

National business cultures of Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine as a factor of the synthesis of Western and Eastern management styles¹

Beata Glinkowska-Krauze, *University of Lodz (Lodz, Poland)*

E-mail: beata.glinkowska@uni.lodz.pl

<https://www.orcid.org/0000-0002-6915-3297>

Viacheslav Chebotarov, *University of Lodz (Lodz, Poland)*

E-mail: viacheslav.chebotarov@wz.uni.lodz.pl

<https://www.orcid.org/0000-0003-1131-9116>

Iegor Chebotarov, *University of Lodz (Lodz, Poland)*

E-mail: iegor.chebotarov@wz.uni.lodz.pl

<https://www.orcid.org/0000-0001-5963-7637>

Abstract

In this study, based on the identification of similarity factors of the national business cultures of Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine, the hypothesis was formulated and verified concerning the formation of premises for a new management style – Eastern European management as a synthesis of Western and Eastern management. Using the measurement tools of modern economic comparative analysis, an analysis of the business cultures of these countries was conducted. The feature system was built by comparing western and eastern conceptual management approaches and practices. It has been proven that the great proximity (similarity) of the national business cultures of Poland,

¹ The authors prepared this article in the context of the implementation of the themes *Theory and practice of comparative analysis of entrepreneurs' profiles (on the example of Poland and Ukraine)* and *"Lublin Triangle": the foundations of the economic development of the post-war reorganization of Europe in the 21st century* of the Polish Ministry of Education and Science and the University of Lodz within the *Excellence Initiative – Research University program for researchers from Ukraine*, as well as the theme *Corporate culture in the conditions of the modern crisis: the content of transformational changes as the basis for management modification* of the project of the Polish National Science Centre, which are implemented at the Faculty of Management, University of Lodz.

Lithuania and Ukraine creates conditions for optimal combination of the advantages of Western and Eastern management.

Keywords: Poland, Lithuania, Ukraine, national business cultures, management in Eastern Europe.

Narodowe kultury biznesowe Polski, Litwy i Ukrainy jako czynnik syntezy zachodniego i wschodniego stylu zarządzania

Streszczenie

W niniejszym badaniu, na podstawie identyfikacji czynników podobieństwa narodowych kultur biznesowych Polski, Litwy i Ukrainy, sformułowano i zweryfikowano hipotezę o kształtowaniu się przesłanek dla nowego stylu zarządzania – wschodnioeuropejskiego zarządzania jako syntezy zachodniego i wschodniego zarządzania. Wykorzystując narzędzia pomiarowe współczesnej komparatyki ekonomicznej, przeprowadzono analizę kultur biznesowych tych krajów. System cech został zbudowany poprzez porównanie koncepcyjnych podejść i praktyk zarządzania zachodniego i wschodniego. Udowodniono, że duża bliskość (podobieństwo) narodowych kultur biznesowych Polski, Litwy i Ukrainy stwarza warunki do optymalnego połączenia zalet zarządzania zachodniego i wschodniego.

Słowa kluczowe: Polska, Litwa, Ukraina, narodowe kultury biznesowe, zarządzanie w Europie Wschodniej.

At the turn of the second and third decades of the 21st century, the world economy entered a period of significant strengthening of anti-globalisation and disintegration processes that have become the most characteristic for the European continent. This is confirmed, among other things, by the rapid exacerbation of global energy, environmental, technological and food problems. The COVID-19 pandemic and the continuous mutation of the virus SARS-CoV-2 have become manifestations of one of the most serious aggravations of the global problem of epidemic diseases in the last century. The "systemic" crisis of the economic and political situation in the world is deepened by the Russian-Ukrainian conflict that negatively influences international socio-economic progress.

The solution to these problems lies largely on business, as the foundation of modern society in the system of its relations with the state. However, in order to solve the identified problems, economic sciences must develop common approaches, mechanisms and practices that would apply to the main existing schools of management: Western (in the classical sense – Anglo-Saxon) and Eastern (in the traditional sense – Japanese). The theoretical and methodical, as well as and practical "scientific rivalry" of modern management directions, however, acts rather as a "deterrent" in solving global problems by business and society as a whole.

The type of rivalry between Western and Eastern management, which has been visible for several decades, has not led to the definition of leadership in this rivalry, but it poses the task of defining the determining premises that would become the basis for the convergence of these schools (their similarity or penetration). The basis for this convergence (interpenetration, synthesis) may be such fundamental phenomena of entrepreneurship

and science as national business cultures, which concentrate the entirety of institutional, economic and natural conditions, as well as factors of social development. However, in terms of content, not all countries' national business cultures are conducive to converging Western and Eastern management styles. There are not many such countries on the political map of the world.

The centuries-old "coexistence" of Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine – together with a number of other countries of the Eastern European subregion within two confederate states – the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the First Polish Republic, provide scientific grounds for the hypothesis that the national business cultures of Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine have the potential for the synthesis of Western and Eastern management styles. The verification of this **hypothesis** poses a complex interdisciplinary scientific problem of identifying and analysing features that are characteristic of the national business cultures of Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine, which may become the basis for the synthesis and enrichment of Western and Eastern management. Identification of the characteristics of national business cultures and their analysis are the **main research objective** of this study. The **main research problem** is whether the national business cultures of Poland, Ukraine and Lithuania are similar or significantly different. **Another research problem** is whether the national business cultures of these countries are eclectic, i.e. whether they contain elements of Western and Eastern cultures. Due to the problems formulated in this way, there is first of all a need for a theoretical analysis of the characteristics of national business cultures adopted in this study for country research.

Analysis of the literature on the subject of research

Various aspects of the relationship between Western and Eastern management have been the subject of systematic research since the 1980s and 1990s. Moreover, it was characteristic of both schools of management. For representatives of the Western style of management, such a development of events was caused primarily by the effects of the Japanese "economic miracle" (from mid-1950s to the world crisis in 1973–1974), as a result of which Japan became one of the most developed countries in the world (despite losing in World War II). For representatives of the Eastern style of management, such research was dictated by the need not only to search for further strengthening of Japan's position, but also by the emergence of the Four Asian Tigers (Hong Kong, Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan), and then the formation of the Chinese "economic miracle" (since the late 1970s).

The initial methodological approach in considering the relationship between Western and Eastern management was a comparative analysis of their basic conceptual approaches and derivatives of specific management practices. There are reasons to believe that the analysis conducted by J. K. Solarz (1994) and D. Waters (1995) has become an example of one of the most productive solutions from the point of view of Western management. In this regard, the very title of the work by D. Waters, devoted to this issue, *21st Century Management: Keeping Ahead of the Japanese and Chinese*, became quite

"revealing" itself. In countries with Eastern style of management, such an analysis was reasonably done by W. Ouchi (1981), I. Watanabe (1999) and M. Yoshimori (1996).

Eliyahu M. Goldratt presented a fundamentally different approach in considering Western and Eastern management. He introduced the process-objective theory (the theory of constraints, see more: Goldratt, Cox 2016), which grew out of the need and desirability of an optimal combination of approaches and practices of both schools of management.

It should be noted that such studies do not pay due attention to the issues of national business cultures. In this regard, in the science of the late 20th century, the only exception may be the works of famous scientists C. Hampden-Turner and F. Trompenaars – one of the creators of the theory of national business cultures. However, their analyses did not take into account the business cultures of the Eastern European sub-region (see: Hampden-Turner, Trompenaars 1995). It is similar in the works of the most famous creator of the theory of national business cultures, G. Hofstede (see: Hofstede 1980; Hofstede et al. 2010). To some extent, the countries of Central and Eastern Europe were also considered by another outstanding representative of the theory of national business cultures, R. Lewis. However, the subject of R. Lewis' analysis are mainly the issues of communication behavior and communication systems of managers and entrepreneurs from different countries, and not management as a whole (see: Lewis 2013).

National business cultures, as a qualifier among indicators/determinants of Western and Eastern management, are analysed in joint Polish-Ukrainian research (Glinkowska-Krauze et al. 2023). Prior to this, the authors laid the theoretical and methodological foundations for a comparative analysis of the "profiles" of Polish and Ukrainian managers (Glinkowska, Chebotarov 2018) and the essence (content) of the national business cultures of Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine (Glinkowska-Krauze et al. 2020a; Zat'ko et al. 2022). However, this requires a logical continuation of research and its deepening in the context of understanding the content of the national business cultures of Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine as the "synthesising" beginning of Western and Eastern management.

Purpose of the article and research methodology

The **research objective of the study** is to identify the features of national business cultures of both styles (Western and Eastern), and then to perform a comparative analysis of the national business cultures of Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine in the context of comparing two groups of countries – the most typical carriers of Western and Eastern management.

In the framework of the presented study, the methods of unity of analysis and synthesis, grouping, comparative analysis and generalisation were used.

The use of the grouping method is confirmed by the separation of three groups of national business cultures for the purpose of comparative analysis: countries of the Eastern European subregion, the most developed countries – representatives of Western management, and the most typical countries of Eastern management (countries of the

Indo-Pacific subregion). In addition, to ensure “purity” and comparability of the overall research methodology, three identified clusters are equivalent in terms of the number of countries in each.

The application of the analysis and synthesis unity method involves analysing the business cultures of individual countries within three selected clusters, and then pointing out the common features of business cultures in each cluster as a whole. The next step in the context of analysis and synthesis is to compare the national business cultures of the three clusters using the tabular method. At this stage of the research, empirical data from the study of national business cultures of countries, conducted by the international consulting agency *Hofstede Insights* (the current authority on this issue), was utilised. Another element of the empirical research was the use of the results of research conducted in parallel by the authors on a sample of managers and entrepreneurs in Poland and Ukraine.

The adoption of generalisation and comparison methods at the same time allows determining specific areas, in which the application of Western and Eastern management approaches and practices will be the most appropriate in the business sphere of Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine, taking into account the properties and features of their national business cultures.

Theoretical basis

The theory and practice of national business cultures is one of the elements defining the interdisciplinary and multicultural field of contemporary economic science – economic comparative studies. The creator of the analysis of these problems is the well-known scientist and practitioner G. Hofstede from the Netherlands (see: Hofstede 1980; Hofstede et al. 2010). The theory and practice of national business cultures began in the 1970s and 1980s. F. Trompenaars (Netherlands) and R. Lewis (UK) also made a significant contribution to the development of the issues of national business cultures and comparative economic studies in general.

Based on the works of G. Hofstede, F. Trompenaars, R. Lewis and their continuators, we can identify the definition of the concept of *national business culture*. It is a system of inseparable and evolutionarily shaped, reproducible in time and space, basic features of entrepreneurial activity. Values, norms and canons, as well as traditions and ethics of running a business are specific for a given country² (Glinkowska-Krauze et al. 2020b). A number of methodological and practical aspects of studying the theory and practice of national business cultures, including defining the essence of the concept, became the subject of the development and registration of intellectual property rights of authors (e.g. see: Chebotarov et al. 2020; Chebotarov, Glinkowska-Krauze 2020).

On the basis of his cultural dimensions theory, G. Hofstede developed indicators (dimensions, parameters) leading to the assessment of national business cultures in individual countries and organisations (corporations), which enables comparative research.

² and/or groups of countries that are characterised by similar features of organising and running a business.

Such measures of culture that are used in global comparative economic research are: power distance, individualism, masculinity, uncertainty avoidance, long-term orientation, indulgence.

In contemporary comparative economic studies, the content of these dimensions by representatives of various schools and trends is understood as follows:

- *Power distance* is a parameter determining the measure of the concentration of power at the highest levels of the hierarchy (or *vice versa*: the measure of the distance of middle and lower level managers from making real decisions; at the same time, distance from power is perceived as a natural phenomenon).
- *Individualism* is a measure that classifies the spread of an individualistic approach in the development and direct implementation of entrepreneurial activity.
- *Masculinity* is a trait that indicates determination in the pursuit of commercial success and the cultivation of celebration (professional successes, victories, etc.).
- *Uncertainty avoidance* is an indicator that determines the internal predispositions of entrepreneurs/managers of a given country to avoid risk in every possible way (or *vice versa*: quite high comfort and habit of working in conditions of uncertainty).
- *Long-term orientation* is a parameter used to assess the internal orientation of managers to focus activities in the short-term perspective (or *vice versa*: focus on the long-term perspective in running a business and achieving its profitability).
- *Indulgence* describes a condescending (quite open and natural) attitude towards the absolutisation of market "values" in business, achieving success by any means and without considering moral, religious, etc. constraints.

To evaluate the above-mentioned measures directly, Hofstede developed their scoring, usually from 0 to 100 points (see: Hofstede Insights WWWa).

Research results

Nowadays, the assessment of national business cultures of countries, their specific groups (clusters) and leading corporations is systematically conducted by the international consulting agency *Hofstede Insights* co-founded by G. Hofstede (see: Hofstede Insights WWWb). At the same time, in-depth and complex scientific and practical research carried out by the authors of this study confirm the impossibility of absolutising the conclusions of the *Hofstede Insights'* research.

Using the research results contained in the *Hofstede Insights'* studies, *Table 1* presents data on the parameters (indicators) of the national business cultures of Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine – the most typical countries of Western and Eastern management. Based solely on the research materials of *Hofstede Insights*, a fairly clear conclusion should be drawn about the significant difference between the national business cultures of Poland and Ukraine. This conclusion is confirmed in almost every respect by the indicators in *Table 1*. However, not only empirical research, but also data from comprehensive scien-

tific research conducted by the authors³ in the context of implementation of several joint scientific international projects do not give grounds for such conclusions (Glinkowska-Krauze et al. 2020b; Glinkowska-Krauze et al. 2023).

In particular, data based on the results of pilot (trial) studies of entrepreneurs in Poland and Ukraine⁴, indicate a much higher level of *individualism* in the national business culture of Ukraine (not 25 points, according to the results of *Hofstede Insights*) and a lower level of this parameter – characteristic of the business culture of Poland (60 points, according to *Hofstede Insights'* results, see: Hofstede Insights W/Wb). This means that the "individualism" parameter records sufficient proximity between Poland and Ukraine.

Table 1: Indicators of national business cultures of Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine in the "Western management" – "Eastern management" coordinate system.

Country / Dimension	Power distance	Individualism	Masculinity	Uncertainty avoidance	Long-term orientation	Indulgence
Poland	68	60	64	93	38	29
Lithuania	42	60	19	65	82	16
Ukraine	92	25	27	95	86	14
Latvia	44	70	9	63	69	13
Estonia	40	60	30	60	82	16
Slovak Rep.	100	52	100	51	77	28
USA	40	91	62	46	26	68
G. Britain	35	89	66	35	51	69
Germany	35	67	66	65	83	40
France	68	71	43	86	63	48
Italy	50	76	70	75	61	30
The Netherlands	38	80	14	53	67	68
Japan	54	46	95	92	88	42
China	80	20	66	30	87	24
S. Korea	60	18	39	85	100	29
Singapore	74	20	48	8	72	46
Indonesia	78	14	46	48	62	38
Malaysia	100	26	50	36	41	57

Source: authors' own elaboration based on publication: Hofstede Insights W/Wb.

³ Authors from the University of Lodz (Poland) and Luhansk Taras Shevchenko National University (evacuated to Poltava, Ukraine).

⁴ 547 respondents were interviewed in Poland, 561 in Ukraine – according to two different surveys.

The authors of this study also note a lower level of masculinity in Poland (below 64 points) and a much higher level of masculinity in Ukraine (significantly above 27 points). Moreover, when it comes to the parameter *uncertainty avoidance*, the characteristics of Polish and Ukrainian business cultures are indeed similar; however, they are significantly lower than in research conducted by *Hofstede Insights* (93 and 95 points respectively). The risk tolerance of entrepreneurs in Poland and Ukraine is not significantly different and is similar to that of Lithuania.⁵

The above-mentioned results lead to the conclusion that there is a fairly high degree of similarity between the national business cultures of Poland and Ukraine. This conclusion is confirmed by a more thorough comparative analysis of organisational (corporate) cultures and "profiles" of entrepreneurs in these two countries (Glinkowska-Krauze et al. 2023). At the same time, there is no reason to repeat a very widespread and unjustified view on the identity of the national business cultures of Poland and Ukraine (it is not confirmed by either theoretical research or practical applied analysis).

Simultaneously, the national business culture of Ukraine is to a greater extent, compared to the business culture of Poland, similar to the features of the business cultures of the Baltic states (primarily Lithuania): the indicators of Lithuania and Ukraine are very close in terms of the dimensions: *long-term orientation* (82 and 86 points, respectively) and *indulgence* (16 and 14 points respectively). The business cultures of Lithuania and the Netherlands are also quite similar (in terms of dimensions *power distance* and *masculinity*).

However, the comparative analysis of national business cultures presented in *Table 1* allows us to draw two following conclusions.

The first: there is a high degree of proximity and mutual general complementarity of the national business cultures of Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine, which are close in terms of their characteristics and a number of institutional, economic, natural and geographical characteristics.⁶ The stated proximity of the national business cultures of Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine is not some artificial and unjustified conclusion. It is confirmed not only by empirical observations, but also by the results of research conducted by the international consulting agency *Hofstede Insights*. The data in *Table 1* contain the absolute similarity of the *individualism* indicators for Poland and Lithuania (60 points each). The *uncertainty avoidance* dimension's score for Poland and Ukraine practically coincides (93 and 95 points, respectively). These parameters (measures), considered by *Hofstede Insight*, are the basis for confirming the correctness of the authors' theoretical conclusion about the organicity and complementarity of the national business cultures of Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine (considered as part of their tripartite cooperation).

⁵ Lithuania's score for the parameter *uncertainty avoidance* coincides with Germany's score of 65 points, which is slightly above neutral.

⁶ Besides that, should be taken into consideration the scientific papers stating the considerably relevant proximity to the first group (Poland, Lithuania, Ukraine) also three other countries, including Eastern European subregions: Slovakia, Latvia and Estonia (Zat'ko et al. 2022).

The second: quite a high degree of similarity between the national business cultures of Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine (as well as Slovakia, Latvia and Estonia) and a number of countries from the East and the Indo-Pacific subregion analysed in *Table 1*. This conclusion is based primarily on the characteristics of the national business culture of Ukraine. The analysis of subsequent data in *Table 1* demonstrates that Ukraine's national business culture is largely similar to that of China (in as many as three dimensions simultaneously: *power distance*, *individualism* and *long-term orientation*), as well as South Korea (in terms of *power distance* and *individualism*, while for dimension *long-term orientation* it is observed less often). Ukraine's business culture is also close to Japan: precisely in terms of *avoiding uncertainty* and *long-term orientation*. In addition, according to two dimensions out of six (*power distance* and *individualism*), the similarity of the business cultures of Ukraine and Malaysia is noted.

Comprehensive comparative studies of national business cultures of a number of groups (clusters) of countries conducted by the authors (Glinkowska-Krauze et al. 2020a,b), including empirical research in the form of surveys among entrepreneurs and managers in various sectors of the Polish and Ukrainian economy (Glinkowska-Krauze et al. 2023), justify the following conclusion.

Considered as a unity, indicators-dimensions of national business cultures (their levels: high and low scores, as well as various combinations of the levels of six dimensions) largely determine and shape the general approaches and value orientations of organisations (enterprises and corporations) of some countries. Orientations to organisational values and the forms of their manifestation are the essential features of organisational cultures (Schein 2009). This means that the content and nature of the national business cultures of some countries largely determine the content and nature of the organisational (corporate) cultures of these countries.

For example, a high score of the dimension *power distance* and a low score of the *individuality* usually determine complex hierarchical structures of management in the organisation (enterprise). *Long-term orientation* (especially in combination with a high ratio of the parameter *uncertainty avoidance*) "stimulates" the company's development of activities with long-term capital turnover and the general nature of the functioning of management systems. A high level of *masculinity*, apart from purposefulness in the pursuit of business interests, is very often accompanied by a general conflict in the implementation of business activities (and a low score in *masculinity* may cause predispositions to corruption in business).

Such understanding of the causal dependence of organisational (corporate) cultures on national business cultures is fully consistent with the approach of G. Hofstede (1980), the creator of the theory and practice of national business cultures, and his followers C Hampden-Turner and F. Trompenaars (1995). In the same context, economic comparative studies considered the subordination of organisational cultures to national business cultures. We can trace this approach in the papers of such representatives of the Western leadership as N. Jacob (2003), H. Bloom, R. Calori, Ph. De Woot (1995). What is interesting, the representatives of the Eastern leadership share such viewpoint: M. Yoshimori (1996), Ch.W. Hill (2007), C.K. Prahalad (1998).

At the same time, in order to practically implement the research triad proposed by the authors: "national business cultures" – "organisational (corporate) cultures" – "profiles" of entrepreneurs (Glinkowska-Krauze et al. 2023: p. 38–49), it would be logical to put forward the following postulate. The content of national business cultures of countries and their organisational cultures have a predetermining impact on specific management practices: mechanisms for justifying and implementing business decisions, the nature of job descriptions, the procedure for communicating, and information exchange by managers at various hierarchical levels in organisations, etc. Also, in the context of comparative analysis of the Western and Eastern management, we should take into account the growing differences in the content of management practices (their techniques) resulting from the essence of national business cultures and the basic legal provisions of the two existing schools of management.

The development of practical aspects of the issues of comparative analysis of Western and Eastern management indicates the desirability of identifying their conceptual (basic) approaches and specific management practices in the first stage, and revealing their essential features in the second stage. The implementations of this methodology are presented in *Table 2*. The data contained in this table allows us to identify conceptual approaches and demonstrates their essence (at this stage of the research, we limit ourselves to distinguishing five main such approaches). As part of the activities of the *Scientific and Research Cooperation Center: Poland-Ukraine*, the authors discussed the legitimacy of exposing the existing conceptual approaches and management practices with representatives of the expert community of the Indo-Pacific subregion – Malaysia and India). Its first five features (from the first to the fifth) indicate the conceptual approach of these schools, and the next five features (from the sixth to the tenth) indicate their management practice (technologies, techniques).

Table 2: Comparative parameters of the main Western and Eastern management conceptual approaches and practices

no.	Features of management approaches	Western management system	Eastern management system
1.	Power distance and the nature of its distribution	Mostly short power distance with little delegation of authority to lower levels	Usually large power distance and decentralisation within a certain level; in many respects, the informal nature of power
2.	Approach to strategic planning	Economic performance orientation (profitability, efficiency, return on investment, etc.)	Focus on developing an optimal model of adapting the company to the conditions of the market environment

3.	General nature of the functioning of organisational and management structures	Mostly egalitarian systems with cross-functional, multi-directional relationships in the enterprise	Mostly complex-hierarchical vertical control systems with a long-term use nature.
4.	Functioning of management systems	Functioning on individual (personal) basis with personalised responsibility	Functioning on group (collective) basis with collective responsibility
5.	General nature of planning systems in the enterprise	Directive-oriented and clearly formalised planning	Indicator-oriented and flexible dynamically changing planning

Source: authors' own elaboration

Thus, the basic parameter of national business cultures – *power distance* and the nature of economic power in organisations (the first feature in *Table 2*) shapes the main differences between Western and Eastern management in the very content (essence) of the approach to strategic planning: achieving economic efficiency indicators for the Western management and development of optimal models of organisation adaptation to the constantly changing conditions of the market environment for Eastern management. The content and nature of business cultures of some countries also determine the specificity of Western and Eastern management in their understanding and the use of other general approaches (from second to fifth element of *Table 2*).

As a result, the differences between Western and Eastern management in the development and implementation of specific management practices deepen: from the division of duties and functional managers to control and motivation systems. The scientific and practical research carried out by the authors (as well as the experience of practical business activity) make it possible to identify the general nature of the activities of managers, the type and distribution of their official and functional duties, the system of communication and information exchange, the nature of job descriptions, the nature of making non-strategic decisions, the content of control systems and incentives for managers and the attitude of managers to improve the performance of enterprises.

Conducting a comparative analysis of the national business cultures of Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine in the context of their comparison with the business cultures of countries that are classic carriers of the essential features of Western and Eastern management, and then identifying the main features and content of both global schools of management, allows us to draw the following main conclusions.

The national business cultures of Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine are multicultural in their content. At the same time, three fundamentally important theoretical and methodological features should be taken into account, fully confirmed by empirical assessments, including parallel studies of entrepreneurs conducted by the authors on the example of Poland and Ukraine. In addition to the assessments of the international agency *Hofstede Insights*, authors' studies are an empirical confirmation of the verification and legitimacy of

the scientific hypothesis and national business cultures of Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine as a factor in the synthesis of Western and Eastern management.

Firstly, the national business cultures of Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine are devoid of the polarity and mutual exclusion inherent in a broad cognitive and cultural understanding of Western and Eastern socio-economic systems.

Secondly, the national business cultures of Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine have their own qualitative certainty and stability, as well as complementarity (especially in pairs).

Thirdly, the national business cultures of Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine have a number of properties that indicate both their similarity to the business cultures of the most developed countries of Western civilisation (mainly due to the parameters of Poland and Lithuania), and their similarity to the business culture of Eastern civilisation (mostly thanks to Ukraine).

Considered together, the essential features of the national business cultures of Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine constitute a factor and a fundamental theoretical and methodological condition for the development of new conceptual approaches and management practices, the aim of which is to synthesise the main advantages of Western and Eastern management. These features include purposefulness and external coordination characteristic of Western management, as well as internal flexibility and ability to adapt to the business environment characteristic of Eastern management. Such new type of management as a real business practice and scientific school can be defined as management in Eastern Europe.

Conclusions

The problem of overcoming polarisation and shaping the synthesis of Western (Anglo-Saxon) and Eastern (Japanese) management is focused not only on the directions of development of modern world science – its interdisciplinarity, interfunctionality and multiculturalism. Its solution is also of great practical importance, creating conditions for a significant increase in management efficiency. However, the consolidation of the premises of such synthesis presupposes the existence of a number of objective and subjective conditions. In many ways, they are rooted in national business cultures as a phenomenon of entrepreneurship and contemporary comparative economic studies.

A comprehensive scientific and practical analysis of the national business cultures of Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine (and the business cultures of several other countries of the Eastern European subregion – Latvia, Estonia and Slovakia) gives grounds for the conclusion that they have a great potential and a real precondition for combining the advantages of Western and Eastern management.

Prospects for the development of the taken problem

The synthesis of Western and Eastern management based on the identified proximity and complementarity of national business cultures of Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine

seems to be both possible and real. In order to deepen this synthesis, it is necessary to develop specific proposals for the use of Western and Eastern conceptual management approaches and practices identified so far in the practical operation of business structures in Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine. In order to strengthen the scientific justification of the above proposals and recommendations, the authors planned parallel research of Polish, Lithuanian and Ukrainian entrepreneurs according to the original questionnaire, which contains a set of questions on national business cultures, organisational (corporate) cultures and "profiles" of entrepreneurs, and managers (with further use for research in the Indo-Pacific subregion). Processing the results of empirical research will be the basis for methodological recommendations for using the advantages of Western and Eastern management in the activities of business formations in Poland, Lithuania and Ukraine.

Beata Glinkowska-Krauze – dr hab., associate professor of the University of Lodz, Chairwoman of the *Scientific and Research Cooperation Center: Poland-Ukraine*. Research interests: business internationalisation, analysis of the economic efficiency of investments, managing organisations in the conditions of dynamic environment and crises.

Beata Glinkowska-Krauze – dr hab., profesor Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, Kierownik *Centrum Współpracy Naukowo-Badawczej: Polska-Ukraina*. Zainteresowania badawcze: internacjonalizacja biznesu, analiza efektywności ekonomicznej inwestycji, zarządzanie organizacjami w warunkach dynamicznego otoczenia i kryzysów.

Viacheslav Chebotarov – professor, dr hab., University of Lodz (Poland), and Luhansk Taras Shevchenko National University (Poltava, Ukraine), Co-chairman of the *Scientific and Research Cooperation Center: Poland-Ukraine* on the Ukrainian side. Research interests: pan-European integration policy, marketing management, state innovative policy.

Viacheslav Chebotarov – profesor, dr hab., profesor Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego (Polska) oraz Ługańskiego Narodowego Uniwersytetu imienia Tarasa Szewczenki (Połtawa, Ukraina), Współprzewodniczący *Centrum Współpracy Naukowo-Badawczej: Polska-Ukraina* po stronie ukraińskiej. Zainteresowania badawcze: europejska polityka integracyjna, zarządzanie marketingowe, polityka innowacyjna państwa.

Igor Chebotarov – doctor, assistant professor of the University of Lodz, secretary of the *Scientific and Research Cooperation Center: Poland-Ukraine*. Research interests: international business and strategy related issues.

Igor Chebotarov – doktor, adiunkt Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, sekretarz *Centrum Współpracy Naukowo-Badawczej: Polska-Ukraina*. Zainteresowania badawcze: zagadnienia związane z biznesem międzynarodowym i strategią.

➔ References:

- BLOOM Helen, CALORI Roland, de WOOT Philippe (1995), *Zarządzanie europejskie*, Warszawa.
- CHEBOTAROV Iegor, GLINKOWSKA-KRAUZE Beata (2020), *Tools for applied empirical research of national business cultures*. Certificate of copyright registration No 97375, 28.04.2020, Ministry of Economic Development, Trade and Agriculture of Ukraine.
- CHEBOTAROV Iegor, GLINKOWSKA-KRAUZE Beata, CHEBOTAROV Viacheslav (2020), *National business cultures: theoretical and methodological foundations of research, categorical definition, content*. Certificate of copyright registration No. 96538, 06.03.2020, Ministry of Economic Development, Trade and Agriculture of Ukraine.
- GLINKOWSKA Beata, CHEBOTAROV Viacheslav (2018), *A Comparative Cross-Cultural Analysis of the Profile of A Modern Ukrainian Manager: The Imperatives of the Future in the Context of Internationalization*, "Comparative Economic Research. Central and Eastern Europe", vol. 21, no. 3.
- GLINKOWSKA-KRAUZE Beata, CHEBOTAROV Iegor, CHEBOTAROV Viacheslav (2020a), *Comparative Studies of National Business Cultures in the Countries of Central and Eastern Europe: The Basics for Improving International Entrepreneurship in Poland and Ukraine*, "Comparative Economic Research. Central and Eastern Europe", vol. 23, no. 1.
- GLINKOWSKA-KRAUZE Beata, CHEBOTAROV Iegor, CHEBOTAROV Viacheslav, KACZMAREK Bogusław (2023), *Narodowe kultury biznesowe i korporacyjne Polski i Ukrainy. Czynniki doskonalenia i integracja międzynarodowa*, Łódź.
- GLINKOWSKA-KRAUZE Beata, KACZMAREK Bogusław, CHEBOTAROV Viacheslav (2020b), *Współczesne problemy zarządzania. Teoria i praktyka*, Łódź.
- GOLDRATT Eliyahu, COX Jeff (2016), *The goal: a process of ongoing improvement*, Routledge.
- HAMPDEN-TURNER Charles, TROMPENAARS Fons (1995), *The seven cultures of capitalism: Value systems for creating wealth in the United States, Britain, Japan, Germany, France, Sweden and the Netherlands*, London.
- HILL Charles W.L. (2007), *International Business – Competing in the Global Marketplace*, 6th edition, Irwin.
- HOFSTEDE Geert (1980), *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, CA.
- HOFSTEDE Geert, HOFSTEDE Gert Jan, MINKOV Michael (2010), *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*, Third Edition, New York.
- HOFSTEDE INSIGHTS (WWWa), *About The Culture Factor Group*, <https://www.hofstede-insights.com/about-us> (17.05.2023).
- HOFSTEDE INSIGHTS (WWWb), *Country comparison tool*, <https://www.hofstede-insights.com/country-comparison-tool> (17.05.2023).
- JACOB Nina (2003), *Intercultural Management*, London–Sterling.
- LEWIS Richard (2013), *Fish Can't See Water: How National Culture Can Make or Break Your Corporate Strategy*, John Wiley & Sons.
- OUCHI William G. (1981), *Theory Z: How American business can meet the Japanese challenge*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, Boston.
- PRAHALAD Coimbatore Krishnarao (1998), *Rola menedżerów nowej ery na konkurencyjnym rynku*, in: Frances Hesselbein, Marshall Goldsmith, Richard Beckhard (eds), *Organizacja przyszłości*, Warszawa.

- SCHEIN Edgar H. (2009), *The corporate culture survival guide* (vol. 158), John Wiley & Sons.
- SOLARZ Jan (1994), *Narodowe style zarządzania. mity czy fakty?*, Wrocław.
- WATANABE Ichigen (1999), *World-class management practices: Enduring methods for competitive success* (vol. 24), Thomson Crisp Learning
- WATERS Donald (1995), *Zarządzanie w XXI wieku. Jak wyprzedzić Japończyków i Chińczyków*, Warszawa.
- YOSHIMORI Masaru (1996), *Różne pojmowania roli przedsiębiorstwa*, „Zarządzanie na Świecie”, no. 8.
- ZATKO Jozef, CHEBOTAROV Viacheslav, GLINKOWSKA-KRAUZE Beata (2022), *Central and Eastern European Economic Cooperation: Foundations and Prospects in the Common European Markets for Goods and Services*, "European Science", vol. 2/2022.