

A.K. Kurmangali¹, A.T. Baiturbayeva¹

¹Abai Kazakh National University

POLITOLOGICAL FACTORS OF FORMATION OF LEADERSHIP

Abstract

In political management practice, the formation of the image of a politician begins with the development of a preliminary program of action, which is determined by elections. To create such a program, the contingent is carefully studied or (as it is commonly called in political science literature) the “target audience” of a political image. This process occurs using various sociological and socio-psychological technologies for analyzing representations, opinions and other manifestations of mass consciousness, conducting expert surveys, observation focus groups, etc. Using these methods, the so-called “ideal image” of a given audience is calculated.

The specific directions of knowledge are studied by the corresponding varieties of political image. The political image, on the one hand, has much in common with the objects of political cognition, on the other, it corresponds to the principles of a systematic classification of political knowledge.

Keywords: image, political leadership, power, problem, position.

A.Қ. Құрманғали¹, А.Т. Байтурбаева¹

¹Абай атындағы Қаз ҰПУ

КӨШБАСШЫЛЫҚТЫ ҚАЛЫПТАСТЫРУДЫҢ САЯСИ ФАКТОРЛАРЫ

Аннотация

Саяси басқару практикасында саясаткердің имиджін қалыптастыру сайлаумен анықталған алдын-ала іс-қимыл бағдарламасын жасаудан басталады. Мұндай бағдарламаны құру үшін контингент мұқият зерделенеді немесе саяси имидждің «максатты аудиториясы» (саяси ғылымдар әдебиетінде аталатындай). Бұл процесс әртүрлі бұқаралық сананың көріністерін, пікірлерін және басқа көріністерін талдауға, сараптамалық сауалнамаларды, фокус-топтарға және т.б. бақылау үшін әртүрлі әлеуметтік және әлеуметтік-психологиялық технологияларды қолдану арқылы жүреді. Осы жоғарыда аталған әдістерді қолдану арқылы, зерттеуге берілген аудиторияның «идеалды бейнесі» есепке алынады.

Білімнің нақты бағыттары саяси имидждің сәйкес тармақтары бойынша зерттеледі. Саяси имидж, бір жағынан, саяси танымның объектілерімен көп ұқсас келеді, екінші жағынан, ол саяси ғылымды жүйелеу және жіктеу қағидаларына дәлме-дәл сәйкес келеді.

Түйін сөздер: имидж, саяси көшбасшылық, билік, мәселе, қызмет.

A.K. Курманғали¹, А.Т. Байтурбаева¹

¹КазНПУ им. Абая

ПОЛИТОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ФАКТОРЫ ФОРМИРОВАНИЯ ЛИДЕРСТВА

Аннотация

В политической практике управления, формирование имиджа политика начинается с разработки предварительной программы действий, которая определяется выборами. Для создания такой программы тщательно изучается контингент или (как принято называть в политологической литературе) «целевая аудитория» политического имиджа. Этот процесс происходит с использованием различных социологических и социально–психологических технологий анализа представлений, мнений и других проявлений массового сознания, проведения экспертных опросов, фокус–групп наблюдения и т.п. С помощью этих методов рассчитывается так называемый «идеальный образ» данной аудитории.

Конкретные направления знания изучают соответствующие разновидности политического имиджа. Политический имидж, с одной стороны, имеет много общего с объектами политического познания, с другой – соответствует принципам системной классификации политических знаний.

Ключевые слова: имидж, политическое лидерство, власть, проблема, должность.

Political science factors of leader formation make it possible to determine and substantiate the main political technological schemes to maintain a balance of interests in foreign and domestic politics. In this regard, the further implementation of political, socio-economic and cultural transformations, concern for improving the welfare of the population (regularly analyze and optimize the public image of the leader; conducting public speaking trainings, psycho-linguistic examination of the texts of the leader's speeches, their correlation, depend on them) with a specific political context; the constant implementation of individual programs for meetings of the leader with voters, representatives of the media, business, cultural and political elites, visits to regions, etc.), with which you can carry out further political modernization and crisis-free management.

In this regard, the study of the political perspective of the image of a leader is a purposefully constructed structure. It reflects the perception of political, psychophysiological, social and other criteria of personality and activity of a political leader. The image is formed and functions only as a result and / or the process of relations of the political leader with groups, adapting to the socio-political field, and changes under the influence of external and internal factors.

As you know, political leadership is a hot topic in modern political science. In theoretical terms, it addresses the decision in the scientific literature on the role of the individual in history, on the boundaries and possibilities of the influence of political figures on the historical process. Today it is one of the constituent parts of the political process, which is confirmed, for example, by the next wave of actualization of the indicated problem, that is, the problem of clarifying “the situation determines the policy or it is the situation”. In the research literature, the theoretical unresolvedness and complexity of assessments of this aspect leave room for its further development. Thus, new trends in this direction are noticeable thanks to the hypothesis of the “planned history” of A. Zinoviev. According to the researcher, “we live in an era of planned history.” This time is characterized by an unprecedented increased role of political figures in the construction of social and political systems and a change in the quality of their participation in the historical process.

Despite the fact that today there are two main approaches to the definition of the concept of “image”. The first is historical. His supporters tend to believe that it has always existed. The concept of “image” is associated with the development of statehood, because it was not by chance that it was reflected even in the nicknames of kings and rulers (for example, Yaroslav the Wise, Charles the Great, etc.). Supporters of the second opinion are convinced that the time the concept “image” appeared was connected with the beginning of the 20th century. It was during this period that mass production of various types of mass media and, in particular, television, appeared and developed everywhere at a rapid pace. The 21st century, like the previous one, is the time of the creation of political idols. This can explain the need for conscious design of what others need.

In accordance with our point of view, it is advisable to talk about the close relationship of political leadership and the image of a political leader. First, let's clarify what is political leadership in general.

First, wherever groups arise, leadership appears. One researcher noted that “leadership is as old as humanity.” It is universal and inevitable. It exists everywhere: in large and small organizations, in business and in religion, in trade unions and charitable organizations, in campaigns and universities. “Any leadership is a group phenomenon. “There cannot be a single leader, a leader” in his own right, “without communication with his followers.”

Secondly, leadership can be considered from the point of view of managerial status, a social position related to the adoption of certain decisions. This understanding of leadership stems from a structurally functional approach that considers society as a complex, hierarchically organized mechanism with its own system of social positions and roles. Occupation in this system of certain niches depends on the performance of certain managerial functions, which, in turn, gives a person the status of a leader. If you take into account this opinion, the leader is a kind of symbol of community and a model of the political behavior of the group. As a rule, his nomination takes place mainly spontaneously from below and then is accepted by followers.

Thirdly, political leadership is a constant priority and legitimate influence of one or more persons who occupy power positions on the whole society, organization or group. So, in the opinion of J. Blondel,

political leadership is “power, because it consists in the ability of one person (or several persons), who are “on top”, to force others to do something positive or negative that they would not do either ultimately could not do at all. But, of course, leadership is not every kind of government. Leadership is top-down power.” [1, P. 156].

Therefore, according to Blondel’s theory, the differences between “natural” and “artificial” structures tend to increase, since the policies of the latter are addressed to a large extent to the whole of society, and not to representatives of its individual part. This paradigm of “artificial” structures gives politics a “national” character. And by this they contribute to the struggle of political leaders with narrow-group trends, which is so inherent in “natural” structures. Nevertheless, “artificial” structures far from always can provide the same strong loyalty that is characteristic of “natural” structures. In the emerging conflict between “natural” and “artificial” structures, citizens may be more likely to cast their votes for the political image of those leaders who represent “natural” structures, and not state ones, despite the fact that these may be formal organizations provided for constitutional, or informal, such as political parties or interest groups.

However, this definition of political leadership is not the only one. However, it seems to us heuristic, especially when analyzing leadership in macrosocial groups. In this case, it represents a kind of intervention of power relations in the communicative process of large social communities.

The interaction of leadership as a specific mode of behavior (that is, the fulfillment of a role) and leadership as a “top” position (that is, possession of this status) is accompanied by the appearance of two problems. The first of them is connected with real leadership, which should be separated from formal (holding a position). In the theory of political leadership, occupation of a certain position which is usually called “positional”. Leadership itself becomes a characteristic of real power and is called “behavioral”. It is only partly the product of an occupied position.

The second type of problem is related to the fact that a positional leader is easy to detect, but it is more difficult to identify a behavioral leader. Although, despite these difficulties, in both cases, leadership is associated with power, because a leader (in a behavioral sense) is a person who has the ultimate influence on changes in the course of events. In addition, even Machiavelli pointed out that it is much more difficult to be able to hold than to conquer. To achieve this goal, something more is required than status. In reality, the formal position and real power, the practical ones always interact.

As already mentioned above, all modern concepts of leadership have a common feature: they recognize the fact of the influence of one or more individuals on most people. But what does it mean to “influence”? Influence is represented, for example, as the priority behavior of one subject, which changes the behavior of another.

Of course, such an understanding of “leadership” is not limited only to the interpretation of the concept of “influence”. This process is aimed at joint actions and means that all its participants strive to achieve common goals. According to S. Djibb, J. Julian and E. Hollander, “the influence of a leader implies his positive assistance in achieving shared goals” [2, P. 91].

Thus, all participants in such a process of creating “leadership” (by “act of leadership” we mean “action, an act of a leader”) imply interpersonal interaction. Therefore, leadership should be defined as one of the types of interpersonal interaction for realizing common goals.

The act of leadership is a combination of four factors that are constantly in interaction and mutual influence. Firstly, the leader’s personality is the sum of his characteristic abilities and capabilities related to target skills. Secondly, his comrades-in-arms (and therefore followers) also have corresponding abilities, personal characteristics, and opportunities to achieve goals. Thirdly, a situation that contributes to the development of this process of interaction. Fourth, the task that interacting individuals are trying to solve. Consequently, the leadership process occurs only within a certain group of people. The leader is a person who takes a specific position in it and fulfills his role to achieve the goals of the group.

As the historical experience of the development of our state shows, leadership problems are closely interconnected with solving the issue of the source of influence and power of the leader. It is enough to give an example from the life of the corporate community. A parent organization appoints a person as the head of one of its units. This means that such a person takes power into his own hands and, of course, will influence the rest of the members of this group. This type of power, as well as the reasons for its emergence, the nature and relations between the bearer and non-bearers of power will radically differ from similar ones that take place in a voluntary union or association.

All this, in our opinion, means that leadership and power, in addition to common features, have certain differences. Most clearly, these differences are manifested in relation to those led to power and the person

who embodies it. It is possible that the status of a leader is not imposed by external sources. Leadership status is determined by the group itself. The role of a leader is granted to a person voluntarily. The colleagues who assigned him this role themselves become followers.

Identifying a number of distinguishing features between the concepts of “management” and “leadership”, it should be noted that the former is closely related to the political organization and the processes that take place in it. The second may be, and is not related to the activities of this organization, which means that some processes may be outside its activities. The management function is carried out by the official authorities. The managers themselves coordinate the tasks of other employees, since they are supposed to do this *ex officio*. Consequently, colleagues follow the manager for formal reasons. Subjective and informal reasons (for example, personal charm) are the driving force pushing followers to follow the leader. R. Steward defined this difference as follows: “Managers have subordinates. But leaders have supporters, people who recognize the leader’s determination and find her attractive. A leader is one who turns co-workers (regardless of whether they are subordinates or not) into people who collaborate with him on conviction. Leaders can instill in others the awareness of the importance of the work being done and thereby – a love of activity” [3, P. 4].

C. Faili, R. House and S. Kerr, defining the difference between management and leadership, write: “Management can be defined as a mental and physical process that leads to the fact that subordinates fulfill their official instructions and solve certain tasks. Leadership, on the other hand, is the process by which one person influences the members of a group” [4, P. 221].

The manager, leader, administrator are the head of the organization as a result of certain actions of a formal organization – delegation of authority. They become leaders either by the will of the organization or contrary to it. At the same time, members of the organization know what they are striving for. This means that the actions of leaders go beyond any authority and structures.

Today, one can note a certain identity between the concepts of “leadership” and “administration”. So, for example, the author of the work “Philosophy of Leadership” K. Hodgkinson acted. The researcher of this phenomenon defines these concepts through each other. In his opinion, administration is leadership, and leadership is administration. Good leadership is good administration, and poor leadership is at the same time poor leadership. This defines the following principle: leadership develops vertically – from the top to the foundation of the organizational hierarchy, covering all its levels.

C. Hodgkinson notes that administration is a kind of “philosophy in action”. Leadership, in his understanding, “the implementation of politics, values, philosophy through collective organizational action” [5, P. 196].

In implementing the democratic political leadership in a mature civil society may experience a plurality of the objective nature of the obstacles. In addition to the external to the civil society corporations counterparty on political cooperation, implement the threat to the life of a democratic leadership might be hiding in the civil society, as the latter is not always conducive to the formation of a truly democratic system of government. It is obvious that an effective and safe (excluding the possibility of usurpation of power by one or another political actors) democratic system should provide the possibility of a political balance that takes into account the interests of all participants in political interaction. At the same time, for the possibility of translating the political will of civic groups without organizational (parties), administrative (bureaucracy), financial and economic (big business) resources and advantages, it is necessary to have effective channels for direct and feedback of these groups with institutions designed to act as democratic mechanisms preparation and decision making. In other words, civil society groups and corporations, organized and united to varying degrees and with different potential for influence on decision-making, should have equal opportunities for such influence.

Along with all of the above, there are several features related to political leadership. As many political scientists believe, every time a serious change arose in the life of a society or a state, a special cohort of people who could lead others around them came to the fore, that is, they had pronounced leadership qualities. As a rule, such people were excellent speakers, masters of speech and gesture. These people had the ability to subjugate other people to their will and evoke special sympathies of their supporters and fellow citizens.

Thus, the image of a political leader is one of the main factors that can have a significant impact on the relationship between formal and informal structures in the modern political system. The political leader can have this effect in several ways. Among them: 1) interaction with political institutions, 2) rivalry with them, 3) leadership of them, 4) creation of new structures. In all the above cases, the image of a political leader can

be a bargaining chip in the game on the side of both informal and formal institutions or represent both types of structures.

Список использованной литературы:

1. Блондель Ж. Политическое лидерство. Путь к всеобъемлющему анализу. – М.: Лабиринт, 1992.-320с.
2. Sills D. *International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences/ Vol. Leadership.* N.Y. 1968
3. Steward R. *Leading in NHS /A Practical Guide.,L., 1989*
4. Filley A., House R., Kerr C. *Managerial Process and Organizational Behavior.* Glenview, 1976.
5. Hodkinson C. *Philosophy of Leadership.* Oxford, 1983.

References:

1. Blondel' ZH. *Politicheskoe liderstvo. Put' k vseob"emlyushchemu analizu.* – М.: Labirint, 1992.-320s.
2. Sills D. *International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences/ Vol. Leadership.* N.Y. 1968
3. Steward R. *Leading in NHS /A Practical Guide.,L., 1989*
4. Filley A., House R., Kerr C. *Managerial Process and Organizational Behavior.* Glenview, 1976.
5. Hodkinson C. *Philosophy of Leadership.* Oxford, 1983.

ӘЛЕУМЕТТАНУДЫҢ ӨЗЕКТІ МӘСЕЛЕЛЕРІ
АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ВОПРОСЫ СОЦИОЛОГИИ
TOPICAL ISSUES OF SOCIOLOGY

МРНТИ 04.51.67

<https://doi.org/10.51889/2020-2.1728-8940.07>

А.А.Бейсенова¹, Б.Н.Игенова¹

*¹КарГУ имени академика Е.А. Букетова,
г. Караганда, Казахстан*

**СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ СОЦИОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ КОНЦЕПЦИИ СЕМЬИ И БРАКА:
ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ И ОГРАНИЧЕНИЯ**

Аннотация

Семья как социальный институт динамична и многогранна, и это добавляет методологических и теоретических трудностей в достижении согласованного взгляда на ее структуру, функции и те изменения, которые с ней происходят. В зависимости от того, какие задаются вопросы, какие сферы изменения рассматриваются и на каком уровне анализа, возникают самые разные теоретические подходы, которые к тому же переплетаются с социальными, экономическими, политическими и личностными процессами.

В данной статье мы рассмотрим современные концепции семьи и брака, в которых анализ сосредоточен на смыслах, которые сами люди придают своей семье, непосредственном семейном взаимодействии и близких отношениях (феноменологический подход); на привлечении внимания к позиции женщин и гендерной политике, где семью рассматривают, как и материнство, в качестве ключевой арены борьбы за власть (феминистский подход); изучают семьи в различных ситуациях, например, в различных обществах, культурах, регионах, сообществах или исторических периодах (сравнительные подходы).

Ключевые слова: семья, брак, социологические теории, феноменология, феминизм, сравнительный подход.

А.А. Бейсенова¹, Б.Н.Игенова¹

*¹академик Е.А. Бөкетов ат. ҚарМУ
Қарағанды қ., Қазақстан*

**ОТБАСЫ МЕН НЕКЕ ТУРАЛЫ ҚАЗІРГІ ӘЛЕУМЕТТІК ТҮСІНІКТЕР:
МҮМКІНДІКТЕР МЕН ШЕКТЕУЛЕР**

Аңдатпа

Отбасы әлеуметтік институт ретінде динамикалық және жан-жақты юолып табылады. Отбасы институтымен болатын өзгерістер туралы келісілген көзқарасқа қол жеткізуде әдістемелік және теориялық қиындықтарды қарастырамыз. Қандай сұрақтар қойылатынына, өзгерудің қай бағыттары қарастырылатындығына және талдаудың қай деңгейінде, әлеуметтік, экономикалық, саяси және жеке процестермен өзара байланысты болатын әр түрлі теориялық көзқарастарды талқылаймыз.

Бұл мақалада біз отбасылық және неке туралы қазіргі заманғы тұжырымдамаларды қарастырамыз. Отбасылық қарым-қатынас пен жақын қатынастарға (феноменологиялық тәсіл); отбасы әйелдер мен гендерлік саясатқа назар аудару, отбасыда ана болу сияқты, билік үшін күрестің негізгі аренасы ретінде қарастырылады (феминистік көзқарас); отбасылар әртүрлі жағдайларда, мысалы, әртүрлі қоғамдарда, мәдениеттерде, аймақтарда, қауымдастықтарда немесе тарихи кезеңдерде (салыстырмалы тәсілдер арқылы) зерттеледі.

Түйін сөздер: отбасы, неке, әлеуметтанулық теориялар, феноменология, феминизм, салыстырмалы көзқарас.