

UDC: 005.936:316.722

JEL Classification: A14, M11, Z13

Received: 30/06/2022

Yelena Kovalenko

National Academy of Managerial Staff of Culture and Arts, Kyiv, Ukraine

The Culture of Economic Life of Society: Essence, Basic Values, Management

Abstract: *Introduction.* The processes that are taking place today under the influence of globalization in the world economy cause serious claims to the theory of economic management, since it mainly takes into account the economic component of economic activity and almost ignores its semantic, symbolic, moral, and aesthetic significance, which negatively affects labor productivity and efficiency management as a whole. Therefore, turning to the study of economic activity in the philosophical and cultural aspects seems relevant and justified. *Purpose and methods.* The purpose of the article is the philosophical and cultural conceptualization of the dynamic nature of the economic life of society, which will allow deepening the understanding of the essence of economic culture, its basic values, and its management system. The methodological basis of the research is the dialectical principle of cognition, systemic, cultural, historical, and interdisciplinary approaches to the study of organizational phenomena and processes. *Results.* The essence of the culture of the economic life of the society is revealed. The regularities and trends of the development of economic culture have been revealed. The basic values of the culture of human economic activity, their semantic, symbolic, moral, and aesthetic significance depending on the stage of development of society and its cultural specificity are determined. *Conclusions.* The scientific novelty of the research results lies in the deepening of the understanding of the essence of the culture of the economic life of society, the definition of its components, and basic values. The significance of the research is found in the addition of cultural science with new theoretical provisions about the culture of economic activity, as well as in the possibility of using them in the process of training managers of economic organizations.

Keywords: culture of economic life, basic values, management.

1. Introduction

The problem formulation. Close attention to economic life has been caused in our country by the radical reform of this sphere, which has been going on for the third decade, and by the systemic crisis of Ukrainian society. A panacea for all ills is mainly sought among economic means – in changing forms of ownership, increasing the competitiveness of domestic products, and increasing the level of material well-being of citizens. Emphasizing attention on external transformations often leads to an underestimation of the fact that the basis of any economic system is a person and an economic culture, which sets the goals of the activity, guided by certain value guidelines. Labor productivity depends on this, as well as the efficiency of economic activity in general. It is man and culture that should be at the center of research into the processes of transformation of the economic sphere of society. But, unfortunately, there is a tendency to underestimate the interest in socio-cultural aspects of economic behavior.

The processes taking place in the modern world economy, production informatization, and digitization, increasing the role of intangible resources – knowledge, experience, and creative abilities, actualize the study of the economic life of society. In the studies of leading economists, sociologists, and philosophers, the transition to a new post-industrial formation is announced, in which the human resource will be decisive, work will undergo a radical transformation, and will have a more personal, free, creative character. The economic competitiveness will depend on the efficiency of using the cultural potential of the nation, and the spiritual resources of the economic entity. However, the question of negative and positive aspects of the subject's transformation remains generally open. The ability to make non-standard decisions, self-discipline, self-education, and spiritual development are perceived by researchers as initially given. Meanwhile, modern economic life realities testify to the opposite: the creative component of work decreases in most people, and hedonistic morality prevents the development of production motivation and personal responsibility formation for the results of one's own activities.

The relevance of this study is also due to the change in social ideology in our country. During the last century and a half, the paradigm of social development in Ukraine changed several times. These changes affected, in particular, one of the spheres of practical implementation of social ideals – the economy, causing a deep transformation of the subject itself and the culture of management. After all, any reforms not only change the external forms of activity but they, through various measures, educate the person himself in one direction or another.

Currently, Ukraine has chosen the path of modernization of the economy based on westernization by imitating and copying the western system of economic relations. At the same time, the national economic culture comes into conflict with the requirements of such modernization. This conflict leads either to the rejection of the reforms themselves by the national consciousness or to the destruction of the national culture. Ignoring the uniqueness of the national economic mentality can endanger the destruction of the national identity and cause serious problems in the development of society. Aggressive propaganda of economic fundamentalism leads to moral nihilism and degradation of the able-bodied part of the population. In this regard, an appeal to the domestic philosophical and cultural thought, which conceptualizes the national and religious tradition, can contribute to the economic development of society, without destroying the domestic worldviews that have developed historically and the value orientations of the personality of the economic entity. In such conditions, turning to the study of economic activity in the philosophical and cultural aspects seems relevant and justified.

State study of the problem. The study of the economic life of society as a whole is of interest to several sciences: economics, sociology, political science, philosophy, cultural studies, management, etc. The multifaceted nature of the problem we are interested in is due to the diversity of aspects of economic life – economic, political, and socio-cultural. The analysis of the economic life of mankind has traditionally been a prominent subject field of philosophical research. The study of the available literature shows that there is a whole range of facets and sides of economic life, which has become the subject of philosophical conceptualization. Traditionally, the main economic categories and laws were in the field of view of economic life researchers. The works of classical political economy representatives: Antoine de Montchrestien (1615), William Petty (1662), John Locke (1690), Francois Quesnay (1758), Adam Smith (1776), Jean-Baptiste Say (1803), David Ricardo (1817), John Mill (1848), Karl Marx (1867) and others, are devoted to the study of such basic categories as goods, money, value, production, labor, added value.

Many researchers focused their attention on the motives of economic activity, trying to explain what makes a person participate in economic activity. The works of Friedrich von Hayek (1948), Paul Heyne, Peter Boettke, and David Prychitko (2013) are devoted to the problems of economic motivation and economic consciousness. One of the influential directions of this current is the so-called “economics”, whose representatives try to explain the evolution of all socio-cultural phenomena only by economic factors, and a person’s behavior as economic activity subject, by the desire to minimize costs and maximize utility. Similar views were substantiated in the writings of Jeremy Bentham (1827), Alfred Sohn-Rethel (1978), Ludwig von Mises (1990), and others.

The statement about the economic basis that defines the socio-cultural superstructure of society is most fully grounded in the concept of Marxism. This concept is presented by the works of both Karl Marx (1867) and his closest supporters, and in the works of his numerous followers.

At the same time, there is a tradition from Plato (4th cent. BC) and Aristotle (4th cent. BC): explanation of economic processes and patterns of economic activity through the spiritual and cultural foundations of social existence. Such scientists as Georg Simmel (1900), Max Weber (1905, 1925), Joseph Schumpeter (1926), and Werner Sombart (1934, 1938) have all shown in their studies that it is unacceptable to reduce all the diversity of motives for economic activity to the desire to obtain the greatest material benefit. The economic entity is just a methodological abstraction: a holistic personality who is a representative of a certain nation participates in real activity. Representatives of the German historical school in economics, Adam Müller (1825), Karl Knies (1853), and Gustav von Schmoller (1875), drew attention to this moment.

Emphasis on the personal spiritual and moral principles of management is made in the works of Vladimir Solovyov (1883), Sergei Bulgakov (1912), and Semjon Frank (1930), Nikolai Berdiaev (1952), and others.

Currently, many works are devoted to reforming the national economy, changing the paradigms of economic development, and the consequences and significance of these reforms. Here we can highlight the works of Diana Hunt (1989), Rajani Kanth (1994), Valeria Mosini (2011), Jati Sengupta (2013), Kurt Dopfer (2022), and other authors.

The processes taking place in the world economy are also of great interest. Globalization, the transition to a post-industrial society, the associated transformations not only of the economic system but also of economic consciousness, motivations of behavior become the subject of reflection by foreign and domestic authors: Yurii Zaitsev (2000), Jonathan Kirshner (2006), Dani Rodrik (2012), Andrii Hrytsenko (2015), Thomas Palley (2016), Olena Shevchenko (2017), Alla Vasina (2017), Ihor Nazarkevich (2020).

Important in the context of our research are the works that reveal the problems of economic management: Jeffrey Luke (1988), Paul Milgrom, John Roberts (1992), Peter Baalen, Lars Moratis (2001), Richard Steers, Luciara Nardon (2005), Alan Griffiths, Stuart Wall (2011), Mykola Latynin (2014), Hennadii Pivniak (2014), Anna Brzozowska, Dagmara Bubel, Larysa Nekrasenko (2022).

In the same regard, it is also necessary to note the research of Yaroslav Martynyshyn, Olena Khlystun, Yelena Kovalenko (Kovalenko, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020a, 2020b, 2021a, 2021b, 2022; Kovalenko et al., 2019; Martynyshyn & Khlystun, 2018, 2019; Martynyshyn & Kovalenko, 2016, 2017, 2018a, 2018b; Martynyshyn et al., 2020a, 2020b, 2022), which relate to socio-cultural aspects of management.

Unresolved issues. However, despite the diversity and value of the achieved results, the socio-cultural aspect of the economic life of society remains little studied. The study of economic activity exactly in the socio-cultural aspect implies its consideration through the prism of the general worldview paradigm of the individual, concretizing its economic paradigm and requires a special approach. Within such an approach, a person is perceived not as a function or a derivative of social institutions but as a personality that gives rise to social life in the aspect of its economic sphere. At the same time, the personality and its economic practice should be considered in the socio-cultural context, emphasizing the features of a specific social system.

2. Purpose and methods

The purpose and research tasks. The purpose of the article is the philosophical and cultural conceptualization of the dynamic nature of the economic life of society, which will allow to deepen the understanding of the essence of economic culture, its basic values and management system.

The specified purpose involves solving the following tasks:

- to reveal the essence of the culture of the economic life of the society;
- to identify patterns and trends in the economic culture development;
- to determine the basic values of the culture of human economic activity, their semantic, symbolic, moral and aesthetic significance depending from the stage of development of society and its cultural specificity.

Methodology and methods. The main ideas of the classics of philosophical, economic, and cultural thought, the works of modern domestic and foreign scientists on the problems of economic philosophy, economics, cultural studies, social anthropology, and psychology served as the theoretical basis of the study.

The methodological basis of the research is the dialectical principle of cognition, systemic, cultural, historical, and interdisciplinary approaches to the study of organizational phenomena and processes, as well as the creative possibilities of the activity approach, which explains human activity as a process of self-creation and self-knowledge. In addition, the used approach is characteristic of modern philosophy, which allows explaining the differences in social practice based on various meaningful and life orientations, worldviews, and dominant values inherent in the relevant paradigms of the economic development of society.

The author, relying on dialectical and systemic approaches, considers the economic life of society as a complex open dynamic system located in the environment of internal and external contradictions, the resolution of which ensures its movement from one qualitative state to another. The historical approach allows us to consider the movement of the economic system in the context of the stage-by-stage historical development of society.

The key methodological approach in solving this problem is cultural principles of cognition, in particular, axiological, which allows us to identify the values that are the driving motives for the development of the economic system at a particular stage of social development. The interdisciplinary approach contributes to a comprehensive study of the economic system from the perspective of related scientific disciplines: economics, political science, sociology, management, etc.

Information base. The information base of the study consists of scientific works of domestic and foreign scientists (philosophers, economists, cultural scientists, practicing managers), directly or indirectly affecting the problems of philosophy and cultural studies of economic life of society. As an empirical basis in substantiating the conceptual foundations of the phenomenon of economic culture, the results of the author's own research, obtained through observation and summarizing the results of practical experience of managers of economic organizations, were used.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Concept of culture of economic life of society

The notion of “culture of economic life” is used in modern science, as well as in journalism, rather rarely and mostly on an intuitive level. Attempts to define it clearly have so far been made by only a few researchers and are insufficiently definite. This can be explained both by the complexity and versatility of the more general, generic notion of “culture” and the vagueness of the specialised branch “economic life of society” and its confusion with the economy of society.

The culture of society's economic life should be defined through the concept of culture as a whole. The multitude of definitions of culture that exist today in modern science makes us dwell on one of them, which most accurately corresponds to the research tasks that we have set. In broad terms, culture can be found as a spiritual component of any human activity, as a general system of value orientations, meanings, motives, and norms, ensuring the integrity and development of society. Culture manifests itself in any form of activity and any social sphere as its human dimension, as the laying down and realisation of ideas about the proper and perfect. This definition, while not exhausting all possible approaches to culture, reveals its most general and significant characteristics and is widely used in modern cultural studies and other scientific disciplines (Erasov, 2000, p. 24).

According to the American researcher *Talcott Parsons* (1971), culture as a subsystem of the overall social action system forms the ultimate reality. It is linked to the action system through the structuring of meaning orienta-

tions. The cultural system is mainly assigned the function of preservation and reproduction of the pattern of behaviour, its transmission, and creative transformation. The main structural variable with the help of which the cultural system can be analysed as values, which “are nothing other than the idea of the desired type of social system that regulates the processes of making certain commitments by the subjects of action” (pp. 19-20).

Consequently, the culture of economic life in society can be defined as a system of values that sets, reproduces, and creatively transforms patterns of behaviour in the sphere of economic activity.

Cultural values, performing the main function of maintaining a model, motivate and regulate human behavior following ideas about the proper, desired type of social action and social organization; contribute to the integration of society through the universalization and transmission of models and ensuring the legitimacy (in the sense of moral justification and permissibility) of certain actions; through the creative change of value models, culture promotes differentiation, the complication of social action and society as a whole, its historical dynamics along the progressive path of complication and adaptation to changing realities.

The culture of economic life is a system of values, meanings, symbols, knowledge, and traditions that provide motivation and regulation of economic (labour, production, entrepreneurial, financial, commercial, and other) activity, determine the form of its implementation, and at the same time the perception of it by society.

We study the culture of the economic life of society precisely in those aspects related to the motivation and regulation of people's economic behaviour, the dynamics of economic activity, and the formation and functioning of economic institutions. The subject of the culture of economic life is norms and rules regulating behaviour, benchmarks of action, including managerial, in certain situations, expected behaviour and ways of modelling it, as well as fundamental values, ideas, symbols, their interpretation, development, and broadcasting. The conditions of legitimation, i.e. society's approval and acceptance of certain economic institutions and the formation of the symbolic capital of social classes and groups engaged in different types of economic activity, should also be included in the subject of culture of economic life. It should be noted that cultural studies should study economic culture like any other branch within specific societies as a really functioning, historically determined, and unique set of values, norms, and meanings.

The question of the culture of the economic life of society is, first of all, a question of the intangible components of economic activity, of what, in addition to purely practical and utilitarian needs, drives human economic activity, and what life attitudes regulate this activity, and what is its normative and

value justification in the general socio-cultural system of a certain society. Human participation in material production is determined not only by one's specific needs for material goods and the class distribution and division of labour existing in society but also by ideas about the meaning and dignity of life, about socially meaningful purposes, prestige, and acceptability of certain activities. The concept of the social and political hierarchy, property, material wealth and prosperity, success, and the relationships between people in the process of economic activity.

The culture of economic life is determined by the nature and dynamics of material production, and at the same time, it itself determines it. It is impossible to work in the field of economy, whether it is entrepreneurship, complex financial and commercial operations, or physical labor of any skill level and at the same time not to be aware of your activity, not treat it as desirable or unpleasant, prestigious, honorable or shameful, conditioned social status and therefore harmonious or, on the contrary, that leads beyond the boundaries of proper social relations and therefore needs justification in the eyes of society, as corresponding to the ideas about the meaning of human life and its purpose or one that demeans human dignity and contradicts its essence. The idea of a high spiritual and moral value of this or that activity, the endowment of it with a remarkable meaning encourages to engage in it more actively, and vice versa.

Existing cultural prohibitions and restrictions on this or that kind of activity can seriously slow down the development of the respective economic sectors and provide minimal competition for representatives of those subcultures that do not know such prohibitions (the growth of Jewish banking capital in Western European countries is explained not only by the special propensity for finance among Jews but also by the strict prohibition on usury among European Christians). The need to develop this or that sphere of the economy for the unwillingness to destroy a stable sociocultural system by the violation of prohibitions stimulates the search for new forms of customary economic institutions (for example, the prohibition on the collection of interest on loans in Islamic countries has given birth to such a phenomenon as “interest-free banks” in our days). The formation of new spiritual values can give a powerful impetus to the intensification of economic activity, a classic example of which is the birth of Protestantism and capitalist entrepreneurship in Western Europe.

3.2. The culture of economic life in the socio-cultural system of society

The culture of economic life is an element of the socio-cultural system of society, connected with its other elements and can only be understood in the context of this interrelation. Above all, it is defined by the most general, fundamental ideas about the structure and meaning of the universe, man's

place in it, the extent and directions of his activity and the meaning of his existence. The active subject of economic life on the long-term, historical scale is oriented not simply to the satisfaction of interests, and not to individual exciting ideas, but to holistic pictures of the world, which order the world, give it content, and set a coordinate system in which she defines her life activity. When projected onto economic life, the such general ordered socio-cultural systems (world pictures) form the values of the culture of economic activity.

The sphere of the culture of the economic life of society includes those values and meanings that concern all kinds of human economic activity. General ideas about the sense of life, man's place in the universe and his purpose, his essence and nature, relations between people, good and evil, righteousness and sin: all these can influence the culture of economic activity.

Religions are particularly influential in forming the culture of economic life. This fact, first investigated in detail by the German scholar *Max Weber*, is now beyond doubt. This is explained by the fact that the underlying basis of motivation is a worldview and above all the solution to the question of the meaning of life, which in most developed societies was determined by religious faith. Thus, the Protestant view of man as God's tool, transforming the sinful world into His glory, generates an active attitude of man to the world in general, "unties his hands" in daily activities, elevates activity to the rank of virtues, which consequently stimulates economic activity. In Lutheranism, the idea of a divine calling transforms profession and daily work into service to God and thus determines the formation of the work ethic, which was so significant for the Western European civilisation formation.

The culture of a society's economic life is closely linked to social relations. Above all, it is influenced by the nature of the relationship between the individual and the ascriptive social communities: communities, castes, states, corporations, or their relationship to the market. Of particular importance are the relation of individual and collective interests and ascritical and attainable values. The subordination of individual practical and feasible orientations to collective ones, or their freedom, is a crucial factor in the formation of ethics of success and an entrepreneurial ethic, the most essential components of a culture of economic activity.

The orientation of economic life towards ascritical values, to maintain ascritical communities has long been accepted as a sign of a society's archaic and even pre-economic state, whereas individual reach and market orientation are the essences of economic relations leading to the formation of the capitalist system. However, the modern development of economic life has shown that corporate orientations and ascritical values are important not only in archaic but also in ultra-modern post-industrial societies and are the most important tools of modern firm management systems. Experience has shown that socie-

ties in which ascriptive relations have not lost their dominance, for example, Japan, the newly industrialised countries of South-East Asia, have a powerful potential for modern development and the formation of a distinctive productive economic culture.

The culture of economic life in its formation and functioning is closely linked to political culture, paradigms of political thinking, and political life. For example, the perception of the role of the state in society and the relation of the group, corporate, individual, and state interests have a significant influence on the economic culture. The liberal paradigm established in the West is based on the independence of the individual from the state, and disobedience to state interests. In the context of the liberal socio-cultural complex, the notion that it is possible to get rich despite the state and independently of it has taken hold. The state is given a minimised role as a “night watchdog”, whose interference in economic life, even as a “conductor”, is fraught with excessive amplification and is, therefore, undesirable.

The political cultures of the East, on the contrary, give the state the role of integrator and supreme arbiter in society, which harmonises relations between individuals and primary social units. In related economic cultures, the individual is oriented towards enrichment together with the state and expects active economic policy from it. Between these two extreme poles, specific economic systems of the West and the East develop, combining the independence of the economic subject from the state with an active economic policy in different proportions corresponding to national peculiarities.

In the context of political culture, a system of priorities along the lines of individual/corporate - general/national/state interests is formed, which also has a significant impact on the culture of economic life. The US is characterised by the priority of private business interests over national and state ones, while Japan and other Eastern cultures, on the contrary, and this has a significant impact on modern economic development and competitiveness of economies: the state, the basic principles of which do not care about private business, is reluctant to introduce protectionist measures and provide financial support. In Japan and Western Europe, for example, powerful state-supported alliances are being formed to carry out expensive scientific research, while US entrepreneurs are forced to rely more on their own resources. American entrepreneurs, on the other hand, have also been slow to change their focus and forgo revenues in favour of national interests, underpinning their reluctance to change priorities by arguing that shareholders will not approve of such policies. Consequently, for society, the main content and leading motive for entrepreneurial activity is still profit and not the general interests of the nation. This example perfectly illustrates the different ways of solving the problem in the context of two fundamentally different value and meaning models of entrepreneurial activity.

This problem is also projected at the level of corporate culture, where the question of the priority of shareholders' interests or the development of the company as a whole is also at stake. Here, too, American and Japanese economic cultures differ most fundamentally: in Japan, a company is considered the property not only of shareholders (as in the US) but also of managers and employees, with managers and employees acting as the most important subjects of its activities. The objective of the company in the Japanese sense is not the maximum profit to pay dividends, but its stable development in the long run. To realise this goal, dividend payments are made on a residual basis (Alston, 2005).

The state itself can act as a large entrepreneur, and the place of the public sector in the economic system, its significance, specific weight, organisation, and attitude towards it in society affect the formation of economic culture. The traditionally large and weighty public sector in the Ukrainian economy caused its particularly high influence on the economic culture. The instability of the institute of private enterprise in Ukraine, unarticulated interests and values, and weakness of the institution of private property have always been associated precisely with the high economic activity of the state. Such features of business culture as bureaucratism, slowness, inflexibility, and, ultimately, bureaucratic indifference to efficient work are usually associated with the influence of the state.

Moreover, the country's role in economic life is often ascribed specifically to the initiative, the primary rudiments of entrepreneurship in many sectors of the economy which are difficult for individual businessmen to master (large-scale manufactures, mining, transport, etc.). It also owes the economic culture of the West to the formation of such features of capitalist enterprise as an orientation to long-term goals and the stability of the enterprise, as opposed to the pursuit of quick profits by pre-bourgeois adventurist businessmen.

The German cultural philosopher *Werner Sombart* (1934) has shown that it was from public administration that many useful managerial techniques and skills came into the practice of private enterprise and have become an integral part of modern business culture. For example, accounting was borrowed from the experience of the city government in fifteenth-century Italy. The very idea of organisation, strict job hierarchy and clear division of duties and responsibilities came to business organisation, according to W. Sombart, from the practice of public administration.

The values of political culture such as justice, dominance, subordination, freedom, and responsibility indirectly affect production relations, business culture, and management. The idea of who and on what grounds has the culturally legitimate right to lead other people and how they should do so is projected from political culture into people's relations in the sphere of production.

The culture of economic life in its formation and development is linked to the legal framework and the legal consciousness of society, the system of rights and obligations of groups, individuals, and the state. The legal system formally consolidates economic institutions and norms of behaviour of economic subjects and provides legal mechanisms for regulating economic activity. Economic culture includes the attitude of the enterprise to legal regulation of its activity, the general level of legal consciousness in society affects the degree of economic legal consciousness, its level, and its peculiarities. The primacy of law or morality in resolving economic conflicts constitutes an important feature of different socio-cultural systems.

In America, conflicts are solved with the help of lawyers; two-thirds of all lawyers in the world are concentrated here, and the profession is one of the most prestigious and well-paid. In Ukraine, the avoidance of going to court, but also on a personal level, conflict is usually resolved by the victory of one party and the defeat of the other, which has led to the intensive development of “power entrepreneurship”, legal and illegal actors forming a market for property rights and contract enforcement services under conditions of low mutual trust and unwillingness to recognise the other's interest as legitimate. The Japanese rarely seek legal assistance (there are 25 times as many citizens per lawyer as in the US) because they tend to make mutual concessions, which in their minds do not conflict with private interests (Alston, 2005). Americans think in terms of “rights”, and the Japanese think in terms of “duties”, which allows for mutually beneficial relationships. Business partners aim to reach an agreement while unconditionally recognising the legitimacy of each other's interests, which does not preclude fierce competition in their midst.

3.3. The basic values of a culture of economic life

When considering this question, it is first of all necessary to find out whether the culture of economic life is an independent segment of the general culture. According to many scholars, particularly *Tatiana Zaslavskaya* and *Rosalina Ryvkina* (1991), the economic culture is a projection of culture on the sphere of socio-economic relations. It is a projection, not a part of the general culture because the entire culture works in the sphere of economy and related socio-economic relations: all its elements appear and function here (p. 112). It can be agreed that any value and norm of culture can be projected in the sphere of economic life: “justice”, “prestige”, etc. But at the same time, they acquire a specific interpretation, actually forming new species concepts, for example, “economic justice”, “social justice”, “fair distribution”, “prestigious consumption”, “prestigious profession”, due to their involvement in the sphere of economy, which form a unified semantic row. Their belonging to the sphere

of the economy allows us to unite them and to single out a segment of general culture as an independent sphere. However, the special sphere of economic culture is not limited to these values. Two types of values can be attributed to it. First, these are values and norms formed as a result of the projection of universal values into the sphere of the economy: “individualism” – “economic individualism”, “competition” – “economic competition”, etc. Second, the sphere of economic culture also includes its own basic values and norms. The basic values of an economic culture are formed in the process of economic activity and directly regulate it, providing motivation, regulation, and legitimation.

Labour, property, wealth, practicality, rationality, professionalism, and enterprise can be identified as the basic values of a society's economic culture.

3.3.1. Labour

Labour is one of the fundamental values of the culture of economic life, expressing the attitudes of individuals and society towards the activities that underpin social beings. Throughout human history, labour is not only an economic or social category but also has a semantic, symbolic, moral, and aesthetic significance: it can be regarded as respect or humiliation for a person (slave labour, servitude); as a means of personal improvement (ascetic labour of Orthodox monks) or punishment, curse; as a way of personal expression and self-realisation (Protestant secular asceticism) or an alienated existence, where a worker loses his true human identity. Consequently, the cultural value of work is contradictory and ambiguous. Which side of these oppositions is realised in a particular culture depends on many social, ideological, and historical circumstances:

1) from the place that workers occupy in the system of public relations. In pre-bourgeois societies, physical labour was the lot of the lower strata of society, seen as a sign of low social standing, and therefore seen as an unworthy, lowly occupation. In the ancient world, labour was unworthy of a free citizen, the lot of slaves. Members of the higher classes and estates indulged in “noble idleness”, which in itself is a sign of high status. In bourgeois society, devoid of class and status distinctions, hard work is one of the basic values, but entrepreneurial and managerial work is still more prestigious because it brings more income than directly productive work;

2) from the supreme spiritual value of material activity and its specific forms as determined by the dominant religion. Thus, some religions attribute low value to material worldly activity, viewing it as a distraction from spiritual salvation, from spiritual perfection, which can be achieved only by minimizing one's active interest in the affairs of society. Religions that accept the worldly life (Confucianism, Islam) take as a model of what is proper also activity in the secular world;

3) from specific perceptions of success and ways of achieving it. In Japanese culture, for example, success is a correlate of hard work and diligence, while in the early Passionist version of the “American Dream”, success was not necessarily seen as a consequence of hard work, but rather the result of fortitude and the ability to take advantage of circumstances;

4) from established ideas about the relationship of leadership and subordination in productive activity: it is known that in most societies wage labour enjoys considerably less prestige than free labour of an independent master. The increased status of wage labour in industrial-capitalist production was the result of a long evolution of social relations and culture. As M. Weber (1905) showed, Christianity and especially the Protestant ethic, which equated the value of all kinds of labour, played a revolutionary role here;

5) from the technological and aesthetic features of labour. Heavy unskilled physical labour always enjoys less prestige than skilled labour. Intellectual labour tends to be more prestigious than physical labour, despite artificial ideological attempts to change this in some societies (e.g. the creators of the ideology of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the ideologues of the USSR).

Labour as a value, that is, a pattern of a proper mode of action, is the result of the historical development of society, its formation is influenced by a set of various economic, social, religious, ideological, concrete-historical factors and circumstances.

Labour as a category of culture encompasses not only directly productive, physical labour but also management and organisation of production, entrepreneurial labour, and intellectual labour in the sphere of spiritual production. Each of these types of labour has its own culture, has its own value, prestige, motivations, etc. The equation of different kinds of activity as worthy, useful, and morally perfect occupation contributes to the integration of society and provides additional incentives to increase the level of economic culture.

It should be noted that free productive labour as the basis of social well-being in the vast majority of developed societies known to historical scholarship was respected and had a rather high cultural status. The diligent labour of the farmer and craftsman was respected and considered a virtue both in antiquity and in medieval Europe, and even in India the varna of farmers-vaishyas belonged to the twice-born, i.e. the highest (although inferior to the status of priests-brahmans and kshatriya rulers). Everywhere there was a bourgeois culture, affirming the virtues of industriousness, thrift, and healthy practicality. But that culture had always occupied a local niche in the general system of that or other culture, and the significance and prestige of its values were limited and did not cover the whole society, but rather a narrow stratum of personally free toilers-owners.

The cultural, value-based content of labour is the most important factor in the economic life of society. Support of a positive attitude to labour, its high status on the scale of values largely determines the success of socio-economic development. For example, traditional societies, which attributed to labour a low, at least local, cultural status, were in a state of economic stagnation for many centuries. The change of attitude towards labour in the late European Middle Ages and then its exaltation during the Reformation, as the only form of service to God, led to the intensification of economic life and, ultimately, to socio-economic breakthrough in Western Europe.

Maintaining the high status and importance of labour is the most important reason for the success of socio-economic modernisation. Traditional Japanese industriousness, supported by the entire cultural system, was responsible for Japan's modernisation breakthrough during the Meiji reforms after the heavy defeat in World War II, which served as the most significant basis for the "Japanese Miracle".

Under certain historical circumstances, above all at turning points in development, there is a need for a rise in working culture, and society then, through the system of the dominant ideology, produces and inculcates high labour orientations in the mass consciousness. Thus, after the Socialist revolution in Russia, the communists who came to power were faced with the necessity of creating a large modern industry and an increase in labour productivity. With all the repression unleashed in the country, it was not possible to achieve the desired goals through coercion alone, and a truly unprecedented campaign of labour mobilisation was launched. Labour was heralded as a matter of honour, a matter of valour, and heroism, with characteristics that applied more to battlefield exploits than to daily chores. The response to the ideological appeals was mass interest and serious achievements in economic life.

However, this mobilising labour culture proved unsustainable and could not be maintained over the long term, just as it was impossible to be constantly under the strain of battle. Once the immediate objectives had been achieved, enthusiasm waned, and the work culture returned to its previous level and attempts to maintain the mobilisation readiness of the labour front through ideological campaigns such as the socialist competition were defeated.

The value of labour is linked to its quality, which is determined by the necessary level of professionalism, diligence, and dedication, conditioned by endowing labour with the highest spiritual and moral value. Where labour is a form of serving God, where professionalism and perfection of a product of labour is a religious obligation (for example, in Catholicism and, to a greater extent, in Protestantism), a tradition of high-quality labour is formed. This tendency is especially evident in those cultural and moral systems where everyday

life in all its concrete manifestations has the highest meaning (Protestant West, Japan). Quality work becomes an element not only of specialised professionals but also of a median economic culture that becomes a stable mass norm of economic activity.

Where the spiritual and moral content of the labour process as an ascetic means of personal self-education is meaningful, and its form and the practical result are secondary (for example, in Orthodox culture), the mass quality of labour is usually lower. At the level of extreme and high-professional culture, the quality of labour is often high, but as a norm of middle and everyday culture, it is unstable. This tendency was not overcome during the Soviet period of history, despite intensive ideological campaigns for quality.

3.3.2. Property

Property is not only an economic, legal and political category, reflecting the historically determined way in which people are appropriate objects of productive and non-productive consumption. Property, in essence, reflects not the relations of people and objects (things, capitals, land, etc.), but the relations of people with these objects. Projected onto the mentality and value-normative system of society, it becomes one of the basic values of economic culture.

The peculiarities of ideas about the property have a significant impact on all economic development in general. Archaic societies are characterised by the property identification and object of labour: the cultivated land is regarded as property. Until the reforms of 1861, the serfs perceived the land cultivated by the community as their collective property and not the the landlord property, which it was in reality: “We are the lord’s property, but the land is ours”. In such societies, the product of labour is also considered the worker property, so, for example, cut hay, chopped firewood, hunting and fishing trophies are perceived as the property of the one who harvested them, not the owner of the land. Therefore, cutting firewood or illegal hunting are not perceived in archaic societies as a sin, but stealing hay from a haystack or the harvest from another person's field (i.e. the products of real people labour) is a sin and an indelible shame.

Many pre-bourgeois cultures were characterised by attributing the supreme right of ownership of land and real estate not to its real owner and steward but a supreme ruler. Often property is perceived as a gift from God, and God is regarded as the supreme owner, to whom the real owner-owner-administrator is accountable. Many businessmen spoke of the wealth that God had given them to use and would require them to account for it, and so they looked upon the management and multiplication of property as a kind of mission entrusted by God.

In the context of bourgeois economic culture, the property began to relate unequivocally to the person of the owner, and became an integral part of the owner, and the institution of private property emerged. In Protestant ethics, the property is seen as a blessing from God, given to a particular person, rather than being given for temporary use and disposal. Private property is identified with the owner's identity. It is no longer transferred to the object and result of work, as in archaic consciousness: the employee is always aware that the instrument and product of labour are the owners property, even if they do not work themselves.

In modern large-scale enterprises, the common form of ownership is shareholding, which manifests the divide between ownership on the one hand and management and labour on the other. But there is a significant civilisational specificity here: in modern Japanese companies, both shareholders and employees on a lifetime employment basis are considered owners, whereas the owners of American companies are only shareholders, and their interests must be protected by hired managers at all levels.

Not all cultures have formed the value of a private property. For example, in Buddhist culture, which denies the individual and sets its highest goal of the complete removal of individual existence, the property is denied as an excessive material burden that prevents salvation and connection with the illusory world.

3.3.3. Wealth

Wealth, material well-being are values of the culture of economic life, closely related to the form of sociality and the general system of values of a particular society. In traditional, pre-bourgeois cultures, wealth is not an independent value but a subordinate one, primarily oriented towards the maintenance of an established type of sociality. In the system of interpersonal relations, wealth is primarily a status sign, and its acquisition and accumulation is primarily aimed at maintaining status. The tribal chief, the troop leader, and the feudal lord should possess material goods appropriate to his social position. He should also, under his position, receive his share of material goods (feudal rent, tribute, etc.) and spend it on supporting the system of traditional relations, organizing common feasts and celebrations, giving rich gifts to the warriors, and helping the poor community members. The community has also been able to use the money to support the system of traditional relations.

Wealth in non-bourgeois cultures is subordinated to the achievement of goals of the highest socio-cultural value. Thus, in traditional Confucian China, where charity and personal harmony were the main values, and the most prestigious was managerial and bureaucratic activity of a state official, wealth was necessary as a condition for getting a good education and preparing for the

examinations for the position of an official. In South-East Asia, the Buddhist countries (Thailand, Burma, etc.) wealth serves primarily to accumulate religious merits and improve karma by building pagodas, giving alms to monks, performing expensive rituals, pilgrimages, etc.

Wealth is an ambiguous cultural value, often associated with vices and crimes to which people go to accumulate them. There are many examples in the artistic culture, and fine arts of various countries and peoples, where wealth is associated with greed, cruelty, laziness and idleness, unnecessary luxury and gluttony, and the rich are considered to be vicious and unworthy of respect. For all their financial power, medieval European merchants and moneylenders had a low social and moral status, and it is well known to the Christian that a camel would rather go through the eye of a needle than a rich man enter the Kingdom of Heaven. Many merchants and businessmen spent huge sums on charity and patronage of the arts and gave numerous museums, libraries, hospitals, and schools to society and their descendants, but they could never justify exploitation and selfishness in the eyes of the people and the intelligentsia.

Moreover, honest poverty and even poverty in some cultural niches were considered an attribute of righteousness and even holiness. Beggar monks, hermits, and hermits who retired from concern for daily bread to spiritual perfection and prayerful service to God were respected and held in spiritual authority; medieval noble ladies on feast days ritually washed the feet of beggars in recognition of their spiritual purity.

However, respect for poverty did not exist in all cultures: Judaism and Islam condemn it, while Protestantism outright shames it, proclaiming it a sign of the death of the soul, and even persecutes it. But even in those cultures where such veneration exists, it occupies strictly defined, localized niches, usually not exceeding certain limits. In everyday life, people everywhere strive for a dignified, prosperous life and material prosperity.

For all its condemnation of wealth, it remains desirable. However, what matters is its fairness, understood as conformity with the prevailing morality and the social status of the possessor: the rich bourgeois eager to join the nobility is despised and mocked, the uneducated commoner who has bought up capital and buys up everything that is sold for money cannot buy himself the respect of traditional society. At the same time, the impoverished senator, unable to fulfil his function as patron, and the impoverished knight, who has no money to buy weapons and no money to pay his warriors, also find themselves outside the established division of socio-cultural roles – this time because of poverty. The impoverished aristocrat is as tragicomic character in art as the rich upstart: remember Pavel Fedotov's picture "The Breakfast of an Aristocrat" (1850).

In bourgeois society, the status of wealth as a cultural value changes. In the culture of the Protestant West, wealth takes on an independent value because it serves as a visible expression of success in the works that God blesses his chosen one. Wealth itself is the only way for a Protestant to be convinced of his chosenness and salvation.

Here the purpose of wealth also changes. It is no longer for consumption, use to acquire other, higher values. It is destined only for self-growth, to be incorporated and to bring forth still greater wealth, to serve God even more intensively, and to glorify His works by work. Consequently, in bourgeois society wealth for the first time does not become consumptive but productive.

Finally, the specific form of wealth also depends on the nature of production, sociality, and division of labour in society. In nomadic tribes, the material expression of wealth is cattle, in sedentary farmers – land, in warriors – prey in the form of values, treasures, slaves, etc. In bourgeois society, wealth becomes invisible, i.e., it takes the form of capital, as *Karl Marx* (1867) defined, “self-generating value”, which cannot be consumed in the ordinary sense, but can produce new capital. In a post-industrial, information society, the main value, along with capital, is information and know-how, the possession of which depends on the support of production at the level of scientific and technological progress and, more importantly, the efficiency of productive activities and control over markets (Mattelart, 2003).

In modern non-class society, wealth is not an attribute of high social status but rather increases an individual's status. Wealth, irrespective of its sources and forms, has prestige in itself, is respected or, at any rate, arouses interest. All this makes wealth so desirable that society eventually becomes indifferent to how it is accumulated: the immoral and even criminal practices underlying many large fortunes are ignored or even justified by success.

In modern society, as in archaic society, wealth requires external manifestation in the form of prestigious consumption and luxurious lifestyles. Unnecessarily high prestige spending is again becoming a symbol of belonging to the upper class.

3.3.4. Practicality and rationality

Practicality and rationality are values denoting the proper quality of an activity, its increasing logical and teleological coherence, i.e., orientation on a clear awareness of goals, assessment of opportunities, search for optimal ways of their realization, obtaining the maximum result with minimal spending of money and effort. Practicality and rationality are necessary attributes of any economic activity and therefore inherent in any culture of economic life, but in different societies, they occupy different places in the hierarchy of values.

In traditional society, practicality is an attribute of the bourgeois charity subculture, so its place in the general value system is very limited. Within the class subcultures outside bourgeois charity, among feudal knights, nobility, warriors, and clergymen, practicality and rationality are assessed negatively, and practical, cautious people are scorned and mocked. The image of the avaricious moneylender who counts every penny, the cautious domed farmer or burgher versus the reckless courage and selfless nobility of the knight is familiar from both medieval literature and chivalric novels.

The desire for enrichment in traditional cultures is not usually associated with rationality and practicality. Here, as *Max Weber* (1925) puts it, adventurous capitalism based on military campaigns and plunder, predatory exploitation of human and natural resources of colonies and their ancestral fiefdoms, accompanied by destructive luxury and absolutely no concern for reproduction. *Werner Sombart* (1938), in his work “The Bourgeois”, declares a bourgeois culture based on rationality as the fate of subjugated peoples and weak-minded people, incapable of independent, active invasion, with no historical initiative and forever forced to survive under the oppression of their initiative compatriots.

The reason non-bourgeois cultures condemn practicality and rationality is that such cultures and corresponding social systems are based on values of solidarity, often supported by spiritual: religious and ideological values of a higher order, and these values are inherently contrary to practicality and rationality. Indeed, one cannot be a generous senor who bestows gifts on his wife, organises lavish celebrations, and helps the poor and a miserly hoarder; a selfless hero, a fighter for a high idea, and a cautious philistine at the same time.

Practicality also contradicts the values of most religions (except Protestantism and Judaism), since they orient the believer to deep spiritual penetration into the foundations of the Doctrine and the higher Gnostic Knowledge, to a retreat from worldly concerns, or at least to minimisation of interest in them. Practicality, on the other hand, concentrates on the minutiae of everyday life; for it, there are no transcendent, extraterrestrial values. The well-known Protestant theologian *Harvey Cox* (1990) understands practicality as the secular man's interest in the question “Should I work?”. The secular person is not overly concerned with mystery. Such a person has little interest in things in which energy and intelligence cannot be invested. This person judges ideas by the results which can lead to practice. The world is not seen as a single metaphysical system but as a set of tasks and goals. The urban secularist is a pragmatist. The individual is concerned with solving concrete problems and figuring out what it will take to do so. Such human is not interested in what is called “ultimate questions” or metaphysical considerations. Since religion is mainly concerned with these very things, it turns out that such a person does not ask religious questions (pp. 114-116).

In many societies, an ambivalent attitude towards rationality and practicality has persisted to the present day. Its bearer is not so much openly condemned but more or less implicitly condemned. An orientation toward practical rationality is recognised as legitimate and justified but not entirely moral and spiritually fulfilling. The values of practicality and rationality are thus not fully legitimate. It is only in a society with dominant “material” relations that rationality becomes the basis of a way of life, acquires universality, and becomes one of the most respected virtues. Here, local subcultures that reject practicality and rationality are constantly reproduced. The youth counterculture of the 1960s in the United States and Western Europe is a striking example of this.

3.3.5. Professionalism

Professionalism is a value of the culture of economic life which is closely related to the division of labour in society and reflects its social and cultural dimension and people's attitude towards it. In any society developed to the extent that there is a division of labour, there is also a value of professionalism, but its concrete embodiment depends on many socio-economic factors, the prevailing religion, ethical system, etc.

In traditional cultures, the profession is an inalienable feature of a person; it is inseparable from his or her social, religious, and personal status. Belonging to a certain profession is, at the same time, a means of acquiring an identity and entering the social system with a certain quality. It is most vividly expressed in the Indian caste system, which is a sacralisation and consolidation of professionalism and division of labour by appealing to the highest religious values. Each caste, which is a professional group, has a clearly defined place in the social hierarchy and corresponding social status. This is why professional activity becomes sacred and is elevated to the rank of religious duty.

The essence of professionalism in traditional society lies in refined craftsmanship, the perfection of the product of labour. The traditional professional puts all his strength and abilities into it, strives to realise himself as a person precisely through professional skill, and treats the tools and products of labour as a part of himself. Each product is a sign of his skill and diligence, a part of his soul. This is how *Werner Sombart* (1938) describes traditional professionalism: “The labour of the true peasant, like a true artisan, is a solitary creation: in quiet immersion, he is given to his occupation. He lives in his creation as an artist lives in his, he would probably not give it up to the market at all. With bitter tears in their eyes, the peasant woman takes her favourite horse out of its stall and takes it to the slaughterhouse; the old bushman fights for his cradle, which the trader wants to buy from him. The peasant, like the craftsman, stands behind his creation; he vouches for it with the honour of an artist. This explains, for instance, any artisan's deep aversion to mass production” (p. 20).

In traditional pre-bourgeois societies, professions are unequal in their status and prestige, like unequal people themselves. The status of each occupation is determined by a specific socio-cultural tradition. At the same time, agriculture is valued almost everywhere as a respected and worthy (albeit lower than worthy) occupation. The pillars of European medieval society are clergy, nobility, and farmers; Indian – varnas of twice-born Brahmans, Kshatriyas, and Vaishyas (farmers).

A real revolution in the understanding of professionalism was made by the teachings of the German Christian theologian *Martin Luther* and Protestantism in Western Europe. Proclaiming professional work as the only way to serve God, a vocation, M. Luther (1529) gave sacred value and equalized the importance and status of various professions. Other Protestant doctrines, notably Calvinism, have gradually stripped professionalism as a value of concrete content (Lunsford, 2015). The proper example was no longer a specific skill but the very fact of regular, rational activity, not the content of work, but professional asceticism as self-sacrificing work for the glory of God for the sake of transforming the sinful world.

The loss or absence of a profession means, above all, the absence of a way of integrating into society and the loss of self-identity. It is these socio-cultural consequences of unemployment that make it the greatest evil and scourge of the modern world, leading developed societies to seek all sorts of means to combat it, while ideologues of the underdeveloped world are encouraged to call for the rejection of modern economic development. *Mahatma Gandhi* (1996), for example, rejected industrial development and modern technology because it causes increasing unemployment and thus destroys traditional solidaristic and value structures.

The value of vocation is closely related to the values of work and professionalism, which gives them the meaning of higher spiritual service. In a religiously colored business culture, a vocation means the sacralization of a profession as the place to which a person is placed by God and in which he must serve him with complete dedication. In modern professional culture, a vocation has the meaning of a pronounced inclination and ability of a person to the chosen profession and is valued extremely highly as a guarantee of the fullest self-realization of an individual.

3.3.6. Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurship becomes a value of the culture of economic life in the New times. Before that, it was characteristic of non-productive activities: the organization of military campaigns and research expeditions aimed at capturing rich booty in new lands, searching for treasures, and practicing alchemy for the purpose of enrichment, as well as the organization of large trade operations.

In the traditional economy of pre-bourgeois societies, entrepreneurship was rather a marginal quality, and the basic values were the stability and constancy of the reproduction of the established structures and relations, as well as the volume of produced and appropriated products. A traditional peasant perceives the number of material goods as a fixed value, a “common pie”, from which everyone has his share, depending on social status. If someone can capture more of their status share as a result of implementing new ideas, it means that the rest of us will get less. Therefore, entrepreneurship is regarded here as a character trait that contradicts justice and is subject to condemnation. In addition, entrepreneurship in a traditional society also contradicts solidarism, as it splits the unity of society, allowing energetic individuals to stand out and acquire prosperity that is not due to their status.

A sharp turn in public attitudes to enterprise emerged in the trading cities of Western Europe during the Renaissance. It was caused both by the growing importance of entrepreneurs (merchants, bankers) for economic life and by the evolution of the cultural environment itself. In this period, theological interpretations of Christian values began to spread in the active and creative spirit. Worldview shifts towards recognising the acceptability and God-pleasingness of economic and entrepreneurial activity began to become clearer. In the writings and sermons of theologians, motives to justify the income of merchants and, most importantly, appeals to worldly activity as a fulfilment of God's purpose began to appear more frequently.

The German theologian and preacher *Berthold von Regensburg* (1269) in his sermon “On the Five Pounds” offered a new interpretation of the Gospel parable of the master who left several talents of silver to his slaves and demanded an account of their use. According to B. Regensburg, God gave man five “talents”: free will, profession and place in the social hierarchy, time, property, and love of neighbour. All these talents man is obliged to use and increase properly. Fulfilment of professional duty, that service which the Lord has given to man, is his most important life purpose. Loyalty to the profession, the craft, and the selfless pursuit of excellence are the most important virtues of the Christian. Property is also seen as a gift from God, and the ability to manage it properly, to multiply it rather than squandering it in excessive luxury is also the highest duty of man (pp. 96-97). In this sermon Berthold, instead of calling for ascetic passivity and withdrawal from the world, insists on the need for socially useful activity as the basis for human existence.

In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, society's attitude towards businessmen gradually changed. Merchants are already recognised as an integral part of society. Theologians in the hierarchy of godly professions and estates, though placing them in the service category, recognise profit as a just reward

for the work, risk, and danger of their profession. Directly among Western European burghers, the prestige of entrepreneurs grew even faster. In many towns, the merchant class determined policy and legislation and took over the courts. This was especially characteristic of Italian cities, where wealth and enterprise were rehabilitated, and local preachers even likened the merchant to Christ himself, who enabled people to exchange transitory earthly things for eternal ones (Rutenberg, 1974). Of course, every entrepreneur considered his wealth to be the result of God's favour, but he also extolled his personal qualities: intelligence, cleverness, courage, and enterprise.

In a bourgeois society in modern times, entrepreneurship became completely united with economic activity and uniformly became its basic principle. In the first half of the 20th century, the Austrian economist *Joseph Schumpeter* (1926, 1942, 1948) created the theory of entrepreneurship, the basis of which is proclaimed "creative destruction", i.e. the ability to abandon established structures and principles of activity to realise a new idea and create new "combinations of production factors". It is characteristic of J. Schumpeter that the entrepreneur is not so much a concrete, class-defined subject of the economy as its predicate. Schumpeter is not so much a concrete, class-defined subject of the economy as its predicate because his entrepreneur is not identical to the capitalist but even to a certain extent opposite to him. The capitalist becomes an entrepreneur only when he creates a new business, for the rest of the time, he is an owner, manager, or bureaucrat, embodying the routinised entrepreneurial charisma. The motives of entrepreneurial innovation are neither pragmatic nor hedonistic. Rather, it is driven by the desire for success, the will to win, and the joy of creativity (Schumpeter, 1926, p. 198). Entrepreneurship thus becomes an essential feature of market economy culture.

4. Conclusions

The article carries out a philosophical and cultural analysis of the nature of the economic life of society, the results of which allow us to draw the following conclusions:

1. The basis of any economic system is its culture, which sets the goals of the activity, guided by certain value orientations. Labour productivity and the efficiency of economic activity as a whole depend on it. Therefore, it is the culture that should be at the centre of research on processes of transformation of the economic sphere of society life.

2. The culture of economic life is a system of values, meanings, symbols, knowledge, and traditions that provide the motivation and regulation of economic activity, determine the form of its implementation, and, at the same time, the perception of it by society.

3. The culture of economic life is an element of the socio-cultural system of society, connected with its other elements, and can only be understood in the context of this interrelation. First of all, it is defined by the most general ideas about the universe, man's place in it, and the degree and directions of his activity.

4. Religions, national culture, state ideology, the legal system, the nature of the relationship between the individual and the ascriptive social communities, group, corporate, individual, and state interests have a particular influence on the formation of the culture of economic life in society.

5. The basic values of the culture of the economic life of society are work, property, wealth, practicality, rationality, professionalism, and enterprise, which, depending on the stage of development of society and its cultural characteristics, may have different semantic, symbolic, moral and aesthetic significance.

The scientific novelty. The scientific novelty of the research results consists in deepening the understanding of the essence of the culture of the economic life of society, defining its components and basic values.

The significance of the study. The significance of the study is expressed in the addition of cultural science with new theoretical provisions on the culture of economic activity, as well as in the possibility of their use in the training of managers of economic organisations.

Prospects for further research. The prospect of further research in this direction could be to establish the specifics of management culture in different branches of economic activity.

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:

- Alston, J. (2005). *Japanese Business Culture and Practices: A Guide to Twenty-First Century Japanese Business*. Bloomington: Universe, Inc.
- Aristotle (4th cent. BC; 1998). *The Politics* (Trans. in ancient Greek). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baalen, P., & Moratis, L. (2001). *Management Education in the Network Economy: Its Context, Content, and Organization*. New York: Springer.
- Bentham, J. (1827; 2000). *Selected Writings on Utilitarianism*. London: Wordsworth.
- Berdiaev, N. (1952). *The Existential Dialectic of the Divine and the Human*. Paris: Ymca-Press.

- Brzozowska, A., Bubel, D., & Nekrasenko, L. (2022). *Organisation Management in the Digital Economy: Globalization Challenges*. Boca Raton: CRC Press.
- Bulgakov, S. (1912; 2000). *Philosophy of Economy: The World as Household*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Cox, H. G. (1990). *The Secular City: Secularization and Urbanization in Theological Perspective*. New York: Collier Books.
- Dopfer, K. (Ed.). (2022). *Economics in the Future: Towards a New Paradigm*. London: Routledge.
- Erasov, B. S. (2000). *Social Cultural Studies*. New York: Wiley.
- Frank, S. L. (1930; 1992). *The Spiritual Foundations of Society*. New York: Prometheus.
- Gandhi, M. (1996). *Gandhi: Selected Political Writings*. New York: Hackett Publishing.
- Griffiths, A., & Wall, S. (2011). *Economics for Business and Management*. London: Pearson.
- Hayek, F. A. von (1948; 1996). *Individualism and Economic Order*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Heyne, P., Boettke, P., & Prychitko, D. (2013). *Economic Way of Thinking*. London: Pearson.
- Hrytsenko, A. A. (Ed.). (2015). *Instytutsjni Transformatsii Sotsial'no-Ekonomichnoi Systemy Ukrainy [Institutional Transformations of the Socio-Economic System of Ukraine]*. Kyiv: Instytut Ekonomiky ta Prohnozuvannia NAN Ukrainy (in Ukr.).
- Hunt, D. (1989). *Economic Theories of Development: An Analysis of Competing Paradigms*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Kanth, R. (1994). *Paradigms in Economic Development: Classic Perspectives, Critiques and Reflections*. London: Routledge.
- Kirshner, J. (Ed.). (2006). *Globalization and National Security*. London: Routledge.
- Knies, K. (1853; 2010). *Die Politische Oekonomie: Vom Standpunkte Der Geschichtlichen Methode [Political Economy from the Standpoint of the Historical Method]* (Trans. in Germ.). Whitefish: Kessinger Publishing.
- Kovalenko, Ye. (2017). Merezhevi Modeli Orhanizatsii Postindustrial'noho Suspil'stva i Mekhanizmy Upravlinnia v Politychnij, Ekonomichnij ta Sotsial'no-Kul'turnij Sferakh [Network Models of Organization of Post-Industrial Society and Management Mechanisms in the Political, Economic and Socio-Cultural Spheres]. *Ekonomika i Menedzhment Kul'tury [Economy and Management of Culture]*, 2, 5-24 (in Ukr.).
- Kovalenko, Ye. Ya. (2018). Evoliutsiia Teorii Menedzhmentu: vid Biurokratii do Adkhokratii [Evolution of Management Theory: from Bureaucracy to Adhocracy]. *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]*, 2, 26-62, doi: <https://doi.org/10.31866/2616-7573.2.2018.149297> (in Ukr.).

- Kovalenko, Ye. Ya. (2019). Teoriia ta Istoriia Kul'tury Mekhanistychnoho Menedzhmentu [Theory and History of Culture Mechanistic Management]. *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]*, 2(1), 32-63, doi: <https://doi.org/10.31866/2616-7573.1.2019.170654> (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. (2021a). 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. (2021b). Management Culture Metaphysics: Chaos, Order, Harmony. *Socio-Cultural Management Journal*, 4(2), 3-28, doi: <https://doi.org/10.31866/2709-846x.2.2021.246704>.
- 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>.
- Latynin, M. (Ed.). (2014). *Derzhavne Rehuliuivannia Innovatsijnoho Rozvytku Ekonomiky: Stratehichni Priorytety [State Regulation of Innovative Economic Development: Strategic Priorities]*. Kharkiv: Mahistr (in Ukr.).
- Locke, J. (1690; 2003). *Political Writings*. New York: Hackett Publishing Company.
- Luke, J. (1988). *Managing Economic Development*. Ann Arbor: Proquest.
- Lunsford, G. (2015). *Calvinism – Reformed or Deformed*. New York: Prometheus.
- Luther, M. (1529; 2017). *Luther's Small Catechism with Explanation*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing.
- 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 Diial'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 yak 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 Diial'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., & Kovalenko, Ye. (2016). Tsyvilizatsiia u Tochsi Bifurkatsii: Zarodzhennia Novoho Sotsialnoho Poriadku i Suchasnoi Modeli Upravlinnia Politychnoiu, Ekonomichnoi 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. 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., Khlystun, O., & Blašková, M. (2020a). 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., Adamoniene, R., & Dibrova, V. (2020b). System Analysis in Socio-Cultural Management: Theory, Methodology and Technology. *Socio-Cultural Management Journal*, 3(2), 3-29, doi: <https://doi.org/10.31866/2709-846X.2.2020.222640>.
- 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 1: A Critique of Political Economy* (Trans. in Germ.). London: Penguin Classics.
- Mattelart, A. (2003). *The Information Society*. New York: SAGE Publications Ltd.

- Milgrom, P., & Roberts, J. (1992). *Economics, Organization and Management*. London: Pearson.
- Mill, J. S. (1848; 2012). *Principles of Political Economy*. Scotts Valley: Create Space.
- Mises, L. von (1990; 2019). *The Best of Ludwig von Mises*. Great Barrington: American Institute for Economic Research.
- Montchrestien, A. de (1615; 2017). *Traicté de L'oeconomie Politique [Treatise on Political Economy]*. Paris: Classiq Garnier (in Fr.).
- Mosini, V. (2011). *Reassessing the Paradigm of Economics: Bringing Positive Economics Back into the Normative Framework*. London: Routledge.
- Müller, A. (1825; 2011). *Versuche Einer Neuen Theorie des Geldes [Attempts at a New Theory of Money]* (Trans. in Germ.). Hamburg: Severus Verlag.
- Nazarkevich, I. B. (2020). *Derzhavne Rehuliuvannia Strukturnykh Zmin v Ekonomitsi Ukrainy: Problemy ta Perspektyvy [State Regulation of Structural Changes in the Economy of Ukraine: Problems and Prospects]*. Lviv: LNU named after Ivan Franko (in Ukr.).
- Palley, Th. (2016). *Economics of Globalization: Theory, Policy and Political Economy*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Parsons, T. (1971). *The System of Modern Societies*. Hoboken: Prentice Hall.
- Petty, W. (1662; 2020). *A Treatise of Taxes and Contributions*. London: Printed for N. Brooke.
- Pivniak, G. (Ed.). (2014). *Sotsial'na Vidpovidal'nist' Vlady, Biznesu, Hromadian [Social Responsibility of Government, Business, and Citizens]*. Dnipro: NHU (in Ukr.).
- Plato (4th cent. BC; 1961). *The Collected Dialogues of Plato* (Trans. in ancient Greek). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Quesnay, F. (1758; 2004). *The Economical Table* (Trans. in Fr.). Azusa: University Press of the Pacific.
- Regensburg, B. von (1269; 2012). *Berthold von Regensburg*. New York: Nabu Press.
- Ricardo, D. (1817; 2004). *The Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*. New York: Dover Publications.
- Rodrik, D. (2012). *The Globalization Paradox: Democracy and the Future of the World Economy*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Rutenberg, V. I. (1974). *Italiia i Evropa Nakanune Novogo Vremeni [Italy and Europe on the Eve of the New Time]*. Moscow: Nauka (in Russ.).
- Say, J.-B. (1803; 2015). *A Treatise on Political Economy* (Trans. in Fr.). New York: Sagwan Press.
- Schmoller, G. von (1875; 2018). *Über Einige Grundfragen des Rechts und der Volkswirtschaft [On Some Basic Questions of Law and Economics]* (Trans. in Germ.). Marrickville: Wentworth Press.
- Schumpeter, J. (1926; 2021). *The Theory of Economic Development*. London: Routledge.

- Schumpeter, J. (1942; 2015). *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*. London: Sublime Books.
- Schumpeter, J. (1948; 1989). *Essays: On Entrepreneurs, Innovations, Business Cycles and the Evolution of Capitalism*. London: Routledge.
- Sengupta, J. (2013). *Theory of Innovation: A New Paradigm of Growth*. New York: Springer.
- Shevchenko, O. O. (2017). *Evoliutsiia Hospodars'koi Systemy: Metodolohiia Analizu u Svitovij Ekonomichnij Dumtsi [Evolution of the Economic System: Methodology of Analysis in World Economic Thought]*. Kyiv: Tsentr Uchbovoi Literatury (in Ukr.).
- Simmel, G. (1900; 1990). *The Philosophy of Money*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, A. (1776; 2012). *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sohn-Rethel, A. (1978). *Intellectual and Manual Labour: A Critique of Epistemology*. New York: The Macmillan Press.
- Solovyov, V. S. (1883; 2011). *Three Talk About War, Progress, and the end of World History*. New York: Green Lion 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.).
- Steers, R., & Nardon, L. (2005). *Managing in the Global Economy*. London: Routledge.
- Vasina, A. Yu. (2017). *Strukturne Reformuvannia Natsional'noi Ekonomiky: Metodolohichni ta Instytutsijni Aspekty [Structural Reform of the National Economy: Methodological and Institutional Aspects]*. Ternopil: Ekonomichna Dumka (in Ukr.).
- Weber, M. (1905; 2016). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (Trans. in Germ.). New York: HardPress.
- Weber, M. (1925; 2010). *Economy and Society* (Trans. in Germ.). Charleston: Nabu Press.
- Zaitsev, Yu. K. (2000). *Systemna Paradyhma ta Analiz Sotsial'noho Rynkovoho Hospodarstva [System Paradigm and Analysis of Social Market Economy]*. Kyiv: Zoloti Lytavry (in Ukr.).
- Zaslavskaya, T. I., & Ryvkina, R. V. (1991). *Sociology of Economic Life*. London: Routledge.

Information about the Author:

Yelena Kovalenko, Assoc. Professor, PhD, National Academy of Managerial Staff of Culture and Arts, 9, Lavrska St., Kyiv 01015, Ukraine; e-mail: elena.kovalenko.ya@gmail.com; orcid id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2253-5762>