NATIONAL CULTURE AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP: THE EXPERIENCE OF KAZAKHSTAN AND CHINA

Y. Tongxin[1], N. Khalid[2], A. Ahmad[3]
[1, 2]KIMEP University, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan
[3]Center for Management and Commerce, University of Swat, Pakistan

ABSTRACT

Owing to its favorable business climate, and productive bilateral relations with China, Kazakhstan is attracting increasing Chinese entrepreneurship to emerge in this country, hence Chinese managers are facing the challenges of cross-cultural management and looking for solutions to them.

The purpose of this study. Is to identify similarities and differences between Kazakh and Chinese culture, and provide implications to enhance managerial practices where two cultures collide.

Methodology. We built up an integrative framework of national culture, and conducted the comparative analysis with an analytical approach.

Originality / value of the research. We attempted to fill the void since there has been very little previous work on comparative study of the two cultures. Our integrative model, and analytical method also offered originality. The results and implications will guide the cross-cultural managers working in these two cultures, especially Chinese managers in Kazakhstan.

Findings. Similarities of the two cultures are hierarchy, collectivism, harmony, polychronism, particularism, diffuse, and human nature. Differences are mainly found in physical space dimension, and neutral-affective dimension; and reflected in other aspects of uncertainty avoidance, gender egalitarianism, long-term orientation, masculinity, assertiveness, and punctuality.

Keywords: national culture, Kazakh culture, Chinese culture, Similarities and differences, Chinese Entrepreneurship, Cross-cultural management.

ҰЛТТЫҚ МӘДЕНИЕТ ЖӘНЕ КӘСІПКЕРЛІК: ҚАЗАҚСТАН МЕН ҚЫТАЙ ТӘЖІРИБЕСІ

Ю. Тунсинь[1], Н. Халид[2], А. Ахмад[3]
[1, 2]КИМЭП Университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан Республикасы
[3]Менеджмент және коммерция орталығы, Сват университеті, Пәкістан

АҢДАТПА

Қолайлы іскерлік ахуал мен Қытаймен тиімді екіжақты қарым-қатынастардың арқасында Қазақстан қытайлық кәсіпкерлердің көбеюіне тартымды болып келеді. Осыған байланысты, қытайлық менеджерлердің алдында мәдениетаралық басқару мәселелері мен оларды шешу қажеттілігі туындайды.

Зерттеудің мақсаты. Қазақ және қытай мәдениеті арасындағы ұқсастықтар мен айырмашылықтарды анықтау, сондай-ақ екі мәдениетте алшақтық болған жағдайда басқару тәжірибесін жетілдіру бойынша ұсыныстар беру.

Зерттеудің әдіснамасы. Ұлттық мәдениеттің интегративті негізі құрылды және аналитикалық тәсілмен салыстырмалы талдау жүргізілді.

Зерттеудің бірегейлігі / құндылығы. Біз қарастырылп отырған мәселені зерттеудегі бар оқылықтарды толтыруға тырыстық, өйткені екі мәдениетті салыстырмалы зерттеу бойынша жұмыстар өте аз. Біздің интегративті модель және аналитикалық әдісіміз бірегейлі. Зерттеу нәтижелері осы екі мәдениетте жұмыс істейтін басқарушыларға мәдениаралық ортада, әсіресе Қазақстандағы Қытай менеджерлерін бағдарлауға мүмкіндік береді.

Зерттеу нәтижелесінде. Екі мәдениеттің иерархия, коллективизм, үйлесімділік, полихронизм, партикуляризм, диффузия және адам табиғатындағы ұқсастықтарын айқындады. Айырмашылықтар негізінен физикалық кеңістіктік өлшемінде және бейтарап-аффективті өлшемде байқалады және белгісіздікті, гендерлік эгалитаризмді, ұзақ мерзімді бағдарлауды, ерлікті, табандылық пен ұқыптылықты болдырмаудың басқа да аспектілерінде көрініс табады.

Түйін сөздер: ұлттық мәдениет, қазақ мәдениеті, қытай мәдениеті, ұқсастықтар мен айырмашылықтар, Қытай кәсіпкерлігі, кросс-мәдени менеджмент.

НАЦИОНАЛЬНАЯ КУЛЬТУРА И ПРЕДПРИНИМАТЕЛЬСТВО: ОПЫТ КАЗАХСТАНА И КИТАЯ

Ю. Тунсинь[1], Н. Халид[2], А. Ахмад[3]
[1, 2]Университет КИМЭП, Алматы, Республика Казахстан
[3]Центр Менеджмента и коммерции, Университет Сват, Пакистан

АННОТАЦИЯ

Благодаря своему благоприятному деловому климату и продуктивным двусторонним отношениям с Китаем, Казахстан привлекает все большее количество китайских предпринимателей. В связи с чем перед китайскими руководителями возникают проблемы кросс-культурного менеджмента и необходимость поиска их решения.

Цель исследования. Состоит в том, чтобы выявить сходства и различия между казахской и китайской культурами, а также дать рекомендации по совершенствованию управленческой практики в случаях расхождения двух культур.

Методология. Нами построена интегративная основа национальной культуры и проведен сравнительный анализ с аналитическим подходом.

Оригинальность / ценность исследования. Нами проделана попытка заполнить существующий пробел исследования рассматриваемой проблемы, поскольку имеется очень мало работ по сравнительному изучению двух культур. Была создана оригинальная интегративная модель посредством аналитического метода. Результаты исследования позволяют менеджерам, работающих в этих двух культурах, ориентироваться в кросс-культурной среде, в особенности китайских менеджеров в Казахстане.

В результате исследования – выявлены сходства двух культур в иерархии, коллективизме, гармонии, полихронизме, партикуляризме, диффузности и человеческой природе. Различия в основном обнаруживаются в физическом пространственном измерении и нейтрально-аффективном измерении, и отражаются в других аспектах избегания неопределенности, гендерного эгалитаризма, долгосрочной ориентации, мужественности, напористости и пунктуальности.

Ключевые слова: национальная культура, казахская культура, китайская культура, сходства и различия, китайское предпринимательство, кросс-культурный менеджмент.

INTRODUCTION
1.1 Glocalization and Cross-Cultural Management
Entrepreneurship goes far beyond national boundaries when the markets become more and more global with an access to the best resources the world can offer [1]. Along with globalization, the "glocalization" [2] occurs, which means "think globally and act locally" with attempts to combine the benefits of localization and

global standardization [3]. In these circumstances, people from different countries or cultures are brought closer together than ever before, hence businesses face growing challenges in managing cross-cultural workforce [1].

In cross-cultural organizations, different nationalities do have different values and behaviors [1], and cultural differences have become one of the biggest barriers in doing business in the global market [4]; Plum et al. [5] claimed that cultural similarities also deserve adequate attention because the further we move into human spirit, the less important are these differences. Nevertheless, cross-cultural management, although complicated, could be used as a huge source of competitive advantage if understood and implemented correctly [1].

1.2 Problem Statement
1.2.1 Business Climate in Kazakhstan and Attraction for Foreign Investment
We selected a set of key indices in terms of political, economic, socio-cultural, technological, environmental, and legal (PESTEL) factors to briefly demonstrate the business conditions in Kazakhstan (see Table 1), which shows that Kazakhstan in general is politically stable, economically growing, socio-culturally promising, technologically advancing, environmentally appealing, and legally upgrading, a country with favorable business climate which provides opportunities, potentials, and attractiveness for foreign investment and business activities across cultures, including those from Chinese entrepreneurship.

Table 1 – Indices in PESTEL factors

Factor	Index	Description	Result	Assessment
P	Freedom	Expansion of freedom based on 10 political rights and 15 civil liberties [6].	22/100 (2019 scores)	Not free.
	Political stability index	The world average in 2018 based on 195 countries is -0.05 points [7].	0 (2018 scores)	Politically stable.
E	GDP (nominal, PPP) per capita	Based on International Monetary Fund data [8].	69th/192 (nominal, 2019 rank); 52nd /192 (PPP, 2019 rank)	The largest economy in Central Asia.
S	Population growth rate	Estimated population is 19.1 million with 68% of Kazakhs, 19.3% of Russians, and others (Uzbeks, Uighurs, etc.); growth rate is only 0.89% [9].	89th/171 (2019 rank)	Low population growth rate.
	Net migration rate	0.4 migrant (s)/1,000 population [9].	51st/121 (2019 rank)	Low migration rate.
	Life expectancy	Median age is 31.6 years; life span is 72 years [9].	85th/138 (2019 rank)	Relatively low life span.
	Prosperity index	Strong in education and investment environment; biggest improvement in social capital [10].	68th/167 (2019 rank)	Increasingly promising.
T	Global competitive index	Drivers of productivity and long-term economic growth reported by World Economic Forum; a score of 63 points at 103 indicators or 12 pillars [11].	55th/141 (2019 rank)	Increasingly competitive.
	Global innovation index	Based on innovation capabilities; 80 indicators [12].	79th/129 (2019 rank)	Increasingly innovative.

E	The world's best countries	Adventure (5.2), citizenship (1.7), cultural influence (0.0), entrepreneurship (0.6), heritage (3.2), movers (26.6), open for business (29.9), power (7.8), and quality of life (4.9) [13].	66th/80 (2019 rank)	Relatively low among best countries.
	Environmental performance index	Scores: 54.56/100 [14].	101st/180 (2018 rank)	Medium environmental performance.
	Global tourism ranking	Reported by World Economic Forum [15].	81st/136 (2018 rank)	Medium tourism ranking.
L	Rule of law index	Modernization of legal framework and adherence to international best practices reported by World Justice Project [16].	62nd/128 (2020 rank)	Highest in Central Asia.
	Doing business ranking	Ease of doing business [17].	25th/190 (2019 rank)	High ranking.
Note – compiled by the authors				

1.2.2 Bilateral Relations and Booming of Chinese Entrepreneurship in Kazakhstan

Besides its PESTEL attraction, Kazakhstan is seeing increasing Chinese entrepreneurship in numbers and scales in this country attributable to its productive bilateral relations with China.

Strategic partnership. Kazakhstan and China are co-founders of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) aimed mainly at regional security, and economic development [18]. China is deepening all-round cooperation with Kazakhstan, seeking synergy between the Silk Road Economic Belt and Kazakhstan's Bright Path new economic policy; and Kazakhstan is developing a permanent, comprehensive, strategic partnership with China [19].

Economic cooperation. China is the largest trade partner of Kazakhstan, while Kazakhstan among the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) countries is China's second largest trading partner and the third largest country to attract the Chinese investment [20]. Two countries have signed a series of agreements in the fields of energy, transportation, agriculture, finance, tourism, and others; they hope to boost cooperation in big data, the internet, AI and supercomputers [21].

Cultural ties. Kazakhstan is the most influential Central Asian country and is an important gateway for cultural exchanges between China and Central Asia. Two countries are setting up an example of cross-cultural cooperation so that the people of Central Asia and China can better understand each other [22].

1.2.3 Research Questions

As the Chinese entrepreneurs come along to perform business in Kazakhstan, they are inevitably facing the cross-cultural challenges which require them to build up a solid understanding of Kazakh culture in comparison with Chinese culture. However, there is little previous research on this issue; and there are even very few official data relevant to Kazakh culture in literature. Hence, we attempted to conduct a comparative study of the two cultures, present a guideline for Chinese managers who are leading a Kazakh workforce, and pave the way for future research in this domain. Our study revolves around three questions: 1) What are the main similarities and differences between Kazakh and Chinese culture? 2) What are the values underlying the two cultures? and 3) What implications can be drawn for Chinese managers in Kazakhstan to improve their cross-cultural management?

2. Literature Review
2.1 Definitions of Culture

Numerous definitions of the term "culture" are found in antecedent management literatures, among those proposed by Kroeber and Kluckhohn [23], Tajfel [24], Levitin [25], Schein [26], Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner [27], Bennett [28], and others. We take the definition of Hofstede [29] in our study: "culture is the

collective programming of the mind distinguishing the members of one group or category of people from another". Culture can be studied at different levels including international, national, regional, industry or professional, and organizational culture [30]; this paper studies national cultures which focus on the general attitudes, belief systems, values, and traditions, particular to a nation [31].

2.2 Theoretical Models

We reviewed seven models of national culture that continue to be widely adopted in management research. We hereby illustrate their respective dimensions very concisely.

2.2.1 Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's 5-Dimension Model [32]

1) Man-Nature relationship – Beliefs about the need or responsibility of people to control nature (mastery, harmony or subjugation); 2) Social relations – Beliefs about social structure (individualistic, collateral, or lineal); 3) Activity orientation – Beliefs about appropriate goals (being, becoming, or doing); 4) Time orientation – Extent to which past events, present circumstances, or future prospects influence decisions; 5) Human nature – Beliefs about inherent human nature (good, mixed, or evil).

2.2.2 Hofstede's 6-Dimension Model [33; 34; 35]

1) Power distance – Extent to which members of a society automatically accept a hierarchical or unequal distribution of power in organizations and the society; 2) Individualism vs. Collectivism – Extent to which individuals perceive themselves to be separate from a group and to be free from group pressure to conform; 3) Masculinity vs. Femininity – Extent to which a society looks favorably on certain masculine and feminine traits in behavior; 4) Uncertainty avoidance – Extent to which members of a given society deal with the uncertainty and risk of everyday life and prefer to work with long-term acquaintances and friends rather than with strangers; 5) Long-term vs. Short-term orientation – Extent to which members of the culture are willing to enjoy present gratification or defer it to achieve long-term goals; and 6) Indulgence vs. Restraint – Beliefs about happiness and pleasure in life, importance of leisure and friendship, and life control.

2.2.3 Hall's 3-Dimension Model [36; 37; 38]

1) Proxemics – Extent to which people are comfortable sharing physical space with others (center of power or center of community); 2) Chronemics – Extent to which people approach one task at a time or multiple tasks simultaneously (monochronic or polychronic); and 3) Communication – Extent to which the context of a message is as important as the message itself (high or low context).

2.2.4 Trompenaars' 7-Dimension Model [27; 39]

1) Universalism vs. Particularism – Extent to which rules and policies are valued across societal members; 2) Individualism vs. Communitarianism – Extent to which people derive their identity from within themselves or their group; 3) Specific vs. Diffuse – Extent to which people's various roles are compartmentalized or integrated; 4) Neutral vs. Affective – Extent to which people are free to express their emotions in public; 5) Achievement vs. Ascription – Manner in which respect and social status are accorded to people; 6) Sequential vs. Synchronous – Relative focus on the past or the future in daily activities; and 7) Inner-directed vs. Outer-directed – Extent to which people believe they control the environment or it controls them.

2.2.5 Schwartz's 3-Dimension Model [40; 41]

1) Conservatism vs. Autonomy – Extent to which individuals are integrated in groups; 2) Hierarchy vs. Egalitarianism – Extent to which equality is valued and expected; and 3) Mastery vs. Harmony – Extent to which people seek to change the natural and social world to advance personal or group interests.

2.2.6 House' 9-Dimension Model (GLOBE) [42]

1) Uncertainty avoidance – Extent to which members of an organization or society strive to avoid uncertainty, dependent on social norms, rituals, and bureaucratic practices; 2) Power distance – Extent to which members

of an organization or society expect and agree that power should be evenly distributed; 3) Institutional collectivism – Extent to which members of a culture identify with broader societal interests; 4) In-group collectivism – Extent to which people are loyal to their organizations and families; 5) Gender egalitarianism – Extent to which male and female roles are distinct from one another; 6) Assertiveness – Extent to which a culture encourages individuals to be tough, forceful, and aggressive versus being timid and submissive in social relations; 7) Future orientation – Extent to which the behavior of people in an organization or a society is focused on planning and investing in the future; 8) Humane orientation – Extent to which a culture rewards people for being fair, altruistic, generous, caring, and kind toward others, etc.; and 9) Performance orientation – Extent to which an organization or society rewards people for setting and meeting challenging goals, and improving business performance and experience.

2.2.7 Lewis' 3-Dimension Model [43]

1) Linear-actives are those who plan, schedule, organize, pursue action chains, do one thing at a time, and execute it in accordance with a preliminarily designed plan; 2) Multi-actives are those lively, loquacious people who do many things at once, planning their priorities according to the relative thrill or importance; and 3) Reactives are those who prioritize courtesy and respect, listen quietly and calmly to their interlocutors, and react carefully to the other side's proposals.

2.3 Research Model

Instead of advocating one model over another, we developed the 9-dimension integrative model (see Table 2) which is more comprehensive and elaborate, based on the work of Nardon and Steers [44].

Table 2 – The integrative model of national culture

Core cultural dimensions	Focus of dimensions
Hierarchy vs. Equality (Models 2.2.2, 2.2.4~2.2.6)	*Power distribution in organizations and society:* Extent to which power and authority in a society are distributed hierarchically or in a more egalitarian or participative fashion.
Individualism vs. Collectivism (Models 2.2.1~2.2.6)	*Role of individuals and groups in social relationship:* Extent to which social relationships emphasize individual rights and responsibilities or group goals and collective action; centrality of individuals or groups in society.
Mastery vs. Harmony (Models 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.4~2.2.6)	*Relationship with the natural and social environment:* Beliefs concerning how the world works; extent to which people seek to change and control or live in harmony with their natural and social surroundings.
Monochronism vs. Polychronism (Models 2.2.1~2.2.4, 2.2.6, 2.2.7)	*Organization and utilization of time:* Extent to which people organize their time based on sequential attention to single tasks or simultaneous attention to multiple tasks; time as fixed vs. time as flexible.
Universalism vs. Particularism (Models 2.2.2, 2.2.4, 2.2.6)	*Relative importance of rules vs. relationships in behavioral control:* Extent to which rules, laws, and formal procedures are uniformly applied across societal members or tempered by personal relationships, in-group values, or unique circumstances.
Other cultural dimensions	Focus of dimensions
Physical space (Model 2.2.3)	*Extent to which people are comfortable sharing physical space with others.* Center of power: Territorial; need for clearly delineated personal space between themselves and others. Center of community: Communal; comfortable sharing personal space with others.
Neutral vs. Affective (Model 2.2.4)	*Extent to which people are free to express their emotions in public.* Neutral: Refrain from showing emotions; hide feelings. Affective: Emotional expressions acceptable or encouraged
Specific vs. Diffuse (Model 2.2.4)	*Extent to which people's various roles are compartmentalized or integrated.* Specific: Clear separation of a person's various roles. Diffuse: Clear integration of a person's various roles.
Human nature (Model 2.2.1)	*Beliefs about good, neutral, or evil human nature.* Good: Belief that people are inherently good. Mixed: Belief that people are inherently neutral. Evil: Belief that people are inherently evil.
Note – compiled by the authors based on source [44]	

3. Research Methodology and Data Collection
3.1 Analytical Approach
We designed a three-step analytical approach that involves critical thinking, and evaluation of facts and information relevant to this study.

Statistical exploration. We allocate the secondary data into our integrative model for an explorative comparison of the two cultures. Each cluster of results is simplified through combining the overlaps, judging and choosing between contradictions if any (we take more official and direct data as dominant ones).

Values navigation. As national cultures are rooted in values [45], we looked through the social, religious, and historical lens for a navigation of their values, beliefs and behaviors based on a variety of relevant documents, literacy research, archival records, and public opinions. This discovery strengthens or improves our understanding of the two cultures.

Integrative analysis. Derived from the exploration and navigation, we arrived at findings regarding the two cultures which are expected to lay a foundation for future empirical research in this area.

3.2 Data Collection
3.2.1 Data and Information for Statistical Exploration
We searched exhaustively in the range of reviewed models for the data regarding the two cultures as listed in Table 3. Since available data are incomplete due to the severe lack of research particularly in Kazakh culture, we compromised to include, for reference when necessary, some substitute data of USSR, Russia, or Kyrgyzstan considering the cultural commonalities among these CIS nations.

Table 3 – Indicators of Kazakh vs. Chinese culture

Models	Dimensions	Scores or Results	
		Kazakhstan	China
Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck	Man-Nature	Harmony [46]	Harmony [30]
	Social relations	Lineal [46, 47]	Lineal [30]
	Activity orientation	Doing [46, 47]	Doing [30]
	Time orientation	Past [46]	Past [30]
	Human nature	Good [46]	Good [30]
Hofstede	Power distance	93*; High [48]	80 [50]
	Individualism vs. Collectivism	39*; Collectivistic [48]	20 [50]
	Masculinity vs. Femininity	36*; Slightly Masculine [49]	66 [50]
	Uncertainty avoidance	95*; High [48]	30 [50]
	Long- vs. Short-term orientation	81*; Slightly Long [48]	87 [50]
	Indulgence vs. Restraint	20*; 39**; Restraint [48]	24 [50]
Hall	Proxemics (Personal, Social and Public space)	40cm+, 60cm+, 90cm+ [51]	50cm+, 70cm+, 100cm+ [51]
	Chronemics (Monochronic vs. Polychronic)	Polychronic [49]	Polychronic [37]
	Communication (High vs. Low context)	High context [49]	High context [37]

Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner	Universalism vs. Particularism	High Particularism* [52]	High Particularism [52]
	Individualism vs. Communitarianism	Individualism* [27]	High Communitarianism [52]
	Specific vs. Diffuse	Diffuse* [53]	Diffuse [53]
	Neutral vs. Affective	Affective [54]	Neutral [27]
	Achievement vs. Ascription	Ascription [54]	Ascription [52]
	Sequential vs. Synchronous	Synchronous* [53]	Synchronous [27]
	Inner- vs. Outer- directed	Outer-directed* [53]	Outer-directed [27]
Schwartz	Conservatism vs. Autonomy	Medium Conservatism* [55]	Conservatism [55]
	Hierarchy vs. Egalitarianism	Medium Hierarchy* [55]	Hierarchy [55]
	Mastery vs. Harmony	Medium Mastery* [55]	Mastery [55]
GLOBE	Uncertainty avoidance	3.66***; 4.42**** [56]	4.94***; 5.28**** [56]
	Power distance	5.31***; 3.15**** [56]	5.04***; 3.10**** [56]
	Institutional collectivism	4.29***; 4.04**** [56]	4.77***; 4.56**** [56]
	In-group collectivism	5.26***; 5.44**** [56]	5.80***; 5.09**** [56]
	Gender egalitarianism	3.84***; 4.75**** [56]	3.05***; 3.68**** [56]
	Assertiveness	4.46***; 3.84**** [56]	3.76***; 5.44**** [56]
	Future orientation	3.57***; 5.05**** [56]	3.75***; 4.73**** [56]
	Human orientation	3.99***; 5.62**** [56]	4.36***; 5.32**** [56]
	Performance orientation	3.57***; 5.41**** [56]	4.45***; 5.67**** [56]
Lewis	Linear-active	-	-
	Multi-active	Multi-active* [57]	-
	Reactive	-	Reactive [57]

Note – * Data of USSR or Russia as reference; ** Data of Kyrgyzstan as reference; *** Country Practice Scores. **** Country Value Scores.

3.2.2 Facts for Values Navigation in Kazakh Culture

Influenced by Islamic principles, the Central Asian countries including Kazakhstan have a lot of cultural resemblance featured by high moral standards, good memory, being wordy, loquacious, excitable and sometimes tough. Kazakh people are proud of their past with strong tribal relatedness, rituals, daring nomad traditions, love to horses, physical contests, courage and bravery; they value respect to age and hierarchy, family closeness, friendship, warmness and hospitality to strangers [43].

The nomadic way of life and continuous struggle with a harsh steppe climate made Kazakh people sturdy and adaptive physically and mentally to environment [58]; meantime, they are anxious about the ambiguity that the future holds, relying on social constructions and institutions to help avoid the uncertainty [48]. The free and nomadic Kazakhs enjoy physical proximity, and older people are generally given more than one meter "distance of comfort" instead [43]. There is a preference for private space both at home and offices, because it is considered a reflection of status. Traditionally, there was a strict role distribution between men and women

in their community. It is a common practice to consult on major decisions with elders, who traditionally hold a special role within the community [59].

Kazakh people have a strong sense of "face" or personal dignity. Unspoken rules play an important role in communication [49]. In business, building trust and loyalty with partners and co-workers is a crucial part of interactions leading to success [59]. They carry on social and business activities at a slow pace, and punctuality is not of the essence unless an older, senior person is involved [43]; appointment time is flexible [49]. They tend to do many tasks at a time [43].

Core values and beliefs of Kazakh culture are broadly summarized as below:
Islam
rituals • nomadic traditions
peace • happiness • freedom
sturdy • adaptive • love of horses
loquacious • unspoken rules • excitable
stability • structure • security • tough • resilient
sincerity • loyalty • family closeness • community • respect for age • hierarchy
warm • hospitable • friendship • citizenship and patriotism • tribal affinities
adventuresome • love of physical contests • daring and bravery
physical proximity • slow pace • unpunctuality
generous • jovial • hearty • feast and drink
mixture of masculinity and femininity
dignity • pride (no losing face)
wisdom

3.2.3 Facts for Values Navigation in Chinese Culture

The imperishable Chinese culture has been spreading over many centuries, and its influence is found in dance, pictures, religion, philosophy, architecture, theater, social structure, administration and, more than everything, in their language. Chinese people are hardworking, bona fide, not demanding, and thrifty. They seem to be in a complete harmony with each other and treat other nations with respect and flexibility [43].

Chinese culture is greatly influenced by Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism. Confucianism advocates that social stability is based on inequality of rights in five relations among people. Taoism proposes a healthy lifestyle, adequate vegetarianism, generosity of spirit, and paradox - the existence of two opposite states of reality simultaneously. Buddhism asserts that harmony should be attained through meditation [43; 60; 61].

"Guanxi" and "Quanzi" are the typical features of Chinese relationships in social and business life, where the former is the linking of two people with mutual dependence [43], and the latter is a circle of trust, separating "insiders" and "outsiders" [60]. A Chinese person belongs to four basic groups, i.e., the work unit, family, school, and community; the powerful people in the work unit usually help to solve miscellaneous things for the person including disputes, housing, medical care, kindergarten, recreation, and even arranging marriage [43].

The Chinese are courteous and considerate interlocutors; they respect privacy when possible and usually maintain a distance of one meter in conversation. They are extremely punctual and abhor wasting anyone's time. Mild flattery is appropriate from both sides in communication; confrontation and loss of face (for both sides) must be avoided. Regarding the Chinese language, the speaker must choose words carefully, because complex meanings may be inferred from the context in which words are spoken [43].

Core values and beliefs of Chinese culture are extensively concluded as following:
modesty
Confucianism
Taoism • Buddhism
paradox • fengshui • thrift
filial piety • courtesy • tolerance
• guanxi • quanzi • sincerity • loyalty • trustworthiness • kindness

moderation • patriotism • harmony • bona fide • family closeness • tradition
generosity • adaptability • conscientiousness • self-sacrifice • asceticism • stoicism • tenacity
diligence • learning • respect for age • hierarchy • patience • flexibility
sense of duty • pride (no losing face) • flattery • punctuality
gratitude for favors • high context
undemanding • calm
impartiality • purity
gentleness
wisdom

4. RESEARCH RESULTS

Our analytical analysis discovers the comparative findings shown in Table 4.

Table 4 – Comparative findings between Kazakh and Chinese Culture

Dimensions	Similarities	Differences	
		Kazakhstan	China
Hierarchy-Equality	- Hierarchy. - Loyalty. - High power distance. - Ascription at status.	- Slightly higher power distance. - High gender egalitarianism.	- Inequality, stability, and moderation (Confucianism). - Low gender egalitarianism.
Individualism-Collectivism	- Institutional and In-group collectivism. - Lineal social relations. - High context in communication. - Citizenship and patriotism.	- Nomadic traditions. - Higher in-group collectivism.	- Much higher institutional collectivism. - Sense of duty. - Self-sacrifice.
Mastery-Harmony	- Harmony, outer-directed at man-nature relationship. - Doing at human activities. - Humane orientation; friendship and family closeness.	- Between masculinity and femininity. - Higher humane orientation. - Higher harmony with nature. - Adaptive, sturdy and resilient.	- Much higher masculinity. - Much higher assertiveness. - Higher performance orientation. - Taoism and Buddhism.
Monochronism-Polychronism	- Past time orientation in decision-making; respect traditions. - Polychronic time orientation.	- Medium future orientation. - Multi-active. - Unpunctuality. - Slow pace.	- High long-term orientation. - Reactive. - Punctuality. - Fast pace. - Thrift.
Universalism-Particularism	- High particularism. - Restraint.	- Roots make trees strong; friends make people strong. - High uncertainty avoidance.	- Guanxi and Quanzi. - Flexibility (Taoism). - Stoicism and asceticism (Buddhism). - Low uncertainty avoidance. - Paradox (Taoism).
Physical Space	- Privacy at home and offices.	- Close proxemics. - Nomadic freedom.	- Distant proxemics. - Moderate (Confucianism).
Neutral-Affective		- More emotional at expression. - Affective and excitable.	- Neutral. - Moderate (Confucianism). - Calm.
Specific-Diffuse	- Diffuse at clear integration of various roles.	- Peace and happiness.	- Diligence. - Self-sacrifice. - Sense of duty.
Human nature	- Belief that people are inherently good. - Wisdom. - Dignity and face. - High morality. - Virtue.	- Islam. - Nomadic traditions. - Adventuresome. - Tough.	- Confucianism, Buddhism, and Taoism. - Learning and education. - Extremely hard work. - Gratitude for favors. - Undemanding.
Note – compiled by the authors			

5. Discussions and Implications
5.1 Interpretation of our findings

Hierarchy-Equality. Both cultures believe that power in the society or organizations should be distributed hierarchically; vertical structure with high power distance is more favored than horizontal structure; people are reluctant to question authority; loyalty is valued and stressed. In comparison, Kazakhstan has even higher power distance; male and female roles are less distinct from one another. In Chinese culture, the belief of inequality for social stability was shaped by Confucianism, and participation of women in the workforce is relatively low.

Individualism-Collectivism. Two cultures both demonstrate strong collectivistic features that value group goals, group membership, participative decision-making, and social harmony; there is priority for relationship-based agreements in business; people tend to communicate subtly and indirectly; citizenship, patriotism, and loyalty are spirits in common. Comparatively speaking, Chinese society shows higher institutional collectivism, typically reflected in their sense of duty and spirit of self-sacrifice for societal interests; while Kazakh culture emphasizes more in-group collectivism in work units and families.

Mastery-Harmony. Two peoples both focus on living in harmony with nature as explained in Chinese Taoism and Buddhism philosophy, and adjusting to the natural and social environment with sturdiness and resilience as displayed in Kazakh traditions; interpersonal relationships are valued over achievement and people tend to be modest, close, and friendly. By comparison, Kazakh people are evenly masculine and feminine, showing a better balance of work and life; Chinese people are much more masculine with stronger ambition in pursuit of personal goals and achievements. Relatively speaking, Kazakh culture values more harmony and humanities, while Chinese culture prioritizes greater mastery and performance.

Monochronism-Polychronism. Two cultures are very similar in respecting traditions and adopting ideas from past experiences in decision-making; they are very much alike in use of time – do many things simultaneously. In comparison, Chinese people have strong propensity to save and invest for the future, they admire dedication, hard work, and thrift, and they are extremely flexible, adaptive, and persistent in achieving results, therefor Chinese culture is highly long-term oriented [50]. Kazakh people tend not to save as willingly as Chinese do, and they are assumed moderately future-orientated based on scores of GLOBE [56]. Kazakhs are multi-active people who are loquacious in communication, plan their priorities according to importance of the tasks, not very concerned about schedules and punctuality, and usually slow-paced; while Chinese people are reactive who are patient in listening first, fast-paced once they have formed their own opinions, and very punctual.

Universalism-Particularism. Both cultures are viewed as highly particularistic in that people emphasize interpersonal relationships and trust, compared with rules and laws; there is much tolerance for rule breaking and informal networks. Kazakh culture believes "friends make people strong", while Chinese "guanxi" and "quanzi" reveal their strong relationship-based belief and flexibility (Taoism). Both cultures believe that gratification needs to be curbed and regulated by strict norms; moreover, Chinese culture praises inner restraint such as stoicism and asceticism. The two cultures show different attitudes toward uncertainty. Kazakh people are inclined to reduce uncertainty through bureaucratic rules and regulations. Oppositely, Chinese people are comfortable with ambiguity, for instance, the Chinese language is full of ambiguous meanings that can be difficult to follow [50]; paradox (Taoism) is a typical concept for high uncertainty acceptance.

Physical space. There is a preference for private space both at home and offices for both cultures, because it is considered a token of status. Kazakh people who have free and nomadic traditions usually enjoy physical proximity in social and public life, while Chinese people prefer to keep up to one meter in public occasions, which is another example of moderate feature (Confucianism).

Neutral-Affective. Nomadic Kazakh people tend to be affective and excitable; they are more likely to express emotions and feelings openly and freely. On the contrary, Reactive and moderate Chinese people are rather reserved and calm who most of the time refrain from showing emotions or quite often hide feelings.

Specific-Diffuse. Both collectivistic cultures have clear integration of a person's various roles played in his or her work unit, family, and personal life. Kazakh culture values a good balance between work and life, and pursues peace and happiness for the present; while Chinese people place more emphasis on diligence, self-sacrifice, and sense of duty for happiness in the long run.

Human nature. Both cultures believe that people were born good; people should have high morality and virtue in nature; wisdom and dignity are admired in social life. Kazakh culture is influenced by Islam and nomadic traditions, and people are generally adventuresome and tough. Chinese culture cultivated by Confucianism, Buddhism, and Taoism, generates characteristics of being undemanding, thankful, and gratuitous for other's favors; education and hard work are highly encouraged and appreciated in Chinese society and organizations, which have to a large extent facilitated China's fast economic growth.

5.2 Implications for chinese managers in Kazakhstan

National cultures differ mostly at the level of values, which are quite stable and take generations to be changed [45]. Thus, it is wise to follow their similarities or adjust to their differences rather than attempt to change them, in order to find the best-fits or trade-offs in cross-cultural management. We make some recommendations for Chinese managers.

1) Discrimination and stereotype against each other's culture must be eliminated because cultural diversity if treated properly, is indeed a good reason for firm prosperity. Chinese managers need to be proactive to acquire an in-depth understanding of Kazakh culture.

2) Interact among the workforce as both cultures value harmonious relationships and diffuse roles; reward those who are particularly competent and loyal at work.

3) Kazakhs tend to be more affective at expressing compared to the Chinese who are most likely calm and moderate, so Chinese managers should remember this difference and give due tolerance.

4) Take a participative and collective method during the process of decision making, which allows Kazakh coworkers to feel belongings to their organization and inspire their creativity. Apply a combination of charismatic, transactional, and transformational leadership.

5) Recruit competent Kazakh candidates who match the values stressed in their organization. Chinese managers shall become role models in aspects of diligence, learning skills, and sense of duty in the process of motivating Kazakh employees.

6) The Kazakhs and Chinese are both good group or team players; strict norms and harmony in relationships are both stressed in light of particularism.

7) Set up the in-group language training classes in the range of Russian, Kazakh, Chinese, and English so as to reduce language barriers in communication; face-to-face talks incorporated with body language are indispensable for proper delivery of message in high-context cultures.

8) Rigid hierarchy, though well accepted in both cultures, may also overly limit employees' empowerment and autonomy, therefore femininity and particularism shall be considered in the organizational structure design for improvement of flexibility.

9) Shape a positive organizational culture through practices [45], which emphasizes employees' strengths, rewards more than punishes, and encourages individual vitality and growth [62].

10) Kazakh employees with high uncertainty avoidance and relatively low future orientation tend to be reluctant to change, so Chinese managers shall stimulate a culture of innovation for change and lead them to learn and adapt to the changing environment in the long term.

6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This paper is focused on the comparative study of national cultures between Kazakhstan and China, which has three originalities: 1) We filled the gap because there is hardly any antecedent work on this subject; 2) We developed an integrative model to study comprehensive features of national cultures; and 3) We tapped into the secondary data from various models, and overviewed values from the social, religious, and historical perspective, to perform the analytical analysis.

We found that the similarities are among seven dimensions, i.e., hierarchy, collectivism, harmony, polychronism, particularism, diffuse, and good human nature; differences are mainly reflected in physical space, and neutral-affective dimensions, where Kazakh culture likes close proxemics and tends to be affective, whereas Chinese cultures distant proxemics and neutral. Some other distinctions are among uncertainty avoidance, gender egalitarianism, long-term orientation, masculinity, assertiveness, and punctuality, in the seven similar dimensions.

Chinese managers in Kazakhstan shall foster a favorable corporate culture, utilize strengths of each culture to its full potential, and choose between trade-offs and best-fits, in their managerial practices.

Limitations of our research include: 1) Some of the secondary data and facts are insufficient and outdated (especially those of Kazakh culture are very few); 2) Data from different sources are not always consistent and are even contradict in some cases, which may cause biases; and 3) Our analytical analysis may incur the lack of reliability and validity in conclusions, which may further impair our implications. For the future research, we suggest to: 1) Conduct empirical studies on the two cultures (Kazakh culture needs more attention); and 2) Undertake case studies in terms of cross-cultural management on Chinese entrepreneurship operating in Kazakh culture.

REFERENCES

1. Predrag T. Managing Cross-culturalism within a Global Company – The Case of Jotun Paints // University of Ljubljana: Faculty of Economics. – 2013. – 73 p.

2. Schnalke M., Mason R. B. The Influence of Culture on Marketing Communications: Critical Cultural Factors Influencing South African and German Businesses // Anthropology of East Europe Review. – 2014. – № 12 (1). – P. 172–179.

3. Stead J. G., Stead E. W. Sustainable Strategic Management: second ed. – London, England: M.E. Sharpe, 2014. – P. 178–179.

4. Hofstede G. Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind. – London: McGraw-Hill, 1991. – 576 p.

5. Plum E., Achen B., Dræby I., Jensen I. Cultural Intelligence: The Art of Leading Cultural Complexity. – Middlesex: University Press. – 2008. – 261 p.

6. Freedom in the world 2020: Kazakhstan [Electronic source] // Freedom House [web-portal]. – 2020. – URL: https://freedomhouse.org/country/kazakhstan/ freedom-world/2020 (accessed: March 13, 2020).

7. Всемирный банк в Казахстане [Электронный ресурс] // Всемирный банк [web-сайт]. – URL: https://www.vsemirnyjbank.org/ru/country/kazakhstan (дата обращения: 12.03.2020).

8. Economy of Kazakhstan [Electronic source] // International Monetary Fund [website]. – 2019. – URL: https://www.imf.org/en/Countries/KAZ (accessed: March 13, 2020).

9. The World Factbook: Central Asia. Kazakhstan [Electronic source] // Central Intelligence Agency [web-portal]. – 2020. – URL: https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/kz.html (accessed: March 18, 2020).

10. Ranks of Kazakhstan [Electronic source] // The Legatum Prosperity Index. – 2020. – URL: https://www.prosperity.com/globe/kazakhstan (accessed: March 13, 2020).

11. Satubaldina A. Kazakhstan ranks 55th in Global Competitiveness Index, moves up four spots [Electronic source] // The Astana Times [website]. – 2019. –URL: https://astanatimes.com/2019/10/kazakhstan-ranks-55th-in-global-competitiveness-index-moves-up-four-spots/ (accessed: March 19, 2020).

12. Kazakhstan: Innovation Index [Electronic source] // TheGlobalEconomy.com [web-portal]. – 2019. – URL: https://www.theglobaleconomy.com/Kazakhstan/GII_Index/ (accessed: March 19, 2020).

13. Overview of Kazakhstan [Electronic source] // USNews [web-portal]. – 2019. – URL: https://www.usnews.com/news/best-countries/kazakhstan (accessed: March 19, 2020).

14. Kazakhstan [Electronic source] // Environment Performance Index [web-portal]. – 2018. – URL: https://epi.envirocenter.yale.edu/epi-country-report/KAZ (accessed: March 19, 2020).

15. Kazakhstan ranks 81st in the global tourism ranking [Electronic source] // The Qazaq Times [web-portal]. – 2020. – URL: https://qazaqtimes.com/en/article/ 64870 (accessed: March 19, 2020).

16. WJP Rule of Law Index 2020 [Electronic source] // World Justice Project [web-portal]. – 2020. – URL: https://worldjusticeproject.org/our-work/research-and-data/wjp-rule-law-index-2020 (accessed: March 19, 2020).

17. Kazakhstan jumps three spots to 25th in World Bank Doing Business Report [Electronic source] // The Astana Times [website]. – 2020. – URL: https://astanatimes.com/2019/10/kazakhstan-jumps-three-spots-to-25th-in-world-bank-doing-business-report/ (accessed: March 19, 2020).

18. The Shanghai Cooperation Organisation [Electronic source] // The Shanghai Cooperation Organisation [website]. – URL: http://eng.sectsco.org/about_sco/ (accessed: March 19, 2020).

19. A strategic partnership [Electronic source] // Xinhuanet [website]. – 2019. – URL: http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/2019-09/12/c_138384816.htm (accessed: March 19, 2020).

20. Trade summary for Kazakhstan 2018 [Electronic source] // WITS: World Integrated Trade Solution [web-portal]. – URL: https://wits.worldbank.org/countrysnapshot/en/KAZ (accessed: February 25, 2020).

21. The 6th meeting of China-Kazakhstan Entrepreneurs Committee held in Beijing [Electronic source] // CGTN [website]. – 2019. – URL: https://news.cgtn.com/news/2019-09-11/The-6th-meeting-of-China-Kazakhstan-Entrepreneurs-Committee-held-JUbiXgpWSI/index.html (accessed: March 19, 2020).

22. Guo Q. China-Kazakhstan Relations from the Perspective of China opening to the West. – Modern International Relations. – 2014.

23. Kroeber A. L., Kluckhohn L. Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions. – Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, 1952. – 219 p.

24. Tajfel H. La Catégorisation Sociale // Introduction a la Psychologie Sociale. – 1972. – Vol. 1. – P. 272–302.

25. Levitin T. Values. In Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes. – Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan. – 1973. – 750 p.

26. Schein E. H. Organizational Culture and Leadership. – San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1985. – 437 p.

27. Trompenaars F., Hampden-Turner C. M. Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Diversity in Global Business. – Intercultural Management Publishers NV, 1998. – 274 p.

28. Bennett M. J. Basic Concepts of Intercultural Communication: Selected Readings. – Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press, 1998. – 288 p.

29. Hofstede G. Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values. – London: Sage Publications, 1984. – 328 p.

30. Ying F. A Classification of Chinese Culture // Cross Cultural Management. – 2000. – Vol. 7 (2). – P. 3–10.

31. Ahmed P. K., Loh A. Y. E., Zairi M. Cultures for Continuous Improvement and Corporate Culture Learning // Total Quality Management. – 1999. – Vol. 4-5. – № 10. – P. 426–434.

32. Kluckhohn F., Strodtbeck F. Variations in Value Orientations. – Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson, 1961. – 342 p.

33. Hofstede G. Motivation, Leadership and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad // Organizational Dynamic. – 1980. – Vol. 9(1) – P. 42–63.

34. Hofstede G., Bond M. H. The Confucius Connection: From Cultural Roots to Economic Growth // Organizational Dynamics. – 1991. – Vol. 16 (4). – P. 4–21.

35. Hofstede G., Minkov M. Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind: Intercultural Cooperation and Its Importance for Survival. – New York: McGraw-Hill. 2010. – 561 p.

36. Hall E. T. The Silent Language. –New York: Doubleday, 1981. – 242 p.

37. Hall E. T. Beyond Culture. – New York: Doubleday, 1976. – 316 p.

38. Hall E. T., Hall M. R. Understanding Cultural Differences. – Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press, 1990. – 196 p.

39. Trompenaars F. Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Cultural Diversity in Business. London: Economists Books, 1993. – 274 p.

40. Schwartz S. H. Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries // Advances in experimental social psychology. – 1992. – Vol. 25. – P. 1–65.

41. Schwartz S. H. Beyond Individualism/Collectivism: New Cultural Dimensions of Values // Cross-cultural research and methodology. – 1994. – Vol. 18. – P. 85–119.

42. House R. J., Hanges P. J., Javidan M., Dorfman P. W., Gupta V. & GLOBE Associates. Leadership, Culture and Organizations: The Globe Study of 62 Societies. // Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 2004. – 818 p.

43. Lewis R. D. When Cultures Collide: Leading across Cultures. – Boston, MA: Nicholas Brealey, 2005. – 625 p.

44. Nardon L., Steers R. M. Navigating the Culture Theory Jungle: Divergence and Convergence in Models of National Culture // Vlerick Leuven Gent Management School Working Paper Series. – 2006. – Vol. 38. – 43 p.

45. Hofstede G. National Cultures, Organizational Cultures, and the Role of Management // Values and Ethics for the 21st Century, BBVA. – 2012. – P. 385–402.

46. Kainazarov F. Cultural Dimension Differences Related to International Management – Kazakhstan vs. Europe // Faculdade de Engenharia da Universidade do Porto, 2013. – 49 p.

47. Muratbekova M. Kazakh Management Culture: Perception of French Managers // The International Journal of Human Resource Management. – 2002. – Vol. 13. – Issue 2. – P. 213–231.

48. Karina M. A Cross-cultural Comparison of Leadership Choices: Commonalities and Differences among Female Leaders in the United States, Kazakhstan and Sweden // University of Oregon Graduate School, 2012. – 105 p.

49. Yusuf Y., Aibarsha I. Teaching Across Cultures: Considerations for International Language Teachers in Kazakhstan / 13th International Educational Technology Conference // Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences. – 2013. – P. 900–911.

50. Country comparison [Electronic source] // Hofstede Insights [web-portal]. – URL: https://www.hofstede-insights.com/country-comparison/ (accessed: February 24, 2020).

51. Sorokowska, A. Preferred Interpersonal Distances: A Global Comparison. // Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology 2017. – Vol. 48 (4). – 577–592.

52. Luthans F., Doh J. P. International Management: Culture, Strategy, and Behavior (8th ed.). – New York: McGraw-Hill. – 2012. – 674 p.

53. The Seven Dimensions of Culture [Electronic source] // MindTools [web-portal]. – 2020. – URL: https://www.mindtools.com/ (accessed: February 24, 2020).

54. Global Affairs Canada [Electronic source] // Government of Canada [website]. – 2020. – URL: https://www.international.gc.ca/gac-amc/index.aspx?lang=eng (accessed: February 24, 2020).

55. Schwatz S. H. Mapping and Interpreting Cultural Differences around the World. In Vinken, H., Soeters, J., and Ester, P., eds., // Comparing Cultures, Dimensions of Culture in a Comparative Perspective. – Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2004. – P. 43–73.

56. Kazakhstan [Electronic source] // GLOBE: 2020 [web-portal]. – 2020. – URL: https://globeproject.com/results/countries/KAZ?menu=list#list; (accessed: February 28, 2020).

57. Lewis R. D. When Teams Collide: Managing the International Team Successfully. Nicholas Brealey, 2012. – 228 p.

58. Dave B. Kazakhstan: Ethnicity, Language and Power. – London: Routledge, 2007. – 242 p.

59. Karibayeva B., Kunanbayeva S. S. Intercultural Business Discourse: Characteristics of Kazakh Context // Proceedings of INTCESS2016 3rd International Conference on Education and Social Sciences. – Istanbul, Turkey, 2016. – P. 154–157.

60. Gannon M. J., Pillai R. K. Understanding Global Cultures: Metaphorical Journeys through 31 Nations, Clusters of Nations, Continents, and Diversity (Fifth Edition). SAGE Publications, Inc, 2012. – 634 p.

61. Mullin G. Buddhism In Mongolia: Three or Five Waves of Cultural Blossoming. Foundation for the Preservation of the Mayahana Tradition in Mongolia. [Electronic source] // My WordPress Blog [web-portal]. – 2014. – URL: http://www.fpmtmongolia.org/buddhism-in-mongolia/ (accessed: February 28, 2020).

62. Stephen P. R., Timothy A. J. Organizational Behavior (17th Edition). – Pearson Education Limited, 2017. – 582 p.

REFERENCES

1. Predrag, T. (2013), "Managing Cross-culturalism within a Global Company – The Case of Jotun Paints", University of Ljubljana: Faculty of Economics, 73 p.

2. Schnalke, M. and Mason, R. B. (2014), "The Influence of Culture on Marketing Communications: Critical Cultural Factors Influencing South African and German Businesses", Anthropology of East Europe Review, No. 12 (1), pp. 172–179.

3. Stead, J. G. and Stead, E. W. (2014), "Sustainable Strategic Management", second ed., London, England: M.E. Sharpe, pp. 178–179.

4. Hofstede, G. (1991), "Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind", London: McGraw-Hill, 576 p.

5. Plum, E., Achen, B., Dræby, I. and Jensen, I. (2008), "Cultural Intelligence: The Art of Leading Cultural Complexity", Middlesex: University Press,261 p.

6. "Freedom in the world 2020: Kazakhstan" (2020), Freedom Hous, available at: https://freedomhouse.org/country/kazakhstan/ freedom-world/2020 (accessed: March 13, 2020).

7. "The World Bank in Kazakhstan", The World Bank, available at: https://www.vsemirnyjbank.org/ru/country/kazakhstan (accessed: March 12, 2020).

8. "Economy of Kazakhstan" (2019), International Monetary Fund, available at: https://www.imf.org/en/Countries/KAZ (accessed: March 13, 2020).

9. "The World Factbook: Central Asia. Kazakhstan", Central Intelligence Agency, available at: https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/kz.html (accessed: March 18, 2020).

10. "Ranks of Kazakhstan" (2020), The Legatum Prosperity Index, available at: https://www.prosperity.com/globe/kazakhstan (accessed: March 13, 2020).

11. Satubaldina, A. (2019), "Kazakhstan ranks 55th in Global Competitiveness Index, moves up four spots", The Astana Time, available at: https://astanatimes.com/2019/10/kazakhstan-ranks-55th-in-global-competitiveness-index-moves-up-four-spots/ (accessed: March 19, 2020).

12. "Kazakhstan: Innovation Index" (2019), TheGlobalEconomy.com, available at: https://www.theglobaleconomy.com/Kazakhstan/GII_Index/ (accessed: March 19, 2020).

13. "Overview of Kazakhstan" (2019), USNews, available at: https://www.usnews.com/news/best-countries/kazakhstan (accessed: March 19, 2020).

14. "Kazakhstan" (2018), Environment Performance Index, available at: https://epi.envirocenter.yale.edu/epi-country-report/KAZ (accessed: March 19, 2020).

15. "Kazakhstan ranks 81st in the global tourism ranking" (2020), The Qazaq Time, available at: https://qazaqtimes.com/en/article/ 64870 (accessed: March 19, 2020).

16. "WJP Rule of Law Index" (2020), World Justice Project, available at: https://worldjusticeproject.org/our-work/research-and-data/wjp-rule-law-index-2020 (accessed: March 19, 2020).

17. "Kazakhstan jumps three spots to 25th in World Bank Doing Business Report" (2020), The Astana Times, available at: https://astanatimes.com/ 2019/10/kazakhstan-jumps-three-spots-to-25th-in-world-bank-doing-business-report/ (accessed: March 19, 2020).

18. "The Shanghai Cooperation Organisation", The Shanghai Cooperation Organisation website, available at: http://eng.sectsco.org/about_sco/ (accessed: March 19, 2020).

19. "A strategic partnership",(2019), Xinhuanet, available at: http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/2019-09/12/c_ 138384816.htm (accessed: March 19, 2020).

20. "Trade summary for Kazakhstan 2018", WITS: World Integrated Trade Solution, available at: https://wits.worldbank.org/countrysnapshot/en/KAZ (accessed: February 25, 2020).

21. "The 6th meeting of China-Kazakhstan Entrepreneurs Committee held in Beijing" (2019), CGTN, available at: https://news.cgtn.com/news/2019-09-11/The-6th-meeting-of-China-Kazakhstan-Entrepreneurs-Committee-held-JUbiXgpWSI/ index.html (accessed: March 19, 2020).

22. Guo, Q. (2014), "China-Kazakhstan Relations from the Perspective of China opening to the West", Modern International Relations, 2014.

23. Kroeber, A. L. and Kluckhohn, L. (1952), "Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions", Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, 219 p.

24. Tajfel, H. (1972), "La Catégorisation Sociale", Introduction a la Psychologie Sociale, Vol. 1, pp. 272–302.

25. Levitin, T. (1973), "Values. In Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes", Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 750 p.

26. Schein, E. H. (1985), "Organizational Culture and Leadership", San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 437 p.

27. Trompenaars, F., Hampden-Turner, C. M. (1998), "Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Diversity in Global Business", Intercultural Management Publishers NV, 274 p.

28. Bennett, M. J. (1998), "Basic Concepts of Intercultural Communication: Selected Readings", Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press, 288 p.

29. Hofstede, G. (1984), "Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values", London: Sage Publications, 328 p.

30. Ying, F. (2000), "A Classification of Chinese Culture", Cross Cultural Management, Vol. 7 (2), pp. 3–10.

31. Ahmed, P. K., Loh, A. Y. E. and Zairi, M. (1999), "Cultures for Continuous Improvement and Corporate Culture Learning", Total Quality Management, Vol. 4-5, No. 10, pp. 426–434.

32. Kluckhohn, F. and Strodtbeck, F. (1961), "Variations in Value Orientations", Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson, 342 p.

33. Hofstede, G. (1980), "Motivation, Leadership and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad", Organizational Dynamic, Vol. 9(1), pp. 42–63.

34. Hofstede, G. and Bond, M. H. (1991), "The Confucius Connection: From Cultural Roots to Economic Growth", Organizational Dynamics, Vol. 16 (4), pp. 4–21.

35. Hofstede, G. and Minkov, M. (2010), "Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind: Intercultural Cooperation and Its Importance for Survival", McGraw-Hill, New York, 561 p.

36. Hall, E. T. (1981), "The Silent Language", Doubleday, New York, 242 p.

37. Hall, E. T. (1976), "Beyond Culture", Doubleday, New York, 316 p.

38. Hall, E. T. and Hall, M. R. (1990), "Understanding Cultural Differences", Intercultural Press, Yarmouth, Maine, 196 p.

39. Trompenaars, F. (1993), "Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Cultural Diversity in Business", Economists Books, London, 274 p.

40. Schwartz, S. H. (1992), "Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries", Advances in experimental social psychology, Vol. 25, pp. 1–65.

41. Schwartz, S. H. (1994), "Beyond Individualism/Collectivism: New Cultural Dimensions of Values", Cross-cultural research and methodology, Vol. 18, pp. 85–119.

42. House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., Gupta, V. & GLOBE Associates (2004), "Leadership, Culture and Organizations: The Globe Study of 62 Societies", Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, 818 p.

43. Lewis, R. D. (2005), "When Cultures Collide: Leading across Cultures", Nicholas Brealey, Boston, MA, 625 p.

44. Nardon, L. and Steers, R. M. (2006), "Navigating the Culture Theory Jungle: Divergence and Convergence in Models of National Culture", Vlerick Leuven Gent Management School Working Paper Series, Vol. 38, 43 p.

45. Hofstede G. (2012), "National Cultures, Organizational Cultures, and the Role of Management", Values and Ethics for the 21st Century, BBVA. pp. 385–402.

46. Kainazarov, F. (2013), "Cultural Dimension Differences Related to International Management – Kazakhstan vs. Europe", Faculdade de Engenharia da Universidade do Porto, 49 p.

47. Muratbekova, M. (2002), "Kazakh Management Culture: Perception of French Managers", The International Journal of Human Resource Management, Vol. 13, Issue 2, pp. 213–231.

48. Karina, M. A (2012), "Cross-cultural Comparison of Leadership Choices: Commonalities and Differences among Female Leaders in the United States, Kazakhstan and Sweden", University of Oregon Graduate School, 105 p.

49. Yusuf, Y. and Aibarsha, I. (2013), "Teaching Across Cultures: Considerations for International Language Teachers in Kazakhstan", 13th International Educational Technology Conference, Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, pp. 900–911.

50. "Country comparison", Hofstede Insights, available at: https://www.hofstede-insights.com/country-comparison/ (accessed: February 24, 2020).

51. Sorokowska, A. (2017), "Preferred Interpersonal Distances: A Global Comparison", Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Vol. 48 (4), pp. 577–592.

52. Luthans F., Doh J. P. International Management: Culture, Strategy, and Behavior (8th ed.). – New York: McGraw-Hill. – 2012. – 674 p.

53. "The Seven Dimensions of Culture" (2020), MindTools, available at: https://www.mindtools.com/ (accessed: February 24, 2020).

54. "Global Affairs Canada" (2020), Government of Canada, available at: https://www.international.gc.ca/gac-amc/index.aspx?lang=eng (accessed: February 24, 2020).

55. Schwatz, S. H. (2004), "Mapping and Interpreting Cultural Differences around the World", in Vinken, H., Soeters, J., and Ester, P., eds., Comparing Cultures, Dimensions of Culture in a Comparative Perspective, Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands, pp. 43–73.

56. "Kazakhstan" (2020), GLOBE: 2020, available at: https://globeproject.com/results/countries/KAZ?menu=list#list; (accessed: February 28, 2020).

57. Lewis, R. D. (2012), "When Teams Collide: Managing the International Team Successfully", Nicholas Brealey, 228 p.

58. Dave, B. (2007), "Kazakhstan: Ethnicity, Language and Power", Routledge, London, 242 p.

59. Karibayeva, B. and Kunanbayeva, S. S. (2016), "Intercultural Business Discourse: Characteristics of Kazakh Context", Proceedings of INTCESS2016 3rd International Conference on Education and Social Sciences, Istanbul, Turkey, pp. 154–157.

60. Gannon, M. J. and Pillai, R. K. (2012), "Understanding Global Cultures: Metaphorical Journeys through 31 Nations, Clusters of Nations, Continents, and Diversity", Fifth Edition, SAGE Publications, Inc, 634 p.

61. Mullin G. (2014), "Buddhism In Mongolia: Three or Five Waves of Cultural Blossoming. Foundation for the Preservation of the Mayahana Tradition in Mongolia", My WordPress Blog, available at: http://www.fpmtmongolia.org/buddhism-in-mongolia/ (accessed: February 28, 2020).

62. Stephen, P. R. and Timothy, A. J. (2017), "Organizational Behavior", 17th Edition, Pearson Education Limited, 582 p.

SUMMARY

This paper seeks to identify similarities and differences of national cultures between Kazakhstan and China, based on which implications are drawn for Chinese managers who are leading a cross-cultural workforce in Kazakhstan. The subject, integrative model, and analytical method of this study provide originalities for further research.

ТҮЙІНДЕМЕ

Бұл мақалада Қазақстан мен Қытайдың ұлттық мәдениеттерінің ұқсастығы мен айырмашылық-тарын анықтау міндеті қойылады, оның негізінде Қазақстандағы кросс-мәдени ортада жұмыс күшін басқаратын Қытай менеджерлері үшін қорытындылар ұсынылады. Осы зерттеудің пәні, интегративті моделі және аналитикалық әдісі одан әрі зерттеу үшін бастапқы деректерді береді.

РЕЗЮМЕ

В данной статье ставится задача выявить сходства и различия национальных культур Казахстана и Китая, на основе которой представляются выводы для китайских менеджеров, возглавляющих рабочую силу в кросс-культурной среде в Казахстане. Предмет, интегративная модель и аналитический метод данного исследования дают исходные данные для дальнейших исследований.

СВЕДЕНИЯ ОБ АВТОРАХ

Юй Тунсинь – докторант Ph.D., Бизнес-колледж Банг, Университет КИМЭП, Алматы, Республика Казахстан, e-mail: tongxin.yu@kimep.kz

Надим Халид – доктор Ph.D., профессор-исследователь**,** Бизнес-колледж Банг, Университет КИМЭП, Алматы, Республика Казахстан, e-mail: nadeem.k@kimep.kz

Ashfaq Ahmad – доктор Ph.D., профессор-исследователь**,** Центр Менеджмента и коммерции, Университет Сват, Пакистан, e-mail: ashfaq.ahmad@uswat.edu.pk