

THEORY, HISTORY, CULTURE AND ART OF MANAGEMENT

Socio-Cultural Management Journal

Volume 5 (2022), Number 2, pp. 3-37

doi: <https://doi.org/10.31866/2709-846X.2.2022.267494>

p-ISSN 2709-846X, e-ISSN 2709-9571

Original Research Article

© Ya. Martynyshyn, O. Khlystun,
M. Antonivska, O. Krupa, 2022

UDC: 316.334.23:008

JEL Classification: A13, A14, M21

Received: 15/07/2022

**Yaroslav Martynyshyn, Olena Khlystun,
Maryna Antonivska, Oksana Krupa**

Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts, Kyiv, Ukraine

Entrepreneurship: Theory, Genesis, Socio-Cultural Dimensions and Strategies

Abstract: *Introduction.* In terms of economic relations transformation in Ukraine, entrepreneurship, which today, to a certain extent, goes beyond the scope of usual economic functions and roles, and is a socio-cultural phenomenon with its own history and civilizational specificity, occupies a special place. Given this, it should be considered not only as an economic category but also as a system of values and a special cultural phenomenon. *Purpose and methods.* The purpose of the article is a theoretical analysis of entrepreneurship as a unique phenomenon, which will deepen the understanding of its essence, socio-cultural dimensions, and strategies at various stages of society's historical development. The methodological basis of the study is the dialectical principle of cognition, systemic, historical, cultural, and interdisciplinary approaches to the study of organizational phenomena in society. *Results.* The history of the scientific opinion formation about entrepreneurship is considered. Socio-cultural principles and strategies of entrepreneurship are revealed. The cultural and historical factors of the entrepreneur's personality formation have been identified. The entrepreneurship functions and the role of an entrepreneur in society are analyzed. Determinants of activation and prospects for entrepreneurial activity development are determined. *Conclusions.* The scientific novelty of the research results lies in the cultural deepening of the understanding of the entrepreneurship essence as a unique socio-cultural phenomenon at various stages of the historical development of human society. The significance of the research is manifested in the addition of science with new theoretical provisions on entrepreneurship, as well as in the possibility of using them in the process of professional training of entrepreneurs and managers.

Keywords: entrepreneurship, socio-cultural dimensions, strategies.

1. Introduction

The problem formulation. In Ukraine, economic relations' transformation continues, and entrepreneurship occupies a special place in this process, which to some extent, is a new and, in many respects, not fully understood phenomenon for domestic science and practice. At the same time, today, entrepreneurship goes beyond economic functions and roles and is a socio-cultural phenomenon with its own history and civilizational specificity. Because of this, it should be considered not only as an economic category, production factor, or management method but also as a set of social groups, professions, lifestyles, values systems, cultural phenomena, ideology, etc. The concept of entrepreneurship includes such properties and involves such functions as wealth ownership, profit orientation, production organization and management, production factors combination, activity in conditions of economic freedom and independence, risk-taking, responsibility, willingness to compete, initiative, creativity, and innovations. Consequently, entrepreneurship can be defined as a free economic activity in the context of competition, related to risk and responsibility, aimed at obtaining profit from production implementation, organizational, and market innovations.

The cultural studies of the economic life of social studies the social functions and roles of entrepreneurship, its social composition and characteristics, the social and cultural environment in which an entrepreneur is formed and works, its motivations (economic and non-economic), lifestyle, value systems, meanings, ideology, forms and trends interaction with other social groups and many other issues.

State study of the problem. The problem of entrepreneurship is the subject of research in various sciences: economics, sociology, political science, philosophy, psychology, cultural studies, and management, each of which studies different aspects of this socio-cultural phenomenon. In the process of studying entrepreneurship, several stages can be distinguished, within which there are different approaches, associated with the constant development of industrial relations, changing the role and place of entrepreneurship in society.

In the first stage, when entrepreneurship first comes into the field of thinkers' view, we can talk about individual statements and general assessments of this phenomenon, which, in general, were sharply negative. The period of this attitude covers the Antiquity and the Middle Ages (see: Aristotle, 4th cent. BC; Paul, 1st cent. AD; Thomas Aquinos, 1273).

The second stage (the era of Early Industrialism) is the period of the capitalist relations victory, in which, what Aristotle called chrematistics (unnatural activity aimed at making a profit and not at satisfying natural human needs), becomes the predominant form of economic life in society and leads

to the entrepreneurship theory emergence as a scientific basis for conducting economic activity. Scientific ideas of such political economists as Richard Cantillon (1755), Adam Smith (1776), Jean-Baptiste Say (1803), and Johann Thünen (1826) played an important role here.

The third stage covers the era of Mature Industrialism, where entrepreneurship, unlike the previous historical period, is considered not only as an economically feasible phenomenon but also as socially useful from a religious, ethical, and other point of view. Such a vision can be traced in the works of famous sociologists and philosophers of that time: Georg Simmel (1900), Max Weber (1905, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921, 1925), Joseph Schumpeter (1926), Werner Sombart (1934, 1938), Friedrich von Hayek (1948). At the same time, theories are being created that entrepreneurship is seen as a rather negative phenomenon than a positive and come out with sharp criticism of it. One of the harshest critics of capitalist entrepreneurship is Karl Marx (1867), who considers business profit as a part of workers' misappropriated labor, the exploitation result.

At today's stage of development of the entrepreneurship theory, existing concepts and their adaptation to the conditions of Post-Industrialism are mainly carried out. Especially noticeable are the works of such foreign scientists as Scott Shane (2003), Sharon Alvarez (2005), Gerald Gundersen (2005), Lisa Keister (2005), Martin Ruef, Michael Lounsbury (2007), Robert Hebert, Albert Link (2009), Gary Stewart (2011), Donald Kuratko (2013), Chandra Mishra, Zachary Manis (2014), Vsm Nair, Vijaya Raghavan, Joe Carlen (2016), Hari Nair (2016), Gary Ferraro, Elizabeth Briody (2017), Ralph Borsella (2018), Ted Baker, Friederike Welter (2020), Bryan Christiansen, John David Branch, Joanna Karmowska (2020), Heidi Neck, Christopher Neck, Emma Murray (2020), Francis Greene (2020), Alf Walle (2022).

Among modern Ukrainian studies of entrepreneurship, the following works are important: Oleksandr Romanovskyi (2002), Olha Chubukova (2005), Vitalii Zianko (2005), Liubov Donets (2006), Yurii Pachkovskyi (2006), Liudmyla Shvab (2006), Zakharii Varnalii (2006), Anatolii Berlach (2007), Ihor Shkola (2007), Anatolii Shehda (2008), Antonina Shliiko (2008), Alla Vynohradska (2008), Andrii Kondrashykhin (2009), Maksym Latsyba, Dmytro Liapin, Kostiantyn Matviienko (2009), Mykola Zubok (2009), Volodymyr Kolot (2010), Yaroslav Zhalilo (2010), Larysa Ostankova (2011), Oleksandr Skibitskyi (2011), Ivan Tyrpak (2011), Liubov Zharova, Yevhenii Kakutysh, Yevhen Khlobystov (2012), Iryna Hoi (2013), Yaroslav Martynyshyn, Olena Khlystun, Yelena Kovalenko (Kovalenko, 2020a, 2020b, 2021, 2022; Kovalenko et al., 2019; Martynyshyn & Khlystun, 2018, 2019; Martynyshyn & Kovalenko, 2016, 2017, 2018a, 2018b; Martynyshyn et al., 2020, 2022).

Unresolved issues. Despite the solid history and many studies aimed at identifying the essence, role, and place of entrepreneurship in the life of society, some issues remain controversial and not fully studied. And not only in Ukraine, where entrepreneurship development was interrupted and banned for many decades. In most publications on entrepreneurship, the main place is microeconomic problems related to the practical activities of economic entities, which is certainly justified. Novice entrepreneurs need organizational and business management skills. But it is equally important to understand the theoretical foundations of this activity, and not only purely economic but also cultural ones, since only in such a complex they provide the right guidelines for interaction with the external environment of business organizations.

The relevance and importance of solving these issues determined the purpose and tasks of our research.

2. Purpose and methods

The purpose and research tasks. The purpose of the article is to carry out a theoretical analysis of entrepreneurship as a unique phenomenon, which will deepen the understanding of its essence, socio-cultural dimensions, and strategies at various stages of the historical development of society.

Achieving this purpose involves solving the following tasks:

- consider the history of the formation of scientific opinion about entrepreneurship;
- reveal the socio-cultural principles and strategies of entrepreneurship;
- identify the cultural and historical factors in the entrepreneur formation;
- analyze the functions and roles of entrepreneurship in society;
- determine the determinants of the entrepreneurial activity activation.

Methodology and methods. The methodological basis of the research is the dialectical principle of cognition, systemic, historical, cultural, and interdisciplinary approaches to the study of organizational phenomena in society.

Based on the dialectical principle of knowledge, the phenomenon of entrepreneurship is considered in the process of continuous development, changes, transformations, and interconnection with other phenomena and processes of society. At the same time, special attention is drawn to the fact that entrepreneurship is a contradictory unity of various opposites, which are simultaneously in a state of unity and struggle. And this mutual struggle is an internal source of changes, development, and self-development of entrepreneurship, which ultimately leads to the resolution of contradictions and is expressed by the transition from the old to a qualitatively new state of entrepreneurship.

Entrepreneurship is studied from the standpoint of a systemic approach, according to which it is a complex, open, dynamic system consisting of a set of interconnected subsystems and elements united by a common goal.

The historical approach allows to explore the origin, formation, and development of entrepreneurship, to better understand its essence and strategies, the cultural approach – to reveal cultural values, meanings, and cultural differences at various stages of society development, and the interdisciplinary approach – to study the multifaceted phenomenon of entrepreneurship from different angles.

In the research process, the following methods were used: conceptual-analytical – to study and generalize the existing theoretical provisions on entrepreneurship; phenomenological – to reveal the content of entrepreneurship phenomenon; classifications – during the development of entrepreneurship typology; comparative – when comparing different types of entrepreneurship; system modeling, analysis, and forecasting – to study strategies for the development of entrepreneurship in the past and the future; observation – during the empirical data collection about the research object; abstraction – to highlight the essential properties of entrepreneurship; analysis and synthesis – with an in-depth study of the entrepreneurship nature and the mechanisms of its self-organization and management; theoretical generalization – to summarize the results of the research.

Research information base. The information base of the research consists of the scientific works of leading Ukrainian and foreign scientists on the theory and history of entrepreneurship, organization and culture of business in society. The results of the authors' own research were used as an empirical justification of the main conceptual provisions of the phenomenon of entrepreneurship.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Formation of scientific thought about entrepreneurship: leading ideas and development history

The formation of scientific thought about entrepreneurship is connected with classical political economy and the Western European socio-cultural and economic tradition.

Classical political economy, the founder of which is considered to be the Scottish economist and philosopher *Adam Smith* (1776), was characterized by an emphasis on the economic role of the entrepreneur as a capital owner and employer, on the source of income received – profit on the capital invested in the business, on the rationality and utilitarianism of its activity in general.

The Irish economist *Richard Cantillon* (1755), to whom the term “entrepreneurship” belongs, saw the market economy as a network of mutual exchanges in which the entrepreneur played the role of an intermediary, bearing the burden of risk and uncertainty. He referred to entrepreneurs as not only owners but, in general, everyone who does not have a stable income and is forced to constantly take care of it. Along with merchants, speculators, and production organizers, this category also included robbers, vagabonds, as well as persons of free professions.

European continental scientific thought, mainly French and German, considered entrepreneurship in a broader socio-economic and cultural context.

The French economist *Jean-Baptiste Say* (1803) saw an entrepreneur not as a representative of a particular social class but as any material production agent, practically using his knowledge and skills to create material values, a universal mediator who connects different sub-economic entities – producers and consumers, landowners and manufacturers, etc. He strictly does not link entrepreneurship with profit-making and capital accumulation, attributing to it mainly organizational and administrative functions. But the condition of any business activity of J.-B. Say considered the inviolable right of private property.

So, initially, entrepreneurship was studied as a universal phenomenon inherent in any social and economic system.

The creation of the most significant concepts of capitalist entrepreneurship and its unique culture, the formation of a new type of person, a new mentality, and a picture of the world is associated with the names of German political economists, philosophers, and sociologists *Karl Marx* (1867), *Max Weber* (1905) and *Werner Sombart* (1938). These thinkers, who stood at the origins of the modern theory of capitalism, revealed the specifics of the economic and socio-cultural system of the Western capitalist society from different worldviews and methodological and ideological positions. First of all, they are characterized by the recognition of the fact, that the capitalist market economy and the phenomenon of capitalist entrepreneurship is a unique phenomenon in the humanity history, which corresponds to a unique type of personality and a unique socio-cultural system. These scientists agree on this, although they understand the essence of the economic and socio-cultural system of capitalism, its differences from pre-bourgeois and non-Western civilizations, as well as, they understand genesis differently.

M. Weber and W. Sombart call entrepreneurship in pre-capitalist societies traditional. Traditionalism, scientists understand as a way of thinking and acting, in which a person is focused on the reproduction of his well-established way of life and does not seek to change it; works only to satisfy usual

needs and does not seek to earn more than is necessary for this: “economic life in the pre-capitalist era was influenced by the principle of covering needs” (Sombart, 1938, p. 16).

In pre-bourgeois societies, there were also large enterprises, for example, plantations, quarries, workshops, etc., in which completely rational methods of organizing work, achieving profitability, and calculating profits were used. However, *Max Weber* (1905) does not see them as capitalists. How does he see the differences? The fact that their goal was the satisfaction of real needs (in particular, the need for wealth), and not the production development as such, in itself. They were still oriented towards meeting specific material or social needs of people, therefore, had a traditional character. The enterprise was not yet physically and organizationally separated from the household, and the labor force used was organized based on personal dependence and non-economic coercion.

Pre-capitalist entrepreneurship is associated with the type of striving for wealth and profit that has always existed, at all times, and was based on the inherently human nature of the “lust for gold”: “The desire for entrepreneurship, the desire for profit, for monetary gain, for the greatest monetary gain itself has nothing to do with capitalism. This desire was observed and is observed in waiters, doctors, coachmen, artists, bribe-taking officials, soldiers, robbers, crusaders, visitors to gambling houses, and beggars” (Weber, 1905, p. 49).

Therefore, entrepreneurial abilities in pre-capitalist societies are manifested, first of all, not in the sphere of economy, which is entirely subordinated to the practical needs of people: “any passion for profit, any desire for money tends to pleasure outside the process of goods production, goods transportation and even a large part and trade in goods. People run into the mines, dig treasures, practice alchemy and all sorts of witchcraft to get money, because it cannot be got in the framework of the everyday economy” (Sombart, 1938, p. 17).

For the upper classes of traditional society, rational economic profit was considered unworthy, which also does not correspond to their social status as frugality. The management of estates rarely interested noble knights and, as a rule, was entrusted to managers, the elders, etc. The deficit that often arose as a result of an attitude to extravagance was compensated not by economic improvements, but by increasing levies from the peasants, and sometimes direct robbery and looting. Such entrepreneurship often took the form of violence, deception, and speculation. In *Werner Sombart's* (1938) interpretation, this was a manifestation of the entrepreneurial spirit, the carriers of which were robbers and pirates, feudal lords, and large speculators.

A pre-bourgeois entrepreneur, according to W. Sombart, is an organizer, a conqueror, and a trader in one person. Both in Europe, on the threshold of the New Age, and in Asia, the pioneers, travelers who pushed the boundaries

of the ordinary world, were merchants who went in search of unexplored rich countries. This is how Europeans penetrated Asia and Africa, this is how America was discovered. At the same time, merchant expeditions were often not only associated with the risk of robberies and pirate attacks but also assumed profit through violence. For the native inhabitants of the New World and many Eastern and African countries, the trade enterprises of European merchants turned into not only robbery but also ruthless genocide. Eastern merchants also followed the troops of the conquerors. One of the most profitable enterprises, based on violence and robbery, was the slave trade, which became a source of enrichment, not only for individuals but also for entire states.

Max Weber (1905) called traditional entrepreneurship adventurous: “Representatives of this kind of entrepreneurship, capitalist adventurers, existed all over the world. Their chances of success (outside of trade, credit, and banking operations) either were purely irrational and speculative or were focused on violence, primarily on loot; this booty could be taken directly during hostilities or through prolonged fiscal exploitation of state subjects” (p. 52). The scientist emphasized the irrational nature of adventurous entrepreneurship as its most striking feature: it is a desire for instant benefits, not for rational permanent business management, enrichment, and extraction of money from economic turnover, rather than for its methodical expansion.

Adventurous entrepreneurship does not go back in time with traditional societies but continues to exist today in the most developed world countries alongside rational productive capitalist entrepreneurship. The difference between M. Weber's and W. Sombart's approaches is that the first takes it beyond capitalism, and the second considers it the most important component of the capitalist spirit.

In general, a traditional economy focused on consumption and the usual way of life, the reproduction of stable social ties, and confident peace. It is opposed to capitalist entrepreneurship as endless, which has a goal only in itself, in the accumulation and expansion of production. Such a desire for profit is not limited by the natural needs of a person and far exceeds the limits of not only ordinary but also prestigious consumption.

Werner Sombart (1938) believes that, until the 18th century, capitalism still “stood on its feet”, that is, it was the proportionate needs of living people and, accordingly, was subject to moral and religious regulation. After the 18th century, it “stands upside down”, i.e. “a living person with happiness and sorrow, with needs and demands, was pushed out of the center of the circle of interests, and the person’s place was taken by two abstractions: profit and business. Man, therefore, ceased to be what he remained until the end of the early capitalist era, the measure of all things” (p. 132). The essence of late,

mature capitalism is a rational desire for business development, which is not at all connected with the real needs of people but is oriented towards itself. Entrepreneurship acquires the form of a self-valued activity, which evokes an analogy with “bad infinity” in the scientist.

Karl Marx (1867) was the first to study the phenomenon of capitalist entrepreneurship, emphasizing the extraction of surplus value and the exploitation of wage workers. He considered the various roles played by representatives of the capitalist class in the production process: “The one who applies capital, even if he works with his capital, is divided into two persons: the simple capital owner and the person who applies capital; his capital itself, concerning the categories of profit, is divided into property capital, capital outside the process of production, which in itself yields interest, and capital in the process of production, which, as capital carrying out the process, yields entrepreneurial income” (p. 417).

The entrepreneur combines the functions of the capital owner, the subject of the assignment of surplus value, and the organizer of production, and in this last guise, he is close to an employee: “The industrial capitalist, unlike the owner of capital, therefore acts not as functioning capital, but as a person, which functions even outside of the capital, as a simple carrier of labor in general, as a worker, moreover, a hired worker” (Marx, 1867, p. 425). Therefore, K. Marx already outlines the differences between property ownership, profit-taking and production organization, which will play a rather important role in the conditions of the predominance of shareholder and corporate capital and the revolution of managers in the middle of the 20th century.

In the future, scientists began to conclude the historical and socio-cultural uniqueness of the type of entrepreneurship that developed in the West in modern times and about its fundamental difference from the traditional entrepreneurship that existed in any society and all eras.

3.2. Socio-cultural principles and strategies of entrepreneurship development

Max Weber (1905), like K. Marx and W. Sombart, considers capitalist entrepreneurship, in the form in which it developed in the West in modern times, to be a unique historical phenomenon and a fundamentally new stage in the development of economic life. In “The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism”, he substantiated the opposite of capitalism and all non-capitalist, or, as he called them, traditional societies and systems of value orientations. He wrote: “The first opponent that the “spirit” of capitalism had to face and which represented a certain lifestyle, normatively conditioned and appearing in an “ethical” image, was a type of perception and behavior that might be

called traditionalism” (p. 51). Traditionalism was considered to be the orientation of economic activity towards consumption and the desire to reproduce established management stereotypes.

But what exactly served as an impetus for the formation of fundamentally new and, from a traditional point of view, absolutely illogical attitudes towards increasing profits for the purpose of investments, expanding the business without consumer use of capital, for rational long-term planning instead of short-term super-profitable operations with the subsequent withdrawal of funds from circulation?

Based on research conducted in Germany at the beginning of the 20th century, *Max Weber* (1919) concluded that among Protestants, the percentage of active entrepreneurs is greater than among Catholics (p. 203). In works devoted to the study of Eastern culture: “The Religion of China: Confucianism and Taoism” (1920) and “The Religion of India (The Sociology of Hinduism and Buddhism)” (1921), he compared the development level of European and Asian societies at the turn of the New Age and had reached the following conclusions: in the period preceding the intensive development of capitalism, the material (economic, technological, demographic, etc.) prerequisites were approximately the same in Europe and Asia, while the spiritual life, caused by religions, differed very significantly; the researcher assumed that the causes of capitalism emergence should be sought in spiritual and worldview systems, and turned to the analysis of the Protestantism influence on it.

Max Weber emphasizes that all the features of Protestantism stem from the Christian idea of God as absolutely transcendent, personified, who actively intervenes in earthly affairs, punishes and saves of his own free will, as the Creator of the world. Having created the world from nothing, God establishes its laws and, together with them, the ethical norms of human communication, which form an idea of a God-pleasing, righteous way of life. From this point of view, as M. Weber repeatedly emphasizes, Christian ethics, including Protestant ethics, rationalizes the way of life of believers, as it organizes it, and subordinates it to the same norms, and orients toward the same goals.

The above-described religious and philosophical ideas determine the prevailing society ideas about the essence of man and his existence. The Christian is endowed with an immortal soul, but life is given to him only once, and during this limited, unknown, and predetermined time period, a person can earn both salvation and eternal bliss, and death and eternal torment. The life of a person, his individual unique existence has an absolute ethical and soul-saving value in Christianity because the soul is eternal, immortal, and how we live this temporary life determines the next eternity.

M. Weber considered the abstract nature of its values and norms to be the most important feature of Christian, especially Protestant, religious ethics. There is a concept of well, good, a righteous way of life, etc., which is opposed by the concept of sin, radical evil, which is also abstract. The universal subordination of believers, equal in their ethical qualities, to the transcendent God and abstract ethical norms creates, according to the scientist, socio-psychological prerequisites for establishing in society the formal equality of people before the law and impersonal legal relations. The commodity economy, and especially capitalist entrepreneurship, as well as the political structure of society, based on formal legal regulation, come from the impersonal relations between individuals who appear in the role of participants in commodity exchange or legal entities.

According to M. Weber, the “capitalist spirit” is based on the Protestant concept of salvation. “High” religions introduce into the minds of believers ideas about the meaning of life and its highest goal – salvation. For Christianity in general and Protestantism in particular, this highest life goal is the acquisition of eternal bliss by a righteous person in the hereafter (unearthly, afterlife) world. Salvation is the full realization of a Christian's personality. It is in the idea of salvation that the general ideas accepted in this religious and cultural complex about the norms and rules of an individual's attitude to the outside world, the main directions and limits of his activity, the content and value hierarchy of life expectations are revealed.

A Protestant lives to be a tool of God and to carry His will into the world. To do this, he must submit his entire earthly existence to the transformation of the world to the glory of God, work honestly and conscientiously and achieve success. His whole life – labor, spiritual, intimate should be imbued with strict asceticism and rationality.

The idea of salvation corresponds to his methodology, which determines the practical ways of achieving the religious ideal, the real forms of behavior of an individual in the world, and the extent and directions of his activity. The basis of the Christian method of salvation is asceticism, which is based on the recognition of the imperfection and sinfulness of the created world, on its resolute denial. The denial of the sinful world naturally implies the rejection of its benefits, the conscious limitation of one's needs, overcoming emotions, and subjecting one's whole life to the idea of serving God.

With the rejection of worldly goods and the principles of secular existence in general, the ideal of a Christian ascetic is a systematic activity aimed at overcoming worldly passions that prevent one from focusing on serving God. *M. Weber* (1919) emphasizes that such asceticism, which can be called otherworldly, leads to “complete alienation from the worldly, to the breaking of social and spiritual family ties, to the abandonment of property, from political, economic, artistic, erotic, in general from all corrupt interests” (p. 249).

As an example of otherworldly asceticism can be considered Christian monasticism, which is removed from worldly affairs, however, does not abandon the activity of itself. Within the framework of this form of asceticism, physical work, for example, among Christian monks, acquires, according to M. Weber, a “hygienic” value, becomes a means of obedience accepted by religion – a distraction from worldly passions. The scientist emphasizes that Western ascetics-monks were at the church service, performing practical work in its interests, either direct production of material goods, security, inquisitor, or political activity. However, it is important that the highest meaning, in this case, was not the activity itself, but spiritual goals.

The uniqueness and historical significance of Protestantism lies in the fact that in the process of the Reformation, the transformation of otherworldly asceticism into otherworldly or worldly asceticism took place, in which activity in the world is considered as a duty imposed on the believer. With all its imperfection, the world is the only object of activity aimed at glorifying God, the very special activity that “allows the ascetic to achieve those qualities that he seeks, and they, in turn, serve as an expression of God's mercy, by virtue of which the ascetic becomes capable of this kind of activity” (Weber, 1919, p. 250).

Max Weber (1919) emphasizes “the principled and systematic unbreakable unity of worldly professional ethics and religious confidence in salvation, which was created throughout the world only by ascetic Protestantism. Only in Protestant professional ethics, the world in its imperfection has an exclusive religious significance as an object of duty fulfillment, through rational activity following the will of God” (p. 264). A man, who belongs to the created world and bears all its imperfections, in ascetic Protestantism, through his activity becomes an instrument of God, fulfilling His will, His calling in the world.

The scientist especially notes that the main content of the professional activity of a Protestant entrepreneur cannot be the accumulation of capital as such. On the contrary, real capitalism in the understanding of *M. Weber* (1905) is associated with the rational regulation of entrepreneurial activity: “The unbridled greed in business for profit is not identical to capitalism to any extent, and even less to its spirit. Capitalism can even be identical to taming this irrational desire, in the case of its rational regulation” (p. 137). The main and essential characteristic of the spirit of capitalism is the desire for rational management and profitability. At the same time, the activity, in general, is not focused on practical, but on ideal goals, which are subordinated to the idea of salvation through ascetic worldly service to God.

The essence of any professional activity of a Protestant is its rational, systematic nature, and thus his diligence differs from the diligence of a traditional craftsman: “Not work as such, but only rational activity within the framework

of one's profession that pleases God. In the Puritan doctrine of professional vocation, emphasis is placed on the methodical nature of professional asceticism” (Weber, 1905, p. 141). Emphasis on the activity rationality is explained by the fact that the believer sees in every event of his life, especially the professional one, signs of Divine appointment, an opportunity to assess his chances for election and salvation. Therefore, a methodical, measured way of life and the style of everyday work are of special moral and religious importance for a Protestant.

According to M. Weber, Protestantism creates unique spiritual attitudes for transforming rational calculation into a universal form of relations both with the external world and one's inner world in all its manifestations.

The most important factor contributing to the formation of capitalism based on reformist religious consciousness is the recognition of the high moral value of doing business. At the same time, the constant expansion of production acquires the character of moral and religious duty – constant service to God, his glorification with everyday productive and profitable work, and the transformation of the sinful world to His glory.

M. Weber highlights the differences between Protestant professional asceticism and traditional Christian asceticism, expressed in the teachings of the church fathers and their interpretations of the Holy Scripture. Thus, the words of the apostle *Paul* (1st cent. AD): “If one does not want to work, one does not eat” (p. 1279) was interpreted by the medieval theologian and saint of the Catholic Church *Thomas Aquinos* (1273) as an imperative for the entire human race as a whole, which does not apply to rich people who have everything they need without any effort (p. 541). And Protestant famous Puritan theologian *Richard Baxter* (1825) emphasized that wealth does not relieve the need to work but, on the contrary, is the reason for even more intensive work (p. 184).

Protestants assume that success is a sign of God's blessing. Failures and, especially, poverty are, on the contrary, a sign of doom to destruction. However, this does not mean that a believer in the case of failure can give up despair and abandon his work – on the contrary, he still needs to make every effort to serve God as diligently and rationally as possible because a sudden success can awaken hopes for a better fate.

Evidence of success is the income expressed in money because such a measurement shows the best possible rationality of activity and is an abstract measure for assessing the godliness of various types of work. Although all professions are equal to God, as M. Weber emphasizes, the prestige and desirability of one or another activity are determined by its usefulness (as a form of service to God) and profitability, since it is the level of income that indicates the chosen one.

Poverty and the poor in the Protestant culture not only do not carry positive moral values (as in traditional Christianity and some other religions) but also cannot be a reason for compassion and even more so, for charity. The poor loser is neglected by God, and therefore people turn away from him. Beggars do not receive sympathy and help but contempt. They are persecuted – well-known examples from the books of Charles Dickens.

The moral and spiritual significance of income in the Protestant economic ethic is not limited to the fact that it is a sign of chosenness. Income also creates the conditions and material prerequisites for further service to God. Protestant ethics dictates strict asceticism in everyday life and rejection of luxury and entertainment in the name of further expansion of the cause. It does not approve of consumer use of income – what you earn should not be wasted, but on the contrary, multiplied for the glory of God. The historical uniqueness of the Protestant ethic, thanks to which it became the spiritual prerequisite of capitalist entrepreneurship, lies in the fact that it creates specific value orientations for endless investment and endless development of production.

As the appeal to God in prayer cannot have an end, so serving Him in the world knows no bounds. A believer cannot stop being a tool of God. Therefore, the Protestant's professional activity, entrepreneurial activity, in particular, cannot stop. A Protestant entrepreneur cannot stop at what he has achieved and be satisfied with the accumulated capital. He must dispose of this God-given wealth exclusively for the increase of God's glory, and not for the satisfaction of his own needs. Thus, Protestantism creates unique spiritual incentives for expanded reproduction, for constant capital growth, not for the sake of wealth itself, but for the sake of multiplying the glory of God and one's own confidence in salvation.

Max Weber in the book “The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism” described the spiritual factors of the primary capitalism formation in the West. In this period, it was the spiritual, religious motivation of entrepreneurial activity, its perception from the point of view of religious salvation of the soul, that dominated the desire for profit, rationalized it, and endowed it with religious content. In modern Western society, the situation has changed: the passion for profit broke out of the “iron shell” of religious regulation and turned into a self-sufficient motive, a basic value: “Currently, the spirit of asceticism – who knows whether it will last forever? – left this worldly shell. In any case, victorious capitalism no longer needs such support... At present, the desire for profit, deprived of its religious and ethical content, takes on the character of unbridled passion, sometimes close to sports” (Weber, 1919, p. 252). Of the Protestant ethical values, only the glimpse of professional duty wanders through the world like a ghost of former religious ideas. Protestant ethics, having laid the spiritual

foundations of high professional culture, lost its direct influence on it. Current research suggests that there is no direct correlation between high levels of Protestant religiosity and work ethic, but it is generally higher where the Protestant tradition has been stronger (Neck et al., 2020).

Capitalism is already developing not based on religious culture but on its basis. If at first, a person with his goals, values, and aspirations created a capitalist economy, now it has turned into a colossal independent mechanism that shapes the way of thinking and lifestyle of every member of society, imposing its norms and rules on the game on him.

3.3. Cultural and historical factors in the formation of an entrepreneur's personality

Werner Sombart's approach to studying the phenomenon of capitalist entrepreneurship is fundamentally different from M. Weber's concept. If the latter built an ideal type that captures only the most characteristic and typical features in the purest form, sharpening the specificity and differences between traditional and adventurous entrepreneurship, then W. Sombart was interested in the bourgeois entrepreneur as a heterogeneous phenomenon that includes various cultural, spiritual, psychological and social beginnings. His entrepreneur appears in the diversity and contradictions of the complex historical dynamics of these beginnings.

The bourgeois personality is based on two opposite principles: the entrepreneurial spirit and the bourgeois spirit.

W. Sombart (1938) characterizes *the entrepreneurial spirit* as “a synthesis of greed for money, passion for adventure, ingenuity and much more” (p. 22). The entrepreneurial spirit prevails at the time of capitalism's genesis, and “in the motley fabric of capitalism, the bourgeois spirit is the cotton thread, and the entrepreneurial spirit is the silk basis” (Ibid.). With all the great variety of an entrepreneur's personality qualities, they always include three components: conqueror, organizer, and trader.

An entrepreneur as a conqueror does not necessarily tend towards aggression and conquests in the literal sense of the word (although military campaigns and expeditions are among the possible enterprises in Sombart). To be a conqueror, according to W. Sombart, means an active attitude towards reality, the ability to look beyond the ordinary, to see new horizons and opportunities where others do not see them, to build a new plan and be ready to implement it, even despite many difficulties and obstacles. This requires the entrepreneur to have such qualities as ideological wealth, spiritual freedom, spiritual energy, perseverance, and consistency in the plan implementation. The ability to be an organizer is, according to W. Sombart, an integral quality of a true entrepreneur,

who is not only able to propose new ideas but also to organize people for their implementation, able to force others to serve his will in a non-violent way. Finally, an entrepreneur's ability to be a trader means more to W. Sombart than just running a commercial enterprise: it is the ability to negotiate and agree, the ability to persuade, not to force, which the scientist called "struggle with spiritual weapons".

The social media groups of the "entrepreneurial spirit", according to the concept of *W. Sombart* (1938), were initially robbers, feudal lords, and large speculators (pp. 35-86).

Robbers and pirates, who are equated with explorers for discovery, "strong, adventurous, accustomed to victory, rude, greedy conquerors of a very large caliber" (Sombart, 1938, p. 35), are declared carriers of the entrepreneurial spirit for their desire to profit, multiplied by energy, determination and the ability to plan and organize large expeditions, to subordinate others to their will.

The feudal economy gradually, as the focus on direct consumption is lost, turns into capitalist or semi-capitalist due to the significant resources possessed by the feudal lords – the owners of the land, its subsoil, forest, and other lands, at the disposal of which were also significant labor force reserves.

Great speculators, who direct large resources to implement adventurous type projects: "He with his passion is experiencing the dream of his successfully carried out to the end enterprise, which was crowned with success. He sees himself as a rich, powerful person who is respected and glorified by all his neighbors for his glorious deeds, which grow in his imagination to incredible size... He dreams of the grandiose. He lives like a constant fever. Overflowing with his own ideas all over again excites him and keeps him in continuous motion... And, based on this basic mood, he does his great work: he captures other people to help him carry out his plan" (Sombart, 1938, p. 79). Speculative capital develops on the scale of large enterprises, the real plan of which is difficult to rationally comprehend – large bank scams, overseas expeditions, colonial enterprises, transport enterprises, etc. These intellectually and spiritually gifted people are, by the definition of the scientist, passionate, "erotic" natures, professing eudaemonistic and even hedonistic ethics, that is, happiness, enjoyment of life – not only wealth as such but also, first of all, the very activity, adventure, game passions This heroic capitalism, according to W. Sombart, is dominated by the racial and biological properties of the conquering peoples, who dominate over others by their vitality and natural energy.

The bourgeois spirit is the second component of the capitalist spirit. By it, *W. Sombart* (1938) understands "all those views and principles (and the behavior and actions guided by them) that together constitute a good citizen and father of a family, a solid and prudent businessman" (p. 87). He considers

the personality composition and the values system, united by the concept of the bourgeois spirit, as well as the capitalist spirit in general, a product of historical development, and attributes its emergence to the 14th -15th centuries, and considers the trading cities of Italy to be its homeland. Within the framework of the bourgeois spirit, W. Sombart singles out two main components: bourgeois morality (“sacred economy”), which includes the principles of the internal economy organization and its management, and business morality, which regulates the owner's relations with the outside world, including with customers and partners.

The sacred economy (an expression borrowed from the Florentine merchant and writer of the 14th century Leon Alberti) assumes, first of all, economic rationalization. W. Sombart points out that, unlike a noble senator, a rational landlord is not ashamed to talk about business as something unworthy, and systematically adjusts the balance of income and expenses, not allowing the latter to exceed the former. This means a complete rejection of the corresponding property status of seignorial, the condemnation of unnecessary expenses, which are often found in merchant memoirs and instructions of the 14th-15th centuries, that is, a fundamental change in the view of a decent lifestyle and the purpose of wealth, which is no longer associated with the expendable, and with a productive economy. Secondly, bourgeois morality involves economizing the management of the economy, i.e. not just balancing, but conscious thrift oriented towards accumulation. Moreover, what is new in this period is the return of the rich to the idea of thrift and accumulation, the transformation of voluntary (and not stimulated by need) savings, and asceticism of life into a virtue and moral imperative of the commercial and industrial state, as a specific social group of people. As a sample of bourgeois virtues of “sacred economy”, W. Sombart cites, in addition to Leon Alberti, Daniel Defoe, and Benjamin Franklin, as examples.

Business ethics includes new norms and values that operate in the sphere of the entrepreneur's relationship with partners and clients. Morality in dealing with clients involves, first of all, “commercial solidity, that is, reliability in fulfilling promises, real service, punctuality in fulfilling obligations, etc.” (Sombart, 1938, p. 102). This new morality differs from traditional business norms in that it involves loyalty to contracts, in which the identity of the contracting party is irrelevant (in traditional business culture, the relationship between the own and the strangers was very different).

Business morality is not only “morality in business”, but also “morality for business”. This means that “henceforth it becomes profitable (for business reasons) to cultivate known virtues, or at least to flaunt them or to have them and show them. These virtues can be united in one collective concept: bourgeois

decency” (Sombart, 1938, p. 103). It was advantageous to have the reputation of a hardworking, sober, moderate, modest, and religious citizen. Finally, the peculiarity of bourgeois morality, according to W. Sombart, is the ability to calculate, and summarize the diversity and complexity of business relations to mathematical calculations of income and expenditure, an ability that is not developed in the traditional economy, where the barn books of even great merchants resembled diaries rather than modern financial documents.

The social groups that most vividly embodied the bourgeois spirit were government officials, merchants, and artisans (Sombart, 1938, pp. 106-118).

State officials-bureaucrats and rulers, concerned about replenishing the treasury, are declared by W. Sombart as one of the first bearers of the capitalist spirit since they often gave impetus to the organization of state enterprises (manufactories, shipyards, mines, etc.). By the scale of invested funds, organizational potential, and most importantly, the rationality of long-term planning, it was state enterprises that influenced the formation of capitalism as a type of economic organization.

Merchants, according to W. Sombart, are those who developed a capitalist enterprise of trading goods and money, growing from the smallest craft enterprises. The most important way of developing merchant entrepreneurship was its gradual transformation into a manufacturing, factory one with the help of hiring small craftsmen. Such small-scale producers were provided with everything they needed for artisanal production to order, and then they were gradually brought under control and turned into real hired workers.

Artisans are those who, unlike merchants, were originally rich and developed in the field of industrial production: machine building, textile industry, etc. Artisans and merchants, in the forms and methods of their activity, are united by the fact that they completely renounced violent, authoritarian ways, they are traders, that is, they know how to negotiate (in contrast to active violent robbers and feudal lords). In addition, artisans and merchants were related by frugality, the ability to accumulate and calculate their funds, which are not characteristic of other layers, bearers of the entrepreneurial spirit.

According to their psychological and moral foundations, bourgeois natures are ascetic. They, not possessing the strength and energy of entrepreneurial natures, profess the ethics of duty and methodical diligence. They grow on the racial and biological basis of peoples doomed to be subjugated and forced to work. Their fate is survival in the conditions of external domination, which can be provided only by patience, caution, diligence, thriftiness, etc. Their ascetic ethics is initially forced in nature. They simply have nothing better left because the “conquerors” leave no other prospects. Then the ethics of duty is interiorized, turning into an internal need, and becomes a natural attribute of bourgeois culture.

So, according to W. Sombart, the capitalist spirit consists of culturally disparate elements. In addition, the bearers of these different cultural beginnings are opposite in their psycho-cultural composition natures. This internal contradiction is the key to the dynamics and, at the same time, instability of the capitalist spirit and the very personality of the entrepreneur.

In the process of historical development, the ratio of elements and types changes, forming historically specific styles of capitalism. W. Sombart singles out the socio-cultural and moral features of early and late (that is, contemporary industrial) capitalism.

For an early capitalist entrepreneur – an old-style bourgeois, the pre-capitalist correlation preservation of production and entrepreneurship with human interests and needs is characteristic. Man, as before, remains the measure of all things, and any entrepreneur still does not stop “comparing his commercial activity with the requirements of healthy humanity: for everyone, their business had remained only a means to the goal of life; for all, their direction and measure of their activity are determined by their own life interests and the interests of other people for whom and with whom they work” (Sombart, 1938, p. 122).

Initially, at the time of capitalism's genesis, entrepreneurial natures, passionate individuals of an adventurous nature dominate among the bourgeoisie. As capitalism develops and stabilizes, they acquire more and more bourgeois virtues: “a natural whole person with healthy instincts, having already suffered great damage, had to get used to the humiliating jacket of bourgeois well-being, had to learn to count. Its claws are trimmed, its claws of a beast are sawed off, its horns are covered with leather pads” (Sombart, 1938, p. 123).

The old-style bourgeois refers to wealth as a desired goal, but not as a self-goal. It must serve its owner. The dignity of an entrepreneur lies in the ability to properly dispose of his wealth and use it to support business, for the benefit of loved ones, and for charity. The means of earning capital also matter – only honestly earned wealth is respected (it remains unclear how Sombart interprets the capitalist nature of robbers and pirates in this regard). Business morality is imbued with respect and decency, and competition is fair: such methods of economic struggle as destroying competitors by selling out at low prices have not yet become widespread. It is still considered reprehensible to lure other people's customers and attract buyers with the help of intrusive advertising. The capitalist, while doing his business, still cares about others: he often refuses to introduce labor-saving technology so as not to deprive his workers of a piece of bread.

According to W. Sombart, the highly capitalist spirit of modern economic man is characterized by a fundamental change in value orientations. The goals of economic activity are now becoming profit and business prosperity.

These two goals are interrelated because a net profit is essential for the business to flourish, and the former is impossible without the latter. At the same time, the endpoint of the entrepreneur's aspirations is pushed into infinity, business development and profit growth have no purpose, no other human meaning, except for the development of production itself.

Among the entrepreneurs of mature capitalism, W. Sombart finds the same social types as in the early one: robbers, speculators, bureaucrats, etc. However, their style, forms, and methods of activity change fundamentally. The infinity of their business and its complete isolation from human interests and needs leads to the fact that the entrepreneur loses normal feelings, attachments, spiritual life, etc., turning into a machine, a slave of his business. The style of doing business is also changing. It is dominated by rationality and an orientation toward production for exchange, the primary goal of any human production – the satisfaction of needs, loses its priority. Hence the desire for cheaper production and increased marketing, which knows no moral limitations. Everything that prevents maximum profit is ruthlessly suppressed, and the competition takes on the character of a cruel game without rules. Religious, moral, and other prohibitions and restrictions can no longer restrain capitalism development.

Bourgeois virtues in high-capitalist culture are undergoing significant changes. In this period, they ceased to be necessary attributes of the entrepreneur's personality, turning into business attributes, “ceased to be qualities of living people and instead became objective principles of management” (Sombart, 1938, p. 145). This means that the entrepreneur himself may not be a hard-working, honest, solid, thrifty person and may not adhere to these moral norms in his private life, but his business, to successfully develop and compete, must be conducted on the principles of diligence, economy, rationality, scrupulous fulfillment of contracts, etc. The virtue of modesty and asceticism also withdraw from the private life of the new-style bourgeois: he can resort to luxury, spend money on extravagant entertainment, etc., only making sure that expenses do not exceed income. At the same time, the capitalist enterprise itself is conducted according to the principles of the strictest rationality and economy, proven methods of accounting, record-keeping, personnel management, etc.

Consequently, the late capitalist entrepreneur no longer creates capitalism himself with the help of personal energy and character, but capitalism with its established socio-cultural values and norms of activity and behavior creates the entrepreneur and, at the same time, opposes him as a huge economic and socio-cultural cosmos.

Sombart presents capitalism as a stage of historical development, while its finitude is determined by the duality of its socio-cultural nature. It is condi-

tioned by the fact that the bourgeois “gets fat” and loses the passionate energy of the entrepreneurial spirit. He begins to unproductively use wealth in the form of rent, gets used to the quiet satiety of rentiers, and returns to the luxury and profligacy he rejected in his era of eminence and flourishing. Apart from that, the development of bureaucracy in a capitalist organization also undermines the energetic entrepreneurial spirit; management technique even takes the place of talent and creative intuition.

3.4. Entrepreneurship functions and entrepreneur role in society

The functions and roles of entrepreneurship in society and its economic life are diverse. The concept of “entrepreneurship” has different meanings depending on the context: it is an economic category, a special management method, and a factor in production development; at the same time, entrepreneurship, as Max Weber and Werner Sombart's works have shown, also means a special cultural phenomenon associated with a certain system of values, and even with a specific way of life.

Entrepreneurship includes the fulfilment of a number of functions and roles (Keister, 2005; Ruef & Lounsbury, 2007; Neck et al., 2020): (a) capital ownership based on private property and its disposal for the purpose of business development; (b) economic activity focus towards obtaining profit and its subsequent capitalization; (c) combining production factors in order to find options for maximum efficiency and profitability; (d) the entrepreneur acts as an economically active entity acting on the market independently, on his own initiative, and oriented towards freedom of choice, decision-making and results-sharing; (e) the entrepreneur's economic freedom causes his responsibility for the decisions made, which he also bears independently; (f) the entrepreneur's activity is never implemented in conditions of full clarity and predictability of results, therefore he bears the burden of risk associated with uncertainty; (g) the most important role of an entrepreneur is his participation in free competition, which involves not only activity, initiative, risk and responsibility, but also high achievability, the desire for success and leadership; (h) the entrepreneur acts as a carrier of innovation, creativity in business, offers new ways of solving problems, looks for new opportunities and optimal adaptation to changing conditions.

The listed functions and roles are interrelated and mutually determined, but scholars have differently identified the main ones that define the very essence of entrepreneurial activity.

Austrian economist *Friedrich von Hayek*, a Nobel Prize laureate (1948), attached special importance to the freedom of entrepreneurship, which he saw

as the only guarantee of the prosperity of modern Western society, while simultaneously ensuring everyone's unlimited right to autonomy and initiative, the opportunity to decide their own destiny. F. Hayek regarded free competition as a “discovery procedure” for effective economic solutions, the dynamics of rewards which is the most reliable indicator of an individual's adaptability to changing conditions. No restrictions on free competition, as well as artificial maintenance of equal reliable welfare for all members of society, were considered by the scientists not only morally unacceptable but also as impossible to realize economically without the intervention of a totalitarian dictatorial political regime.

One of the best known and most popular theories in science is the theory of another Austrian economist, *Joseph Schumpeter* (1926), who in “The Theory of Economic Development” explored entrepreneurship as a phenomenon of economic life. He points out that, although the entrepreneur fulfills the roles of capital owner, the rational production manager, worker, inventor, and profit seeker in free competition conditions, none of them exhausts the specific content that is the basis of the entrepreneur's positive role in economic life. J. Schumpeter saw the main role and essence of entrepreneurship in overcoming the inertia of the economic system. The fact is that the rationality of an economic man implies an orientation towards optimal, reliably calculated production, financial, and commercial operations that bring, if not maximum, but, at least, a guaranteed profit. Therefore, rationality is a factor in the economic system sustainability and inertia. The entrepreneur activity in the proper sense of the word, according to the scholar, consists in changing stable stereotypes of economic activity and creating new combinations of production factors in anticipation of competitor preference. Entrepreneurship, thus, can be defined as an organizational innovation for profit. Entrepreneurship is characterized as “creative destruction” – the dismantling of established combinations of production factors, principles, and stereotypes of economic activity to create new ones, the effectiveness of which is checked by competition. If it is confirmed by a high profit, the innovation itself gradually becomes a stable stereotype and is reproduced by inertia, until the entrepreneur destroys it in the name of new, more efficient forms of business (pp. 67-69). Therefore, economic life under the conditions of entrepreneurial freedom is like a kind of “cycle”.

Socially, entrepreneurship is not identified with any particular class, property, professional group, or a specific social or economic system. The entrepreneur, from J. Schumpeter's point of view, is not identical to the capitalists' class, nor bourgeois culture or society. Rather, it forms the basis of capitalism as a market economy, and the capitalist class itself arises from the routinization of entrepreneurial charisma. Any professional in the business

sphere – whether it's a manager, merchant, etc. – finds himself in the role of an entrepreneur at the time when he makes innovations. If the innovation is successful and turns into a stable stereotype of economic activity or a sustainable economic organization, its author is no longer an entrepreneur, but simply an owner or manager who maintains stability. The scientist gives an analogy with soldiers and officers who become warriors and warlords only when they take part in combat.

Thus, according to J. Schumpeter, entrepreneurship is not a social group but a role performed by representatives of different groups. At the same time, entrepreneurship is conditioned by the presence of certain inclinations and motives in individuals and readiness to lead a particular way of life.

The leading motives for an entrepreneur are the desire for novelty and the joy of creativity: innovations, although aimed at profit, are carried out by a true entrepreneur not for his own sake, as change for the sake of change. Therefore, the role of an entrepreneur does not imply hedonistic or bourgeois motives for profit to enjoy further peaceful enjoyment of wealth. A true entrepreneur cannot stop at the achieved results, because for him the activity as such is valuable, he does not commit his brainchild: loving the creative idea in it, he still abandons or destroys it to start a new business.

The motive of the entrepreneur's activity is the desire for success and the will to win. At the same time, profit is important as an expression of success, and not as an independent goal. A real entrepreneur strives for self-affirmation, and self-realization in business, and even, according to J. Schumpeter, he is mesmerized by the magic of struggle, he needs to overcome hostile circumstances, environmental resistance, and competition.

So, the achievable values of a culture are most vividly embodied in entrepreneurship. Having the will to win means the entrepreneur's ability to mobilize in the struggle, subordinate all his strength and resources, and force others to obey his interests and will. In addition, a true entrepreneur is characterized by the ability to “hold the blow” – because not every innovation is always successful, and when daring to do so, a person is guided not only by rational calculation but also by an irrational belief in victory. If he is defeated, faith in his own strength and desire for success help him not to break down, not to despair, but to mobilize for a new struggle.

Another motive for entrepreneurial activity is the thirst for power, the desire to be the owner not only of own destiny, but also of business, to organize, if not the whole world, then at least some part of it following his ideas about values, norms, order, and organization. The entrepreneur seeks to create an “empire” in which he is the full-fledged owner, manages, is responsible for everything, and everything is subordinate to him. One of the varieties of

such “empires” is large family affairs, and dynasties. However, it is precisely in them that the role-role essence of entrepreneurship rather than structure and status is most clearly expressed – it is in “empires” that the above-mentioned routinization of entrepreneurial charisma occurs, a well-adjusted and established business turns into a resistant and then stagnant structure, and the will to power and the desire for creativity usually fades away in the next generations, who at the best turn out to be good manager-administrators and at worst to be simply hedonistic consumers.

J. Schumpeter noted the “fading” of entrepreneurial initiative in modern forms of economic activity, such as large monopolies, state-owned enterprises, or joint-stock companies. Here, entrepreneurial roles become symbolic rather than genuine.

With the help of J. Schumpeter's theory, it is possible to clearly define the concepts of “business” and “entrepreneurship”, which are not identical, although they are now often mistakenly used as synonyms. Entrepreneurship should be understood as innovative economic and organizational activity related to the creation of new combinations of production factors, while business is the reproduction of economic structures and already established patterns of activity, focused on profit generation.

One of the most significant manifestations of entrepreneurship as a social role is the “forced entrepreneurship” phenomenon. The economist *Vadim Radaev* (2005), in particular, points out this phenomenon. According to his research, the increase in entrepreneurial activity in society occurs in times of crisis. This can be explained by the fact that, due to rising unemployment and falling incomes of those employed in both the public and private sectors, the most active part of the population does not expect or demand help from the state (or simply realize that there is no point in counting on such help), but solves its problems by running a small business on its own. In times of crisis, small business in different spheres of economic activity creates up to 2/3 of all jobs, being a kind of social “safety valve”, the possibility to resort to which reduces the tension in society. The disorganization of economic institutions and inadequacy of established economic stereotypes to the new situation also contributes to the growth of small businesses in times of crisis. “Forced entrepreneurship” in crisis periods is a classic manifestation of population adaptation to the changed living conditions. For example, everyone knows that in the 90s of the 20th century in the former republics of the USSR, there was a sharp increase in the number of “shuttle” traders and other types of small businessmen, whose ranks were filled by people who had lost their jobs or “public sector workers” desperate to make ends meet (pp. 138-139).

Moreover, in economic crisis conditions, society's need for entrepreneurial initiative and the search for new forms of economic life objectively increases. Therefore, during these periods the symbolic capital of entrepreneurs often manifests itself – their prestige grows because hopes for a way out of the crisis are associated with their innovative activities; ideologies focused on individual freedom and self-activity, and the ethics of success become more active; the mythology of “strong personality”, “self-made person”, etc., is consciously cultivated.

When the economic situation stabilizes, there is a gradual decline in entrepreneurial activity, and the number of small businesspeople declines evenly. This is explained by the fact that those forced to engage in small business activities for the sake of basic survival under stabilizing conditions usually cease business and find quieter and more secure earnings in the public sector or for hire in the private sector. Moreover, if we apply J. Schumpeter's concept, the reduction in the entrepreneurial activity itself can also be explained by a decline in social demand for it. In a situation of stability, economic growth can be supported by managers.

3.5. Religious, ethnic and psychocultural determinants of entrepreneurial activity activation

Since ancient times, it has been observed that ethnic and religious minorities are often more entrepreneurial, more receptive to innovation, and more willing to explore new economic niches and roles than the autochthonous population. Archaic consciousness ascribed negative asocial traits to outsiders – insidiousness, cruelty, hypocrisy, greed, avarice – often attributing them to a false faith or false ethnic character. Active outsiders aroused hatred and fear and became victims of brutal persecution, but at the same time, it was impossible to do without them altogether, as they assumed functions and roles unacceptable to the autochthonous majority.

In the twenties century, this problem became the object of attention of scientists who wondered what social, cultural, and psychological characteristics of minorities were favorable to their entrepreneurial activity and whether there was a direct connection with religious ethics or national characteristics. *Max Weber* (1919) notes that economic activity was facilitated not so much by religious ethics per se but by the position of the foreigner, often limited in rights and even persecuted: “national and religious minorities, opposed as subordinate to any other dominant group, usually voluntarily or forced to renounce political influence and political activity, concentrate all their efforts in the field of entrepreneurship; thus the most gifted of their representatives seek to satisfy their ambitions, which do not find application in public service” (p. 211). Due

to legislative restrictions, all channels of social mobility were often closed for non-believers and foreigners, except economic: political, military, educational, and often cultural activities were limited. At the same time, they sometimes had a full monopoly on both forbidden and innovative economic niches.

In addition, for religious and ethnic minorities of non-autochthonous origin, traditional occupations were inaccessible because they were generally not integrated into primary social structures (communities, castes, etc.) and did not have access to land and other productive resources.

Psycho-cultural qualities of migrants – their dynamism, readiness for change and ability to adapt to new conditions, some adventurism and propensity for risk, and experience of entrepreneurship accumulated over many generations, due to which they received the stable name of trading peoples – also played a great role.

During the formation of commodity-money relations and from the very beginning of the communal organization of society collapse, foreign minorities often became the pioneers of new forms of economic activity – trade, credit. This was facilitated by their marginal position: they were not bound by social relations, all sorts of obligations, and personal preferences, they were not subject to unconditional the autochthonous majority religious and moral prohibitions and restrictions, according to *W. Sombart* (1934), “the alien was empty” (p. 49). Thus, it is widely known that in Western Europe, where the Catholic Church strictly condemned usury and for a long time (until the 13th century) perceived trade as a “morally inferior” occupation, as well as in the Near and Middle East, where Islam strictly forbade charging loan interest, these undesirable economic to Christians and Muslims economic niches were filled by Jews. In the traditional societies of Africa and Asia in the pre-colonial and colonial period, where interpersonal relations dominated and communal organization was preserved, trade, especially in rural areas, was also mainly conducted to a greater extent by members of ethnoreligious minorities: in Africa by Indians, Lebanese, Berbers; in South-East Asia by Chinese. This is explained by the fact that autochthons originally involved in interpersonal relations had to adhere to the principles of personal loyalty, from which the position of “gift” or “service” arises, and not equivalent exchange; paternalism, not formal and impersonal agreements and contracts. Outsiders, not bound by such obligations, were freer in choosing behavioral strategies, not being bound by traditional status and role relations, they could freely occupy the niches that remained (Hebert & Link, 2009; Carlen, 2016). This is because the autochthonous people initially involved in interpersonal relations had to adhere to the principles of personal loyalty, from which the position of “gift” or “service” rather than equivalent exchange follows; paternalism rather than formally impersonal

agreements and contracts. Outsiders who were not constrained by such commitments were freer in their choice of behavioural strategies, not being bound by traditional status and role relations, they were free to occupy the remaining niches (Hebert & Link, 2009; Carlen, 2016).

The phenomenon of high entrepreneurial, especially financial, activity of ethnoreligious minorities was analyzed by the German philosopher and sociologist *Georg Simmel* (1900) in the well-known work “The Philosophy of Money”. His remark that money is the homeland of the homeless is widely known. The possession of money allows outcasts to engage in social connections, socialise, which is otherwise impossible for them. Even if communication with such minorities is taboo, if religion or custom dictates to despise and avoid them – the need for money forces one to approach them and maintain relations with them. Such minorities, above all the Jews in Western Europe, but other examples can be given – remain in a special position. Due to their foreignness, they can never fully integrate, and dissolve into society, therefore they cause a wary and hostile attitude. At the same time, having concentrated money in their hands, these minorities become vital to society. The contradictory status of entrepreneurial minorities also causes a contradictory attitude towards them on the part of the majority: they are allowed to remain within the framework of society, but they are aware of their usefulness as a dependency, as an unacceptable, illegitimate secret power over society, which increases fear and hostility towards them.

Autochthonous religious minorities, included in traditional economic relations and having access to land (sectarians in Ukraine, Sikhs in India), also as a result of their position and special mentality, often turned out to be carriers of advanced economic roles or new technologies. Sikhs have traditionally played a prominent role in the development of agriculture in India and they showed great dynamism even during the colonial period. According to the British, “Sikhs are the most modern of all Indians: they are eager to pursue anything that gives some advantage and benefit, whether it is a sewing machine, agricultural machinery, East African trade or war” (Singh, 2001, p. 210).

At the end of the 20th century, religions that had retained their entrepreneurial traditions in many parts of the world became active agents of industrial modernisation and post-modernisation. Although the Sikhs suffered greatly from the partition of India in 1947, they managed to regain their leadership in commodity-oriented agriculture in the 1950s (in 1950, Punjab became an exporter of grain). Moreover, they demonstrated a clear tendency to master new, including labor-intensive, technologies, and the traditionally high level of their agriculture was increasing. Thanks to this, they became the main creators of the “Punjabi economic miracle” of the 60s and 70s of the last century, associated

with the green revolution – the development of new selective high-yielding varieties of cereals. However, the reasons for the “miracle” were, as usual, not so much the new varieties per se, but the Sikhs' accumulated farming culture: the green revolution was the result of green evolution (Singh, 2001).

Representatives of various faiths become trading peoples and active minorities. Among them were Christians of various denominations (Protestants, the Armenian Church members), Jews, Hindus, Sikhs, Confucians, Muslims, Parsis, and others. Probably, the reason for the entrepreneurial activity of religious minorities is not their specific religious ethics in itself, but its synthesis with other cultural factors and a set of specific circumstances in which its bearers find themselves (Dyatlov, 1996, p. 210). These circumstances contribute to the actualization of that active potential, achievable orientations, which are present in almost every ethical system, but in normal, stable conditions of the ethnoreligious majority may simply not be needed on a mass scale.

At the same time, some religious minorities have specific spiritual attitudes different from the majority, which determine their high modernization activity. First of all, membership in a sect indicates a high tension of religious feelings: “Belonging to a sect, as opposed to belonging to a church, which is given to a person from birth, is a kind of moral (primarily, in a business sense) personal certificate. The church is nothing else than an institution for giving grace... church membership is mandatory and therefore does not in itself characterize the moral qualities of the parishioners. A sect, on the other hand, is a voluntary association of only worthy (ideally) religious-ethical people, qualified as those who voluntarily joined the association, on the condition that permission was also given to them voluntarily, taking into account their proven religious choice” (Weber, 1919, p. 302).

On the other hand, the teachings professed by some sects and religious minorities really contain spiritual and ethical attitudes towards entrepreneurial activity. Such attitudes, from M. Weber, contained Protestant ethics, especially in the interpretation of Baptists and Methodists. We can say the same about Indian Sikhs. Researchers believe that Sikhism forms a type of personality that well adapts to the conditions of the modern market economy. Sikhism advanced the ethical ideal of the hardworking householder, for whom work is a duty. Sikhism condemns extreme asceticism and religiously motivated poverty and proclaims the value of human worldly life. Unlike Hindus, Sikhs do not divide professions into “pure” and “impure”, and do not know the many rituals and rites that bind Hindus, as well as astrology. The picture of the world formed by Sikhism is more rational, less mystical, and imbued with magic than the Hindu one. And although Sikhism by itself would hardly be able to become a spiritual prerequisite of endogenous capitalism in the conditions of India, it certainly provides a strong spiritual impulse for secondary modernization.

Active entrepreneurship of ethnic and religious minorities leads to the destruction of established stable stereotypes of economic behaviour and aggravates the conflict between modernised and traditional elements of the socio-cultural system. It is during periods of intensive modernisation that not only the activity of ethnic and religious minorities grows but also the environment's rejection of them. For traditionalists, they turn out to be carriers of a hostile capitalist spirit; for national entrepreneurial circles that are being formed, they turn out to be competitors whose activities must be restricted by any means; for customers, clients, and the masses, they turn out to be exploiters and fraudsters who profit from their misfortunes; for the state, they are constantly a "fifth column" that pursues the interests of the former colonialists and imperialists. It is during such periods that persecution of minority traders begins, sometimes violently and bloodily.

The further development of entrepreneurship in the modern world will depend on the direction in which society will move: downward – towards the forceful resolution of the capitalism contradictions, into modern barbarism in the style of the Middle Ages and reaching the bottom of the social crisis at the lowest point of the equilibrium of civilization; or upwards – by forming the humanistic foundations of the future society and, on this basis, solving the social crisis and reaching the pinnacle of the development of civilization. The modern process of transformation objectively forms the prerequisites for the transition of society and its institution of entrepreneurship to the network social order, when network flows, network structures and network interactions become the basis of the organization. Cooperation becomes the mechanism of development instead of competition (Martynyshyn & Kovalenko, 2016). As a result, the model of entrepreneurship based on collective self-management and socialization of management of economic activities of the society is emerging.

4. Conclusions

The article provides a comprehensive theoretical analysis of entrepreneurship as a unique socio-cultural phenomenon at various stages of the development of human society. The results of the study allow us to reach the following conclusions:

1. The following stages can be distinguished in the study of entrepreneurship: (1) denial of entrepreneurship as an unnatural human activity (pre-industrial period of history); (2) the emergence of the entrepreneurship theory as a scientific basis of economic management (early industrial period); (3) philosophical and religious legitimization – entrepreneurship is no longer seen not only as an economically expedient phenomenon but also as socially useful from a religious and moral perspective (period of mature industrialism); (4) adaptation of entrepreneurship theory to conditions of post-industrial society.

2. In a broad sense, entrepreneurship is an innovative, creative activity that can be carried out not only in economic but also in any other sphere of life of society (political, social, cultural, educational, scientific, etc.). However, most often the concept of entrepreneurship is used to characterize economic and organizational activity, associating it with ownership, risks, and receiving economic benefits.

3. Entrepreneurship in economic activity evolves in the following socio-cultural forms: pre-capitalist (traditional) entrepreneurship, oriented towards meeting real human needs and simple reproduction of production; early capitalist entrepreneurship – where man still remains the measure of all things; mature capitalist entrepreneurship, not connected to real human needs, but oriented towards itself – towards infinite growth and expansion. At the same time, each preliminary form does not disappear but integrates with the next socio-cultural type of society.

4. Which socio-cultural form and strategy of entrepreneurship in the future depends on the direction in which society will continue to develop: downwards – towards the forceful resolution of the contradictions of capitalism, into modern barbarism and reaching the bottom of the social crisis; or upwards – by forming the humanist foundations of future society and on this basis resolving the social crisis.

5. Today, there are objective conditions for the socialization of entrepreneurship, the formation of a network social order, and network interactions. Instead of competition, cooperation and collective self-government, aimed at harmonizing and satisfying the reasonable needs of humanity, can become the development mechanism.

The scientific novelty. Cultural deepening of the understanding of entrepreneurship essence as a unique socio-cultural phenomenon at various stages of the historical development of human society.

The significance of the study. The significance of the research is revealed in the addition of science with new theoretical provisions about entrepreneurship, as well as in the possibility of using them in the process of training professional entrepreneurs and managers.

Prospects for further research. The prospect of further research in this direction may be to find out the peculiarities of entrepreneurship in various spheres of society's life.

Acknowledgement

This publication has been made in accordance with the theme of the Research Institute of the Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts within the theme: “Formation of the Modern Paradigm of Management of Socio-Cultural Activity in the Context of Civilization Development” (Project No. 0118U100544).

References:

- Alvarez, S. (2005). *Theories of Entrepreneurship*. New York: Now Publishers Inc.
- Aquinas, Th. (1273; 2010). *Summa Theologica* (Trans. in Lat.). Washington: Coyote Canyon Press.
- Aristotle (4th cent. BC; 1998). *The Politics* (Trans. in ancient Greek). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baker, T., & Welter, F. (2020). *Contextualizing Entrepreneurship Theory*. London: Routledge.
- Baxter, R. (1825; 2020). *The Reformed Pastor*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth.
- Berlach, A. I. (2007). *Bezpeka Biznesu [Business Security]*. Kyiv: Universytet "Ukraina" (in Ukr.).
- Borsella, R. (Ed.). (2018). *Entrepreneurship: Theory, Processes and Practice*. New York: Willford.
- Cantillon, R. (1755; 2018). *An Essay on Economic Theory*. Auburn: Ludwig von Mises Institute.
- Carlen, J. (2016). *A Brief History of Entrepreneurship: The Pioneers, Profiteers, and Racketeers Who Shaped Our World*. New York: Columbia Business School Publishing.
- Christiansen, B., Branch, J., & Karmowska, J. (Eds.). (2020). *Cultural Factors and Performance in 21st Century Businesses*. Harrisburg: IGI Global.
- Chubukova, O. Yu. (2005). *Spil'ne Pidprijemnytstvo: Ekonomiko-Informatsijna Paradyhma [Joint Venture: Economic and Information Paradigm]*. Kyiv: MAUP (in Ukr.).
- Donets, L. I. (2006). *Osnovy Pidprijemnytstva [Fundamentals of Entrepreneurship]*. Kyiv: Tsentr Uchbovoi Literatury (in Ukr.).
- Dyatlov, V. I. (1996). *Entrepreneurial Minorities: Merchants, Strangers, or God-Sent?* New York: Springer.
- Ferraro, G. P., & Briody, E. K. (2017). *The Cultural Dimension of Global Business*. London: Routledge.
- Greene, F. J. (2020). *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*. New York: Red Globe Press.
- Gunderson, G. (2005). *An Entrepreneurial History of the United States*. New York: Beard Books.
- Hayek, F. A. von (1948; 1996). *Individualism and Economic Order*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hebert, R., & Link, A. (2009). *A History of Entrepreneurship*. London: Routledge.
- Hoi, I. V. (2013). *Pidprijemnytstvo [Entrepreneurship]*. Kyiv: Tsentr Uchbovoi Literatury (in Ukr.).
- Keister, L. (2005). *Entrepreneurship*. Bingley: Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Kolot, V. M. (2010). *Pidprijemnytstvo: Orhanizatsiia, Efektyvnist', Biznes-Kul'tura [Entrepreneurship: Organization, Efficiency, Business-Culture]*. Kyiv: KNEU (in Ukr.).

- Kondrashykhin, A. B. (2009). *Teoriia ta Praktyka Pidprianshyts'koho Ryzkyku [Theory and Practice of Entrepreneurship Risk]*. Kyiv: Tsentr Uchbovoi Literatury (in Ukr.).
- Kovalenko, Ye. (2020a). The Scientific and Philosophical Understanding of Socio-Cultural Essence of Management. *Socio-Cultural Management Journal*, 3(2), 30-56, doi: <https://doi.org/10.31866/2709-846X.2.2020.222646>.
- Kovalenko, Ye. (2020b). Theory and History of the Humanistic Management Culture in the Era of Industrialism. *Socio-Cultural Management Journal*, 3(1), 39-65, doi: <https://doi.org/10.31866/2709-846X.1.2020.219797>.
- Kovalenko, Ye. (2021). The Success Phenomenon in Socio-Cultural Management. *Socio-Cultural Management Journal*, 4(1), 3-33, doi: <https://doi.org/10.31866/2709-846x.1.2021.235662>.
- Kovalenko, Ye. (2022). The Management Culture: Philosophical and Cultural Understanding. *Socio-Cultural Management Journal*, 5(1), 31-57, doi: <https://doi.org/10.31866/2709-846x.1.2022.257667>.
- Kovalenko, Ye., Khlystun, O., & Martynyshyn, Ya. (2019). Humanism as a Philosophical Category and Socio-Cultural Phenomenon in the Society's Life Management. *Bulletin of Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts. Series in Management of Social and Cultural Activity*, 2(2), 3-31, doi: <https://doi.org/10.31866/2616-7573.2.2019.190553>.
- Kuratko, D. F. (2013). *Entrepreneurship: Theory, Process, and Practice*. Boston: Cengage Learning.
- Latsyba, M., Liapin, D., & Matviienko, K. (2009). *Yak Politychni Partii Rozvyvaiut' Pidprianshyts'tvo [How Political Parties Develop Entrepreneurship]*. Kyiv: Ahentstvo "Ukraina" (in Ukr.).
- Martynyshyn, Ya. M., & Khlystun, O. S. (2018). Fenomen Idej v Upravlinni Zhyttiedial'nistiu Suspil'stva [The Phenomenon of Ideas in the Management Activity of the Society]. *Visnyk Kyivs'koho Natsional'noho Universytetu Kul'tury i Mystetstv. Serii: Menedzhment Sotsiokul'turnoi Dial'nosti [Bulletin of Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts. Series in Management of Social and Cultural Activity]*, 2, 7-25, doi: <https://doi.org/10.31866/2616-7573.2.2018.149294> (in Ukr.).
- Martynyshyn, Ya. M., & Khlystun, O. S. (2019). Hierarkhiia iak Fenomen Orhanizatsijnoi Kul'tury [Hierarchy as a Phenomenon of Organizational Culture]. *Visnyk Kyivs'koho Natsional'noho Universytetu Kul'tury i Mystetstv. Serii: Menedzhment Sotsiokul'turnoi Dial'nosti [Bulletin of Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts. Series in Management of Social and Cultural Activity]*, 2(1), 7-31, doi: <https://doi.org/10.31866/2616-7573.1.2019.170653> (in Ukr.).
- Martynyshyn, Ya. M., & Kovalenko, Ye. Ya. (2017). Smysly v Kul'turi Upravlinnia [The Measures in Culture of Management]. *Visnyk Natsional'noi Akademii Kerivnykh Kadriv Kul'tury i Mystetstv [Herald National Academy of Managerial Staff of Culture and Arts]*, 4, 26-31 (in Ukr.).

- Martynyshyn, Ya. M., & Kovalenko, Ye. Ya. (2018a). *Mystetstvo Upravlinnia j Osvitni Tekhnologii Pidhotovky Menedzheriv Sotsiokul'turnoi Diial'nosti [Art of Management and Educational Technologies of Preparation of Managers of Social and Cultural Activity]*. Bila Tserkva: Publisher Pshonkivskyj O. V. (in Ukr.).
- Martynyshyn, Ya. M., & Kovalenko, Ye. Ya. (2018b). Formuvannia Suchasnoi Systemy Upravlinnia Zhyttiediial'nistiu Suspil'stva [Formation of the Modern System Management of Life Society]. *Visnyk Kyivs'koho Natsional'noho Universytetu Kul'tury i Mystetstv. Serii: Menedzhment Sotsiokul'turnoi Diial'nosti [Bulletin of Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts. Series in Management of Social and Cultural Activity]*, 1, 7-24, doi: <https://doi.org/10.31866/2616-7573.1.2018.143383> (in Ukr.).
- Martynyshyn, Ya., & Kovalenko, Ye. (2016). Tsyvilizatsiia u Tochsi Bifurkatsii: Zarozhennia Novoho Sotsialnoho Poriadku i Suchasnoi Modeli Upravlinnia Politychnoiu, Ekonomichnoiu ta Sotsiokulturnoiu Sferamy [Civilization at the Point of Bifurcation: the Emergence of a New Social Order and the Modern Model of Management of Political, Economic and Socio-Cultural Spheres]. *Ekonomika i Menedzhment Kul'tury [Economy and Management of Culture]*, 1, 5-32 (in Ukr.).
- Martynyshyn, Ya., Khlystun, O., & Blašková, M. (2020). The System as a Socio-Cultural Phenomenon Philosophy of Management. *Socio-Cultural Management Journal*, 3(1), 3-38, doi: <https://doi.org/10.31866/2709-846X.1.2020.219795>.
- Martynyshyn, Ya., Khlystun, O., Antonivska, M., & Krupa, O. (2022). Business Ethics in Harmonization of Society Life. *Socio-Cultural Management Journal*, 5(1), 3-30, doi: <https://doi.org/10.31866/2709-846x.1.2022.257649>.
- Marx, K. (1867; 1992). *Capital: Volume III (Book 3)* (Trans. in Germ.). London: Penguin Classics.
- Mishra, Ch., & Manis, Z. (2014). *The Theory of Entrepreneurship: Creating and Sustaining Entrepreneurial Value*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nair, V., Raghavan, V., & Nair, H. (2016). *Entrepreneurship Made Easy: A Manual on How the Winners Win and Why the Losers Lose*. Chennai: Notion Press, Inc.
- Neck, H. M., Neck, C. P., & Murray, E. L. (2020). *Entrepreneurship: The Practice and Mindset*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Ostankova, L. A. (2011). *Analiz, Modeliuvannia ta Upravlinnia Ekonomichnyh Ryzkykamy [Analysis, Modeling and Management of Economic Risks]*. Kyiv: Tsentr Uchbovoi Literatry (in Ukr.).
- Pachkovskiy, Y. F. (2006). *Psykhologhiia Pidpriemnytstva [Psychology of Entrepreneurship]*. Kyiv: Karavela (in Ukr.).
- Paul (1st cent. AD; 2016). Second Epistle to the Thessalonians. *Bible*. London: Minerva Classics.
- Radaev, V. V. (2005). *Economic Sociology*. New York: Wiley.
- Romanovskiy, O. O. (2002). *Mystetstvo i Sekrety Pidpriemnyts'koi Diial'nosti [Art and Secrets of Entrepreneurship Activities]*. Kyiv: Demiur (in Ukr.).

- Ruef, M., & Lounsbury, M. (Eds.). (2007). *The Sociology of Entrepreneurship*. Greenwich: JAI Press.
- Say, J.-B. (1803; 2015). *A Treatise on Political Economy* (Trans. in Fr.). New York: Sagwan Press.
- Schumpeter, J. (1926; 2021). *The Theory of Economic Development*. London: Routledge.
- Shane, S. A. (2003). *A General Theory of Entrepreneurship: The Individual-opportunity Nexus*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Shehda, A. W. (2008). *Ryzyky v Pidpriemnytstvi: Otsiniuvannia ta Upravlinnia [Risks in Entrepreneurship: Evaluation and Management]*. Kyiv: Znannia (in Ukr.).
- Shkola, I. M. (2007). *Rozvytok Pidpriemnytstva v Konteksti Ievrointehratsijnykh Protsesiv [Entrepreneurship Development in the Context of European Integration Processes]*. Chernivtsi: Knyhy-XXI (in Ukr.).
- Shliiko, A. V. (2008). *Ekonomika Pidpriemnytstva na Rynku Tovariv i Posluh [Economics of Entrepreneurship in the Market of Goods and Services]*. Kyiv: Tsentr Uchbovoi Literatury (in Ukr.).
- Shvab, L. I. (2006). *Osnovy Pidpriemnytstva [Fundamentals of Entrepreneurship]*. Kyiv: Karavela (in Ukr.).
- Simmel, G. (1900; 1990). *The Philosophy of Money*. London: Routledge.
- Singh, P. (2001). *The Sikhs*. New York: Image.
- Skibitskyi, O. M. (2011). *Orhanizatsiia Biznesu: Menedzhment Pidpriemnyts'koi Diial'nosti [Business Organization: Management of Entrepreneurship Activities]*. Kyiv: Kondor (in Ukr.).
- Smith, A. (1776; 2012). *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sombart, W. (1934; 2018). *Economic Life in the Modern Age*. London: Routledge.
- Sombart, W. (1938; 2013). *Le Bourgeois: Contribution a L'histoire Morale et Intellectuelle de L'homme Economique Modern [The Bourgeois: A Contribution to the Moral and Intellectual History of Modern Economic Man]*. Canton: Ink Book (in Fr.).
- Stewart, G. A. (2011). *Entrepreneurship: Economics Powered by Imagination*. Scotts Valley: CreateSpace.
- Thünen, J. H. von (1826; 2014). *Der Isolierte Staat [The Isolated State]*. Nicosia: TP Verone Publishing (in Germ.).
- Tyrpak, I. V. (2011). *Osnovy Ekonomiky ta Orhanizatsii Pidpriemnytstva [Fundamentals of Economics and Entrepreneurship Organization]*. Kyiv: Kondor (in Ukr.).
- Varnalii, Z. S (2006). *Osnovy Pidpriemnytstva [Fundamentals of Entrepreneurship]*. Kyiv: Znannia-Pres (in Ukr.).
- Vynohradska, A. M (2008). *Osnovy Pidpriemnytstva [Fundamentals of Entrepreneurship]*. Kyiv: Kondor (in Ukr.).
- Walle, A. H. (2022). *Entrepreneurship and Culture: The New Social Paradigm*. London: Routledge.

- Weber, M. (1905; 2016). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (Trans. in Germ.). New York: HardPress.
- Weber, M. (1918; 1967). *Ancient Judaism* (Trans. in Germ.). New York: Free Press.
- Weber, M. (1919; 1993). *The Sociology of Religion* (Trans. in Germ.). New York: Beacon Press.
- Weber, M. (1920; 1959). *The Religion of China: Confucianism and Taoism* (Trans. in Germ.). New York: Free Press.
- Weber, M. (1921; 2009). *The Religion of India (The Sociology of Hinduism and Buddhism)* (Trans. in Germ.). New York: Free Press.
- Weber, M. (1925; 2010). *Economy and Society* (Trans. in Germ.). Charleston: Nabu Press.
- Zhalilo, E. (Ed.). (2010). *Mekhanizmy Rozvytku Pidpriumnytstva v Umovakh Postkryzovoho Vidnovlennia Ekonomiky Ukrainy [Mechanisms of Business Development in the Conditions of Post-Crisis Recovery of Ukraine's Economy]*. Kyiv: NISD (in Ukr.).
- Zharova, L., Kakutysh, E., & Khlobystov, E. (2012). *Ekolohichne Pidpriumnytstvo ta Ekolohizatsiia Pidpriumnytstva: Teoriia, Orhanizatsiia, Upravlinnia [Ecological Entrepreneurship and Greening of Entrepreneurship: Theory, Organization, Management]*. Sumy: Universytet'ska Knyha (in Ukr.).
- Zianko, V. V. (2005). *Innovatsijne Pidpriumnytstvo v Ukraini: Problemy Stanovlennia i Rozvytku [Innovative Entrepreneurship in Ukraine: Problems of Formation and Development]*. Vinnytsia: Universum (in Ukr.).
- Zubok, M. I. (2009). *Zakhyst Pidpriumnyts'koi Diial'nosti vid Nedobrovisnoi Konkurentsii i Promyslovoho Shpyhunstva [Protection of Entrepreneurship Activities from Unfair Competition and Industrial Espionage]*. Kyiv: KNTEU (in Ukr.).

Information about the Authors:

Yaroslav Martynyshyn, Professor, DSc, Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts, Kyiv, Ukraine; e-mail: martinishin.ya@gmail.com; orcid id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8599-7206>

Olena Khlystun, Professor, DSc, Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts, 36, Ye. Konovalets St., Kyiv 01601, Ukraine; e-mail: with_joy@ukr.net; orcid id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1764-6559> (corresponding author)

Maryna Antonivska, Lecturer, Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts, Kyiv, Ukraine; e-mail: antonivska_maryna@ukr.net; orcid id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4451-3735>

Oksana Krupa, Lecturer, Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts, Kyiv, Ukraine; e-mail: oksanakrupa24@gmail.com; orcid id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7387-7565>