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The paper considers elements of modern media environment taking more and more space in day-to-day life of people. The modern media environment enriched with various informational and technological resources, information transfer speed and availability of all kinds of content in unlimited quantities, requires careful examination - first of all, revealing dangerous and harmful effects of human interaction with media environment. There is a necessity of development of media hygiene from early childhood for the purpose of safe use of media content. The safety of media space is in general the task of state as the institution of society organization.
Introduction

According to the neoclassical economic theory our society consists of separate individuals, competing with each other to meet their needs to the maximum degree, not of communities united by common cultural values. Speaking about “economic man” in marginalism, researchers don’t take into account his various specific features except delight and emotional experience, all individual preferences are stable and don’t depend on external factors. Economic man’s activity is determined by only his own ideas, not by standards and traditions of the society.

Sophisticated interactions and communities are not taken into account, or even disclaimed, but key postulates of neoclassical theory are not substantiated by researches, and the principle of methodological individualism is rather an axiom, it was not proved in practical scientific investigations.

However, it is obvious that in a real economic system an individual is influenced by external factors in his activity and acts not separately, but in complex relationships with others. So it is of interest to analyze scientific investigations dealing with influence of individuals’ relationships on the economic mode.

Literature review

The first works in this field were devoted to traditional societies, they were investigated by anthropologies Sahlins M., Firth R., Malinowski B. (Sahlins, 1972; Firth, 1956; Malinowski, 1922). According to their researches, economic systems in traditional societies were determined by specific features of culture and by influence of its structural parts.

Next stage of investigation of cultural impact on economy was industrial societies research (Huntington, 1993; Schumacher, 1973).

Having analyzed these works, we came to the following conclusions:
- all people, involved in business activities, are interrelated, they identify themselves as culture – bearers of the society;
- motivation of labor process is based not only on a financial reward;
- national culture reflects in the economy.

It is obvious that all these statements require statistical demonstration. Unfortunately, there is a lack of scientific investigations devoted to the statistical research of culture’s impact on economics. From our point of view, there are several reasons for it, first, national culture is not homogeneous, even in the hedges of one country it is very difficult to find a culturally homogenous society. Second, national culture is a very sophisticated phenomenon with a large number of structural elements, so it is very difficult to emphasize an impact of a definite cultural element on one or another macroeconomic index.

However, despite of the difficulties presented above, there are some scientific researches devoted to this topic.

One of the founders of national cultures research and their influence on entrepreneurs activity was G. Hofstede, he emphasized 6 cultural dimensions – power distance, individualism, masculinity, uncertainty avoidance, long term orientation and indulgence (Hofstede, 2001). According to his investigation, all these dimensions are determined by national mentality and constant.

Using these dimensions, Hofstede assessed national cultures’ influence on the values of
companies' corporate cultures that in their turn determine entrepreneurs' behavior.

Scientific followers of Hofstede were Shane, Davidsson, Wiklund, Scheinberg, MacMillan, Kolvereid, Westhead, Mitchell, Smith, Seawright, Morse, Mueller and Thomas.

Researching culture's influence on national economies, Shein, Mitchell, Smith, Seawright and Morse found out that such cultural characteristics as individualism and power distance influence entrepreneurial activity most of all (Shane, 1992; Shane, 1993; Shane, 1994; Mitchell, Smith, Seawright, Morse, 2000).

**Problem statement and research objective**

The aim of the research is to check statistical significance of an association between entrepreneurial activity and cultural dimensions “individualism” and “power distance” by means of correlation analysis. We used statistical data of entrepreneurial activity of 11 countries for 9 years (2006-2014), for entrepreneurial activity assessment we used Total early – stage Entrepreneurial activity (TEA)—percentage of 18-64 population who are either a nascent entrepreneur or owner-manager of a new business) (GEM Global Entrepreneurship Monitor) for entrepreneurial activity assessment (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The USA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>10.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>8.98</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>7.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>16.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>24.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>14.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>6.995</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>7.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indexes of individualism (I) and power distance (PD) are presented in Table 2 (Hofstede, 2001). Besides indexes, developed by Hofstede, we offer to use “entrepreneurialinitiative” (EI) index that is equal to “100-Power distance”.
Table 2 - Cultural dimensions “individualism”, “power distance” and “entrepreneurial initiative”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Individualism</th>
<th>Power distance</th>
<th>Entrepreneurial initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The USA</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key results

We found out statistically significant associations between cultural characteristics and average TEA in both cases. A correlation rate for an association «individualism – TEA average» is 0,75, for «entrepreneurial initiative – TEA average» - 0,67. We used Cheddock scale for a qualitative evaluation of the coefficients. Depending on a correlation rate an association can be:
- 0,1-0,3 feeble
- 0,3-0,5 noticeable
- 0,5-0,7 medium
- 0,7-0,9 strong
- 0,9-1,0 very strong.

«+» means a direct relationship, «-» - an inverse association.

So, the association “individualism – TEA average” can be assessed as strong, the association «entrepreneurial initiative – TEA average» as medium. Negative correlation rates mean that both associations are inverse.

To create a model, describing the influence of individualism and entrepreneurial initiative on TEA, we chose the following formula:

\[ TEA_{average} = a \cdot I^b, \]  \hspace{1cm} (1)

Where a and b – coefficients, that should be calculated on the basis of statistic data for 11 countries for 9 years (2006-2014), C - a cultural dimension.

The model is non linear, but it can be transformed into linear by calculating a hyperbolic logarithm of TEA and C.

So, for the association “individualism – TEA average” an equation of the model is the following:

\[ TEA_{av} = 79,96 \cdot I^{-0,58} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2)
And for the association “entrepreneurial initiative – TEA average”:

$$TEA_{cp} = 181.58 \cdot EI^{-0.81}$$

Conclusions

We came to the conclusion that there is a statistically significant association between individualism, entrepreneurial initiative and Total early stage Entrepreneurial activity, for our research we used a correlation analysis of entrepreneurial activity data of eleven countries for nine years and Hofstede’s cultural dimensions.

Our models show inverse associations of individualism, entrepreneurial initiative and entrepreneurial activity, but they contradict with Hofstede’s theory about direct influence of these cultural characteristics on entrepreneurial activity.

However, if we suppose that individualism and entrepreneurial initiative change as time goes, a direct association between cultural characteristics and entrepreneurial activity is possible according to our mathematical tools.
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