Political economy is theory of interests. Subject of contemporary political economy should be interests of contemporary classes and groups, and the science should work by contemporary methods. One of these classes is academic workers (of science and higher education). In Russia we have 400-500 thousands of academic workers. Contemporary method of economy science is system I-O analysis first of all.

Scenario conditions for 'uklad' of academic workers includes “life cycle” table, here a row of meaningful events of family life (demography and career events, etc.). In Russia life cycle information is collected with demography statistics. One can clarify it by sociological observation of the grope.

Ground layer of the model is I-O table for academic workers ‘uklad’. For some form of family activities (consumption) S-U table exist (income-expenditure balans). But decomposition S-U table into I-O is complicated because even set of forms of activity (“industries”) have not been work out yet. We can suppose that consumption activity of family consists from 400-500 forms. But we can't eliminate this number to be set for every year activity as well as set for all life cycle. Next, big number of forms makes structure empirically not observable. Rosstat work out 45-48 thousands consumption budgets, and only 300-500 budgets belong to analysing grope. On the other hand, aggregation into low number forms of activity (10-15) generates danger of forecasting power loose. For instance, cellphone introducing in Russia in the early 2000th is a fraction activity, but it forecasting was meaningful for economy just right.

Additionally, productive activity of family ought to be taken in viev. As we analyse academic workers, we need to solve problem of observation of results of scientific and educational activities. However, possible the problem will solve itself in main when substantiated forms of productive activity will be setted. Another possibility is of composition-decomposition technique.


Top layer consist in structure of interest properly. This is the contradiction of benefits and expenses as analysing class evaluate them. We suppose for Russian academy workers these contradiction to be of labour character (by A.V.Chayanoff): (limit) disutility of labour contradicts against (limit) utility of income. On the one hand, differential change in intensity of labour produce (differential) change in tension of needs. Tension of needs increase, and that is disutility of labour properly. On the other hand, change in intensity of labour produce (differential) change in income, and by that change ability of family to enjoy needs (limit utility of income). Alternative hypothesis would be: a) academicians are interested in maximal income (refuted); b) academicians have interest of rantier (investor).

In the early XX A.V.Chayanoff verified his hypothesis (labour character of interest of Russian farmers) with the effects of family size. In XXI labour interest hypothesis verifying effect would be threshold change in activity structure of academy workers. Throw first decade Russian academy workers get near five time rise of wage. Consequently all the class get possibility fulfil but direct training activity only, also methodical study, some investigation activity, etc. Academicians evaluate results of work upon “3rd generation of educational standards” with “sharp self-critic”. But 10 years
ago one can’t think about time expenditure 2008-2011 for than methodical studies. With existing organisation research and critic activity is almost impossible for Russian academicians. Further rise of wage will made them possible – first research, second critic. For the Science reverse order is desirable.

Also pure sociological features of interests are observable: motivational system of group, labour ethics, labour satisfaction, etc.