalism, [http://www.nchu.edu.tw/~hum/download/eo-heidegger\\_phenom,MZ.pdf](http://www.nchu.edu.tw/~hum/download/eo-heidegger_phenom,MZ.pdf).

