

Aysel Rasim ASHIRLI

Institute of Economy of the Ministry of Science and Education of the Republic of Azerbaijan,
Researcher of the Department of Theoretical Basis of Economic Policy,
Ph.D. student, Baku, Azerbaijan
E-mail: ashirliaysel@gmail.com
ORCID ID: 0009-0000-6485-0774

**THEORETICAL-CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE COLLECTIVISM-
INDIVIDUALISM CULTURAL DIMENSION AND ITS MECHANISMS OF INFLUENCE
ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

Abstract

This article analyzes the theoretical-conceptual foundations of the collectivism–individualism cultural dimension and its mechanisms of influence on economic development within the framework of contemporary social sciences. The study demonstrates that collectivism and individualism should be understood not merely as opposing value orientations, but also as multidimensional and dynamic cultural systems shaping psychological self-construals, behavioral patterns, social interactions, and mechanisms of institutional coordination. By systematizing classical and contemporary theoretical approaches, the article argues that collectivism–individualism should be interpreted not as a static binary model, but as an adaptive cultural structure transformed in response to changing socio-economic conditions. It is further shown that the influence of this cultural dimension on economic development is realized indirectly through institutional quality, innovation, entrepreneurship, risk behavior, family structures, social capital, and trust relations, thereby shaping different models of economic coordination and long-term development trajectories. The scientific novelty of the article lies in conceptualizing collectivism–individualism as a multilevel and transformable cultural mechanism linking micro-level individual behavior with macro-level institutional and economic processes, as well as in presenting a dynamic analytical approach integrating psychological, institutional, and socio-economic mechanisms within a unified theoretical framework.

Keywords: cultural values, social capital, entrepreneurship, institutions, economic development.

UOT: 316.7:330.34

JEL: O10, O43, Z13, D91

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54414/CLHK6337>

Introduction

In contemporary social sciences, it has become increasingly evident that explaining economic development solely through material resources, technology, and institutional factors is insufficient. Theoretical and empirical studies conducted over recent decades have demonstrated that cultural values and social norms play a significant role in shaping economic activity. In this context, the cultural dimension of collectivism–individualism has attracted particular attention: it is regarded as one of the principal analytical approaches

explaining how individuals establish social relations, which behavioral patterns they prioritize in economic decision-making, and upon which principles economic coordination is organized. From this perspective, collectivism–individualism should be considered not merely as a theoretical construct characterizing cultural differences, but also as a multilevel mechanism shaping the functioning of institutions, entrepreneurial tendencies, the structure of social capital, and long-term development trajectories.

The main objective of this article is to re-examine the collectivism–individualism cultural dimension within the framework of both classical and contemporary approaches, to analyze the limitations of traditional measurement methods, to conceptualize the theoretical foundations for measuring this cultural dimension in a more reliable, dynamic, and multilevel manner, and to systematically investigate the principal mechanisms through which it relates to economic development.

Theoretical-conceptual foundations of the collectivism–individualism cultural dimension. Various analytical dimensions and approaches have been developed in the social sciences to explain the role of cultural values in shaping economic and social processes. Most of these approaches have been limited to describing specific behavioral patterns, normative preferences, or institutional characteristics. What distinguishes the collectivism–individualism cultural dimension from these approaches is its focus on explaining how the relationship between the individual and society is organized. Rather than centering on the question of “what people believe,” this dimension places at its core the question of “how individuals position themselves within the social world,” thereby functioning as a fundamental analytical category that explains the mechanism balancing individual interests and collective expectations.

The emergence of this concept within scientific discourse was not the product of a single author or theoretical school. On the contrary, collectivism–individualism arose from the need to integrate culturally differentiated phenomena, which had long existed in social sciences but had been explained only fragmentarily, into a unified analytical framework. Analyzing the early stages of cross-cultural research, Hofstede demonstrates that differences between societies during that period were largely descriptive in nature and did not allow for systematic empirical comparison [12, p.13]. It was precisely this methodological gap that created the need for more generalized yet empirically measurable cultural dimensions.

According to Hofstede, the collectivism–individualism dimension makes it possible to capture deep differences between societies through the extent to which individuals perceive themselves primarily as independent actors or as inseparable parts of specific social groups [12, p.14–15]. Behind this approach lies a more fundamental thesis: culture is not merely an external factor influencing behavior as an outcome, but an internal coordination mechanism that shapes how individuals perceive the world and which behaviors are considered “appropriate.” Therefore, the analytical strength of this dimension derives from its ability to explain behavior not simply as an outcome, but as an expression of the socio-psychological structures that make behavior possible.

The psychological foundations of the concept become more evident in the self-construal models proposed by Markus and Kitayama. The authors argue that the self is not a universal and unchanging psychological construct; rather, its structure differs depending on the cultural context [15, p.225–227]. The independent self-construal model, widespread in Western societies, is based on individuals understanding themselves through internal attributes, personal goals, and individual choices; motives such as agency, self-expression, and personal achievement are emphasized. In collectivist environments, the interdependent self-construal model defines the individual through social relationships, positions, and roles within the group, while behavior is primarily regulated by social expectations and the need for harmony [15, p. 229–232]. These differences are not merely variations in value preferences — they are psychological systems shaping cognition, emotional experience, and motivational mechanisms [15, p. 226–246].

Nevertheless, subsequent research has shown that these two cultural orientations do not necessarily exist in rigid opposition, but may coexist in more flexible and interconnected ways. In this regard, Kagitcibasi emphasized the limitations of the classical binary model, arguing that autonomy and relatedness are not mutually exclusive and



can develop simultaneously under certain socio-economic conditions [13, p.405]. Her model of the “autonomous-related self” demonstrated that, with urbanization, rising educational levels, and increasing economic prosperity, many non-Western societies have managed to preserve emotional connectedness while simultaneously strengthening individual agency and self-regulation capacities [13, p. 406–408]. This approach moves collectivism–individualism beyond a static dichotomy and presents it instead as a cultural system capable of being reconfigured in response to changing conditions.

The question of how the concept should be studied methodologically occupies a special place in cross-cultural psychology. The main framework here is based on the emic (culture-specific, internal perspective) and etic (comparative, external perspective) approaches. The etic approach treats collectivism and individualism as universal constructs existing in the same structural form across all societies and prioritizes the use of standardized measures for cross-cultural comparison; the works of Hofstede and Triandis are considered classical examples of this approach [12, 24]. The main advantage of this perspective is that it enables systematic comparisons between different societies. However, subsequent research has demonstrated that collectivism and individualism do not manifest themselves in the same way across different cultural contexts. Therefore, the emic approach emphasizes the importance of taking into account each society’s unique social norms, systems of meaning, and behavioral logic. Triandis stresses that these two approaches are not mutually exclusive but complementary; according to him, relying solely on the etic approach reduces cultural differences to reductionism, whereas relying only on the emic approach makes comparison impossible [23, p.41–51].

An important theoretical contribution to this methodological framework was provided by Schwartz’s theory of values. The empirical studies of Schwartz and Bilsky demonstrated that values possess a universal psychological

structure [20, p.550–552], while subsequent cross-cultural research confirmed that this structure is organized around similar motivational relations across different societies [17, p.12–17]. By systematizing values within a circular motivational model based on relations of compatibility and conflict, Schwartz showed that although universal psychological foundations exist, the way these foundations are expressed in behavior and social norms is determined by cultural context [19, p.8–10]. This approach made it possible to interpret collectivism–individualism within a broader motivational system and strengthened the theoretical basis for integrating the emic and etic perspectives.

Subsequent studies in cross-cultural psychology demonstrated the necessity of viewing collectivism–individualism as a more complex structure than the classical binary model suggests. The cultural syndrome approach proposed by Triandis and Gelfand — that is, the approach explaining collectivism–individualism as a complex system of interrelated cultural elements — is considered a major turning point in this regard [25, p.498–502]. The authors explain collectivism and individualism not merely as separate values or behavioral forms, but as complex cultural systems consistently manifested in attention, cognition, emotions, motivation, self-definitions, and social behavior [25, p.506–508]. This perspective presents collectivism–individualism not only as an answer to the question of “what is preferred,” but also as a complex cultural system answering the question of “how people think and act in the social world.”

This conceptual expansion also laid the foundation for a more nuanced analysis of the internal structure of the dimension. The horizontal and vertical distinction proposed by Triandis demonstrates that the relationship between the individual and the group is determined not only by the degree of autonomy or connectedness, but also by whether this relationship is structured around principles of equality or hierarchy [22, p.1–5]. As a result of this approach, individualism and collectivism are divided into four distinct

cultural orientations. Horizontal individualism refers to contexts in which individual autonomy coexists with social equality, whereas vertical individualism characterizes environments where competition, status differences, and personal achievements are normalized [22, p.8]. The same distinction applies to collectivist orientations: horizontal collectivism emphasizes intra-group equality and harmony, while vertical collectivism reflects relationships in which social hierarchy and role differences are accepted. This multidimensional approach demonstrates that collectivism and individualism in real social environments are not homogeneous phenomena, but rather combinations of diverse structural components [24, p.5–7].

The limitations of the classical binary model have also become evident in the field of empirical measurement. Schwartz notes that the simultaneous use of collectivism and individualism at different analytical levels — such as national culture, individual values, behavioral patterns, and self-construal models — creates conceptual ambiguity [16, p.139–142]. This conceptual confusion makes it difficult to explain the actual structures of culture and renders it impossible to account for societies in which high autonomy and strong group attachment coexist simultaneously [16, p.150–152]. These criticisms have led contemporary research to analyze collectivism–individualism not as a single index, but as a multidimensional cultural system composed of various sub-components. Demonstrating the limitations of Hofstede’s classical index, Komisarof and Akaliyski emphasize that separate analysis of sub-factors such as conformity (the tendency to prioritize group norms and expectations over individual judgment), social dominance (the tendency to gain influence and superiority within the group), and outgroup exclusion (the tendency to favor one’s own group while actively excluding external groups from social relations) increases the precision of empirical analysis [14, p.7–12].

Granato, Inglehart, and Leblang also emphasize that cultural values are usually formed not as isolated characteristics, but as

interconnected and mutually reinforcing features. Therefore, the strong presence of a particular cultural orientation within a society generally indicates the existence of other related values as well. For example, societies that place importance on individual initiative, personal achievement, and independence also tend to display greater openness to innovation, stronger work motivation, and higher levels of self-expression. Conversely, societies that prioritize collective conformity and the preservation of traditions often simultaneously exhibit obedience, social harmony, and cautious attitudes toward change. According to the authors, these characteristics are, in fact, different manifestations of the same underlying cultural mindset [6, p.610–614]. For this reason, it is neither necessary to list all cultural values separately and extensively nor to present them as entirely distinct factors, since many of them originate from the same fundamental value system and indirectly reflect one another.

Recent studies in cross-cultural psychology have also paved the way for characterizing collectivism–individualism as an adaptive system that changes over time and generates new configurations. Hamamura, Bettache, and Xu explain collectivism and individualism as dynamic systems shaped by the interaction of socio-ecological, historical, and psychological factors [10]. Their research particularly demonstrates that individualistic tendencies have increased significantly in certain Asian societies, including China. However, this transformation has not been accompanied by the complete weakening of collectivist values — family attachment, obligations of reciprocal relationships, and group-oriented norms have largely been preserved while coexisting with greater individual agency and personal goals [10, p. 371–375]. These findings reveal that cultural change is not linear, but rather selective and multidimensional.

Hampton and Varnum’s studies are particularly important for explaining the mechanisms underlying cultural dynamics. The authors demonstrate that collectivism–individualism can change both at the level of

short-term situational activation and long-term structural transformation [11, p.5–6]. Experimental studies show that cultural symbols and influences from the social environment can temporarily activate individualistic or collectivist behaviors in individuals; however, these short-term effects are insufficient for explaining the deep structures of culture. Long-term transformation, by contrast, occurs through urbanization, economic development, technological change, and demographic processes, leading to the structural reconfiguration of cultural orientations [11, p.5].

These approaches indicate that collectivism–individualism is not a fixed cultural characteristic — rather, it is an adaptive cultural system that is reconfigured in response to changing conditions. This dimension represents the culturally stabilized, yet transformable, expression of how societies respond to problems of social coordination. Cultural orientations are shaped through the interaction of historical legacies, institutional environments, and socio-economic transformations; this process creates “path dependency,” whereby existing cultural structures both constrain the direction of future change and enable adaptation to new conditions.

At the same time, the collectivism–individualism dimension functions as a mediating mechanism between individual values and social structure. The extent to which individuals perceive themselves as independent or interdependent influences behavioral choices, the distribution of responsibility, and attitudes toward social expectations; these behaviors, in turn, become stabilized at the meso level through the organization of social interactions, forms of cooperation, and the coordination of collective action. Over time, these coordination mechanisms become institutionalized as informal norms, social rules, and logics of institutional behavior. From this perspective, collectivism–individualism serves as an analytical bridge that explains how culture affects not only the individual psychological

level, but also broader forms of social organization and institutional environments.

Thus, the collectivism–individualism cultural dimension has evolved in the social sciences beyond a simple category explaining differences in individual behavior into a multilevel theoretical-conceptual framework that explains how individuals perceive and coordinate within the social world. This framework has been developed through psychological self-construal models, methodological approaches, and mechanisms of structuration and transformation, and has become one of the principal analytical directions in contemporary cross-cultural research.

Theoretical mechanisms linking the collectivism–individualism cultural dimension to economic development. For a long time, the role of culture in explaining economic development was regarded as secondary or ambiguous. In neoclassical economic approaches, economic outcomes were mainly explained through technology, capital accumulation, and formal institutions, while cultural values were often excluded from the analytical framework. However, research conducted in recent decades has demonstrated that culture — particularly values, beliefs, and behavioral norms transmitted across generations — systematically affects economic outcomes by shaping the logic of individuals’ economic decision-making [9]. According to these approaches, culture functions neither as a simple social background nor as an independent variable directly determining economic outcomes; rather, it acts as an intermediate mechanism that conditions how economic incentives are perceived and translated into behavior.

Since collectivist and individualist values shape the ways individuals evaluate their interests, social relationships, and risks differently, the influence of this cultural dimension on economic outcomes is realized not directly, but through behavioral and institutional mechanisms. The key issue here is not whether collectivism or individualism is “economically superior,” but rather which types of economic behavior and coordination

each orientation encourages. For this reason, collectivism–individualism should be understood not as a factor directly determining economic development, but as a cultural context structuring development trajectories.

The empirical analysis conducted by Gorodnichenko and Roland demonstrates that individualism, compared to other cultural variables, has the strongest and most persistent relationship with economic development and productivity [5, p.402–410]. Although some other indicators — such as emotional and intellectual autonomy, trust, and tolerance — produce significant results in certain cases, many of them are highly correlated with the individualism indicator and essentially reflect similar content. Therefore, the authors evaluate individualism as the principal cultural foundation of innovation and long-term economic growth [4].

Contemporary literature on culture and economics explains the influence of cultural values on economic development through a multilevel conceptual model. According to this model, cultural values first shape individuals' beliefs and preferences; these beliefs are then translated into economic decisions and behaviors, while behaviors ultimately affect institutional quality and economic performance in the long run [2]. From this perspective, collectivism–individualism should be understood neither solely as an individual psychological characteristic at the micro level nor merely as a stable cultural label at the macro level; rather, it functions as a mediating mechanism linking micro and macro levels.

One of the principal approaches explaining how this mechanism operates within the institutional framework is the institutional hierarchy model. According to this model, culture and informal norms constitute the deepest and slowest-changing layer of institutions; it is this foundational layer that determines how formal rules function in practice. Formal institutions — such as legal systems, contractual mechanisms, and state structures — generate effective economic outcomes when they are aligned with cultural expectations; when such

alignment is absent, the same institutions may produce different and often weaker outcomes across societies. Williamson's institutional hierarchy model also demonstrates that the actual functioning logic of formal rules is determined precisely through social norms and cultural expectations [26]. This approach provides an important analytical foundation for explaining why collectivism–individualism differences alter the economic effects of institutions.

Schwartz explains the relationship between institutions and societal values as a process of mutual interaction. In his view, dominant cultural values influence the formation of the economic system, educational models, and legal and political institutions, while the functioning of these institutions simultaneously strengthens or weakens those values. The author emphasizes that institutions are not merely technical governance mechanisms, but also cultural structures that legitimize specific behaviors and orientations. For example, systems based on competition promote values of achievement and mastery, whereas cooperation-based models reinforce orientations toward mutual responsibility and equality. Similarly, authoritarian institutions strengthen obedience and collective conformity, while autonomy-based institutions foster individual initiative and creative thinking. According to Schwartz's approach, when institutions are successful, the cultural values supporting them also become more legitimate and sustainable; otherwise, space emerges for alternative orientations. Therefore, the author evaluates culture and institutions as mutually reinforcing systems that continuously shape one another [18, p.137–150].

Greif's historical comparative studies further strengthen this argument. The author explains cultural beliefs as collective mental models that shape individuals' expectations regarding reciprocal behavior and transform institutions into "self-enforcing" mechanisms. Historical comparison demonstrates that collectivist cultural beliefs created forms of coordination based on reputation, group monitoring, and informal sanctions; although

these mechanisms strengthened internal cooperation, they also limited the development of formal legal institutions and broader market relations. Individualist cultural beliefs, by contrast, facilitated the emergence of institutions based on individual responsibility, written contracts, and formal legal enforcement, thereby encouraging more open and scalable models of economic coordination [7].

These differences were generalized within a broader historical perspective in the joint studies of Greif and Tabellini. The authors show that in collectivist environments economic cooperation is organized primarily through clan and kinship networks, whereas in individualist environments corporate and formal institutions dominate [8]. Although clan-based coordination may be effective at the local level due to strong internal trust and control mechanisms, it creates limited opportunities for broad market integration and institutional innovation. In contrast, the corporate-based and formal coordination model promotes the rule of law, the expansion of market institutions, and the scalability of economic relations. These differences are transmitted across generations, creating institutional path dependency and stabilizing long-term development trajectories.

Tabellini's empirical analysis of European regions confirms this mechanism at the level of contemporary indicators as well [21]. Individualist values such as trust, respect for others, and a sense of personal control are positively associated with institutional quality and economic performance, whereas obedience and closed social structures are associated with weaker economic dynamism. Economic differences observed between regions operating under the same formal legal framework cannot be explained without taking culture into account — demonstrating that culture constitutes a deeper and more enduring layer than institutions themselves. The broader literature on the complementarity between institutions and culture is also consistent with this perspective: empirical studies show that the impact of governance and legal institutions on economic growth varies depending on

cultural context and is realized more strongly in individualist cultural environments [5]. This fact further confirms that culture is not an alternative to institutions, but rather a filter conditioning their economic effects.

The influence of the cultural dimension on economic development is not limited solely to institutional mechanisms; it is also realized through shaping individuals' everyday economic behavior, entrepreneurial tendencies, and social interactions. In this regard, the second principal channel of economic influence operates through micro-level economic behaviors, entrepreneurial orientations, and trust-based social relations.

Cultural values systematically shape individuals' attitudes toward risk and their decision-making strategies under conditions of uncertainty. In individualist cultural environments, the normative encouragement of personal responsibility and self-realization strengthens the tendency to take risks and transforms the testing of new economic opportunities into a legitimate form of behavior. These characteristics create a favorable environment for innovation, entrepreneurship, and technological adaptation. In collectivist environments, however, the stronger presence of social sanctions and reputational risks encourages more cautious decision-making; consequently, the scale of risky economic initiatives may become limited. Thus, collectivism and individualism shape economic behavior not as "good" or "bad" models, but as cultural frameworks generating different profiles of risk and initiative.

These differences become especially evident in the dynamics of entrepreneurship and innovation. Empirical studies demonstrate that societies dominated by individualist values exhibit higher levels of individual initiative, creative activity, and market-based innovation [4]. In collectivist environments, economic activity is more often organized around optimization within existing structures and intra-group coordination. Although this characteristic strengthens internal stability, it may also play a limiting role with regard to radical innovation and market expansion.

Behavioral mechanisms are connected to the broader social environment through family structures. In collectivist societies, family and close kinship ties function as mechanisms of social and economic security, leading economic activity to be concentrated primarily within the family or narrow social networks. In individualist environments, by contrast, the earlier establishment of relationships beyond the family and the encouragement of personal independence increase both geographic and occupational mobility within the labor market. As demonstrated by Alesina and Giuliano, although strong family ties create advantages in terms of short-term social security, they may, in the long run, limit labor market flexibility and the development of institutional trust [1]. Thus, family structures function as an important mediating mechanism between culture and economic behavior.

This relationship can be explained more systematically through the concept of social capital. The economic impact of social capital is determined not only by its existence, but also by the form in which it is organized. In collectivist environments, social capital is primarily based on limited trust and generates high levels of cooperation within families, clans, and close social groups; although this model strengthens internal coordination, it restricts the development of broad and anonymous market relations. In individualist environments, however, generalized trust enables the establishment of wider social interactions and facilitates the development of formal economic relationships. The research of Algan and Cahuc demonstrates that generalized trust has a significantly stronger relationship with long-term economic growth and institutional quality [3].

From this perspective, social capital is not an alternative to the collectivism–individualism cultural dimension, but rather one of its principal mechanisms manifested at the behavioral level. Family structures, forms of trust, entrepreneurial tendencies, and risk behavior are formed in interaction with one another, creating a unified behavioral environment that explains how cultural values are translated into economic outcomes. By

structuring individuals' economic decisions, this environment exerts an indirect yet persistent influence on macro-level economic indicators.

Thus, the influence of the collectivism–individualism cultural dimension on economic development operates through both institutional and historical mechanisms, as well as through behavioral and social-capital channels. In collectivist environments, economic coordination is based more heavily on reputation, group monitoring, and informal relationships, whereas in individualist environments law, contracts, and formal institutions play the decisive role. At the same time, risk behavior, entrepreneurship, family structures, and forms of trust shape the micro-foundations of economic activity and thereby influence long-term development trajectories. This approach makes it possible to evaluate the cultural dimension not as a direct cause of economic development, but as a multilevel mechanism structuring economic behavior and forms of coordination.

Conclusion

The analysis conducted demonstrates that the collectivism–individualism cultural dimension in contemporary social sciences is not merely an analytical category describing cultural differences, but rather a multilevel theoretical-conceptual framework explaining how individuals perceive the social world, organize economic relations, and determine forms of coordination. Contemporary theoretical approaches show that collectivism and individualism are not simply differences in values, but also complex cultural systems connected with psychological, behavioral, and institutional mechanisms. Therefore, this dimension should be understood not as a static and binary model, but as a dynamic, multidimensional, and transformable cultural structure.

The theoretical generalizations presented in this article demonstrate that the influence of the collectivism–individualism cultural dimension on economic development is primarily realized through mechanisms of institutional coordination, risk behavior,



entrepreneurship, family structures, and social capital. This influence is formed indirectly at the micro level through individual behaviors — such as risk-taking tendencies, personal initiative, and economic decision-making strategies; at the meso level through social capital and trust relations; and at the macro level through institutional quality and economic coordination. Collectivist and individualist environments create different coordination models and behavioral frameworks for economic activity, and these differences are reflected in long-term development trajectories.

It should be emphasized that evaluating the economic role of the collectivism–individualism cultural dimension as either a “good” or “bad” model would be methodologically incorrect. Collectivist and individualist values generate different forms of economic coordination and institutional advantages, while the economic outcomes of these advantages vary depending on the context. Thus, culture should be understood not as an alternative explanation for economic development, but as a structuring context that determines how economic institutions and behaviors function.

REFERENCES

1. Alesina A., Giuliano P. Family ties (NBER Working Paper No. 18966). National Bureau of Economic Research. 2013.
2. Alesina A., Giuliano P. Culture and institutions. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 2015;53(4):898–944.
3. Algan Y., Cahuc P. Inherited trust and growth. *Journal of Economic Growth*, 2009;14(3):241–270.
4. Gorodnichenko Y., Roland G. Individualism, innovation, and long-run growth. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 2011;108(S4): 21316–21319.
5. Gorodnichenko Y., Roland G. Culture, institutions and the wealth of nations. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 2017;99(3):402–416.
6. Granato J., Inglehart R., Leblang D. The effect of cultural values on economic development: Theory, hypotheses, and some empirical tests. *American Journal of Political Science*, 1996;40(3):607–631.
7. Greif A. Cultural beliefs and the organization of society: A historical and theoretical reflection on collectivist and individualist societies. *Journal of Political Economy*, 1994;102(5):912–950.
8. Greif A., Tabellini G. The clan and the corporation: Sustaining cooperation in China and Europe. *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 2015;43(2): 135–160.
9. Guiso L., Sapienza P., Zingales L. Does culture affect economic outcomes? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 2006;20(2):23–48.
10. Hamamura T., Bettache K., Xu Y. Individualism and collectivism. In V. Zeigler-Hill & T. K. Shackelford (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of personality and individual differences* (pp. 368–379). Sage. 2019.
11. Hampton R.S., Varnum M.E.W. Individualism–collectivism. In V. Zeigler-Hill & T. K. Shackelford (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of personality and individual differences* (pp. 1–8). Springer. 2017.
12. Hofstede G. Foreword. In H.C. Triandis & M.J. Gelfand, *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications* (pp. xiii–xvi). Sage. 1994.
13. Kagıtcıbaşı Ç. Autonomy and relatedness in cultural context: Implications for self and family. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 2005;36(4):403–422.
14. Komisarof A., Akaliyski P. New developments in Hofstede's individualism–collectivism: A guide for scholars, educators, trainers, and other practitioners. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 2025;107: 102200.

15. Markus H.R., Kitayama S. Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 1991;98(2):224–253.
16. Schwartz S.H. Individualism–collectivism: Critique and proposed refinements. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 1990;21(2):139–157.
17. 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;25:1–65.
18. Schwartz S.H. A theory of cultural value orientations: Explication and applications. *Comparative Sociology*, 2006;5(2–3):137–182.
19. Schwartz S.H. An overview of the Schwartz theory of basic values. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2012;2(1):1–20.
20. Schwartz S.H., Bilsky W. Toward a universal psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1987;53(3):550–562.
21. Tabellini G. Culture and institutions: Economic development in the regions of Europe. IGIER Working Paper, Bocconi University. 2007.
22. Triandis H.C. Horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism and work. 1994.
23. Triandis H.C. Theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of collectivism and individualism. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S.-C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and application* (pp. 41–51). Sage Publications. 1994.
24. Triandis H.C. *Individualism and collectivism*. Westview Press. 1995.
25. Triandis H.C., Gelfand M.J. A theory of individualism and collectivism. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of social psychology*: Sage. 2012;2:498–520.
26. Williamson O.E. The new institutional economics: Taking stock, looking ahead. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 2000;38(3):595–613.

Aysel Rasim qızı AŞIRLI

Azərbaycan Respublikası Elm və Təhsil Nazirliyinin İqtisadiyyat İnstitutu
İqtisadi siyasətin nəzəri əsasları şöbəsinin kiçik elmi işçisi, doktorant, Bakı, Azərbaycan

KOLLEKTİVİZM–İNDİVİDUALİZM MƏDƏNİ ÖLÇÜSÜNÜN NƏZƏRİ-KONSEPTUAL ƏSASLARI VƏ İQTİSADI İNKİŞAFA TƏSİRİ MEXANİZMLƏRİ

Xülasə

Məqalədə kollektivizm–individualizm mədəni ölçüsünün nəzəri-konseptual əsasları və onun iqtisadi inkişafa təsir mexanizmləri müasir sosial elmlər çərçivəsində təhlil olunur. Tədqiqat göstərir ki, kollektivizm və individualizm yalnız qarşılıqlı əks dəyər orientasiyaları deyil, həm də psixoloji özlük modellərini, davranış formalarını, sosial qarşılıqlı münasibətləri və institusional koordinasiya mexanizmlərini formalaşdıran çoxölçülü və dinamik mədəni sistemlərdir. Məqalədə klassik və müasir nəzəri yanaşmalar sistemləşdirilərək kollektivizm–individualizmin statik ikili model deyil, dəyişən sosial-iqtisadi şəraitə uyğun transformasiya olunan adaptiv mədəni struktur olduğu əsaslandırılır. Eyni zamanda göstərilir ki, bu mədəni ölçünün iqtisadi inkişafa təsiri institusional keyfiyyət, innovasiya, təşəbbüskarlıq, risk davranışı, ailə strukturları, sosial kapital və etimad münasibətləri vasitəsilə dolayı şəkildə reallaşır və müxtəlif iqtisadi koordinasiya modelləri formalaşdıraraq uzunmüddətli inkişaf trayektoriyalarına təsir göstərir. Məqalənin elmi yeniliyi kollektivizm–individualizmin mikro səviyyəli fərdi davranışlarla makro səviyyəli institusional və iqtisadi proseslər arasında əlaqə yaradan çoxsəviyyəli və transformasiya oluna bilən mədəni

mexanizm kimi konseptuallaşdırılmasında və psixoloji, institusional və sosial-iqtisadi mexanizmləri vahid nəzəri çərçivədə birləşdirən dinamik analitik yanaşmanın təqdim edilməsindədir.

Açar sözlər: mədəni dəyərlər, sosial kapital, təşəbbüskarlıq, institutlar, iqtisadi inkişaf.

Айсель Расим АШИРЛИ

Институт экономики Министерства науки и образования Азербайджанской Республики
Научный сотрудник отдела «Теоретические основы экономической политики»,
Докторант, Баку, Азербайджан

ТЕОРЕТИКО-КОНЦЕПТУАЛЬНЫЕ ОСНОВЫ КУЛЬТУРНОГО ИЗМЕРЕНИЯ КОЛЛЕКТИВИЗМА–ИНДИВИДУАЛИЗМА И МЕХАНИЗМЫ ЕГО ВЛИЯНИЯ НА ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКОЕ РАЗВИТИЕ

Резюме

В статье анализируются теоретико-концептуальные основы культурного измерения коллективизма–индивидуализма и механизмы его влияния на экономическое развитие в контексте современных социальных наук. Исследование показывает, что коллективизм и индивидуализм следует рассматривать не только как противоположные ценностные ориентации, но и как многомерные и динамичные культурные системы, формирующие психологические модели самости, поведенческие формы, социальные взаимодействия и механизмы институциональной координации. Систематизируя классические и современные теоретические подходы, статья обосновывает, что коллективизм–индивидуализм следует интерпретировать не как статичную бинарную модель, а как адаптивную культурную структуру, трансформирующуюся в зависимости от изменяющихся социально-экономических условий. Также показано, что влияние данного культурного измерения на экономическое развитие реализуется косвенно через качество институтов, инновации, предпринимательство, риск-поведение, семейные структуры, социальный капитал и отношения доверия, формируя различные модели экономической координации и долгосрочные траектории развития. Научная новизна статьи заключается в концептуализации коллективизма–индивидуализма как многоуровневого и трансформируемого культурного механизма, связывающего индивидуальное поведение на микроуровне с институциональными и экономическими процессами на макроуровне, а также в представлении динамического аналитического подхода, объединяющего психологические, институциональные и социально-экономические механизмы в единую теоретическую рамку.

Ключевые слова: культурные ценности, социальный капитал, предпринимательство, институты, экономическое развитие.

Daxil olub: 13.05.2026