

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NATIONAL CULTURES AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF CREATIVE AND INNOVATIVE ENTREPRENEURSHIP

DUBINA I.N.¹

doctor of Economic Sciences, professor

RAKHMETULINA ZH.B.*²

candidate of Economic Sciences, professor

APYSHEVA A.A.³

candidate of Economic Sciences, Ass. Professor

ZHANABERGENOVA M.A.⁴

Doctor PhD

¹Altai State University, Barnaul, Russia

²L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan

³Sarsen Amanzholov East Kazakhstan University, Ust-Kamenogorsk, Kazakhstan

⁴Export promotion Department JSC QazTrade, Astana, Kazakhstan

ABSTRACT. The article is devoted to analyzing the influence of national cultures on the development of creative and innovative entrepreneurship. Culture, as a multifaceted phenomenon, exerts a significant impact on the values, norms, and behavior of individuals and organizations, shaping approaches to creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship. This influence is particularly evident at the level of national culture, where different cultures emphasize and implement various aspects of creativity and innovation.

Special attention is given to the relatively underexplored aspects of this influence on business processes and management practices in the context of differences between "Western" and "Eastern" cultures. The study employs G. Hofstede's cultural dimensions model to explain culturally driven variations in creative and innovative styles. The article presents a generalized overview of differences in the understanding and practice of creativity in "Western" and "Eastern" cultural contexts.

The authors demonstrate that national cultures can both facilitate and constrain the development of creative and innovative activities, influencing the perception and implementation of entrepreneurial initiatives.

KEYWORDS: national cultures, creativity, innovation, entrepreneurship, Hofstede's model, cultural differences.

ВЗАИМОСВЯЗЬ НАЦИОНАЛЬНЫХ КУЛЬТУР И РАЗВИТИЯ КРЕАТИВНОГО И ИННОВАЦИОННОГО ПРЕДПРИНИМАТЕЛЬСТВАМ

ДУБИНА И.Н.¹

доктор экономических наук, профессор

РАХМЕТУЛИНА Ж.Б.*²

кандидат экономических наук, профессор

АПЫШЕВА А.А.³

кандидат экономических наук, асс. профессор

ЖАНАБЕРГЕНОВА М.А.⁴

Доктор PhD

¹Алтайский государственный университет, Барнаул, Россия

²Евразийский национальный университет имени Л.Н. Гумилева, Астана, Казахстан

³Восточно-Казахстанский университет имени Сарсена Аманжолова, Усть-Каменогорск, Казахстан

⁴Департамент продвижения экспорта АО QazTrade, Астана, Казахстан

АННОТАЦИЯ. Статья посвящена анализу влияния национальных культур на развитие креативного и инновационного предпринимательства. Культура, как многогранное явление, оказывает значительное влияние на ценности, нормы и поведение как индивидов, так и организаций, определяя подходы к креативности, инновациям и предпринимательству. Такое влияние проявляется в том числе и на уровне национальной культуры. В частности, различные культуры акцентируют и реализуют различные аспекты креативности и инновационности.

Особое внимание уделяется малоизученным аспектам данного влияния на бизнес-процессы и управленческие практики в контексте различий между «западными» и «восточными» культурами. В исследовании используется модель «размерностей культуры» Г.Хофстеде для объяснения культурно обусловленных различий в стилях творчества и инновационности. В статье в обобщенной форме представлены различия в понимании и практики креативности в «западных и восточных» культурах.

Авторы показывают, что национальные культуры способны как способствовать, так и сдерживать развитие креативной и инновационной активности, влияя на восприятие и реализацию предпринимательских инициатив.

КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА: национальные культуры, креативность, инновации, предпринимательство, модель Хофстеде, культурные различия.

ҰЛТТЫҚ МӘДЕНИЕТТЕРДІҢ БАЙЛАНЫСЫ ЖӘНЕ ШЫҒАРМАШЫЛЫҚ-ИННОВАЦИЯЛЫҚ КӘСІПКЕРЛІКТІ ДАМУ

ДУБИНА И.Н.¹

экономика ғылымдарының докторы, профессор

РАХМЕТУЛИНА Ж.Б.^{*2}

экономика ғылымдарының кандидаты, профессор

АПЫШЕВА А.А.³

экономика ғылымдарының кандидаты, асс. профессор

ЖАНАБЕРГЕНОВА М.А.⁴

Доктор PhD

¹Алтай мемлекеттік университеті, Барнаул, Ресей

²Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті, Астана, Қазақстан

³Сәрсен Аманжолов атындағы Шығыс Қазақстан университеті, Өскемен, Қазақстан

⁴«QazTrade» АҚ Экспортты жылжыту департаменті, Астана, Қазақстан

АНДАТПА. Мақала шығармашылық және инновациялық кәсіпкерлікті дамытуға ұлттық мәдениеттердің әсерін талдауға арналған. Мәдениет көп қырлы құбылыс ретінде жеке тұлғалардың да, ұйымдардың да құндылықтарына, нормаларына және мінез-құлқына елеулі әсер етеді, шығармашылыққа, инновацияға және кәсіпкерлікке көзқарастарды анықтайды. Бұл әсер ұлттық мәдениет деңгейінде де көрінеді. Атап айтқанда, әртүрлі мәдениеттер шығармашылық пен инновацияның әртүрлі аспектілеріне баса назар аударады және жүзеге асырады.

«Батыс» және «шығыс» мәдениеттері арасындағы айырмашылықтар контекстінде бизнес-процестер мен басқару тәжірибесіне әсер етудің аз зерттелген аспектілеріне ерекше назар аударылады. Зерттеу шығармашылық пен инновация стильдеріндегі мәдени анықталған айырмашылықтарды түсіндіру үшін Г.Хофстедедің «мәдениет өлшемдері» моделін пайдаланады. Мақалада «Батыс және Шығыс» мәдениеттеріндегі шығармашылықты түсіну мен тәжірибедегі айырмашылықтар жинақталған.

Авторлар ұлттық мәдениеттер кәсіпкерлік бастамаларды қабылдауға және жүзеге асыруға әсер ете отырып, шығармашылық және инновациялық белсенділікті дамытуға ықпал ете де, тежеу де мүмкін екенін көрсетеді.

ТҮЙІН СӨЗДЕР: ұлттық мәдениеттер, шығармашылық, инновация, кәсіпкерлік, Хофстед үлгісі, мәдени айырмашылықтар.

INTRODUCTION. National culture is a system of values and behavioral traits that characterize the people of a specific country and distinguish their behavior from that of individuals in other nations [1]. This understanding of national culture is subject to criticism, as it implicitly uses national

borders as a defining criterion. Additionally, it raises questions about homogeneous versus heterogeneous cultures, the stability of cultural values, and related issues [2]. There are relationships between four indicators related to economic development - the Global Innovation

Index (GII), the Global Entrepreneurship Index (GEI), the Global Creativity Index (GCI) and the Bloomberg 50 Most Innovative Countries (B50) [3]. It is important to highlight that the influence of cultural attributes on innovation has diminished in recent years, particularly in developing countries. It is highly probable that, without the establishment of appropriate systems, cultural development or transformation alone cannot significantly enhance the innovation outcomes in these nations [4].

The article consists of two main sections. The first section examines the influence of national cultures on creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship, using the so-called "Western" and "Eastern" cultural division [5]. While this distinction is somewhat stereotypical, it nevertheless reflects real cultural differences. The second section focuses on the characteristics of national cultures, measured through Hofstede's cultural dimensions model, and their impact on various aspects of creativity, innovation, entrepreneurship, and management practices.

MATERIAL AND METHODS OF RESEARCH.

Culture is one of the fundamental determinants of human behavior and one of the most complex terms to define [6]. Among the hundreds of definitions of culture, the following stand out [2]:

- A shared system of values, beliefs, customs, and rules that determine how people can and should interact with each other;
- A socially transmitted set of behavioral standards and norms;
- "The collective programming of the mind" (G. Hofstede), which distinguishes the members of one social group from another.

It is possible to identify several "levels of culture," as individuals simultaneously belong to various cultural layers: national, gender, generational, organizational, professional, and others. Each level exerts a specific influence on the behavior of individuals within the corresponding cultural context [1].

Human behavior is shaped by cultural values, as people's choices reflect their values and perceptions of acceptable behavior [7]. Thus, it can be hypothesized (a hypothesis partially supported by empirical evidence) that if cultural values foster creativity, innovation, entrepreneurship, and similar traits among individuals within a specific national culture, then different cultures and nations may exhibit varying degrees of creativity, innovativeness, and entrepreneurial activity.

The most common (albeit conditional and stereotypical) differentiation of national cultures is the division into "Western" and "Eastern" cultures. For instance, it is often suggested that the "West" is more creative than the "East," that the "West" creates while the "East" copies, and so on [8]. Despite its generalization, this dichotomy reflects certain distinctions in national cultures and their influence on human behavior, including perceptions of creativity. These differences are particularly evident in educational practices. For example, the definitions and attributes of creativity vary significantly between "Western" and "Eastern" cultures. Originality and humor, as components of creativity, are predominantly valued and cultivated in "Western" cultures but are almost absent in "Eastern" cultures [8].

In "Western" cultures, creativity is understood as the ability and process of producing a product that is both novel and contextually significant (referring to an observable product that can be evaluated). A creative outcome is characterized as:

1. New and useful (e.g., a novel solution to a complex business problem)
2. Understandable and reproducible, implying that creativity can be taught.

This conceptualization of the creative process—as a sequential progression toward a new stage, followed by evaluation of the results—aligns with "Western" cosmology [9, 10].

In contrast, "Eastern" cultures perceive creativity more as intellectual and aesthetic modification, adaptation, interpretation, and similar activities, reflecting "Eastern" cosmology, where the creation of the world is viewed as a continuous and ongoing process. For example, in Chinese tradition, creativity is traditionally understood as following the Tao ("The Way"). Creativity is not aimed at creating something new but at discerning the appropriate action in response to a situation in alignment with the Tao. Invention is traditionally regarded as imitation (including imitation of nature), based on the belief that "there is nothing that has not already been created" [10].

In the process of research, when solving theoretical problems, general scientific research methods were used, such as the method of systems analysis, abstract-logical, comparative analysis, etc.

RESULTS AND THEIR DISCUSSION. A comparable distinction can be identified at

Table 1 - Differences in Elements of Management Systems for Innovation in Japan and the U.S.

Element	Japan	USA
Problem statement	Key element: involving employees in identifying problems at an early stage	Not enough time to look for problems; "firefighting mode"; focus on the solution, not the problem
Encouraging suggestions	Each suggestion is encouraged (from \$5), and effective suggestions are rewarded (up to \$10,000)	Only "strong ideas" are encouraged
Motivational factors	Feeling of importance, recognition and growth	Money
Employee involvement in generating new ideas	Company development is everyone's business	Mostly employees of specialized departments (R&D, marketing, etc.)
Main tasks	Continuous improvement	Breakthrough (new products, methods, cost reduction, profit increase, etc.)
Communications	"Employee - group and manager"	"Employee-manage"
Idea collection system	Group discussion	"Idea box"
Number of new suggestions	On average, 50 suggestions per year from an employee	On average, 2 suggestions per year from an employee

Source: compiled by the authors based on [11, 12,13]

the level of national cultures [11]. For example, most fundamentally new ideas and businesses originate in the United States, while the majority of "improvement" inventions are made in Japan, often based on "Western" ideas. The U.S. is known for conducting key fundamental research and defining "breakthrough" scientific directions, whereas Japan excels at successfully advancing new ideas to technological and commercial levels. American companies are highly successful at inventing new products and services, while Japanese companies excel at refining and bringing them to market [11].

A comparison of the elements and characteristics of the management systems for innovation and innovativeness in Japan and the U.S. is presented in Table 1.

In a generalized form, the differences in the understanding and practice of creativity in "Western and Eastern" cultures are presented in Table 2.

Some researchers link the significant

differences in the understanding of creativity to the philosophical foundations of "Western" and "Eastern" cultures, specifically the Socratic and Confucian traditions [11]. Socrates taught that the primary values and priorities are self-knowledge, self-determination, rationality, differing viewpoints, and discussion (as intellectual competition). In contrast, Confucian teaching emphasizes that the family is the prototype of any social organization, and a person is, first and foremost, a family member rather than an individual. Therefore, people must overcome their individuality and maintain harmony within society.

Confucianism is associated with a characteristic feature of "Eastern" cultures—a sharp sense of pride or shame for the success or failure of members of one's social group. These cultures are often referred to as "shame-based" cultures. The desire to avoid "losing face" is one of the primary motivators of behavior in Asian countries. Consequently, there may be a decrease in the

Table 2 - "Western" and "Eastern" views on creativity

Attributes of creativity in "Western" cultures	Attributes of creativity in "Eastern" cultures
Change, rejection of traditions Discontinuity Revolutionary Fast, effective process Individualism Expressiveness Logicity and methodicalness Pragmatism	Respect, consistency with traditions Continuity Evolutionary Slow process, requiring constant persistent work and based on knowledge Collectivity Restraint Intuitiveness and repeatability Social utility

Source: compiled by the authors based on [11, 13]

social status of entrepreneurs and a diminished interest in entrepreneurial professions [9].

Culture "promotes" certain types of activities by attributing them varying degrees of social status and recognition [14]. For instance:

- The social status of an entrepreneur differs significantly between the United States and Kazakhstan.
- The social status of a teacher varies greatly between Kazakhstan and Japan.
- The social status of a politician is markedly different in Kazakhstan and China.

As a result, corresponding educational programs hold different levels of appeal in different cultures.

Different cultures have developed distinct educational priorities. In "Western" cultures, these priorities emphasize individuality, originality, independence, and self-determination, which are expected and encouraged. Western educational systems produce individuals focused on novelty and efficiency. A "Western" student tends to value openness, originality, immediate effectiveness, entrepreneurship, and paradigm shifts.

In "Eastern" cultures, educational priorities focus on tradition, social order, cooperation, family, social groups, persistent hard work, and a solid foundation of knowledge. In such cultures, there may be a tendency to "restrain" displays of originality, and creativity is expected to emerge only after demonstrating mastery of traditional methods and skills. Eastern cultures emphasize the social role of acquired knowledge and skills, with the "Eastern" student oriented toward improving existing paradigms.

Cultural values also shape the interaction format between teachers and students. In the Confucian ("Eastern") tradition, a teacher is not merely an instructor but a role model whose behavior students are expected to emulate. Thus, it is considered inappropriate for students to propose ideas that differ from those of the teacher. Politeness, calmness, focus, and precision are key values of the "Eastern" educational system. Similar characteristics are observed in the interaction between leaders and employees.

A notable example of the influence of national cultures on the teacher-student dynamic is the manner of asking questions during classes. A "Western" student typically asks questions immediately when something is unclear. In contrast, an "Eastern" student usually waits until the end of the lesson, assuming that the teacher

will clarify unclear points during the session, rendering the question unnecessary.

There is even a joke about this difference: "Eastern" students ask questions "from knowledge," while "Western" students ask "from ignorance."

Interesting differences are observed in the results of various types of educational tests across cultures. "Western" students tend to perform better than "Eastern" students on subject-specific tests that require "flexible thinking" and "non-standard" answers. However, these tests were originally developed within "Western" cultures and do not account for the cultural characteristics of "Eastern" educational systems. "Eastern" students demonstrate lower levels of "Western" creativity but surpass "Western" students in "adaptive" tests that require the application of specific subject knowledge. Cultural elements that inhibit student creativity in the "West" often enhance it in the "East," and vice versa.

As noted by G. Hofstede [12], the roles of teacher and student are archetypal for every culture, and challenges arise as soon as the teacher and student come from different cultural backgrounds. These challenges can stem from differing social statuses of educators and learners, varying methods of knowledge transfer, and different acceptable ways of interaction between teacher and student in different cultures.

These observations also apply to cross-cultural differences in management practices, particularly in the relationships between "manager and employee" within international companies operating in foreign countries. To bridge "cross-cultural gaps," managers must understand the cultural characteristics of the national culture their employees belong to and possess skills in intercultural dialogue.

Developing such managerial competencies requires additional investment from companies whose strategies involve the "internationalization" of their business operations.

"Cultural Consequences" for Creativity, Innovation, Entrepreneurship, and Management

One of the earliest and most extensive studies on the influence of national cultures on business practices was conducted by Dutch sociologist Geert Hofstede. Between 1967 and 1973, commissioned by IBM, Hofstede examined cultural values and cross-cultural differences in countries where the company had branches. The primary aim of the study was to identify

the reasons behind significant disparities in production outcomes across branches in different countries, despite the implementation of identical business models. The study involved approximately 117,000 employees from 64 IBM branches worldwide. The results of this research culminated in the book "Culture's Consequences" [15], which quickly gained acclaim, was translated into over thirty languages, but notably has not been translated into Russian.

Hofstede identified four "dimensions of culture" [15]:

- Power Distance – The degree of social inequality accepted as normal by members of a society.

- Uncertainty Avoidance – The extent to which members of a society avoid uncertainty and risks.

- Individualism/Collectivism – The preference of members of a society to act individually or collectively.

- Masculinity/Femininity – The emphasis placed by society on "masculine" qualities (e.g., persistence, assertiveness, goal orientation) compared to "feminine" qualities (e.g., social stability, harmony).

In the 1990s, an additional dimension was introduced:

- Long-Term/Short-Term Orientation – The degree to which members of a society focus on future vs. immediate outcomes [1].

Hofstede's model is well-known globally, including in Kazakhstan. Therefore, we will not delve deeper into the discussion or critique of these cultural dimensions but instead explore their consequences (sometimes only hypothetical) for creativity, innovation, entrepreneurship, and management practices. It is regrettable that Hofstede and other international researchers have not conducted specific studies in Kazakhstan or other post-Soviet republics, leaving the classification of these cultures uncertain in existing frameworks.

Power Distance reflects the degree of inequality in the distribution of power and resources considered acceptable within a culture, ranging from relative equality to absolute inequality. Examples of countries with varying levels of Power Distance (in ascending order) include Austria (11), Norway (31), the United States (40), Japan (54), China (80), Russia (93), and Malaysia (104) [15].

In cultures with high Power Distance:

- Employees often exhibit significant

deference to their leaders.

- Titles and status are heavily valued, shaping behavior.

- Subordinates rarely express disagreement openly.

- A directive, autocratic management style is prevalent.

- Leaders are viewed as "different" from subordinates.

- Access to top management is restricted.

- Significant wage disparities exist.

Such cultures typically discourage employee initiative, with workers expecting instructions from leaders. Management practices emphasize clear task assignments and regular oversight.

In contrast, cultures with low Power Distance:

- Subordinates frequently express disagreement openly.

- A democratic management style is common.

- Leaders are perceived as "equals" by subordinates.

- Leadership is accessible to employees.

- Wage disparities are relatively small.

- Initiative, autonomy, and self-regulation are cultivated.

- New approaches to problem-solving are encouraged.

High Power Distance cultures are characterized by:

- Social hierarchy and bureaucracy, which may hinder innovation and entrepreneurial activity.

- A lack of inter-level communication and information exchange, potentially stifling the "creative flow."

- Centralized decision-making and top-down control, which may suppress initiative and creativity.

- Fatalism and conformity, which can foster passivity.

- Resistance to change, potentially excluding innovation.

Such cultures may be less flexible, mobile, and creative but could excel in executing large-scale projects.

Uncertainty Avoidance refers to the degree to which members of a culture tend to avoid uncertainty and risk, preferring structured actions and clearly defined situations. Cultures with high levels of Uncertainty Avoidance adhere to the principle "The unfamiliar is dangerous," whereas cultures with low levels follow the principle "The

unfamiliar is intriguing." Examples: Singapore (8), China (30), USA (46), Japan (92), Russia (95) [15].

In high Uncertainty Avoidance cultures, employees generally prefer large companies, exhibit low risk tolerance, and tend to fear failure and worry about the future. Internal competition is typically discouraged, and there are strict workplace rules with high levels of business process formalization. Such environments often rely on structured systems, rules, and procedures, coupled with a low appetite for risk, which may weaken motivation to propose new ideas. However, these cultures are favorable for incremental innovations, consistent improvements, and the implementation of advancements.

In low Uncertainty Avoidance cultures, employees are more inclined to prefer small companies, display greater risk tolerance, and are characterized by optimism and a "live for today" attitude. Internal competition is seen as normal and productive, and there is a relatively low degree of business process formalization. These cultures encourage exploring new approaches, initiating changes, pursuing radical innovations, and fostering innovative entrepreneurship.

This dimension reflects a society's self-perception as an "I Society" or a "We Society." Individualistic cultures emphasize personal autonomy, self-orientation, individual goals, and personal achievements. Collectivist cultures prioritize group belonging, cooperation, and social harmony. Examples (scale reflects the degree of individualism): China (2), Guatemala (6), Russia (39), Japan (46), Denmark (74), USA (91) [15]. Hofstede found a strong correlation between individualism and GDP per capita.

In individualistic cultures, employees believe they should rely on themselves and defend their own interests independently. Managers generally do not involve themselves in employees' personal lives, and career growth is based on individual merits and achievements. Social connections tend to be weak. Management practices focus on individual motivation, providing opportunities for employees to "shine," fostering a culture of "healthy competition," rewarding individual contributions, and offering personalized feedback on successes and mistakes. However, excessive individualism in the workplace may result in a reluctance to collaborate.

In collectivist cultures, employees expect management to protect their interests and support them in difficult situations. Managers are

often involved in personal matters of employees. Career progression depends on loyalty and tenure, and social connections are highly developed. Management practices emphasize team motivation, fostering a "team spirit," creating a friendly and cooperative atmosphere, and providing public recognition of successes while addressing errors privately. A potential downside of collectivism in the workplace is the "social loafing" syndrome, where individuals may rely excessively on the group to achieve goals.

This dimension of national culture relates to the value priorities of its members regarding "masculine" traits (e.g., assertiveness, persistence, goal orientation) versus "feminine" traits (e.g., nurturing social relationships, fostering harmony). Masculine cultures follow the principle "Live to work," while feminine cultures adhere to "Work to live." Examples (in ascending order of masculinity): Sweden (5), Russia (36), USA (62), China (66), Japan (95) [15].

In masculine cultures, employees are encouraged to display assertiveness and persistence. They value material rewards, strive to stand out, and aim for career advancement. Male employees often predominate in these cultures, and decisions are largely based on logic and calculation. Managers highlight "successful" employees, project confidence, make swift decisions, and adopt large-scale approaches. There is a strong focus on implementing innovations.

In feminine cultures, non-material rewards play a significant role. Core corporate values include team relationships and concern for others. Decision-making often relies on intuition. Managers engage with employees' issues, show empathy, promote conflict-free teamwork, and seek compromises. They demonstrate magnanimity and a willingness to "forgive mistakes." These cultures focus more on generating new ideas and less on their implementation.

This dimension reflects a culture's focus on the future versus immediate goals. Long-term-oriented cultures prioritize hard work, continuous education, and self-discipline. In contrast, short-term-oriented cultures emphasize the values of freedom and rights, focusing on tangible, immediate results. Examples (scale reflects long-term orientation): Spain (19), USA (29), India (61), Japan (80), China (118) [1].

In companies operating within cultures with a short-term orientation, short-term planning

predominates, guided by the principle of "living for today" (spending, loans, short-term investments). The primary goal is to achieve quick results. Managers motivate employees with short-term objectives and encourage creativity and initiatives related to change.

In companies operating within cultures with a long-term orientation, long-term planning is the norm, adhering to the principle of "living within one's means" (savings, long-term investments). The primary goal is to achieve stable, long-term outcomes in the future. Employees in such cultures are typically pragmatic, persistent, hardworking, frugal, modest, and patient. Managers motivate employees with long-term goals, involve them in "serious" projects, and reward diligence, hard work, and initiatives aimed at continuous improvement.

It has been found that long-term orientation correlates statistically with achievements in mathematics and the hard sciences, while short-term orientation is more conducive to the development and promotion of new projects [1].

Cultural dimensions can have varying influences on entrepreneurship:

- Individual entrepreneurship may be facilitated by cultural traits like Individualism and Masculinity, while hindered by Power Distance and Uncertainty Avoidance.

- Organizational entrepreneurship may benefit from Masculinity and Long-term Orientation but be obstructed by Power Distance.

The influence of cultural dimensions on innovation is nuanced and depends on the type of innovation activity:

- For initiating innovations, Individualism is favorable, while Power Distance and Uncertainty Avoidance are unfavorable.

- For implementing innovations, Individualism may become a limiting factor, while Masculinity, Long-term Orientation, and

Uncertainty Avoidance can act as supportive cultural factors [16].

Hofstede's model has faced substantial criticism regarding its choice of respondents, methodological and technical issues, multicollinearity of cultural dimensions, and other concerns [2]. Despite its limitations and critiques, as well as the development of numerous alternative cultural dimension models [17], it remains the most well-known and widely applied. Hofstede's research is effectively an ongoing project, with modifications and refinements by various researchers, as well as updates to cultural dimension data (see geert-hofstede.com).

CONCLUSION. Research highlights culturally driven differences in styles of creativity and innovation across countries. However, no single model of national culture can fully account for these differences, as they are also shaped by historical, political, economic, and social factors.

While national culture undeniably influences creativity, inventiveness, innovation, and entrepreneurial activity, it is not the sole determinant. Research findings in this area are inconsistent, and the empirical foundation remains insufficient for drawing robust conclusions about the relationship between cultural values and levels of creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship.

Thus, the study of the relationship between national cultures and the development of creative and innovative entrepreneurship is still in its formative stages. Despite the relatively limited number of publications, this topic is attracting growing interest from researchers, highlighting its importance and potential for further exploration.

The article was prepared within the framework of grant funding with the support of the Science Committee of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan (grant IRN AR19680192)

REFERENCES:

1. Hofstede, G. (2010). Minkov M. Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind. Revised and expanded 3rd Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill USA,550.
2. Dubina, I.N., Ramos, S.J. and Ramos, H. (2016). Culture as a driving force of individual and organizational behavior. *Creativity, Innovation, and Entrepreneurship Across Cultures: Theory and Practices*, New York, Springer, 1-28.
3. Jourdan, L., Smith, M. (2021). National culture dimensions as predictors of innovation, creativity, and entrepreneurship. *Journal of Global Business Insights*, 6(2), 154-171. DOI:10.5038/2640-6489.6.2.1093
4. Lee, H.S., Chernikov, S.U., Nagy, S., Degtereva, E.A. (2022). The Impact of National Culture on Innovation: A Comparative Analysis between Developed and Developing Nations during the Pre- and Post-Crisis Period 2007–2021. *Social Sciences*, 11, 522. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci11110522> (Accessed 20.01.2025)
5. Adilova, A. M., Shildibekov, E. Zh., & Alpysbaev, K. S. (2025) Sovremennaja koncepcija vzaimodejstvija upravlenija proektami i upravlenie innovacijami [Modern concept of interaction between project management and innovation management] Nauchnyj

- zhurnal Education. Quality Assurance, № 1(38), pp. 26–34. [in Russian]
6. Inkster, I. (2007). Technology in world history: cultures of constraint and innovation, emulation, and technology transfers. *Comparative Technology Transfer and Society*, 5 (2), 108–127.
7. Runco, M. A. (2004). Personal creativity and culture. *Creativity: When East Meets West*. Singapore, World Scientific Publishing, 9 - 21.
8. Dubina, I.N. and Ramos, S.J. (2016). Creativity through a cultural lens: The dichotomy of “The West” and “The East” // *Creativity, Innovation, and Entrepreneurship Across Cultures: Theory and Practices*, New York: Springer, 29 - 34.
9. Lubart, T.I. and Georgsdottir, A. (2004). Creativity: Developmental and cross-cultural issues. *Creativity: When East Meets West*. – Singapore, World Scientific Publishing, 23–54.
10. Raina, M.K. (1999). Cross-cultural differences. *Encyclopedia of Creativity*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 1.
11. Herbig, P. and Jacobs, L. (1996). Creative Problem-Solving Styles in the USA and Japan. *International Marketing Review*, 13 (2), 63-71.
12. Cole, R.E. and Whittaker, D.H. (2006). *Recovering from Success: Innovation and Technology management in Japan*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
13. Herbig, P.A. (1995). *Innovation Japanese style: a cultural and historical perspective*. Westport, Conn., Quorum Books.
14. Akybayeva, G. S., Petrova, M., & Yeskerova, Z. A. (2025) The impact of female leadership on organizational performance and innovation. *Nauchnyj zhurnal Education. Quality Assurance*, № 2(39), pp. 13–19.
15. Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture’s Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Beverly Hills, CA, Sage Publications.
16. Jones, G.K. and Herbert, J. (2000). National culture and innovation: Implications for culture and innovation. *Management International Review*, 40(1), 11-39.
17. House, R.J., Quigley, N.R. and de Luque, M.S. (2010). Insights from project GLOBE. *International Journal of Advertising*, 29 (1), 111–139.

СВЕДЕНИЯ ОБ АВТОРАХ:

Дубина Игорь Николаевич - доктор экономических наук, профессор, Алтайский государственный университет, Барнаул, Россия.

E-mail: igor_dubina@yahoo.com ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6241-0932>

Рахметулина Жибек Берлибековна* - кандидат экономических наук, профессор кафедры экономика и предпринимательство, Евразийский национальный университет им. Л.Н. Гумилева, г. Астана, Республика Казахстан,

E-mail: rahmetulina_zh@mail.ru

Апышева Асель Ануарбековна - кандидат экономических наук, асс. Профессор, Восточно-Казахстанский университет имени Сарсена Аманжолова, Усть-Каменогорск, Казахстан

E-mail: asel_gan@mail.ru, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0798-1078>

Жанабергенова Мира Айтпаровна - Доктор PhD, Департамент продвижения экспорта АО QazTrade, Астана, Казахстан

E-mail: m.zhanabergenova@gmail.com ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7249-3586>

Дубина Игорь Николаевич - экономика ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Алтай мемлекеттік университеті, Барнаул, Ресей,

E-mail: igor_dubina@yahoo.com ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6241-0932>

Рахметулина Жибек Берлибековна* - экономика ғылымдарының кандидаты, экономика және кәсіпкерлік кафедрасының профессоры, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті, Астана қ., Қазақстан Республикасы

E-mail: rahmetulina_zh@mail.ru ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9973-9627>

Апышева Асель Ануарбековна - экономика ғылымдарының кандидаты, асс. профессор, Сәрсен Аманжолов атындағы Шығыс Қазақстан университеті, Өскемен, Қазақстан

E-mail: asel_gan@mail.ru, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0798-1078>

Жанабергенова Мира Айтпаровна - Доктор PhD, «QazTrade» АҚ Экспортты жылжыту департаменті, Астана, Қазақстан

E-mail: m.zhanabergenova@gmail.com ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7249-3586>

Dubina Igor Nikolaevich - Doctor of Economic Sciences, professor, Altai State University, Barnaul, Russia

E-mail: igor_dubina@yahoo.com ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6241-0932>

Rakhmetulina Zhibek Berlibekovna* - Candidate of Economic Sciences, Professor of the Department of Economics and Entrepreneurship, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan

E-mail: rahmetulina_zh@mail.ru

Apysheva Asel Anuarbekovna - Candidate of Economic Sciences, Associate Professor, Sarsen Amanzholov East Kazakhstan University, Ust-Kamenogorsk, Kazakhstan

E-mail: asel_gan@mail.ru, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0798-1078>

Zhanabergenova Mira Aitparovna - Doctor PhD, Export promotion Department JSC QazTrade, Astana, Kazakhstan

E-mail: m.zhanabergenova@gmail.com ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7249-3586>