1. Introduction

It has been acknowledged long time ago that culture factors and values are among the decisive drivers of the entrepreneurship. Economic development of countries is positively connected to higher assessment of importance of Openness to change (Self-direction, Stimulation and Hedonism) and Self-transcendence (Benevolence, Universalism) values and is negatively connected to Conservation (Conformity, Tradition, Security) and Self-enhancement (Achievement, Power) values.

Therefore, the entrepreneurial model of values includes Openness to change (Self-direction) and Self-enhancement (Achievement, Power) values; increase of level of these individual values shall hypothetically lead people, sharing these values, to the involvement into entrepreneurial activity.

Based on results of his cross-cultural researches of values referred Russia to the group of East European countries. Based on values this region takes intermediate position between countries of West Europe.

It appeared that Russia is characterized by higher, in comparison to other countries, variety of individualistic value types (more than half of population). Individualistic orientation is expressed in combination of Openness to change (Self-direction) and Self-enhancement (Achievement, Power) values; increase of level of these individual values shall hypothetically lead people, sharing these values, to the involvement into entrepreneurial activity.
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change values and Self-enhancement values. By the gross share of types with individualistic orientation Russia appeared to be one of four leading countries in Europe (together with Hungary, Portugal, Czech Republic and Israel, which was also included into research). At that, difference between Russia and Mediterranean and former soviet countries by the share of these classes is slightly lower than difference between Russia and Scandinavian and West European countries.

Value orientations may influence the intension to start entrepreneurial activity, but the way of implementation of this intension depends on entrepreneurial personality potential.

The particular importance for entrepreneurs, acting in conditions of uncertainty and stress and regularly overcoming consequences of failures in business solutions, takes such personality resource as resilience. Resilience, the "developable capacity to rebound or bounce back from adversity, conflict, failure, or even positive events, progress, and increased responsibility is arguably the most important positive resource to navigating a turbulent and stressful workplace".

has operationalized similar to resilience concept of Hardiness and has developed methodology of its differential measurement that includes three scales (adaptation by)

- commitment, shall be determined as conviction that involvement into what is happening gives maximum chance to find something valuable and interesting for the personality.
- control, is the conviction that fight will allow the influence on the result of what is happening, even if this influence is not absolute and no success is guaranteed.
- challenge, means conviction of a person that everything, which happens to him, enhance his development due to the knowledge, obtained from the experience.

The research performed by demonstrated that high level of Hardiness allows managing professional stress and reduces the possibility of falling ill for managers within a year after they face stressful situation. The most important fact is that cross-cultural researches of immigrants demonstrated that high level of Hardiness reduces culture shock and level of stress in conditions of alien culture. Adaptation to new and constantly changing culture of business is a significant factor of success of entrepreneurs in former soviet countries.

Besides, cross-cultural research with selection of students (China, N = 302; Germany, N = 154; United States, N = 83; and Vietnam, N = 350) confirmed the connection between resilience and Self-Direction, Stimulation, Hedonism, Achievement and Universalism values. These are the values, which, in different combinations, are included in value models of entrepreneurial activity.

2. Concept Headings

Based on review of behavioral researches of entrepreneurship have built the model of connection between entrepreneurship and culture. In this model cultural values of the country are the general factor, which determines, on one side, economic and institutional context of entrepreneurial activity, and on other side, together with peculiarities of personality (risk-taking propensity, locus of control and self-efficiency), is a factor that influence motives and goals of the entrepreneur.

Large-scale researches of peculiarities of personality ("big five, NEO Personality Inventory) in the context of different cultures confirm connections between cultural values and peculiarities of personality. In particular, Openness to Experience and Agreeableness personality traits are connected to conservatism, autonomy and Egalitarian commitment (over-individual values at the level of culture in general according to).

Unfortunately, these researches are devoted to study of connection between values of cultures in general and peculiarities of personality, perceived as "national character". These are the most general characteristics of cultures and populations of bearers of these cultures.

If we start to research the entrepreneurial personality potential itself, it will appear that not a traditional steady personality traits act as predicts of success, but other peculiarities of entrepreneurs: achievement motivation, risk-taking propensity, and preference for innovation (Internal Locus of Control).

In organizational psychology, the Job Demands–Resources Theory (JD-R-model) may be considered as extension of empirical model. The model includes personality resources (self-efficacy, organizational-based self-esteem, and optimism), using which a person manages requirements of activity and under influence of which chooses the strategy of behavior. In case requirements of activity correspond to resources of the executor, he gains the condition of engagement and wellbeing. The research of American entrepreneurs (N=116, founders and top
managers) demonstrated that, like it was predicted by JD-R model, entrepreneurs with high level of personality resources keep psychological wellbeing even in case of increase of requirements towards them (duties).

Still JD-R – model includes another one assumption: selection of strategies of behavior by a person depends on relation between requirements of activity and both personality resources and characteristics of operational and organizational context (including organizational culture). In case the context does not prevent but enhances the success, it may be considered as operating resource of the activity.

If we transfer this model to entrepreneurial activity, the involvement into entrepreneurial activity, with the equal level of requirements to it, shall be determined by relation between personality resources and individual values that reflect values of cultural values of the country as a context and, sometimes, resource of activity (clearly, not the only one: there are also institutional and other contexts).

Correspondingly, we may generate the hypothesis of our research: in developing countries with transition economy, the factor of involvement into entrepreneurial activity is a relation between cultural context (Self-enhancement and Openness to change individual values) and personality resources (Hardiness) of an entrepreneur.

3. Method

3.1 Participants of the Research

According to the data of cross-cultural researches of cultural values, Russia takes intermediate position between countries of Europe and Asia. That is why, for the cross-cultural comparing we have chosen countries of former Soviet Union, located in Central Asia (Tajikistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan). These countries and Russia have common long-term history of staying in socialistic system and yet not very high level of economic development; but in question of traditional cultural values these countries and Russia are very different. Among the European countries with developed economy, as we have already mentioned several times, Russia is closer to the Mediterranean countries in question of cultural values. That is why we have chosen Italy to perform the comparative research: Russia and Italy have common cultural values, but there are significant differences in modern level of economic development.

The entrepreneurs may include both company promoters (i.e. founders of a company) and runners/owners of small-sized business (i.e. people, who run a company, but are not founders of it). Correspondingly, the participants of the research were selected according to the following criteria: each entrepreneur ought to be an owner or leader of a company, who took part in start of the business or have run the business during recent three years. Additionally, he must speak Russian.

Overall, 163 entrepreneurs, representatives of medium- and small-sized business, took part in the research. Among them 39 entrepreneurs from Russia, 42 entrepreneurs from Italy, 82 entrepreneurs from three countries of Central Asia (Tajikistan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan). Mean age of the participants is 41 years old (26 to 50 y.o.), among them 107 men and 56 women.

3.2 Procedure of the Research

The survey was performed “face to face”, the participants filled in two questionnaires in different sequences (one-half started with Maddi test, other half – with Schultz test). To measure individual values of the entrepreneurs we used The Portrait Values Questionnaire (PVQ) adapted for Russian-speaking selection by (the translated text was approved by). The PVQ consists of 40 items designed to measure ten-value types that are ordered along two dimensions: 1) Openness to Change (stimulation, self-direction, and hedonism) vs. Conservatism (tradition, and security), and 2) Self-Enhancement (achievement, power and hedonism) vs. Self-Transcendence (universalism and benevolence). Entrepreneurs respond to each item by answering how much like you is this person? The scale is a six point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (not like me at all) to 6 (very much like me). The items include 40 short verbal portraits. Each portrait describes a person's goals, desires or aspirations representing 1 of the 10 basic values.

To measure Hardiness we used questionnaire by S. Maddi (The Personal Views Survey III-R), adapted for Russian-speaking selection by. The questionnaire consists of 45 items, containing direct and indirect questions of all three scales of the questionnaire: commitment, control, challenge (risk-taking propensity). The participants expressed their agreement or disagreement with statements of the questionnaire using four-point Likert-type scale with rating from 1 (no) to 4 (yes).
4. Results

The descriptive statistics of the obtained factors can be found in Table 1. Naturally, there is a question to what extent the obtained factors are influenced by the control variables: gender and age of the respondents?

The unique weak correlation of variables of the research and age was found for universalism ($r = 0.185$, $p < 0.05$). Age was not also included into number of predictors of discriminant model during systematic discriminant analysis of factors. We have not found any significant gender differences (Mann-Whitney test) among participants of the research for none of the studied variables. Absence of differences in Hardiness between men and women has been also confirmed by data of other researches with Russian-speaking selection. Table 1 contains the descriptive statistics of factors, obtained during the research.

We have not found any differences among the groups of respondents for only one of individual values: Stimulation. The performed one-factor dispersion analysis demonstrated low correspondence of inter-group and intra-group dispersion for this factor ($F = 1.7$; $p = 0.310$).

Besides, one can pay attention to the complete lack of significant differences in all factors of Hardiness among entrepreneurs of Russia and Italy. At the same time, entrepreneurs of Central Asia, unlike Russian and Italian entrepreneurs, have significantly lower level of Hardiness.

Low level of Hardiness of the entrepreneurs of Central Asia is combined with higher commitment to such values as Conformity, Tradition, Security, as well as Benevolence and Universalism. These values make complete set of two basic dimensions of values: Conservation and Self-transcendence. As mentioned above, priority of Conservation signifies protective reactions, anxiety, and desire to preserve the existing situation. On the contrary, self-transcendence and care about others and nature means low level of anxiety. Therefore, in situation with residents of Central Asia, one tendency compensates the other, which may result in lower level of anxiety and reduced level of Hardiness. Conservation, as loyalty to social environment, and Self-transcendence, as benevolence to people and nature, may reflect the tendency for non-confrontation activity and reduce requirements for level of hardiness.

As for the values Openness to change (Self-Direction, Hedonism) and Self-enhancement (Achievement, Power), included into entrepreneurial value model, the entrepreneurs of Italy have either higher or the same ratings as Russian entrepreneurs, and Russian entrepreneurs, in their turn, have either higher or the same ratings as entrepreneurs of Central Asia. Therefore, the total ordering of groups of entrepreneurs for these individual values is the following: entrepreneurs of Italy $\geq$ entrepreneurs of Russia $\geq$ entrepreneurs of Central Asia.

Ratings of the Italian entrepreneurs are higher than ratings of Russian entrepreneurs in expression of such values as Hedonism, Achievement, and Power, which signifies greater tendency for competitive self-esteem. At the same time, the Italian entrepreneurs keep high level of social commitment: tendency for compromise (Conformity) and care about people and nature (Universalism).

Table 1 also contains information about standard deviations for each value. High standard deviation means low level of intra-country value consensus. Significance of differences of standard deviations was checked with Levene test for equality of dispersions. The table demonstrates standard deviations, hypothesis of equality of which for different countries deviates at the level $p > 0.05$.

Both Italian and Russian entrepreneurs have high consensus and have formed more monolithic group in relation to Self-enhancement (Achievement and Power) values than entrepreneurs of Central Asia.

Besides, the Italian entrepreneurs are more consolidated in relation to Openness to change (Stimulation and Hedonism) values.

Therefore, we have the decreasing line of consolidation levels for groups of entrepreneurs in relation to Self-enhancement and Openness to change values: Italy is the first (both Self-enhancement and Openness to change), Russia is the second (only Self-enhancement), and entrepreneurs of Central Asia are the last, as they have demonstrated the greatest inter-individual differences in both dimensions of basic values.

Table 1 gives comparison of absolute factors of assessment for separate values’ scales. Schwartz recommends using not absolute, but relative factors: position of the value among others. He suggests abstracting mean factor of assessment through the total line of values for the respondent from each assessment of a value, performed by the respondent. In such case we obtain assessments that are centered in relation to mean factor. The algorithm of centering was suggested
Upon results of systematic analysis, Power, Self-Direction, Hedonism, and Universalism appeared to be among the value variables, in which groups of entrepreneurs differ significantly.

Consistency of the discriminant model can be confirmed by Wilks’ Lambda factor, equal to 0.484 ($p < 0.0005$). The low level of Wilks’ Lambda demonstrates that differences between groups (countries) are higher than intra-group differences, i.e. the built functions significantly differentiate the groups.

As a result of discriminant analysis we obtained two discriminant functions, which may be used for prediction of membership of the respondents in either group (number of such functions equals to number of groups minus 1).

Comparison of assessments of predicted (by factors of discriminant functions) membership of objects in groups with their actual membership in the group enables assessment of precision of the model: the less number of prediction failures, the more precise is the model. Below you can find the relation between correctly classified objects and their total number for selection in general and for each group (Table 4). According to the table, the result of classification is acceptable: 69.3% of initial grouped reviews were classified correctly.

To check reliability of the obtained discriminant functions we additionally calculated coefficients of the canonic discriminant function for random selection of respondents (50% of respondents). Correlation of discriminant points, calculated for selection in general and for random selection (test sample) for function equals 0.973 ($p<0.001$), and for function 2 equals 0.874 ($p<0.001$). This confirms relatively high reliability of the results of discriminant analysis.

The means of discriminant functions for all three groups of entrepreneurs can be found in Table 5.

Means of the first function for entrepreneurs of Russia and Italy, on one side, differ from means of this function for entrepreneurs of Central Asia, on other side. Therefore, this function divides entrepreneurs, who are members of the contrast national cultures. Standardized coefficients of discriminant function (Table 3) demonstrate that factor of this function increases in proportion to Hedonism, Power, and Self-Direction values: tendency to take pleasure of life, power and autonomy, or, in the other words, individualistic commitment.

Means of the second function divide entrepreneurs of Italy and Russia into opposite sides. The entrepreneurs of Central Asia take intermediate position. The factors

by Negative factors of assessments signify that this assessment of the value is lower than mean through all values of the respondent. Correspondingly, positive factors signify that assessment of the value is higher than mean for the respondent. The centered factors can be found in Table 2.

Difference between Russian and Italian entrepreneurs in centered assessments was only revealed for Self-Direction (rating of Russian entrepreneurs is higher) and Universalism (rating of Italian entrepreneurs is higher) factors.

The centered assessments presented more contrast difference between entrepreneurs of Central Asia on one side, and Italian and Russian entrepreneurs on other side.

In personal rating of values of entrepreneurs of Central Asia, priority is given to such values as Conservation (Conformity, Tradition, and Security) and Self-transcendence (Benevolence and Universalism).

Russian and Italian entrepreneurs assess such values as Openness to change (Self-Direction, Stimulation, and Hedonism) and Self-enhancement (Achievement и Power) higher than entrepreneurs do of Central Asia in their personal ratings.

Therefore, more individualistic cultures of Italy and Russia encourage preference of such values as Openness to change and Self-enhancement among the entrepreneurs; and this makes ratings of values of entrepreneurs of these countries closer to entrepreneurial value model.

In personal ratings of the entrepreneurs of Central Asia such values as Openness to change and Self-enhancement are pushed back by Conservation and Self-transcendence values, which more conform with national culture.

At that, in absolute factors of Openness to change and Self-enhancement the entrepreneurs of Central Asia have significantly less difference with entrepreneurs of Russia and Italy.

Further, we have performed the discriminant analysis of information about values of entrepreneurs of different countries. The discriminant analysis enables selection of variables (values), which are most significant for distinction of groups (of entrepreneurs from different countries), and determine to what extent the distinction of the groups is statistically significant and precise using this set of variables. We used the procedure of systematic selection of variables.

The results of discriminant analysis are given in Table 3.

Upon results of systematic analysis, Power, Self-
of the function are directly proportional to Universalism value and are inversely proportional to Power value: harmony versus power (Table 3). The entrepreneurs of more economically developed and safe Italy are closer to the pole, which combines social commitment to harmony (Universalism) with individualistic Self-Direction and Hedonism, and entrepreneurs of less safe Russia are closer to strictly individualistic pole, which combines Self-Direction and Hedonism with tendency for Power. The entrepreneurs of Italy are committed to autonomy and pleasure and at the same time hope to stay in harmony with the environment (“pull” factors according to 21), and entrepreneurs of Russia strive not only for pleasures of life and autonomy, but also for superiority, for position “above” their environment without care about it (“push” factors21).

Correlations of Hardiness factors with factors of discriminant functions, calculated for each participant of the research, can be found in Table 6.

Hardiness factors are connected only to factors of the first discriminant function. The higher rating of Power, Self-Direction and Hedonism values, the higher is level of Hardiness of an entrepreneur. The higher level of individualism is related to the higher level of personality hardiness resource of an entrepreneur.

5. Discussion

Among the participants of the cross-cultural research there were entrepreneurs of countries with transition economy, but contrast national cultures (Russia versus Central Asia) and entrepreneurs of more common cultures, but different level of economic development (Russia versus Italy).

The cultural context of European countries (Italy and Russia) leads to involvement of people with dominating Openness to change and Self-enhancement values into entrepreneurial activity. These groups are sufficiently homogeneous: entrepreneurs of both Italy and Russia, despite the difference in level of development of their countries, have high consensus in relation to Achievement

| Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Factors by Country (group means and group standard deviations) |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Italy N=42                                      | Russia N=39                                      | Central Asia N=82                                  |
| Commitment                                    | Control                                         | Challenge                                       |
| M 43.553                                      | M 41.333                                        | M 19.573                                        |
| SD 4.23                                      | SD 7.31                                         | SD 3.67                                         |
| M 15.613                                     | F 371.56                                        | F 12.703                                        |
| SD 6.66                                      | Sig. .000                                        | Sig. .000                                        |
| Control                                       | Challenge                                       | Hardiness                                       |
| M 36.023                                     | M 19.873                                        | M 99.143                                        |
| SD 3.91                                      | SD 3.80                                         | SD 8.43                                         |
| M 20.053                                     | F 12.693                                        | F 97.003                                        |
| SD 5.64                                      | Sig. .000                                        | Sig. 13.93                                      |
| M 6.82                                      |                                                            | F 48.463                                        |
| SD 7.31                                      |                                                            | Sig. 14.66                                      |
| F 31.56                                    |                                                            |                                                            |
| Sig. .000                                  |                                                            |                                                            |
| Conformity                                    | Tradition                                        | Security                                        |
| M 3.543                                     | M 2.833                                         | M 4.916                                         |
| SD .94                                      | SD .85                                         | SD .75                                         |
| M 3.103                                     | M 2.463                                         | M 3.733                                         |
| SD .92                                      | SD .87                                         | SD .76                                         |
| M 4.423                                     | M 3.783                                         | M 4.553                                         |
| SD .92                                      | F .91                                          | Sig. .93                                        |
| F 4.423                                     | Sig. .91                                        |                                                            |
| Sig. .000                                  |                                                            |                                                            |
| Tradition                                    | Security                                         | Self-Direction                                  |
| M 4.29                                      | M 1.533                                         | M 4.86                                          |
| SD .503                                     | SD 4.02                                         | SD .69                                         |
| M 4.083                                     | M .973                                         | M 4.693                                         |
| SD 1.113                                    | Sig. .423                                       | Sig. 4.693                                      |
| M 4.133                                     |                                                            | Sig. .79                                        |
| SD .973                                    |                                                            | F .79                                          |
| F 5.853                                    |                                                            | F 4.693                                         |
| Sig. .004                                  |                                                            | Sig. .79                                        |
| Self-Direction                               | Achievement                                     | Power                                           |
| M 4.693                                     | M 4.473                                         | M 4.833                                         |
| SD 1.033                                    | SD .583                                         | SD .553                                         |
| M 3.993                                     | M 3.993                                         | M 4.313                                         |
| SD .693                                    | F .693                                          | F .693                                          |
| M 3.993                                     | F 4.19                                          | F 3.883                                         |
| SD .693                                    | F 1.013                                         | F 1.043                                         |
| F 1.013                                    | Sig. .323                                       | Sig. .163                                       |
| Sig. .043                                  |                                                            |                                                            |
| Power                                         | Benevolence                                      | Universalism                                   |
| M 3.643                                     | M 3.643                                         | M 4.043                                         |
| SD 1.08                                     | SD 3.303                                         | SD .66                                         |
| M 3.543                                     | M .88                                          | SD 3.263                                         |
| SD .75                                      | F .453                                          | F 4.463                                         |
| F .75                                      | Sig. .319                                       | Sig. .83                                        |
| Sig. .000                                  |                                                            | F .83                                          |
|                                                            |                                                            | F 29.23                                        |

Note. Significant (p < 0.05) coupled differences of means: 1 – difference from mean in Italy selection, 2 – difference from mean in Russia selection, 3 – difference from mean in Central Asia selection. Significant differences of standard deviations (p > 0.05): 1 – difference from mean in Italy selection, 2 – difference from mean in Russia selection, 3 – difference from mean in Central Asia selection. “Hardiness” means total assessment for all three Hardiness scales.
**Table 2.** Descriptive Statistics of centered Factors by Country (group means and group standard deviations)

|                      | Italy N=42 | Russia N=39 | Central Asia N=82 | F  | Significance |
|----------------------|------------|-------------|-------------------|----|--------------|
| Conformity           | -0.56      | -0.63       | -0.13             | 19.16 | 0.000        |
| Tradition            | -1.27      | -1.27       | -0.51             | 20.91 | 0.000        |
| Security             | -0.19      | 0.00        | 0.26              | 7.69  | 0.001        |
| Self-Direction       | 0.74       | 1.33        | 0.39              | 25.18 | 0.000        |
| Stimulation          | 0.17       | 0.28        | -0.05             | 3.54  | 0.031        |
| Hedonism             | 0.57       | 0.34        | -0.15             | 13.52 | 0.000        |
| Achievement          | 0.35       | 0.25        | 0.09              | 9.00  | 0.000        |
| Power                | 0.71       | 0.57        | -0.40             | 40.68 | 0.000        |
| Benevolence          | -0.46      | 0.90        | 0.24              | 18.56 | 0.000        |
| Universalism         | -0.06      | 0.53        | 0.17              | 14.13 | 0.000        |

Note: Significant p < 0.05 coupled differences of means: 1 – difference from mean in Italy selection, 2 - difference from mean in Russia selection, 3 - difference from mean in Central Asia selection.

**Table 3.** The Discriminant Results

| The Discriminant Results Step Number | Factor Entered | F Value | “p” Value | Standardized Coefficients Function | Standardized Coefficients Function 2 |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|---------|-----------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1                                    | Power          | 40.69   | <0.0005   | 0.461                              | -0.622                              |
| 2                                    | Self-Direction | 27.91   | <0.0005   | 0.303                              | 0.487                               |
| 3                                    | Hedonism       | 20.46   | <0.0005   | 0.742                              | 0.536                               |
| 4                                    | Universalism   | 17.14   | <0.0005   | 0.035                              | 0.722                               |

**Table 4.** Results of classification

| Actual Group Membership | Quantity | Predicted Group Membership | Total |
|-------------------------|----------|----------------------------|-------|
|                         |          | Italy | Russia | Central Asia |       |
| Italy                   | 28       | 12    | 2      | 42           |       |
| Russia                  | 7        | 25    | 7      | 39           |       |
| Central Asia            | 13       | 9     | 60     | 82           |       |
| %                       | Italy    | 66.7  | 28.6   | 4.8          | 100.0 |
| Russia                  | 17.9     | 64.1  | 17.9   | 100.0        |       |
| Central Asia            | 15.9     | 11.0  | 73.2   | 100.0        |       |

Note: a. 69.3% of initial grouped reviews were classified correctly.

**Table 5.** Group means (centroid) non-standardized discriminant functions

|                      | Italy N=42 | Russia N=39 | Central Asia N=82 | F  | Significance |
|----------------------|------------|-------------|-------------------|----|--------------|
| Discriminant assessments of function 1 | 0.77      | 0.82       | 0.93              | 1.02 | 58.19        | 0.000        |
| Discriminant assessments of function 2 | 0.62      | 0.96       | -0.62             | 0.91 | 15.596       | 0.000        |

Note: Significant (p < .05) coupled differences of means: 1 – difference from mean in Italy selection, 2 - difference from mean in Russia selection, 3 - difference from mean in Central Asia selection.
and Power values, and entrepreneurs of Italy – in relation to Stimulation and Hedonism values. Individualistic value commitments of the entrepreneurs of Italy are to some degree compensated by socially committed Conformity and Universalism. Nevertheless, highly expressed individualism of entrepreneurs of Italy and Russia is related to increased level of Hardiness despite the differences in level of economic development of Italy and Russia.

This combination of individualistic value commitments and Hardiness personality resource distinguishes European entrepreneurs from the entrepreneurs of Central Asia. Conservative and socially committed entrepreneurs of Central Asia have significantly lower Hardiness personality resource. Entrepreneurs of Central Asia highly appreciate social support (culture as a social resource) and have lesser personal resource (Hardiness).

According to the discriminant analysis, such values as Self-Direction, Hedonism and Power have a key role in differentiation of entrepreneurs of European countries (Russia and Italy) and countries of Central Asia. Such combination of autonomy, tendency to take pleasures of life and power is related to high level of Hardiness.

Russian and Italy have common cultural values, but differ in level of economic development. Entrepreneurs of these two countries have different combinations of values, but the same level of Hardiness.

Russian entrepreneurs are committed to such values as Self-Direction and Hedonism in combination with Power. Italian entrepreneurs combine the same Self-Direction and Hedonism with Universalism.

Russian entrepreneurs live in more severe conditions, tend to rise above their environment (high level of Power) and do not care about sustainability and harmony of relations (low Universalism). Using terminology of involvement into entrepreneurial activity in Russia is connected to influence of “Push” factor, which “pushes” a person into the entrepreneurship.

Italian entrepreneurs live in country that is more prosperous, they are committed to self-dependence and pleasures of life, but, in addition to this, they are ready to take care of nature and people around them. Their transition to entrepreneurship takes place more due to “pulling” effect (“pull” factor according to Geert Hofstede et al); it is not an escape from desperation of life, but a desire to obtain advanced options for themselves and others.

6. Conclusion

Summarizing the discussion, we can make the following conclusion. The obtained data demonstrates that selection of entrepreneurship as a behavioral strategy for achievement of the life goals depends on combination of characteristics of cultural context, as cultural resource, and Hardiness, as personality resource.

Values of residents of Central Asia, who have chosen the entrepreneurial activity, are committed to attraction of social support resource; and the entrepreneurs have limited Hardiness resource. European entrepreneurs, being members of more individualistic culture, are committed to autonomy and self-esteem and have significantly higher personality resource.

Therefore, the hypothesis of the research has been confirmed at the first approximation. Surely, to completely check and confirm the hypothesis we shall include more countries into selections, as well as take economic and institutional contexts of activity of the entrepreneurs into account.
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