



Peer-Reviewed, International,
Academic Research Journal



Citation

Dubois, N. (2022). Assumptions, Applications and Implications of Modern Economic Analysis in Comprehending Neo-Classical Economics. *Social Science Chronicle*, Vol. 2, Issue - 1, pp. 1-19.

Digital Object Identifier (DOI)

<https://doi.org/10.56106/ssc.2022.010>

Received - May 18, 2022

Accepted - November 18, 2022

Published - November 25, 2022

Web-Link

All the contents of this peer reviewed article as well as author details are available at <http://socialsciencechronicle.com/article-ssc-2022-010>

Copyright

The copyright of this article is reserved with the author/s.
© 2022, Nicole Dubois.

This publication is distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution, Non-Commercial, Share Alike 4.0 International License. It permits unrestricted copying and redistribution of this publication in any medium or format.



RESEARCH ARTICLE

Assumptions, Applications, and Implications of Modern Economic Analysis in Comprehending Neo-Classical Economics

Nicole Dubois^{1*}

¹ University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa.

* Corresponding Author

Abstract

This research paper dives into the foundational principles, assumptions, applications, and limitations of neoclassical economics, presenting a comprehensive exploration of its significance in economic analysis, policy formulation, and the understanding of market behavior. Neoclassical economics serves as a fundamental framework that shapes economic theories, models, and policy decisions. The paper embarks on an exploration of key concepts within neoclassical economics, starting with the foundational assumptions of rationality in decision-making. The assumption of perfect rationality underpins economic analyses, offering a framework for understanding individual and firm behavior. However, emerging insights from behavioral economics challenge this assumption, highlighting cognitive biases and deviations from perfect rationality, thereby necessitating a more nuanced understanding of human decision-making. The study dives into the fundamental concept of supply and demand, elucidating its role in market interactions and price determination. The idealized assumption of perfect competition within neoclassical economics sets the stage for market efficiency, but the realities of imperfect markets, asymmetries in information, and externalities complicate this assumption, impacting the efficiency of resource allocation. Additionally, the concept of rational expectations posits that economic agents make predictions based on all available information, yet uncertainties and unforeseen events in the real world challenge this assumption. The paper discusses the implications of these assumptions in economic analysis, policy formulation, and market efficiency, emphasizing the need to integrate insights from emerging economic paradigms like behavioral and institutional economics. The implications of the study extend to economic modeling, policy formulation, and education, suggesting the need for a multidisciplinary approach to economic analysis. This research paper provides a critical analysis of neoclassical economics, acknowledging its foundational significance while advocating for the integration of alternative economic paradigms to refine economic analyses, policy formulations, and our understanding of market dynamics.

Keywords

Behavioral Economics, Economic Assumptions, Economic Models, Institutional Economics, Market Behavior, Market Efficiency, Neoclassical Economics, Policy Formulation, Rational Expectations, Supply and Demand.

1. Introduction

Economics, as an academic discipline, is a multifaceted field that analyzes human behavior, decision-making, and resource allocation within various markets and societal frameworks. Within the broad landscape of economic theories and paradigms, neoclassical economics stands as a foundational pillar, providing a framework for understanding market behavior,

resource allocation, and the interplay between consumers and producers (Bang, 2009; Chen, 2017; Madrian, 2014; Tomer, 2017; Yoon & Lee, 2009). Rooted in a set of fundamental principles and assumptions, neoclassical economics has been a driving force behind economic analyses, policy formulations, and academic research over the past century. The evolution of neoclassical economics can be traced back to the late 19th and early 20th centuries, as a response and critique of classical economic theories. Emphasizing the importance of individual decision-making, rationality, and the interplay between supply and demand, neoclassical economics sought to establish a more methodical and analytical approach to economic analysis. Its foundational principles rest on the assumptions of rational behavior by economic agents, the concept of equilibrium in markets, and the efficient allocation of resources. The neoclassical framework is characterized by its emphasis on market mechanisms and the interaction between consumers and producers.

It places a substantial focus on the concept of supply and demand, portraying markets as the arena where buyers and sellers interact to determine prices and quantities of goods and services. The foundational principle of supply and demand forms the bedrock of neoclassical economics, guiding analyses of market behavior, price determination, and resource allocation (Ellison, 2014; Frantz, 2019; Lutzenhiser, 2009; Marinescu, 2016a; Söderbaum, 2016). At the core of neoclassical economics lies the assumption of rationality in decision-making. This assumption posits that economic agents—consumers, producers, and firms—make choices that maximize their utility or satisfaction, taking into account all available information. Rational choice theory within neoclassical economics emphasizes the logic behind decision-making, asserting that individuals act in ways that maximize their own well-being, given their preferences and constraints. Marginalism, another pivotal concept within neoclassical economics, underscores the importance of decisions made at the margin. It focuses on analyzing the additional benefit or cost of one more unit of a good or service. The notion of marginal utility and the law of diminishing marginal returns are instrumental in understanding consumer behavior and production decisions, defining how individuals assess the value of each additional unit of a good or service (Angner & Loewenstein, 2007; Driscoll & Holden, 2014; Gowdy, 2008; Hursh & Roma, 2013; Kremer, Rao, & Schilbach, 2019).

Moreover, the theory of perfect competition, a fundamental assumption in neoclassical economics, depicts an ideal market structure with many buyers and sellers, homogeneous products, perfect information, and no barriers to entry or exit. Under perfect competition, prices are determined by the interaction of supply and demand, leading to an efficient allocation of resources. Additionally, factor pricing theory within neoclassical economics addresses the determination of wages, rent, interest, and profits in competitive markets. It emphasizes that the remuneration of factors of production is determined by their marginal productivity, aligning prices with their contributions to the production process. Furthermore, concepts like equilibrium and efficiency in markets play a vital role in neoclassical economic analysis. Equilibrium in markets is characterized by a state where supply equals demand, determining the equilibrium price and quantity (Beaulier & Caplan, 2007; D. Beerbaum & Puschunder, 2018; D. O. Beerbaum & Puschunder, 2019; McMahan, 2015; Pech & Milan, 2009). Effi-

ciency, within this context, suggests that markets reach an optimal state where resources are allocated to maximize total welfare.

The assumptions and principles within neoclassical economics have been both foundational and influential in shaping economic thought, policy formulation, and empirical research. These concepts have provided a framework for analyzing and understanding market behavior, consumer and producer decision-making, and resource allocation within various economic settings. However, the assumptions within neoclassical economics have faced scrutiny and critique. Critics argue that these assumptions do not fully capture the complexities of real-world economic behavior, individual decision-making, and market dynamics. Behavioral economics, for instance, challenges the assumption of perfect rationality, highlighting biases, heuristics, and bounded rationality in decision-making. Moreover, the assumption of perfect competition might not align with the realities of many markets, as imperfections, asymmetries, and externalities often influence market behavior. This research paper aims to delve into the concepts, assumptions, applications, and limitations of neoclassical economics. It seeks to provide a comprehensive analysis of the foundational principles and explore their applications within economic analyses, market behavior, policy implications, and the broader socio-economic landscape. Additionally, it aims to address the critiques and limitations of neoclassical economics, while exploring potential areas for further development and refinement in economic theories.

2. Marginalism in Neoclassical Economics: Exploring Incremental Decision-Making, Applications, and Critiques

Marginalism stands as a cornerstone concept within neoclassical economics, embodying a fundamental principle in decision-making and resource allocation. It fundamentally revolves around the evaluation of incremental changes in benefits and costs for a particular action or decision, particularly emphasizing the significance of the last or additional unit consumed or produced (Fehr, Goette, & Zehnder, 2007; Jabbar, 2011; Samson, 2016; Venkatachalam, 2008; Weimer, 2017). This concept has played a pivotal role in shaping economic analysis and has far-reaching implications across various domains, from individual consumer choices to business strategies and policy-making. At its core, marginalism underscores the principle that individuals make decisions based on the marginal benefit or utility derived from an additional unit of a good or service compared to its associated marginal cost. This incremental perspective is vital in understanding the choices made by consumers, firms, and policymakers in allocating scarce resources efficiently. The essence of marginalism lies in recognizing that most decisions are not about the overall benefit or cost of a product or action but rather about the extra advantage or drawback of consuming or producing one more unit (Altman, 2008, 2014a; Heukelom, 2014; Kanev & Terziev, 2017; A. Kaufman & Englander, 2011).

In the context of consumer behavior, marginalism is evident in the law of diminishing marginal utility, a foundational concept in neoclassical economics. This law suggests that as an individual consumes more units of a good, the additional satisfaction or utility derived from each successive unit tends to

decrease. This diminishing marginal utility illustrates how consumers assess the utility gained from each additional unit of a good against its price, leading to rational choices based on the marginal benefit. Moreover, in the realm of production and cost, marginalism manifests through the principle of diminishing marginal returns. This principle stipulates that as additional units of a variable input, such as labor or capital, are added to a fixed input, the overall output increases at a decreasing rate. In other words, the marginal product of the variable input decreases as more units are employed, affecting the overall cost of production. Firms, guided by this principle, aim to produce at the point where the marginal cost equals the marginal revenue to maximize profits, aligning with the concept of rational decision-making based on marginal analysis. Marginalism is not confined solely to microeconomic decision-making but also extends its influence into macroeconomic policy (Cooper & Kovacic, 2012; Ghisellini & Chang, 2018; McChesney, 2013; Stucke, 2006; Thaler, 2016).

In macroeconomics, the evaluation of marginal costs and benefits is crucial in policy formulation, particularly in issues like taxation, government spending, and monetary policy. For instance, the idea of the marginal propensity to consume, which represents the fraction of additional income that a household spends, plays a pivotal role in understanding the impact of fiscal policy on aggregate demand. Neoclassical economics, heavily influenced by marginalism, uses mathematical and graphical models to depict the optimization process based on marginal analysis. The marginal principle is illustrated in graphs showing demand and supply curves, where equilibrium is achieved when marginal benefit equals marginal cost, determining the market price and quantity. In this context, the marginalist approach helps in the determination of efficient resource allocation and market equilibrium (Berg, 2015; Dohmen, 2014; Holcombe, 2009; Schnellenbach & Schubert, 2015; Wright, 2006). However, while the concept of marginalism has been immensely influential, it's not without its critiques and limitations. Some argue that the assumptions of rational decision-making based on marginal analysis might not always hold true in the real world. Human behavior might be influenced by psychological factors, social norms, or imperfect information, which can deviate from purely rational decision-making based on marginal utility.

Furthermore, critics argue that in certain situations, the concept of marginalism might not adequately account for externalities or broader societal implications. For instance, in environmental economics, the cost of an additional unit of production might not consider the external costs imposed on society, like pollution, which challenges the completeness of the marginal cost analysis. Marginalism is a central tenet of neoclassical economics, offering a powerful framework for understanding decision-making processes at both micro and macro levels (Baddeley, 2018; Lefevre & Chapman, 2017; Lunn, 2012; J. Shogren, 2012; Sontheimer, 2015). Its emphasis on evaluating the incremental benefits and costs of actions or decisions has profoundly shaped economic analysis, offering insights into consumer behavior, production processes, and policy formulation. Despite its wide application, criticisms surrounding its assumptions and limitations prompt ongoing discussions and explorations within economic research, aiming to refine and enhance our understanding of decision-making processes in the complex real-world settings.

3. Rational Choice in Neoclassical Economics: Assumptions, Applications, and Challenges in Understanding Human Behavior

The principle of rational choice is a fundamental pillar in neoclassical economics, embodying a core assumption about human behavior. It posits that individuals, whether consumers or producers, act purposefully to maximize their utility or satisfaction, making decisions based on available information in a manner that is logically consistent (Berndt, 2015; Dawney, Shah, Dietz, Michie, & Oughton, 2011; Faure & Luth, 2011; Kao & Velupillai, 2015; Zalega, 2014). At the heart of this assumption lies the idea that people are rational and make choices that serve their best interests, given the constraints and information available to them. This concept plays a central role in economic models, driving the foundation for understanding and predicting human behavior in various economic contexts. Rational choice theory rests on the premise that individuals seek to maximize their satisfaction, typically represented by utility, given their preferences and constraints. For consumers, this means making choices that yield the highest level of satisfaction or utility, often subject to budget constraints. The utility derived from consuming a good or service depends not only on its intrinsic properties but also on individual preferences and the relative scarcity of the good (Altman, 2016; MacFadyen, 2015; Obregón, 2018; Tuyon & Ahmad, 2016; Wade, 2009).

Rational consumers aim to allocate their limited resources in a way that maximizes their overall satisfaction, considering the trade-offs between different goods and services. Similarly, in the realm of production and business, rational choice theory is evident in the behavior of firms. Firms are assumed to operate with the objective of maximizing profits. They make decisions regarding input usage, output levels, and pricing strategies based on rational calculations that aim to achieve the highest possible profits. This involves analyzing the marginal cost of production, setting output levels where marginal cost equals marginal revenue, and making choices that lead to profit maximization. The assumption of rationality also plays a pivotal role in shaping economic decision-making at the macroeconomic level (Fontana, 2010; Gillingham & Palmer, 2014; Harstad & Selten, 2013; Leslie, 2013; McKenzie, 2018). Policymakers often base their decisions on the assumption that individuals, businesses, and other economic agents act rationally. For instance, fiscal and monetary policies are designed assuming that consumers and businesses will respond in predictable, rational ways to changes in taxes, interest rates, or government spending.

While the rational choice theory forms the bedrock of neoclassical economics and has been instrumental in providing a systematic framework for understanding human behavior, it's not without its criticisms and limitations. Critics argue that human behavior is not always perfectly rational. Psychological and behavioral economics have highlighted numerous cognitive biases, emotions, and bounded rationality that influence decision-making, leading to deviations from purely rational choices (Dunning, 2017; Jefferson & King, 2010; Kirman, 2010; Sugden, 2018; Teraji, 2018). Moreover, the assumption of perfect information, a key element in rational choice theory, is often unrealistic. In the real world, individuals do not always have access to complete or accurate information. Incomplete information or asymmetric information can lead to imperfect decision-making, where individuals might not always make choices

that best serve their interests due to informational constraints. However, despite these criticisms, the concept of rational choice remains a powerful and influential tool in economic analysis. It offers a structured framework for understanding and predicting behavior in various economic contexts, providing valuable insights into consumer behavior, production decisions, and policy implications. The rational choice model continues to evolve, incorporating insights from behavioral economics and other disciplines to refine our understanding of decision-making processes in real-world settings.

4. Supply and Demand in Neoclassical Economics: Foundations, Market Dynamics, and Real-World Implications

Supply and demand represent the foundational forces that govern market economies, a principle deeply embedded in neoclassical economics. This concept forms the cornerstone of understanding how prices and quantities of goods and services are determined within a market. It encapsulates the interaction between buyers, who represent the demand for a product, and sellers, who constitute the supply, to establish equilibrium prices and quantities (Holt, Rosser Jr, & Colander, 2011; Ménard & Shirley, 2014a; Rischkowsky & Döring, 2008; Schmid, 2008; Wolff & Resnick, 2012). The relationship between supply and demand lies at the core of market dynamics and influences the allocation of resources, guiding the decisions of both consumers and producers. The demand curve illustrates the quantity of a good or service that consumers are willing and able to buy at different prices. It embodies the law of demand, which states that as the price of a good decreases, the quantity demanded increases, assuming all other factors remain constant. This inverse relationship between price and quantity demanded reflects consumers' preferences, income levels, and the law of diminishing marginal utility. Neoclassical economic theory emphasizes that consumers seek to maximize their utility by allocating their limited income among various goods and services in a manner that provides the highest satisfaction.

On the other hand, the supply curve represents the quantity of a good or service that producers are willing and able to sell at various prices. It embodies the law of supply, suggesting that as the price of a good increases, the quantity supplied also increases, assuming other factors remain constant (Foster & Metcalfe, 2012; Gallagher, Mastrogiorgio, & Petracca, 2019; Granovetter, 2018; Lund & Hvelplund, 2012; Urbina & Ruiz-Villaverde, 2019). This positive relationship between price and quantity supplied reflects the behavior of producers, where higher prices offer greater incentives for firms to produce and sell more of a product. The equilibrium in a market is determined by the intersection of the supply and demand curves, where the quantity demanded equals the quantity supplied at a particular price. At this point, the market reaches a state of balance, and no surplus or shortage exists. This equilibrium price and quantity are considered the most efficient allocation of resources because they reflect the desires of both buyers and sellers. One of the critical implications of the supply and demand framework is price determination. If the market is not in equilibrium, forces come into play to adjust prices (Beckert & Streeck, 2008; Guzavicius, Gižienė, & Žalgirytė, 2015; Lo, 2007; North, 2010; Pejovich, 2006).

For instance, if the price is above the equilibrium, leading to a surplus, sellers are motivated to reduce prices to clear ex-

cess inventory. Conversely, if the price is below the equilibrium, causing a shortage, sellers may increase prices to balance demand and supply. The dynamics of supply and demand go beyond simple price determination; they play a crucial role in influencing market behavior and outcomes. Changes in demand and supply conditions lead to shifts in the respective curves, impacting equilibrium prices and quantities. Factors such as changes in consumer preferences, income levels, technological advancements, input prices, or government policies can cause shifts in either the supply or demand curves, leading to adjustments in market equilibrium. Moreover, the supply and demand framework has far-reaching implications across different markets and industries (Altman, 2007; Beder, 2011; P. Boettke, Caceres, & Martin, 2013; Manner & Gowdy, 2010; Richter, 2015).

It is not only applicable to goods but extends to labor markets, financial markets, and various services. In labor markets, the demand for labor is influenced by the price (wage) and the quantity of labor supplied. Similarly, in financial markets, the interaction between supply (savings) and demand (investment) influences interest rates and capital allocation. However, while the supply and demand model provides a robust and useful framework for analyzing markets, it has its limitations and simplifications. The model assumes *ceteris paribus*, meaning all other factors are held constant, which might not always hold true in the real world where various factors constantly change. Additionally, the model assumes perfect competition, where all firms produce homogeneous goods, and all market participants have perfect information, which might not align with the complexities of real-world markets (Frerichs, 2011; Hodgson, 2007a; Mendola, 2007; Rafiqui, 2009; Soti, 2020). Nonetheless, despite these limitations, the supply and demand model continues to be an essential tool in economic analysis. It provides a foundational understanding of market behavior, guiding decisions for businesses, policymakers, and consumers alike. Its adaptability to various market scenarios and its role in determining market equilibrium make it a crucial component of economic theory, facilitating the analysis of price determination and resource allocation in a market economy.

5. Marginal Utility in Neoclassical Economics: Exploring Consumer Behavior, Diminishing Satisfaction, and Economic Implications

Marginal utility, a foundational concept in neoclassical economics, captures the incremental satisfaction or benefit derived from the consumption of an additional unit of a good or service. It rests on the fundamental principle of diminishing marginal utility, which suggests that as a person consumes more units of a specific good, the additional satisfaction obtained from each successive unit decreases. This concept plays a crucial role in understanding consumer behavior, rational decision-making, and the determination of individual preferences and demand (Arthur, 2021; Avtonomov & Avtonomov, 2019; Dhimi, 2016; Prechter Jr & Parker, 2007; Thaler, 2018). At the core of marginal utility lies the principle that individuals allocate their resources in a manner that maximizes their satisfaction or utility. The satisfaction gained from consuming a good or service is not uniform across all units consumed. The first unit consumed typically provides the most substantial benefit, and with each subsequent unit, the additional satisfaction obtained tends to diminish. For instance, the first slice of pizza may bring significant enjoyment, but as a person consumes

more, the marginal utility diminishes, leading to less additional satisfaction from each subsequent slice. This diminishing marginal utility serves as the foundation for rational consumer behavior, as consumers aim to maximize their overall satisfaction given their limited income or resources (Boeckler & Berndt, 2013; Dolderer, Felber, & Teitscheid, 2021; Ménard & Shirley, 2014b; Oliver, 2013; Richter & Richter, 2015).

They make choices based on the marginal utility derived from each additional unit of a good or service, assessing whether the additional benefit justifies the cost of acquiring it. This assessment influences the quantity of a good or service that a consumer is willing to purchase at a given price. Marginal utility is often represented graphically through the individual demand curve. As the quantity of a good consumed increases, the total utility derived rises, but at a decreasing rate due to diminishing marginal utility. This curve depicts the relationship between the quantity consumed and the total utility, illustrating the point where the marginal utility becomes zero, indicating that additional units would provide no extra satisfaction. The concept of marginal utility is not solely limited to the realm of consumer behavior but extends to production decisions and the behavior of firms (Altman, 2013, 2015; Brzezicka & Wiśniewski, 2014; Bubb & Pildes, 2013; Frederiks, Stenner, & Hobman, 2015).

In production, the idea of marginal utility is analogous to the principle of diminishing marginal returns. As a firm employs additional units of a variable input, such as labor or capital, the additional output or benefit derived from each extra unit decreases. This concept guides firms in determining the optimal level of production, where marginal cost equals marginal revenue to maximize profits. Moreover, the concept of marginal utility has implications for pricing strategies and market equilibrium. For businesses, understanding consumer behavior based on marginal utility is crucial in setting prices to maximize profits. In competitive markets, prices tend to adjust to reflect the marginal utility perceived by consumers, aligning with the principle that prices tend to approximate the marginal benefit that consumers derive from consuming the last unit of a good (Altman, 2012; Holden, 2012; Marinescu, 2016b; ORHAN, 2016; Stucke, 2014).

However, while the concept of marginal utility has been instrumental in understanding consumer behavior and guiding economic decision-making, it has also faced criticisms and challenges. Critics argue that the assumption of diminishing marginal utility may not hold universally across all goods or individuals. Some goods, particularly positional or status goods, might exhibit different patterns where increased consumption enhances satisfaction rather than diminishes it. Additionally, the concept of marginal utility assumes that individuals make decisions based on clear and consistent preferences, without considering behavioral complexities, such as irrational behavior, cognitive biases, or changing preferences over time. Behavioral economics has shed light on various deviations from purely rational decision-making, challenging the assumptions underpinning the concept of marginal utility (Altman, 2014b; Chavance, 2008; EREN, 2018; Bruce E Kaufman, 2018; Shughart, Thomas, & Thomas, 2020).

The concept of marginal utility stands as a fundamental tenet in neoclassical economics, providing a framework to understand and predict consumer behavior and rational decision-making. It forms the basis for explaining the diminishing satis-

faction derived from additional consumption, guiding choices made by consumers and firms. While it offers valuable insights into how individuals allocate their resources to maximize satisfaction, ongoing research continues to refine and expand our understanding of human behavior, acknowledging the complexities that challenge the simplicity of the concept of diminishing marginal utility.

6. Diminishing Marginal Returns in Neoclassical Economics: Understanding Input-Output Relationships and Economic Decision-Making

The principle of diminishing marginal returns is a key concept in neoclassical economics that elucidates the relationship between input and output in production processes. It posits that as additional units of one input (like labor or capital) are added to a production process while keeping all other inputs constant, the incremental increase in output will eventually diminish (Hodgson, 2009; Kasper, Streit, & Boettke, 2012; Bruce E Kaufman, 2007; Rossiaud & Locatelli, 2010; Wang & Dobbs, 2008). Initially, when inputs are added to a fixed production factor, output increases at an increasing rate, but as the quantity of the variable input continues to increase, the rate of output growth will start to slow down, and eventually, it might even decline. The principle of diminishing marginal returns is closely tied to the more general law of diminishing returns. As more units of a variable input are combined with a fixed input, the total output initially increases. This early stage of production displays increasing returns, indicating that the additional input contributes significantly to overall output. However, as the utilization of the variable input continues, a point is reached where the marginal product of that input begins to decline, signifying diminishing marginal returns. This concept is often visualized through the production function, a graphical representation that depicts the relationship between inputs and output (Braun, 2021; Bruce Evan Kaufman, 2006; Bruce E Kaufman, 2015; North, 2016; Vatn, 2007).

In the short run, where at least one factor of production is fixed, the law of diminishing marginal returns is typically observed. Initially, the addition of more units of a variable input, like labor, to a fixed input, such as capital, results in an increased level of output. However, beyond a certain point, the productivity of each additional unit of the variable input decreases, leading to a less than proportionate increase in output. The implications of the law of diminishing marginal returns extend beyond the realm of production and have significance in economic decision-making. For businesses, understanding this principle is crucial in determining the optimal level of input usage to maximize productivity. Firms strive to operate at a level where the marginal cost of an additional unit of input equals the marginal revenue generated by that input, aiming to achieve cost efficiency and maximize profits (Joskow, 2008; Kirsten, Karaan, & Dorward, 2009; Levin & Lo, 2021; Schwartz, 2007; Wilkinson & Klaes, 2017).

Additionally, the concept of diminishing marginal returns holds implications for macroeconomic policies and resource allocation. It underlines the importance of balancing resources and inputs for maximum productivity across various sectors of an economy. The concept guides policymakers and businesses in making informed decisions regarding resource allocation, especially in industries where production processes involve multiple inputs and the efficient use of resources is essential.

However, while the law of diminishing marginal returns is a fundamental concept in economic theory, it is not without limitations and criticisms. One of the critiques is that the assumption of *ceteris paribus*, or “all other things being equal,” might not hold in real-world scenarios. In practical situations, various factors affecting production, such as technological advancements, changes in management practices, or innovation, might not be held constant, impacting the applicability of this principle. Moreover, the principle of diminishing marginal returns does not provide a comprehensive explanation for all production scenarios (Davis, 2017; Yahya Mete Madra, 2007; Yahya M Madra, 2016; Meramveliotakis, 2021; Verboven, 2015).

It might not apply uniformly across all industries or in all production contexts. Certain industries or processes might exhibit economies of scale, where the increase in output leads to a decrease in average costs, rather than experiencing diminishing marginal returns. The concept of diminishing marginal returns is a central component of neoclassical economics, providing insights into the relationship between inputs and output in production processes. It elucidates the pattern where the addition of more units of a variable input eventually results in smaller incremental increases in output. This concept informs production decisions and resource allocation strategies, offering a framework for businesses and policymakers to optimize efficiency and productivity (Benfratello & Bachi, 2019; Cohen & Winn, 2007; Demeritt & Hoff, 2018; Elsner, Heinrich, & Schwardt, 2014; Mazur-Wierzbicka, 2018). However, while it is a valuable tool in economic analysis, its limitations and the complexities of real-world scenarios warrant a nuanced and multifaceted approach in understanding production processes and resource management.

7. Perfect Competition in Neoclassical Economics: Ideal Market Conditions and Real-World Deviations

Perfect competition is a foundational concept in neoclassical economics, serving as a benchmark against which real-world market structures are compared. It is characterized by a set of ideal conditions that include a large number of buyers and sellers, all offering and demanding a homogenous product, possessing perfect information, and operating in a market without entry or exit barriers. This theoretical market structure serves as a fundamental framework for understanding market behavior, pricing dynamics, and resource allocation (Brožová, 2018; Epstein, 2007; Ho, Lim, & Camerer, 2006; Pykett, 2013; Stucke, 2010). The condition of a large number of buyers and sellers is a fundamental component of perfect competition. In such a market, no single buyer or seller has the power to influence the market price. Each individual participant, whether a buyer or seller, is a price taker, meaning they must accept the prevailing market price and cannot impact it with their transactions. The absence of market power among individual participants ensures that the market operates solely based on the forces of supply and demand, without any entity having the ability to manipulate prices. Moreover, the products traded in a perfectly competitive market are considered homogeneous or identical. This means that products offered by different sellers are essentially the same in terms of quality, features, and characteristics.

As a result, buyers have no preference for one seller's product over another, solely making purchase decisions based

on price. This characteristic further reinforces the idea that individual sellers cannot influence the market price since their product is indistinguishable from others in the market (Akansel, 2016a; Dequech, 2006; Eirik G Furubotn & Richter, 2008; Eirik Grundtvig Furubotn & Richter, 2010; Menard & Shirley, 2012). Perfect competition assumes perfect information, where all buyers and sellers have complete and instantaneous knowledge of market conditions, prices, and other relevant information. This assumption ensures that all market participants have access to the same information, eliminating any informational advantage or disadvantage among buyers and sellers. Perfect information allows participants to make rational decisions, facilitating efficient resource allocation and market outcomes. The absence of barriers to entry or exit is another critical feature of perfectly competitive markets. New firms can freely enter the market if they wish to do so, and existing firms can exit the market without facing obstacles or costs.

This feature ensures that profits in the long run are driven down to zero due to the ease of entry and exit. In the long run, if firms are making economic profits, new firms will enter the market, increasing supply and decreasing prices until profits are eliminated (Fine, Johnston, Santos, & Van Waeyenberge, 2016; Hodgson, 2014; Markey-Towler, 2019; J. F. Shogren & Taylor, 2008; Tremblay & Tremblay, 2012). The model of perfect competition is instrumental in understanding the ideal market conditions that promote efficiency and allocative optimality. In a perfectly competitive market, the equilibrium price and quantity are determined by the intersection of the supply and demand curves. This equilibrium represents an efficient allocation of resources, where the quantity demanded equals the quantity supplied, ensuring that resources are allocated to their most valued uses. It is seen as the most economically efficient market structure since it leads to the allocation of resources in a manner that maximizes consumer and producer surplus. However, while the model of perfect competition offers valuable insights and serves as a benchmark for economic analysis, it has limitations and does not fully represent real-world markets. Real markets often deviate from the conditions of perfect competition due to various reasons, such as product differentiation, the presence of market power among firms, imperfect information, and barriers to entry (Avineri, 2012; Ónday, 2016; Richter, 2008; Scriciu, Rezai, & Mechler, 2013; Wildman, 2006).

In reality, many markets exhibit varying degrees of imperfection, with few meeting all the criteria set by perfect competition. For instance, in many markets, products are differentiated to some extent. Brands, quality differences, and advertising strategies create distinctions between products, allowing firms to have some degree of market power by differentiating their products. Additionally, information asymmetry, where one party has more or better information than the other, is a common occurrence in many markets, challenging the assumption of perfect information. Furthermore, entry and exit barriers, such as regulatory requirements, economies of scale, and brand loyalty, can hinder the entry of new firms or the exit of existing ones, preventing markets from achieving the conditions of perfect competition. These barriers might give existing firms the ability to influence market prices, thereby deviating from the notion of a large number of small firms, each unable to impact the market price (P. J. Boettke & Candela, 2017; Lieberherr, 2009; McKenzie, 2009; Sornette, 2014; Tauheed, 2011). Perfect competition is an idealized market structure in neoclassical economics that represents a benchmark for as-

sessing market behavior and efficiency. It offers a theoretical framework that highlights the conditions necessary for an efficient allocation of resources and a determination of equilibrium prices and quantities. While it provides a useful model for economic analysis, real-world markets often deviate from these ideal conditions, exhibiting varying degrees of imperfection due to factors such as product differentiation, information asymmetry, and barriers to entry and exit. The model of perfect competition remains a theoretical construct that aids in understanding market dynamics but requires consideration of the complexities and realities present in actual market settings.

8. Profit Maximization in Neoclassical Economics: Rational Objective, Challenges, and Societal Implications

Profit maximization stands as a core principle within neoclassical economics, encapsulating the fundamental objective of firms within market economies. It involves the rational pursuit of maximizing profits as the primary goal for businesses. In this context, profit is the difference between total revenue and total cost. Firms aim to achieve this by optimizing their output level and the utilization of inputs, seeking to strike a balance between revenue generation and cost efficiency (Altman, 2010; Frerichs, 2021; Ross, 2014; Van de Ven & Lifschitz, 2013). The pursuit of profit maximization stems from the assumption that firms are rational economic agents that seek to operate in a manner that yields the highest possible profits. Firms are assumed to have a clear understanding of their cost structures, demand for their products, and market conditions, allowing them to make informed decisions that enable them to achieve this objective. In the neoclassical perspective, firms seek to maximize profits by determining the optimal level of output that would generate the highest possible revenue while minimizing costs.

This involves analyzing the marginal costs and marginal revenues associated with each unit of output produced. In an ideal scenario, firms will produce at a level where marginal cost equals marginal revenue. Beyond this point, producing an additional unit would result in higher costs than the revenue it generates, leading to reduced overall profit (Crotty, 2011; Lim, 2017; Minniti & Lévesque, 2008; Tisdell, 2009). Moreover, firms engage in input usage to achieve profit maximization. They aim to strike a balance in utilizing inputs such as labor, capital, and raw materials to ensure cost efficiency while maximizing output. Firms consider the marginal productivity of each input, weighing the additional output generated against the cost of the input. They aim to use inputs in such a way that the marginal cost of an input is equal to the marginal revenue product it generates. This balanced usage ensures that the cost of inputs does not outweigh the additional revenue they bring, optimizing the overall profit. The concept of profit maximization is often illustrated through the lens of the production function. This graphical representation showcases the relationship between input and output.

It demonstrates the point where firms achieve maximum profit by utilizing input in a manner that ensures marginal cost equals marginal revenue. Beyond this point, any further increase in output would lead to higher costs than the revenue generated, thereby diminishing overall profit. However, in real-world scenarios, achieving profit maximization can be complex and challenging due to various factors. One of the challenges is the uncertainty and variability in market conditions. Firms of-

ten operate in markets where demand fluctuates, input prices change, and external factors such as technological advancements or regulatory changes impact production (Bruni & Sugden, 2007; Hodgson, 2007b; Keita, 2012; Pollitt & Shaorshadze, 2013). These uncertainties can affect a firm's ability to accurately predict the marginal costs and revenues associated with each unit of output. Additionally, various market imperfections, such as imperfect competition, can affect a firm's ability to achieve profit maximization. In markets where firms have some degree of market power or face barriers to entry, they might not operate as price takers and may have the ability to influence prices. This deviation from the perfect competition assumption can complicate the pursuit of profit maximization, as firms might operate in a way that maximizes market power rather than profit.

Moreover, profit maximization as the sole objective of firms might not always align with broader societal goals. Critics argue that a singular focus on profit maximization might lead to decisions that neglect social or environmental implications. Firms, in their pursuit of maximizing profits, might prioritize cost-cutting measures that lead to negative externalities, such as environmental pollution or labor exploitation, undermining the welfare of society (Beckert, 2009; Felin & Foss, 2009; Spithoven, 2019; Tor, 2018). Profit maximization stands as a fundamental objective for firms within neoclassical economics, representing the rational pursuit of maximizing profits through optimal output and input usage. It involves a complex analysis of marginal costs and revenues to strike a balance between generating revenue and minimizing costs. While profit maximization is a guiding principle for businesses, achieving this objective can be challenging due to uncertainties in market conditions, market imperfections, and the potential conflict between profit maximization and broader social goals. The pursuit of profit maximization remains a key aspect of economic theory, but it requires considerations beyond the purely economic realm to align with societal well-being and sustainable practices.

9. Equilibrium in Markets: The Ideal Balance and Real-world Dynamics in Neoclassical Economics

The concept of equilibrium in neoclassical economics represents a fundamental state of balance and stability within markets, where the forces of supply and demand intersect. This point of equilibrium is a cornerstone of economic theory, signifying the ideal state where the quantity supplied equals the quantity demanded, establishing an equilibrium price and quantity for a particular good or service (Amir & Lobel, 2008; Merameliotakis, 2020; Primrose, 2017; Ritsatos, 2014). In a market, the equilibrium is determined by the interaction of the supply and demand curves. The demand curve illustrates the quantity of a good or service that consumers are willing and able to buy at various prices, while the supply curve represents the quantity of that good or service that producers are willing and able to sell at different prices. The intersection of these curves determines the equilibrium price, where the quantity demanded equals the quantity supplied. The state of equilibrium is crucial in ensuring market stability and efficiency. At the equilibrium price, the quantity demanded by consumers matches the quantity supplied by producers, resulting in neither a surplus nor a shortage of the product.

This situation ensures that resources are allocated efficiently, reflecting the desires of consumers and the capabilities of

producers. The mechanism of supply and demand working toward equilibrium is central to the pricing dynamics in markets (Akansel, 2016b; Burnham, 2013; Dold & Schubert, 2018). If the price of a good is above the equilibrium level, there is excess supply (a surplus) as producers are willing to sell more than consumers are willing to buy at that price. In response, producers may lower prices to clear the surplus and reach the equilibrium point. Conversely, if the price is below the equilibrium, there is excess demand (a shortage) as consumers are willing to buy more than producers are willing to sell at that price. In this case, producers might increase prices to balance supply and demand. The concept of equilibrium plays a vital role in the efficient allocation of resources.

In a state of equilibrium, resources are allocated to their most valued uses, as reflected in the market price. This equilibrium price guides the allocation of resources and influences decisions made by producers and consumers. It represents the point where the marginal benefit of consuming the last unit of a good equals the marginal cost of producing it, ensuring an efficient utilization of resources (Brazelton & Whalen, 2011; Hobman, Frederiks, Stenner, & Meikle, 2016; Manne & Zywicki, 2013). However, achieving and maintaining a state of equilibrium is an ongoing process in real-world markets. Markets are subject to constant changes in demand and supply conditions, input prices, consumer preferences, and external factors such as technological advancements or government policies. These changes lead to shifts in the supply and demand curves, influencing the equilibrium price and quantity.

The adjustment of prices and quantities over time is an essential feature of market dynamics as markets continuously move toward a new equilibrium in response to changing conditions. Additionally, while the concept of equilibrium is foundational in economic theory, it is not always reflective of real-world market scenarios. Many markets often experience imperfections and may not reach a state of equilibrium due to factors such as imperfect competition, product differentiation, information asymmetry, or barriers to entry (Canitez, 2019; Daniels, 2021; Parks & Gowdy, 2013). In these cases, the equilibrium price and quantity might not accurately represent the point where supply equals demand due to deviations from the assumptions of perfect competition. Furthermore, there are markets where equilibrium might not be a stable or achievable state.

For instance, in dynamic markets, such as stock markets or those involving innovative technology, continuous changes and information flow prevent a static equilibrium. Instead, these markets might operate under a dynamic equilibrium, where prices and quantities continuously adjust based on new information and changing conditions. The concept of equilibrium is a fundamental idea in neoclassical economics, representing a state of balance in markets where supply equals demand, determining the equilibrium price and quantity. It signifies the efficient allocation of resources and guides market dynamics. However, while the pursuit of equilibrium is a guiding principle, real-world markets often deviate from these ideal conditions due to various factors, leading to ongoing adjustments and continuous movements toward new equilibriums. The concept of equilibrium, while foundational, remains an idealized construct in economic theory, offering insights into market behavior and the efficient allocation of resources.

10. Factor Pricing in Competitive Markets: Theory and Real-world Complexities

Factor pricing constitutes a critical aspect of neoclassical economics, serving as the foundation for understanding how the prices of factors of production—such as labor (wages), land (rent), capital (interest), and entrepreneurship (profits)—are determined within competitive markets. These factors collectively contribute to the production process, and their prices are crucial in determining resource allocation and income distribution. Wages, the price of labor, are determined by the intersection of the supply and demand for labor in the labor market. The demand for labor is derived from the marginal product of labor, representing the additional output produced by an additional unit of labor. Firms hire labor up to the point where the marginal cost of employing an additional worker equals the marginal revenue product, reflecting the value of the additional output produced by that worker. This intersection establishes the equilibrium wage rate.

The supply of labor, on the other hand, is derived from individuals' decisions to participate in the labor market at various wage rates. Equilibrium in the labor market is reached where the quantity of labor supplied equals the quantity demanded, determining the prevailing wage rate. Rent, the price of land or other natural resources, is determined by the marginal productivity of land. It reflects the additional output derived from using an additional unit of land. In a competitive market, the price of land is equal to its marginal product. Land is a fixed factor of production, and its supply is relatively inelastic in the short run, which influences the determination of rent. The more productive or scarce the land, the higher the rent, as firms will be willing to pay more to utilize more productive land for production (Altman, 2020; Foster, 2006; Frerichs, 2018; Tomer, 2007). Interest, the price of capital, is determined by the interplay of the supply and demand for capital in financial markets. The demand for capital is derived from the marginal productivity of capital, representing the additional output generated by an additional unit of capital. Firms and individuals demand capital up to the point where the marginal benefit from using an additional unit of capital equals the marginal cost.

The supply of capital represents individuals' and entities' willingness to save and invest. The equilibrium interest rate is where the quantity of capital demanded equals the quantity supplied, determining the prevailing interest rate. Profits, the return to entrepreneurship, are considered as residual earnings after accounting for the payments to labor, land, and capital. In a perfectly competitive market, profits are driven to zero in the long run due to the mobility of resources. If a firm earns economic profits (revenue exceeds total costs), it attracts new firms to enter the market, increasing competition and driving down prices. Conversely, if a firm sustains losses, some firms exit the market, reducing competition and driving prices upward. This competitive process ensures that in the long run, profits are minimized, and firms operate at a level where their revenue equals their total costs. The determination of factor prices is influenced by the marginal productivity of each factor of production. Marginal productivity refers to the additional output generated by an additional unit of a factor of production, such as an hour of labor or an additional unit of land.

The theory suggests that in competitive markets, factor prices tend to equal the marginal productivity of the factor.

This relationship ensures that factors are remunerated according to their contribution to the production process, aligning with the principles of efficiency and equity in resource allocation. Moreover, the factor pricing theory operates under the assumption of perfect competition, where factors of production are homogenous and there are many buyers and sellers in each market. Perfect competition ensures that no single entity has the power to influence the price of a factor. Instead, prices are determined by the interaction of supply and demand, guiding resource allocation and income distribution. However, while factor pricing theory provides a framework for understanding the determination of factor prices in competitive markets, it has limitations and might not fully represent real-world scenarios. Factors such as imperfect competition, market power, externalities, and government interventions can influence the determination of factor prices. In imperfectly competitive markets, firms might have the ability to influence factor prices, leading to deviations from the principles of perfect competition and the ideal equilibrium in factor markets.

Furthermore, factor pricing theory might not account for externalities, such as the societal costs and benefits that are not reflected in factor prices. For instance, factors of production might generate costs or benefits for society that are not reflected in their market prices, challenging the completeness of the factor pricing mechanism in determining the true societal value of factors of production. Factor pricing theory in neoclassical economics provides a framework for understanding the determination of wages, rent, interest, and profits in competitive markets. It operates under the principles of perfect competition, where factor prices are determined by the interaction of supply and demand based on the marginal productivity of each factor. However, while this theory offers valuable insights into the principles guiding resource allocation and income distribution, real-world markets often deviate from perfect competition and are subject to various imperfections, leading to deviations from the idealized conditions set by factor pricing theory. The theory of factor pricing remains a fundamental construct in economic analysis but requires considerations of market imperfections and externalities to provide a more comprehensive understanding of how factor prices are determined in real-world settings.

11. Balancing Efficiency and Fairness: Understanding Pareto Efficiency in Economics

Pareto Efficiency, named after the Italian economist Vilfredo Pareto, is a central concept in neoclassical economics that signifies an optimal state in resource allocation, where it's impossible to make any individual or group better off without making someone else worse off. This concept serves as a benchmark for evaluating the efficiency of economic allocations and is fundamental to understanding social welfare and the potential for improving the allocation of resources in an economy. At its core, Pareto Efficiency examines the allocation of resources or the distribution of goods and services to determine whether any change in allocation could make at least one individual better off without harming anyone else. In a Pareto efficient allocation, resources are allocated in a manner that maximizes overall social welfare, given the existing constraints and available resources. This state signifies that resources are distributed in a way that exhausts all possible gains from trade and any further reallocation would reduce someone's well-being without increasing anyone else's.

However, attaining Pareto Efficiency doesn't necessarily imply that the distribution of resources is equitable or fair. Instead, it reflects a state where resources are allocated in the most efficient manner possible, maximizing overall welfare within the existing framework. The concept does not inherently consider how resources are initially distributed or whether such initial allocations are fair. It focuses on the potential for improving the allocation within the given constraints, without any party losing. The concept of Pareto Efficiency is deeply intertwined with the notion of Pareto Optimality. A state is said to be Pareto Optimal if there is no way to reallocate resources to make one individual or group better off without making someone else worse off. It's the state where the allocation of resources is efficient and cannot be improved without decreasing the well-being of at least one individual. Pareto Efficiency is a practical application of Pareto Optimality in real-world economic scenarios. In economics, the achievement of Pareto Efficiency is often linked to the functioning of competitive markets. The competitive market model often operates under the assumption that markets tend toward Pareto Efficiency, as price mechanisms guide resource allocation to an optimal state where supply equals demand.

Under perfect competition, market prices are determined by the interaction of supply and demand, ensuring that resources are allocated in a way that maximizes overall welfare. Any change in the allocation of resources or goods within this framework would make at least one party worse off without making others better off, signifying the state's Pareto Efficiency. However, attaining Pareto Efficiency in practice can be complex and challenging. Real-world markets might deviate from the assumptions of perfect competition, leading to market imperfections, externalities, information asymmetry, and barriers to entry, which can hinder the achievement of Pareto Efficiency. Imperfect competition can result in market power, allowing some entities to influence prices or resource allocation, potentially leading to a non-optimal allocation of resources. Externalities, such as costs or benefits that are not reflected in market prices, can also hinder the achievement of Pareto Efficiency. For instance, pollution caused by a firm's production activities might impose costs on society that are not accounted for in the market prices, leading to a suboptimal allocation of resources.

Additionally, information asymmetry, where one party has more information than the other, can lead to a non-optimal allocation, as decisions are made without complete information, potentially harming some parties. Furthermore, achieving Pareto Efficiency might conflict with the goals of income redistribution or social equity. Policies aimed at redistributing income or providing social safety nets might lead to a more equitable distribution of resources but could potentially conflict with the principle of Pareto Efficiency. These redistributive policies might make some individuals better off without making others worse off, which, from an efficiency standpoint, may conflict with the Pareto Efficiency criterion. Pareto Efficiency stands as a fundamental concept in neoclassical economics, representing an optimal state of resource allocation where no one can be made better off without making someone else worse off. While it provides a benchmark for evaluating the efficiency of resource allocation, achieving Pareto Efficiency in real-world scenarios can be complex due to various market imperfections, externalities, information asymmetry, and conflicts with social goals. The concept of Pareto Efficiency offers valuable insights into the efficiency of resource allocation but

requires considerations of real-world complexities and societal objectives to provide a more comprehensive understanding of economic welfare and resource allocation.

12. Assessing Consumer Welfare: The Role of Consumer Surplus in Economics

Consumer surplus is a foundational concept in neoclassical economics that signifies the economic welfare or benefit enjoyed by consumers in a market. It represents the difference between the total value that consumers are willing to pay for a good or service and the actual amount they pay in the market. This surplus emerges from the disparity between the maximum price consumers are willing to pay and the actual market price. Understanding consumer surplus provides insights into consumer behavior, the determination of market prices, and the overall welfare of consumers within an economy. Consumer surplus is closely tied to the concept of individual demand and the valuation of goods or services by consumers. Every individual has a maximum price or willingness to pay for a specific good or service based on their preferences, needs, and utility derived from that product. This willingness to pay is subjective and can vary among individuals based on their personal preferences and circumstances. In a market, the actual price of a good or service is determined by the interaction of supply and demand. The market price typically reflects the marginal utility or valuation of the good for the marginal consumer, that is, the last consumer willing to pay the market price.

Consumer surplus arises from the fact that individuals who are willing to pay more for a good than the market price, the so-called “surplus” consumers, can purchase that good at a lower price, creating a difference between what they are willing to pay and what they actually pay. This difference between what consumers are willing to pay and what they actually pay represents their surplus or gain from participating in the market. Consumer surplus is often visualized through the demand curve. The area between the demand curve and the price paid by consumers represents the total consumer surplus in a market. Graphically, it's depicted as the triangular area between the demand curve and the price line, starting from the quantity purchased up to the price consumers pay. The size of the consumer surplus varies based on the market price and the willingness of consumers to pay for the good. Consumer surplus provides insights into the economic welfare of consumers within a market. A larger consumer surplus typically indicates that consumers benefit more from the market transaction, as they are able to purchase a good at a price lower than their maximum willingness to pay. This surplus represents a form of economic benefit or utility that consumers enjoy from participating in the market. It signifies the excess value consumers receive beyond what they have to pay, contributing to their overall well-being and satisfaction.

Understanding consumer surplus is instrumental in assessing the overall welfare effects of different policies or changes in market conditions. For instance, changes in market prices, subsidies, or improvements in technology that lead to a reduction in the price of a good could increase consumer surplus. Lower prices could enable more consumers to access the good at a more affordable rate, leading to a potential increase in overall consumer welfare and surplus. Similarly, policies that lead to an increase in market prices or restrictions that reduce consumer access to a good could decrease consumer surplus,

potentially reducing overall consumer welfare. However, while consumer surplus serves as a valuable tool in evaluating consumer welfare and market transactions, it does have limitations and might not fully capture the complexities of consumer behavior.

The concept assumes that individuals have consistent and predictable preferences and valuations for goods, which might not always hold true in real-world scenarios. Consumer behavior is influenced by various factors such as changes in income, preferences, information, or social and cultural factors, which might lead to fluctuations in consumer surplus. Moreover, consumer surplus might not fully account for the entire welfare of consumers, as it does not consider factors like externalities, distributional impacts, or non-market goods that are not captured in market transactions. For instance, the concept doesn't reflect the well-being derived from non-market activities, such as leisure time, social relationships, or environmental factors, which can significantly impact consumer welfare but are not captured in the calculation of consumer surplus. Consumer surplus stands as a vital concept in neoclassical economics, representing the difference between what consumers are willing to pay for a good and what they actually pay. It provides insights into consumer welfare and the economic benefit consumers derive from participating in markets. While the concept offers valuable insights into consumer behavior and welfare, it has limitations in capturing the complexities of consumer preferences, non-market factors, and changes in individual valuations, requiring a nuanced understanding of consumer behavior and welfare beyond the scope of consumer surplus.

13. Profitability and Beyond: Understanding Producer Surplus in Economics

Producer surplus, a key concept in neoclassical economics, denotes the additional benefit or profit gained by producers beyond what they are willing to accept for a good or service and what they actually receive in the market. It encapsulates the discrepancy between the minimum price at which producers are willing to supply a good or service and the actual price they receive. Understanding producer surplus is pivotal in assessing the profitability and welfare of producers within a market and provides insights into the dynamics of supply and production. In economic terms, the supply curve represents the quantity of a good or service that producers are willing to supply at different price levels. This supply curve is reflective of the marginal cost of production, which varies based on the cost of inputs, technology, and efficiency of production. Producers, like consumers, have their own valuation for the goods they supply. The price at which producers are willing to supply a certain quantity of a good represents their minimum acceptable price or the minimum compensation they require to cover their costs and make a reasonable profit. The market price is determined by the intersection of supply and demand curves, representing the equilibrium where the quantity supplied equals the quantity demanded. In this market equilibrium, the actual price producers receive for their goods might be higher than their minimum acceptable price.

This difference between the price producers are willing to accept and the actual market price represents the producer surplus. Graphically, producer surplus is depicted as the area between the supply curve and the market price up to the quantity supplied. It forms a triangular area, illustrating the surplus

gains obtained by producers. This surplus emerges from the fact that producers are willing to accept a lower price for their goods, given that the market price exceeds their minimum acceptable price. The larger the difference between the minimum price and the market price, the larger the producer surplus. Producer surplus is an essential measure of producer welfare and profitability within a market. It signifies the additional revenue or benefit accrued by producers beyond their minimum compensation. A larger producer surplus indicates that producers are receiving prices higher than their minimum acceptable prices, leading to increased profitability and benefits from participating in the market.

This surplus is crucial in assessing the overall welfare and economic well-being of producers within an economy. Understanding producer surplus also has implications for the analysis of market dynamics and changes in market conditions. For instance, changes in market prices, technological advancements, or shifts in demand can impact producer surplus. An increase in market prices or higher demand can lead to a larger producer surplus, as producers can receive prices higher than their minimum acceptable prices, potentially increasing their profitability. Similarly, improvements in technology that reduce production costs might lead to a decrease in the minimum acceptable price, contributing to an increase in producer surplus. However, while producer surplus offers insights into producer welfare and profitability, it does not encapsulate the entire scope of producer behavior and welfare within markets. The concept assumes that producers have consistent and predictable valuations for their goods, which might not always align with the complexities of real-world market behavior. Producer behavior is influenced by various factors, such as changes in input prices, technological advancements, market competition, and external conditions, which might lead to fluctuations in producer surplus.

Additionally, producer surplus might not fully account for the entire welfare of producers, as it does not consider factors like costs, profits, non-market factors, or distributional impacts. For instance, the concept does not capture the well-being derived from non-market activities, changes in input costs, or the impact of externalities, such as environmental or social costs, which significantly influence producer welfare but are not captured in the calculation of producer surplus. Producer surplus is a fundamental concept in neoclassical economics, representing the difference between what producers are willing to accept for a good and the price they actually receive. It provides insights into producer welfare, profitability, and the additional benefit gained by producers in the market. While the concept offers valuable insights into producer behavior and welfare, it has limitations in capturing the complexities of producer behavior, non-market factors, and fluctuations in production costs, requiring a more comprehensive understanding of producer welfare beyond the scope of producer surplus.

14. Decoding Responsiveness: Exploring Elasticity in Neoclassical Economics

Elasticity is a crucial concept in neoclassical economics, offering a quantitative measure of the responsiveness or sensitivity of the quantity demanded or supplied of a good or service to changes in various factors, primarily price. It provides insights into how changes in price or other determinants influence the quantity demanded or supplied, enabling a better understand-

ing of market dynamics and consumer and producer behavior. The price elasticity of demand measures how much the quantity demanded of a good changes in response to a change in its price. It is calculated as the percentage change in quantity demanded divided by the percentage change in price. A high price elasticity of demand (greater than 1) indicates that a small change in price leads to a relatively larger change in quantity demanded, signifying a highly responsive demand. In contrast, a low price elasticity of demand (less than 1) indicates that a quantity demanded is relatively insensitive to changes in price. Understanding price elasticity of demand is pivotal in evaluating consumer behavior and market response to changes in price.

For example, essential goods like food and medicine often have an inelastic demand, meaning that changes in their prices have a relatively minor impact on the quantity demanded. Conversely, luxury goods might have a more elastic demand, as changes in their prices can lead to more significant changes in quantity demanded due to consumers' flexibility in purchasing them. Cross-price elasticity measures the responsiveness of the quantity demanded of one good to changes in the price of another. For substitutes, a rise in the price of one good might lead to an increase in the quantity demanded for the substitute, resulting in a positive cross-price elasticity. For complements, an increase in the price of one good might lead to a decrease in the quantity demanded for the complement, resulting in a negative cross-price elasticity. Income elasticity measures the responsiveness of quantity demanded to changes in income. For normal goods, an increase in income leads to an increase in the quantity demanded, resulting in a positive income elasticity. For inferior goods, an increase in income leads to a decrease in the quantity demanded, resulting in a negative income elasticity.

Elasticity of supply measures the responsiveness of the quantity supplied to changes in factors other than price. For instance, the elasticity of supply measures how much the quantity supplied of a good changes in response to changes in input costs or technology. If the quantity supplied changes significantly in response to changes in these factors, the supply is considered elastic; if the quantity supplied changes marginally, it is considered inelastic. Understanding elasticity provides critical insights into market behavior and the implications of price changes or shifts in factors affecting demand or supply. Elasticity helps businesses and policymakers predict how changes in prices or other determinants might impact the market and assists in making informed decisions. For instance, knowing the price elasticity of demand for a good helps businesses understand how changes in prices might impact their revenue. If the demand for a good is inelastic, a rise in price might lead to increased revenue despite a reduction in the quantity demanded.

On the other hand, if the demand is elastic, a price increase might result in reduced revenue due to a significant decrease in the quantity demanded. Moreover, elasticity helps in evaluating the impact of policies or external factors on markets. For instance, understanding the cross-price elasticity of goods assists in assessing the impact of changes in the price of one good on the demand for another. Policymakers can use this information to predict the consequences of policies affecting various markets and goods. Elasticity is also essential in assessing market efficiency and the effects of taxes or subsidies. For instance, the incidence of a tax can be evaluated by understanding the elasticity of demand and supply. In markets with inelastic de-

mand, a tax burden might fall more on consumers, as they are less responsive to price changes, whereas in markets with elastic demand, producers might bear a larger share of the tax burden. However, while elasticity offers valuable insights into market behavior and the impact of changes in price or other factors, it has its limitations and challenges. Elasticity measures might vary over different ranges of prices or other determinants, and calculating precise elasticity values might be challenging due to the complexity of market conditions. Additionally, elasticity measures might not fully capture the complexities of consumer or producer behavior.

While they offer insights into how consumers and producers respond to changes in prices or other determinants, they might not fully encompass the dynamics of decision-making and preferences. Consumer behavior can be influenced by various factors beyond price, such as brand loyalty, habit, or psychological factors, which might not be fully reflected in elasticity measures. Elasticity stands as a fundamental concept in neoclassical economics, providing a measure of the responsiveness of quantity demanded or supplied to changes in price or other factors. It offers valuable insights into market behavior, consumer and producer responsiveness, and the impact of changes in determinants on market outcomes. However, while elasticity measures are essential in understanding market dynamics, they might not fully encapsulate the complexities of consumer and producer behavior, requiring a nuanced understanding of market conditions and factors beyond price to provide a more comprehensive assessment of market responses.

15. Balancing Realities: Assessing Rational Expectations in Economic Models

The concept of rational expectations, a cornerstone in neoclassical economics, embodies a set of assumptions that postulate economic agents as highly rational, equipped with all available information and utilizing it efficiently to make predictions about the future. These assumptions suggest that individuals, firms, and other economic agents form expectations or predictions about future economic variables based on the information available at a given time. This concept is rooted in the belief that these agents make predictions that are as accurate as possible and take into account all information that is relevant to the prediction, resulting in efficient markets. Rational expectations suggest that individuals within an economy possess the cognitive abilities to process and interpret available information in a way that leads to rational and unbiased predictions. This assumption is fundamental in the neoclassical economic model, as it infers that agents do not make systematic errors in predicting future economic variables.

Instead, their predictions are based on all information available to them at a given point in time, including historical data, current market conditions, and expectations about future policies and events that might impact the economy. In essence, rational expectations assume that economic agents are forward-looking and that their predictions about future economic variables are highly accurate, incorporating all relevant information available to them. This concept is closely tied to the efficient market hypothesis, which posits that asset prices reflect all available information at any given time. It suggests that if markets are efficient and information is rapidly and accurately incorporated into asset prices, then predictions made based on

this information will be rational and accurate. The rational expectations hypothesis further suggests that markets will adjust quickly and accurately to new information, reflecting changes in expectations and leading to market efficiency. For instance, if there is an unexpected change in economic policy or a new piece of information that impacts the future outlook, rational economic agents will quickly incorporate this information into their predictions, leading to adjustments in market prices and other economic variables. This implies that markets will be in a constant state of equilibrium, as new information is swiftly and efficiently integrated into the current expectations and prices.

However, while the assumption of rational expectations provides a powerful framework for understanding economic behavior and market dynamics, it is not without criticism and limitations. Furthermore, the assumption assumes that all relevant information is known, which might not always hold true, as some information might be asymmetrically distributed or unknown to certain economic agents. Moreover, behavioral economics challenges the assumption of rational expectations by highlighting the presence of cognitive biases, heuristics, and bounded rationality in decision-making. These behavioral factors can lead to deviations from fully rational expectations, as individuals might not always process information optimally or make perfectly rational predictions. Another limitation of the rational expectations hypothesis lies in its assumption that individuals do not learn from their past mistakes or systematically deviate from their predictions. In reality, economic agents might adapt and adjust their predictions based on their experiences and past errors, leading to changes in expectations over time.

This adaptability and learning process can influence the efficiency of markets and the accuracy of predictions. Additionally, the assumption of rational expectations assumes that all economic agents have complete foresight about future economic events, which might not align with the uncertainty and unpredictability inherent in the real world. Unforeseen events, changes in government policies, technological innovations, or natural disasters are examples of factors that might disrupt rational expectations, as they introduce unpredictability and uncertainty into the economic environment. The assumptions of rational expectations in neoclassical economics propose that economic agents make predictions about the future based on all available information, resulting in efficient markets. These assumptions postulate highly rational and forward-looking economic agents who incorporate all relevant information into their predictions, contributing to market efficiency. However, while the concept of rational expectations provides a foundational framework for understanding economic behavior, it has limitations in its assumptions about information equality, behavioral biases, adaptability, and the inherent uncertainty of the real-world economic environment. A nuanced understanding of market dynamics and the complexities of economic behavior beyond the scope of perfect rationality is essential for a comprehensive analysis of economic outcomes.

16. Implications

The exploration of neoclassical economics, its foundational concepts, assumptions, and limitations carries substantial implications for economic theory, policy formulation, and our understanding of market dynamics. The implications arising

from the study of neoclassical economics stretch across various domains, impacting economic analysis, policy decisions, and the understanding of market behavior.

Economic Analysis and Modeling: The concepts and assumptions within neoclassical economics form the basis of economic models and analyses. They offer a structured framework for understanding market behavior, the interplay between consumers and producers, and the allocation of resources. The implications of this foundational framework are profound as it underpins economic research, empirical analyses, and forecasting. The concepts of supply and demand, marginalism, and rational choice theory guide economists in constructing models to explain and predict market outcomes. However, the assumptions within neoclassical economics, particularly the assumption of perfect rationality, have significant implications for economic modeling. Integrating insights from behavioral economics into these models could provide a more realistic depiction of human decision-making and market behavior. Recognizing and accounting for cognitive biases, bounded rationality, and heuristics in economic models can enhance their predictive power and accuracy.

Policy Formulation: Neoclassical economics has played a substantial role in shaping economic policies across the globe. The assumption of market efficiency and the principles of supply and demand guide policy formulation in various economic spheres. For instance, policies related to price controls, subsidies, or taxation often draw from the principles of supply and demand to influence market behavior. The implications here lie in the need for policymakers to balance the assumptions of neoclassical economics with the realities of market imperfections. Understanding that markets might not always operate perfectly, recognizing information asymmetries, and accounting for behavioral biases are essential in formulating effective and pragmatic policies. Additionally, acknowledging the role of institutions, social norms, and cultural factors in economic outcomes is crucial in developing policies that align with real-world complexities.

Market Behavior and Efficiency: The assumptions within neoclassical economics about market behavior and efficiency have implications for how markets are perceived and understood. The concept of rational expectations and perfect competition implies a certain level of efficiency in market operations. However, the real-world implications deviate from these idealized assumptions. Imperfections in markets, asymmetric information, externalities, and behavioral biases challenge the perfect competition model. This suggests that markets might not always reach equilibrium and that resources might not always be allocated efficiently. Understanding these deviations is crucial in assessing market behavior and improving market efficiency.

Emerging Paradigms in Economics: The limitations and critiques of neoclassical economics have led to the emergence of alternative economic paradigms. Behavioral economics, institutional economics, and other emerging theories offer insights that challenge and complement the assumptions within neoclassical economics. The implications here are profound as they indicate the need for a multidisciplinary approach to economic analysis. Integrating insights from behavioral economics into neoclassical models can refine our understanding of human behavior in economic decision-making. Additionally, acknowledging the role of institutions and societal structures in shaping

economic behavior provides a more comprehensive understanding of market dynamics and economic outcomes.

Education and Research: The implications of the study of neoclassical economics extend to education and research. Neoclassical economics has been a fundamental part of economic curriculums and academic research. The concepts and assumptions within neoclassical economics have laid the groundwork for economic education and research. However, the evolving landscape of economics, with the emergence of behavioral economics and institutional economics, implies the need to adapt economic education and research. Providing a more comprehensive understanding of economic paradigms and their implications can prepare future economists to navigate the complexities of real-world economic scenarios.

The implications of the study of neoclassical economics span across economic analysis, policy formulation, market behavior, emerging paradigms, and education. Recognizing the limitations and challenges within neoclassical economics and integrating insights from alternative economic theories can lead to a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of economic phenomena. This multidisciplinary approach holds the potential to refine economic analyses, improve policy formulation, and provide a more realistic portrayal of market behavior and economic outcomes.

17. Conclusion

The journey through the landscape of neoclassical economics has unveiled a multitude of foundational concepts, principles, and assumptions that have significantly shaped economic thought, analysis, and policy formulation. From the underpinnings of rational choice theory to the intricacies of supply and demand, the neoclassical framework has been instrumental in providing a lens through which economic behavior, market interactions, and resource allocation are observed. However, as we conclude this exploration, it is evident that while neoclassical economics provides a robust framework for understanding certain aspects of economic behavior, it is not without limitations and areas of scrutiny. At the heart of neoclassical economics lies the assumption of rationality in decision-making. This assumption, while foundational, has faced substantial critique in light of emerging insights from behavioral economics. Behavioral economics introduces the idea of cognitive biases, heuristics, and bounded rationality in decision-making, suggesting that economic agents might not always make decisions in a perfectly rational manner. Human behavior is influenced by various psychological and social factors, often deviating from the idealized rationality assumed in neoclassical economics.

Moreover, the assumption of perfect competition, characterized by many buyers and sellers, homogeneous products, perfect information, and no barriers to entry or exit, might not accurately depict the complexities of real-world markets. Imperfections, market power, asymmetries in information, and externalities play substantial roles in market behavior, deviating from the idealized assumptions of perfect competition. The concept of rational expectations, assuming that economic agents make predictions about the future based on all available information, has been pivotal in understanding market efficiency and the interplay between information and market behavior. However, this assumption assumes perfect foresight and com-

plete information, which might not align with the uncertainties and unpredictabilities inherent in the real world. Critiques of neoclassical economics have led to the emergence of alternative economic theories and paradigms. Behavioral economics, for instance, offers a different perspective on decision-making by incorporating psychological and cognitive elements into economic analysis. It challenges the assumption of perfect rationality, shedding light on the biases, heuristics, and limitations in human decision-making, and emphasizing the role of individual psychology in economic behavior. Furthermore, institutional economics provides insights into the role of institutions, norms, and societal structures in shaping economic behavior and market interactions.

It focuses on the influence of institutions on economic transactions, emphasizing the significance of social, political, and cultural factors in economic outcomes. The limitations and critiques of neoclassical economics do not diminish the significance of its foundational principles. The concepts of supply and demand, marginalism, factor pricing, and equilibrium have been valuable in analyzing market behavior and resource allocation. Moreover, neoclassical economics has provided a basis for policy formulation, economic modeling, and empirical research. Its assumptions and principles have driven economic thought and analysis for decades, offering valuable insights into economic behavior and market dynamics. As we conclude this exploration, it becomes apparent that while neoclassical economics provides a valuable framework for understanding cer-

tain aspects of economic behavior, it does not encompass the entirety of human decision-making or market interactions. The complexities of human behavior, the presence of imperfections in markets, and the inherent uncertainties in economic environments warrant a more nuanced and multidisciplinary approach to economic analysis. Integrating insights from behavioral economics, institutional economics, and other emerging paradigms into the neoclassical framework might offer a more comprehensive understanding of economic behavior, market dynamics, and policy implications.

Future avenues of research in economics could focus on refining the assumptions within neoclassical economics and incorporating insights from other economic paradigms. Addressing the limitations of perfect rationality, developing models that account for behavioral biases, and exploring the role of institutions in shaping economic behavior could contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of economic phenomena. Neoclassical economics, with its foundational assumptions and concepts, has been instrumental in shaping economic thought and analysis. However, it is crucial to recognize its limitations and incorporate insights from emerging economic paradigms to develop a more comprehensive and multidimensional understanding of economic behavior and market interactions. This multidisciplinary approach could pave the way for more robust economic theories and policy frameworks, offering a more nuanced perspective on economic phenomena and their implications for society.

Funding Information:

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Disclosure Statement:

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Competing Interest:

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Data Availability Statement:

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analysed in this study.

References

- Akansel, I. (2016a). New Institutional Economics (NIE) Origins of Neoliberalism. *China-USA Business Review*, 15(1), 14-32.
- Akansel, I. (2016b). Technology in new institutional economics—comparison of transaction costs in Schumpeter's capitalist development ideology. *The China Business Review*, 15, 64-93.
- Altman, M. (2007). Effort discretion economic agency and behavioral economics: Transforming economic theory and public policy. In *Renaissance in Behavioral Economics* (pp. 105-145): Routledge.
- Altman, M. (2008). Behavioral economics, economic theory and public policy. *Economic Theory and Public Policy* (June 27, 2008).
- Altman, M. (2010). Prospect theory and behavioral finance. *Behavioral Finance: Investors, Corporations, and Markets*, 191-209.
- Altman, M. (2012). Implications of behavioural economics for financial literacy and public policy. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 41(5), 677-690.
- Altman, M. (2013). Hayek's complexity assumption, ecological and bounded rationality, and behavioral economics. In *Hayek and behavioral economics* (pp. 221-262): Springer.
- Altman, M. (2014a). Behavioral economics, thinking processes, decision making, and investment behavior. *Investor behavior: the psychology of financial planning and investing*, 43-61.
- Altman, M. (2014b). Insights from behavioral economics on how labor markets work. Available at SSRN 2467741.
- Altman, M. (2015). *Handbook of contemporary behavioral economics: foundations and developments*: Routledge.
- Altman, M. (2016). A bounded rationality assessment of the new behavioral economics. In *Routledge Handbook of Behavioral Economics* (pp. 179-193): Routledge.

- Altman, M. (2020). Why realism and methodological pluralism matter for robust research and public policy: perspectives from behavioural economics. *International Journal of Pluralism and Economics Education*, 11(2), 130-148.
- Amir, O., & Lobel, O. (2008). Stumble, predict, nudge: How behavioral economics informs law and policy. In: HeinOnline.
- Angner, E., & Loewenstein, G. (2007). Behavioral economics. *Handbook of the philosophy of science: Philosophy of economic*, 641-690.
- Arthur, W. B. (2021). Foundations of complexity economics. *Nature Reviews Physics*, 3(2), 136-145.
- Avineri, E. (2012). On the use and potential of behavioural economics from the perspective of transport and climate change. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 24, 512-521.
- Avtonomov, V., & Avtonomov, Y. (2019). Four Methodenstreits between behavioral and mainstream economics. *Journal of Economic Methodology*, 26(3), 179-194.
- Baddeley, M. (2018). *Behavioural economics and finance*: Routledge.
- Bang, P. F. (2009). The ancient economy and new institutional economics. *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 99, 194-206.
- Beaulier, S., & Caplan, B. (2007). Behavioral economics and perverse effects of the welfare state. *Kyklos*, 60(4), 485-507.
- Beckert, J. (2009). The social order of markets. *Theory and society*, 38, 245-269.
- Beckert, J., & Streeck, W. (2008). Economic sociology and political economy: A programmatic perspective. Available at SSRN 2464458.
- Beder, S. (2011). Environmental economics and ecological economics: the contribution of interdisciplinarity to understanding, influence and effectiveness. *Environmental conservation*, 38(2), 140-150.
- Beerbaum, D., & Puaschunder, J. M. (2018). A Behavioral Economics approach to a Sustainable Finance Architecture–Development of a Sustainability Taxonomy for investor decision usefulness. *Julia M., A Behavioral Economics Approach to a Sustainable Finance Architecture–Development of a Sustainability Taxonomy for Investor Decision Usefulness (October 1, 2018)*.
- Beerbaum, D. O., & Puaschunder, J. M. (2019). A Behavioral Economics Approach to Sustainability Reporting. Available at SSRN 3381607.
- Benfratello, L., & Bachi, E. (2019). Methodological Issues in Neoclassical and Behavioral Economics.
- Berg, N. (2015). Behavioral labor economics. *Handbook of Contemporary Behavioral Economics*, 479-500.
- Berndt, C. (2015). Behavioural economics, experimentalism and the marketization of development. *Economy and Society*, 44(4), 567-591.
- Boeckler, M., & Berndt, C. (2013). Geographies of circulation and exchange III: The great crisis and marketization ‘after markets’. *Progress in Human Geography*, 37(3), 424-432.
- Boettke, P., Caceres, W. Z., & Martin, A. (2013). Error is obvious, coordination is the puzzle. In *Hayek and behavioral economics* (pp. 90-110): Springer.
- Boettke, P. J., & Candela, R. A. (2017). Price theory as prophylactic against popular fallacies. *Journal of Institutional Economics*, 13(3), 725-752.
- Braun, E. (2021). The institutional preconditions of homo economicus. *Journal of Economic Methodology*, 28(2), 231-246.
- Brazelton, W. R., & Whalen, C. J. (2011). Towards a Synthesis of Institutional and Post-Keynesian Economics. *Financial Instability and Economic Security after the Great Recession*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 28-52.
- Brožová, D. (2018). The minimum wage in the neoclassical and the behavioural labour market theory. *Acta Oeconomica Pragensia*, 26(4), 30-41.
- Bruni, L., & Sugden, R. (2007). The road not taken: how psychology was removed from economics, and how it might be brought back. *The Economic Journal*, 117(516), 146-173.
- Brzezicka, J., & Wiśniewski, R. (2014). Homo oeconomicus and behavioral economics. *Contemporary Economics*, 8(4), 353-364.
- Bubb, R., & Pildes, R. H. (2013). How behavioral economics trims its sails and why. *Harv. L. Rev.*, 127, 1593.
- Burnham, T. C. (2013). Toward a neo-Darwinian synthesis of neoclassical and behavioral economics. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 90, S113-S127.
- Canitez, F. (2019). Urban public transport systems from new institutional economics perspective: a literature review. *Transport Reviews*, 39(4), 511-530.
- Chavance, B. (2008). *Institutional economics*: Routledge.
- Chen, S.-H. (2017). *Agent-based computational economics: How the idea originated and where it is going*: Routledge.
- Cohen, B., & Winn, M. I. (2007). Market imperfections, opportunity and sustainable entrepreneurship. *Journal of business venturing*, 22(1), 29-49.
- Cooper, J. C., & Kovacic, W. E. (2012). Behavioral economics: implications for regulatory behavior. *Journal of Regulatory Economics*, 41, 41-58.
- Crotty, J. (2011). *The realism of assumptions does matter: Why Keynes-Minsky theory must replace efficient market theory as the guide to financial regulation policy*. Retrieved from
- Daniels, P. L. (2021). Veblen, North, and the institutional economics on poverty. In *Poverty in Contemporary Economic Thought* (pp. 69-88): Routledge.
- Davis, J. (2017). Is mainstream economics a science bubble? *Review of Political Economy*, 29(4), 523-538.
- Dawnay, E., Shah, H., Dietz, S., Michie, J., & Oughton, C. (2011). Behavioural economics. Seven Key principles for environmental policy. *The Political Economy of the Environment*, 74-97.
- Demeritt, A., & Hoff, K. (2018). The making of behavioral development economics. *History of Political Economy*, 50(S1), 303-322.
- Dequech, D. (2006). The new institutional economics and the theory of behaviour under uncertainty. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 59(1), 109-131.
- Dhimi, S. (2016). *The foundations of behavioral economic analysis*: Oxford University Press.
- Dohmen, T. (2014). Behavioral labor economics: Advances and future directions. *Labour Economics*, 30, 71-85.
- Dold, M. F., & Schubert, C. (2018). Toward a behavioral foundation of normative economics. *Review of Behavioral Economics*, 5(3-4), 221-241.
- Dolderer, J., Felber, C., & Teitscheid, P. (2021). From neoclassical economics to common good economics. *Sustainability*, 13(4), 2093.
- Driscoll, J. C., & Holden, S. (2014). Behavioral economics and macroeconomic models. *Journal of macroeconomics*, 41, 133-147.

- Dunning, R. J. (2017). Competing notions of search for home: behavioural economics and housing markets. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 34(1), 21-37.
- Ellison, S. (2014). Attack of the cyborgs: Economic imperialism and the human deficit in educational policy-making & research. *Journal of Educational Controversy*, 8(1), 7.
- Elsnor, W., Heinrich, T., & Schwardt, H. (2014). *The microeconomics of complex economies: Evolutionary, institutional, neoclassical, and complexity perspectives*: Academic Press.
- Epstein, R. A. (2007). The neoclassical economics of consumer contracts. *Minn. L. Rev.*, 92, 803.
- EREN, M. (2018). INSTITUTIONAL ECONOMICS. *Selected Studies on Economics and Finance*, 57.
- Faure, M. G., & Luth, H. A. (2011). Behavioural economics in unfair contract terms: Cautions and considerations. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 34, 337-358.
- Fehr, E., Goette, L., & Zehnder, C. (2007). The behavioral economics of the labor market: Central findings and their policy implications. *Unpublished manuscript, Boston Federal Reserve*.
- Felin, T., & Foss, N. J. (2009). Social reality, the boundaries of self-fulfilling prophecy, and economics. *Organization Science*, 20(3), 654-668.
- Fine, B., Johnston, D., Santos, A. C., & Van Waeyenberge, E. (2016). Nudging or fudging: The world development report 2015. *Development and Change*, 47(4), 640-663.
- Fontana, M. (2010). Can neoclassical economics handle complexity? The fallacy of the oil spot dynamic. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 76(3), 584-596.
- Foster, J. (2006). Why is economics not a complex systems science? *Journal of Economic Issues*, 40(4), 1069-1091.
- Foster, J., & Metcalfe, J. S. (2012). Economic emergence: An evolutionary economic perspective. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 82(2-3), 420-432.
- Frantz, R. (2019). *The Beginnings of Behavioral Economics: Katona, Simon, and Leibenstein's X-efficiency Theory*: Academic Press.
- Frederiks, E. R., Stenner, K., & Hobman, E. V. (2015). Household energy use: Applying behavioural economics to understand consumer decision-making and behaviour. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 41, 1385-1394.
- Frerichs, S. (2011). False promises? A sociological critique of the behavioural turn in law and economics. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 34, 289-314.
- Frerichs, S. (2018). What is the 'social' in behavioural economics? The methodological underpinnings of governance by nudges. In *Research Methods in Consumer Law* (pp. 399-440): Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Frerichs, S. (2021). Putting behavioural economics in its place: the new realism of law, economics and psychology and its alternatives. *N. Ir. Legal Q.*, 72, 651.
- Furubotn, E. G., & Richter, R. (2008). The new institutional economics—a different approach to economic analysis. *Economic Affairs*, 28(3), 15-23.
- Furubotn, E. G., & Richter, R. (2010). *The new institutional economics of markets*: Citeseer.
- Gallagher, S., Mastrogiorgio, A., & Petracca, E. (2019). Economic reasoning and interaction in socially extended market institutions. *Frontiers in psychology*, 10, 1856.
- Ghisellini, F., & Chang, B. Y. (2018). *Behavioral economics: Moving forward*: Springer.
- Gillingham, K., & Palmer, K. (2014). Bridging the energy efficiency gap: Policy insights from economic theory and empirical evidence. *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy*.
- Gowdy, J. M. (2008). Behavioral economics and climate change policy. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 68(3-4), 632-644.
- Granovetter, M. (2018). Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. In *The sociology of economic life* (pp. 22-45): Routledge.
- Guzavicius, A., Gižienė, V., & Žalgirytė, L. (2015). Education as public good: Behavioral economics approach. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 191, 884-889.
- Harstad, R. M., & Selten, R. (2013). Bounded-rationality models: tasks to become intellectually competitive. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 51(2), 496-511.
- Heukelom, F. (2014). *Behavioral economics: A history*: Cambridge University Press.
- Ho, T. H., Lim, N., & Camerer, C. F. (2006). Modeling the psychology of consumer and firm behavior with behavioral economics. *Journal of marketing Research*, 43(3), 307-331.
- Hobman, E. V., Frederiks, E. R., Stenner, K., & Meikle, S. (2016). Uptake and usage of cost-reflective electricity pricing: Insights from psychology and behavioural economics. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 57, 455-467.
- Hodgson, G. M. (2007a). Evolutionary and institutional economics as the new mainstream? *Evolutionary and Institutional Economics Review*, 4, 7-25.
- Hodgson, G. M. (2007b). The revival of Veblenian institutional economics. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 41(2), 324-340.
- Hodgson, G. M. (2009). Institutional economics into the twenty-first century. *Studi e Note di Economia*, 14(1), 3-26.
- Hodgson, G. M. (2014). On fuzzy frontiers and fragmented foundations: some reflections on the original and new institutional economics. *Journal of Institutional Economics*, 10(4), 591-611.
- Holcombe, R. G. (2009). The behavioral foundations of Austrian economics. *The Review of Austrian Economics*, 22, 301-313.
- Holden, S. (2012). Implications of insights from behavioral economics for macroeconomic models.
- Holt, R. P., Rosser Jr, J. B., & Colander, D. (2011). The complexity era in economics. *Review of Political Economy*, 23(3), 357-369.
- Hursh, S. R., & Roma, P. G. (2013). Behavioral economics and empirical public policy. *Journal of the experimental analysis of behavior*, 99(1), 98-124.
- Jabbar, H. (2011). The behavioral economics of education: New directions for research. *Educational Researcher*, 40(9), 446-453.
- Jefferson, T., & King, J. (2010). Can Post Keynesians make better use of behavioral economics? *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics*, 33(2), 211-234.
- Joskow, P. L. (2008). Introduction to new institutional economics: A report card. *New institutional economics: A guidebook*, 1-19.
- Kanev, D., & Terziev, V. (2017). Behavioral economics: development, condition and perspectives. *IJASOS-International E-Journal of Advances in Social Sciences*, 3(8).

- Kao, Y.-F., & Velupillai, K. V. (2015). Behavioural economics: Classical and modern. *The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought*, 22(2), 236-271.
- Kasper, W., Streit, M. E., & Boettke, P. J. (2012). *Institutional economics: Property, competition, policies*: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Kaufman, A., & Englander, E. (2011). Behavioral economics, federalism, and the triumph of stakeholder theory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 102, 421-438.
- Kaufman, B. E. (2006). The institutional theory of John R. Commons: Foundation for a heterodox labor economics. *Commons: Foundation for a Heterodox Labor Economics (February 2006). Andrew Young School Research Paper*(06-02).
- Kaufman, B. E. (2007). The institutional economics of John R. Commons: complement and substitute for neoclassical economic theory. *Socio-Economic Review*, 5(1), 3-45.
- Kaufman, B. E. (2015). Integrating emotions into economic theory. *Handbook of Contemporary Behavioral Economics*, 100-120.
- Kaufman, B. E. (2018). The institutional and neoclassical schools in labor economics. *The Institutional Tradition in Labor Economics*, 13-38.
- Keita, L. (2012). Revealed Preference Theory, Rationality, and Neoclassical economics: science or ideology. *Africa Development*, 37(4), 73-116-173-116.
- Kirman, A. (2010). *Complex economics: individual and collective rationality*: Routledge.
- Kirsten, J. F., Karaan, A. M., & Dorward, A. R. (2009). Introduction to the Economics of Institutions. *Institutional economics perspectives on African agricultural development*, 35-74.
- Kremer, M., Rao, G., & Schilbach, F. (2019). Behavioral development economics. In *Handbook of Behavioral Economics: Applications and Foundations 1* (Vol. 2, pp. 345-458): Elsevier.
- Lefevre, A.-F., & Chapman, M. (2017). Behavioural economics and financial consumer protection.
- Leslie, C. R. (2013). Can Antitrust Law Incorporate Insights from Behavioral Economics? *Tex. L. Rev. See Also*, 92, 53.
- Levin, S. A., & Lo, A. W. (2021). Introduction to PNAS special issue on evolutionary models of financial markets. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(26), e2104800118.
- Lieberherr, E. (2009). *Policy relevance of new institutional economics? Assessing efficiency, legitimacy and effectiveness*. Retrieved from
- Lim, D. (2017). Retooling the patent-antitrust intersection: Insights from behavioral economics. *Baylor L. Rev.*, 69, 124.
- Lo, A. W. (2007). Efficient markets hypothesis.
- Lund, H., & Hvelplund, F. (2012). The economic crisis and sustainable development: The design of job creation strategies by use of concrete institutional economics. *Energy*, 43(1), 192-200.
- Lunn, P. D. (2012). Behavioural economics and policymaking: Learning from the early adopters. *The Economic and Social Review*, 43(3, Autumn), 423-449-423-449.
- Lutzenhiser, L. (2009). Behavioral assumptions underlying California residential sector energy efficiency programs.
- MacFadyen, A. J. (2015). Beliefs in behavioral and neoclassical economics. In *Handbook of Contemporary Behavioral Economics* (pp. 205-223): Routledge.
- Madra, Y. M. (2007). *Late neoclassical economics: Restoration of theoretical humanism in contemporary mainstream economics*: University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Madra, Y. M. (2016). *Late Neoclassical Economics: The restoration of theoretical humanism in contemporary economic theory*: Routledge.
- Madrian, B. C. (2014). Applying insights from behavioral economics to policy design. *Annu. Rev. Econ.*, 6(1), 663-688.
- Manne, G. A., & Zywicki, T. J. (2013). Uncertainty, evolution and behavioral economic theory. *JL Econ. & Pol'y*, 10, 555.
- Manner, M., & Gowdy, J. (2010). The evolution of social and moral behavior: evolutionary insights for public policy. *Ecological economics*, 69(4), 753-761.
- Marinescu, A. (2016a). Axiomatiical examination of the neoclassical economic model. Logical assessment of the assumptions of neoclassical economic model. *Theoretical & Applied Economics*, 23(2).
- Marinescu, A. (2016b). Human nature in the economic behavior based on the neoclassical economic model. *Theoretical & Applied Economics*, 23(4).
- Markey-Towler, B. (2019). The new microeconomics: A psychological, institutional, and evolutionary paradigm with neoclassical economics as a special case. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 78(1), 95-135.
- Mazur-Wierzbička, E. (2018). *Mainstream Economics Versus Behavioral Economics—A Contribution to Reflection*. Paper presented at the Problems, Methods and Tools in Experimental and Behavioral Economics: Computational Methods in Experimental Economics (CMEE) 2017 Conference.
- McChesney, F. S. (2013). Behavioral economics: Old wine in irrelevant new bottles? *Supreme Court Economic Review*, 21(1), 43-76.
- McKenzie, R. B. (2009). *Predictably rational?: in search of defenses for rational behavior in economics*: Springer Science & Business Media.
- McKenzie, R. B. (2018). *A Brain-Focused Foundation for Economic Science: A Proposed Reconciliation Between Neoclassical and Behavioral Economics*: Springer.
- McMahan, J. (2015). Behavioral economics as neoliberalism: Producing and governing homo economicus. *Contemporary Political Theory*, 14, 137-158.
- Menard, C., & Shirley, M. M. (2012). New institutional economics: From early intuitions to a new paradigm. In: Citeseer.
- Ménard, C., & Shirley, M. M. (2014a). The contribution of Douglass North to new institutional economics. *Institutions, property rights, and economic growth: the legacy of Douglass North*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 11-29.
- Ménard, C., & Shirley, M. M. (2014b). The future of new institutional economics: from early intuitions to a new paradigm? *Journal of Institutional Economics*, 10(4), 541-565.
- Mendola, M. (2007). Farm household production theories: a review of “institutional” and “behavioral” responses. *Asian Development Review*, 24(01), 49-68.
- Meramveliotakis, G. (2020). Surveying the methodological and analytical foundations of the new institutional economics: A critical comparison with neoclassical and (old) institutional economics. *Economic and Business Review*, 22(3), 2.
- Meramveliotakis, G. (2021). The issue of efficiency and the role of state in New Institutional Economics: A Critical Perspective. *New Political Economy*, 26(1), 138-151.
- Minniti, M., & Lévesque, M. (2008). Recent developments in the economics of entrepreneurship. *Journal of business venturing*, 23(6), 603-612.

- North, D. C. (2010). Economics and cognitive science. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(5), 7371-7376.
- North, D. C. (2016). Institutions and economic theory. *The American Economist*, 61(1), 72-76.
- Obregón, C. (2018). Beyond behavioral economics: who is the economic man.
- Oliver, A. (2013). From nudging to budgeting: using behavioural economics to inform public sector policy. *Journal of social policy*, 42(4), 685-700.
- Ónday, Ó. (2016). Organizational economics theory: from theory of firm of Jensen & Meckling to business transactions of Rubin. In: Behavior.
- ORHAN, S. (2016). In the new institutional economics approach R. Coase and Law, D. North and social psychology context: pluralist approach opportunities in economics. *Sosyoekonomi*, 24(28), 189-208.
- Parks, S., & Gowdy, J. (2013). What have economists learned about valuing nature? A review essay. *Ecosystem Services*, 3, e1-e10.
- Pech, W., & Milan, M. (2009). Behavioral economics and the economics of Keynes. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 38(6), 891-902.
- Pejovich, S. (2006). The effects of the interaction of formal and informal institutions on social stability and economic development. *Institutions, Globalisation and Empowerment*, 56.
- Pollitt, M. G., & Shaorshadze, I. (2013). The role of behavioural economics in energy and climate policy. In *Handbook on energy and climate change* (pp. 523-546): Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Prechter Jr, R. R., & Parker, W. D. (2007). The financial/economic dichotomy in social behavioral dynamics: the socionomic perspective. *The Journal of Behavioral Finance*, 8(2), 84-108.
- Primrose, D. (2017). The subjectification of 'homo economicus' in behavioural economics. *Journal of Australian Political Economy*, 56(80), 88-128.
- Pykett, J. (2013). Neurocapitalism and the new neuros: using neuroeconomics, behavioural economics and picoeconomics for public policy. *Journal of economic geography*, 13(5), 845-869.
- Rafiqi, P. S. (2009). Evolving economic landscapes: why new institutional economics matters for economic geography. *Journal of economic geography*, 9(3), 329-353.
- Richter, R. (2008). On the New Institutional Economics of Markets. *Bielefeld University: Bielefeld, Germany*.
- Richter, R. (2015). *Essays on new institutional economics*: Springer.
- Richter, R., & Richter, R. (2015). *German "Ordnungstheorie" from the perspective of the new institutional economics*: Springer.
- Rischkowsky, F., & Döring, T. (2008). Consumer policy in a market economy considerations from the perspective of the economics of information, the new institutional economics as well as behavioural economics. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 31, 285-313.
- Ritsatos, T. (2014). Tax evasion and compliance; from the neo classical paradigm to behavioural economics, a review. *Journal of Accounting & Organizational Change*, 10(2), 244-262.
- Ross, D. (2014). Psychological versus economic models of bounded rationality. *Journal of Economic Methodology*, 21(4), 411-427.
- Rossiaud, S., & Locatelli, C. (2010). Institutional economics. *Polinares W/P*, September.
- Samson, A. (2016). The behavioral economics guide 2016 (with an introduction by Gerd Gigerenzer). In: Behavioral Science Solutions Ltd.
- Schmid, A. A. (2008). *Conflict and cooperation: institutional and behavioral economics*: John Wiley & Sons.
- Schnellenbach, J., & Schubert, C. (2015). Behavioral political economy: A survey. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 40, 395-417.
- Schwartz, H. H. (2007). A introduction to behavioral economics: The complicating but sometimes critical considerations. Available at SSRN 960222.
- Scricciu, S., Rezai, A., & Mechler, R. (2013). On the economic foundations of green growth discourses: the case of climate change mitigation and macroeconomic dynamics in economic modeling. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Energy and Environment*, 2(3), 251-268.
- Shogren, J. (2012). Behavioural economics and environmental incentives.
- Shogren, J. F., & Taylor, L. O. (2008). On behavioral-environmental economics. *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy*.
- Shughart, W. F., Thomas, D. W., & Thomas, M. D. (2020). Institutional change and the importance of understanding shared mental models. *Kyklos*, 73(3), 371-391.
- Söderbaum, P. (2016). Behavioral Concepts as Part of a Participative Political Economics Perspective. *New Perspectives for Environmental Policies Through Behavioral Economics*, 147-158.
- Sontheimer, K. (2015). Behavioral versus neoclassical economics: Paradigm shift or generalization? In *Handbook of Contemporary Behavioral Economics* (pp. 259-278): Routledge.
- Sornette, D. (2014). Physics and financial economics (1776–2014): puzzles, Ising and agent-based models. *Reports on progress in physics*, 77(6), 062001.
- Soti, R. (2020). Exploring economic theory: A comprehensive literature review. *International Journal of Science and Research Archive*, 1(1), 069-076.
- Spithoven, A. (2019). Similarities and dissimilarities between original institutional economics and new institutional economics. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 53(2), 440-447.
- Stucke, M. E. (2006). Behavioral economists at the gate: Antitrust in the twenty-first century. *Loy. U. Chi. L.J.*, 38, 513.
- Stucke, M. E. (2010). Money, Is That What I Want: Competition Policy and the Role of Behavioral Economics. *Santa Clara L. Rev.*, 50, 893.
- Stucke, M. E. (2014). How can competition agencies use behavioral economics? *The Antitrust Bulletin*, 59(4), 695-742.
- Sugden, R. (2018). *The community of advantage: A behavioural economist's defence of the market*: Oxford University Press.
- Tauheed, L. F. (2011). A proposed methodological synthesis of post-Keynesian and institutional economics. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 45(4), 819-838.
- Teraji, S. (2018). *The cognitive basis of institutions: A synthesis of behavioral and institutional economics*: Academic Press.
- Thaler, R. H. (2016). Behavioral economics: Past, present, and future. *American economic review*, 106(7), 1577-1600.
- Thaler, R. H. (2018). From cashews to nudges: The evolution of behavioral economics. *American economic review*, 108(6), 1265-1287.
- Tisdell, C. A. (2009). *Resource and environmental economics: modern issues and applications* (Vol. 7): World Scientific Publishing Company.
- Tomer, J. F. (2007). What is behavioral economics? *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 36(3), 463-479.
- Tomer, J. F. (2017). *Advanced introduction to behavioral economics*: Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Tor, A. (2018). Should Antitrust Survive Behavioral Economics? *Forthcoming in CPI Antitrust Chronicle, Notre Dame Legal Studies Paper*(1919).
- Tremblay, V. J., & Tremblay, C. H. (2012). *New perspectives on industrial organization: With contributions from behavioral economics and game theory*: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Tuyon, J., & Ahmad, Z. (2016). Behavioural finance perspectives on Malaysian stock market efficiency. *Borsa Istanbul Review*, 16(1), 43-61.
- Urbina, D. A., & Ruiz-Villaverde, A. (2019). A critical review of homo economicus from five approaches. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 78(1), 63-93.
- Van de Ven, A. H., & Lifschitz, A. (2013). Rational and reasonable microfoundations of markets and institutions. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 27(2), 156-172.
- Vatn, A. (2007). *Institutions and the Environment*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Venkatachalam, L. (2008). Behavioral economics for environmental policy. *Ecological economics*, 67(4), 640-645.
- Verboven, K. (2015). The knights who say NIE. Can neo-institutional economics live up to its expectation in ancient history research. *Structure and Performance in the Roman Economy. Models, Methods and Case Studies*, 350, 33-57.
- Wade, R. (2009). Beware what you wish for: lessons for international political economy from the transformation of economics. *Review of International Political Economy*, 16(1), 106-121.
- Wang, G. G., & Dobbs, R. L. (2008). Institutional economics and human resource development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 10(6), 770-787.
- Weimer, D. L. (2017). *Behavioral economics for cost-benefit analysis: benefit validity when sovereign consumers seem to make mistakes*: Cambridge University Press.
- Wildman, S. S. (2006). Paradigms and analytical frameworks in modern economics and media economics. *Handbook of media management and economics*, 67-90.
- Wilkinson, N., & Klaes, M. (2017). *An introduction to behavioral economics*: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Wolff, R. D., & Resnick, S. A. (2012). *Contending economic theories: neoclassical, Keynesian, and Marxian*: MIT Press.
- Wright, J. D. (2006). Behavioral law and economics, paternalism, and consumer contracts: An empirical perspective. *NYUJL & Liberty*, 2, 470.
- Yoon, M., & Lee, K. (2009). Agent-based and “history-friendly” models for explaining industrial evolution. *Evolutionary and Institutional Economics Review*, 6, 45-70.
- Zalega, T. (2014). Behavioural Economics as a New Trend in Modern Economics. *An Overview (Ekonomia behawioraln jako nowy nurt ekonomii - zarys problematyki)*, Research Reports, University of Warsaw, Faculty of Management, vol. 1(18), pages 7-25.

© 2022, Author(s).

This open access publication is distributed under Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) License.



You are free to:

Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format.

Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material.

However,

Attribution — You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made.

Non-Commercial — You may not use the material for commercial purposes.

Share Alike — If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you must distribute your contributions under the same license.

You shall not apply legal terms or technological measures that legally restrict others from doing anything the license permits.

There are no additional restrictions.