



ISSN: 0975-833X

RESEARCH ARTICLE

**FEATURES OF THE POLITICAL CULTURE DEVELOPMENT IN THE
MODERNIZATION OF KAZAKH SOCIETY**

¹Baimenova Botagoz, *¹Zhubakova Saule, ²Meyramgul Bulakbayeva and ¹Albytova Nazymgul

¹Faculty of Social Sciences L.N. Gumulyov Eurasian National University,
Munaitpassov Street, 5, 010000, Astana, Kazakhstan

²Department of Pedagogy Kazakh State Female Pedagogical University, 050000 Republic of Kazakhstan, City of
Alma-Ata, Street Ayteke би, The House 99

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 09th February, 2014
Received in revised form
16th March, 2014
Accepted 09th April, 2014
Published online 31st May, 2014

Key words:

Political Culture,
Constitutional Democratic State,
Civil Society,
Civilization.

ABSTRACT

The article presents the current state of political culture of Kazakh society as an important factor of the objective, holistic understanding of the social-political reality. Authors analyze various approaches of the definition "political culture" in detail. Political culture is a kind of indicator of the development of the political system of the state and is a reflection of the degree of political life. Therefore, the authors reveal its development features in the condition of modernization and integration of Kazakhstan into the global cultural space. The article also contains the results of a mini-research devoted to this problem.

Copyright © 2014 Baimenova Botagoz et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

In modern conditions Kazakhstan oriented to the values of law and civil society is undergoing the transformation of totalitarian political system with its all institutes, structures and relationship to entirely new political system. At this point natural interests in searching for new approaches appeared. In this connection, there was a natural interest in the search for new approaches, development methods and improvement of the political culture of a different type, more adequate democratic trend in the development of the country seems to be very relevant. To do this, it is important to return to this category and identify features of the development of political culture from the standpoint of emerging new democratic values in Kazakhstan. The term "political culture" first appeared only in the XVIII century in the German philosopher and educator Johann Herder's writings. Formation of the theory of political culture has developed in the foreign literature in the 50-60s of the 20th century. We can meet interpretation of political culture through sociocultural concepts in G. Almond, S. Verba, R. Inglehart, D. Divayna, D. Kavanaha, S. Lipset, R. Takera, U. Rozembauma, L. Paya's works etc. (Almond and Verba 1965; Almond 1963; Inglehart 1988; Divine 1972; Kavanagh 1983; Lipset 1972; Tucker 1987; Rosenbaum 1975; Verba 1965; Pye and Verba 1965). The political system

concept is mainly used by foreign authors in explaining modernization processes which happen in different countries in the world. Considering the political culture as a social and cultural phenomenon, foreign authors' approaches were different to the interpretation of this concept.

There are three main approaches

1. Objective approach (R. Karr, M. Bernsteyn, R. Taker etc.). Political culture from the standpoint of the objectivist approach - a culture of behavior in politics.
2. Subjective approach - Michel Foucault, J. Habermas, etc. In their understanding political culture - is the imposition of political meanings and individual orientation. This is an agreement on the objectives and meanings of policy.
3. Constructive approach (G. Almond, S. Verba, S. Lipset, S. Vayt, R. Leyn, A. Vildavski, R. Inglehart etc.). It is a value vision of political culture, the essence of which is motivated by the political values of human activity in the area of policy, direct and justify social action socio-political subjects.

In general, all the concepts are based on cultural and analytical approach to political life, which Max Weber had been planted. This position allows us to consider the political culture as a socio cultural phenomenon. The first works in political culture first appeared in early 80th: G.A. Aminev, V.P. Vasil'ev, K.S. Gadjev, D.V. Gudimenko, V.G. Gutsu, N.M. Kaiirov, A.I.

*Corresponding author: **Zhubakova Saule**
faculty of social sciences L.N. Gumulyov Eurasian National University,
Munaitpassov Street, 5, 010000, Astana, Kazakhstan.

Keizerov, A.A. Kopaneva, V.M. Korbu, P.V. Konanykhin, U.P. Ozhegov, V.A. Shegortsev etc. The authors of the most significant works in Kazakhstan are political scientists such as: GA Abdikerovoy, LA Baideldinova, KU Biekenova, ZN Bulatov, VK Grigorieva, ZN Ismagambetova, RK Kadyrzhanova, GV Malinin, EM Mamyrova, TT Mustafina, SZ Narmatova, SE Nurmuratova NI Saitova, TS Sarsenbayev, AI Solovevoj, MM Suzhikova, JA Shalabayeva etc. Analysis and study of the essence of political culture notion has enabled us to establish that there are different approaches in its definition among researchers now and as before. Some of them confirm that the political culture – is a type, part of the general culture of human, attribute, the dialectical unity of culture and politics, cumulative political experience, quality, political knowledge and political preferences, patterns of behavior and functioning of political actors, an integral characteristic of image and style of political life of society, and person. (Keizerov NM, Rebkalov VA, Corbu VV Shegortsev VV Kruglov LK Ozhegov YP, N. Blinov, Biekenov KU, Sheregi Yu M. Irkhin Y., Maltsev VA, Borisov LP, Reshetnikov SV et al.) Others imagine political culture as the core, the ideological basis of the general culture of the individual, and structurally identify the following elements: political knowledge, values, and behaviors. (AP Cherednychenko, Nichkalo NG Degtyareva RV Belokopytov DD, Zhampeisova KK, etc.). In terms of our study the important point is that despite all the differences in the approaches to the definition "political culture" concept there is still common thing found:

- It is some civility degree of personality, and its ability to accept certain rules of political behavior and actions;
- And the political culture - is a characteristics of human creativity in the sphere of relations, including political, fixed, "objectified" in political institutions and values, based on the realization of these values and creating new ones.

As it is given the above, we should notice that in our study we adhere the essence of political culture definition, given by the second group of scientists which examines the political culture as the core and the ideological basis of the general culture of the person which is generated by the ideological and political orientation of complete pedagogical educational process institutions. Adhering this definition, we assume that the ideological and political education, and, therefore, political culture and personality is a specific historical phenomenon that the orientation of the Republic of Kazakhstan for the building of a democratic state and a civil society based on the priority of human values, requires implement education political culture of the younger generation from these positions. It should be noted that in our study we adhering to the definition of political culture as the core rod of ideological foundations of person's general culture formed by ideological and political orientation of integrated pedagogical process of an educational institution (Zhampeisova KK) we, along with so do not repeat the content side of the earlier studies in this direction. In this regard, the difference of our work from previously written (Katsebinoy IV, Chichikin AT, Zhampeisovoy KK, Naumova YA Gulyaev IP) works is that: - firstly, these works were written, as we have already mentioned in 1990-1994., - Secondly, deals with the

essence of a democratic state and civil society were not tackled in these papers. Respectively, features of the development of political culture in the conditions of Kazakhstan in a democratic state and civil society were not disclosed and the essence of political socialization, political socialization types, types and functions of political culture in the modern world are not studied. In order to understand the contemporary political culture of the population of Kazakhstan we should study the typology of political cultures represented by Kadyrzhanova RK first. The main question that arises in this context: what type of political culture can be attributed modern Kazakhstan? Specifying the different types of political culture: patriarchal, subservient and civil activist, or rather, Kadyrzhanov RK notes that the first type of political culture is common to underdeveloped countries. Authoritarian and totalitarian regimes differ from dominating subjective (national) political culture. Active political culture dominates in developed Western democracies. The following table gives an idea of how these ratios are presented in various modes. (See table 1) The leftmost column of the table describes the political culture of developed Western democracies. It is distinguished by the fact that a sizeable majority of adult citizens of these countries, 60% - media activist culture, 30% of the adult population – subjective (national), and 10% - patriarchal. As politicians' studies, show countries with the most severe civil political culture are the U.S. and UK.

The second column on the left describes the political culture of totalitarian and authoritarian industrialized countries. These included the communist regimes of the past (the USSR and the socialist countries of Eastern Europe), and continuing currently totalitarian regimes in communist countries (China, North Korea, Cuba, etc.), and non-Communist countries (Iran, Iraq and others.) The bulk (over 80%) of the adult population in these countries are citizens whom the state can always mobilize for public works and to make them get involved in the grandstanding election and other activities of the regime. The share of activists and patriarchal is insignificant - less than 10% each. Third column from the left describes the political culture of authoritarian regimes transition to industrialism type. This type of political culture is inherent in the majority of Latin American countries. Here most of the population is also citizens, but their share is lower (60%) than in totalitarian regimes. However, much more patriarchal (30%) and slightly more (10%) activists. The column on the right of the table characterizes democratic, but preindustrial countries, such as India. In these countries, predominantly rural population is illiterate. Therefore, they have less activists (5-6%) than in other types of political culture, but much more patriarchal (about 60%). Citizens' share is also high in these countries and it is about 40%. (Kadyrzhanov 1999). "We – says the author - of course, aware that this classification, like any other, cannot reveal the variety of existing political culture. Many of them do not fit entirely in the listed four types of political cultures, they are intermediate in character." The author confirms that we could include an intermediate type to the political culture of modern Kazakhstan. This intermediate position is between the second and third columns on the left above the table between totalitarian and authoritarian transitional political culture. Although modern Kazakhstan expresses its commitment to the ideals of democracy, however, real democracy is a distant goal

of transitional period of our country. Democracy activist political culture corresponds to the main part of the adult population. Proportions of citizenship activism and patriarchal resemblance to the relative proportions of democratic communities very little in the domestic political culture. Further, the author says that in the Soviet era model of political culture of Kazakhstan, formerly part of the Soviet totalitarian state, fit completely into the second column of our table, and was typical totalitarian political culture. After independence, when Kazakhstan joined the transitional period, the objectives of which were declared to build a market economy and democratization of society, one would expect that the model of the political culture of the republic would evolve into a democratic type of political culture. It seemed that this evolution in Kazakhstan at the time of gaining independence has developed all the prerequisites. It is meant that in particular the industrial base which has been sufficiently developed, although carrying the raw-material nature; moreover, the high educational level of the population of Kazakhstan (not inferior to even the developed western countries).

Table 1. Dominance of types of political culture in different political regimes

Activists	Activists	Activists	Activists
	Citizens		Citizens
		citizens	
			Patriarchal
		Patriarchal	
atriarchal	Patriarchal		
Industrial	Totalitarians	authoritarian	Democratic
	authoritarian	transitional	Preindustrial
	Industrials		

Therefore, at that time it seemed that the reform of economic and political system of Kazakhstan will contribute to the emancipation, the rise of civil activity of the population. In reality, however, the political culture in Kazakhstan has evolved in a different direction. Modern political culture of Kazakhstan no longer refers to the totalitarian type. Now you can definitely say that neither Kazakhstan nor in other former Soviet republics, there is no absolute dominance carriers citizenship political culture, as it was under the communist regime. However, the decrease of the citizens' share in political culture of post-Soviet Kazakhstan did not automatically lead to an increase in the proportion of activists there. Actually, the proportion of patriarchal very significantly increased. As a result, the political culture of modern Kazakhstan began to evolve in the direction of those models that are presented in the third and fourth columns of the table, ie models of totalitarian and democratic transition preindustrial political culture. (11, 220). There are dates from our public opinion poll in Kazakhstan, which clearly demonstrate the low level of development of political culture. In particular, it should be noted that various sociological studies of the population of Kazakhstan with the same constancy indicate people's poor knowledge in the political system of the state, which they are citizens. Students of social disciplines (economics right)

revealed the same level of ignorance of the main actors of Kazakhstan politics. Students have little understanding of the separation of powers that the Constitution of Kazakhstan recorded as one of the fundamental principles of the political system of the country. Only one out of every surveyed three students could correctly answer the question, what kind of branches are there in the power of our country. Among the general population, this figure consists 4% out of 490 respondents. Continuing the conversation about the separation of powers, the vast majority of the population (73%) even among the students know what is inside the parliament, the titles of its chambers, on what basis these chambers are elected. They have a good idea about the Kazakhstani party system and the existing parties in the country. 98% of respondents said the main part of the country "NurOtan", 42% said the other parties, such as "AkJol", "Azat", "Communist Party", etc. We were interested in knowing the opinion of the citizens of Kazakhstan on how they characterize the political structure of the country. Thus, 68% of respondents believe that we have a democratic political system, 15.4% believe that the authoritarian, 5.4% - a totalitarian, 8.5% were undecided, 2.7% gave other answers: "hidden totalitarianism», "anarchy", etc. We mention another important aspect of regime orientations of political culture as legitimacy. This concept as it is known expresses a positive assessment, public acceptance of government recognition of its right to operate and consent to obey her. The notion of legitimacy of power requires its operationalization empirically verifiable facts.

These facts can include an assessment of how the rules "work" in a given society as citizens pay taxes, as they often shy away from paying them. If the light of these figures refer to the situation in modern Kazakhstan, it is possible to ascertain the low level of legitimacy of power. So, the question: "To what extent do you trust the current government?" 46.7% answered that they trust partially, 18.8% - do not trust, 18.1% were undecided and only 16.2% said that they trust the current authorities. To the question: "What political leader you satisfied?" 33% of respondents said Nursultan Nazarbayev, 5.1% named VV Putin at 3.7% - Akhmetov SA and Tasmagambetova IN, 3.2% scored by BK Tleuhanov and current KT, 2.3% preferred Massimov KK, 11.6% said other political leaders and 33.9% did not name a single leader, who would have been happy. Despite these low interest rate responses, it should be noted that the majority of students (85%) would like to further their career in the public service. Now let us consider another very important aspect of the research for us in RK Kadyrzhanova's study: the reasons of patriarkhanilization of political culture in Kazakhstan. Trend patriarkhanilization of political culture is not confined to modern Kazakhstan, but also for all the former Soviet republics, including Russia. R.K Kadyrzhanov notes that this trend did not appear in the post-Soviet era, but much earlier, in the last 2 or even three decades of Soviet power. Tendency topatriarkhanilization of Soviet political culture manifested in the fact that ordinary people increasingly sought privacy and tried to be out of political and other mobilizations of communistic regime. Care of ordinary people's privacy led to the fact that they are increasingly turning away from social, political values, preferring domestic values, material. Political life is becoming increasingly formal ritual. However, in the late

80's and early 90's there was a surge of social and political activity of the population associated with the formation of an independent state. Moreover, public attention to the plight of the Kazakh language and peaking in the whole of the language problem in the country, the problem of public concern territorial integrity of Kazakhstan, the emergence of social movements and political parties, and a variety of other factors increased. After 1993, the social activity of the population began to decline. Kadyrzhanov thinks that reason for this is that the results of people's socio-political activity fell short of their hopes and expectations, especially in terms of improving their material well-being. The people not receiving welfare reforms from the authorities proclaimed turned away from politicians and from politics in general. Tendency which in Soviet union indicated people's going away to privacy, is in the newly independent states, including Kazakhstan, has been further developed trend patriarkhanalisation of political culture in Kazakhstan. (Kadyrzhanov 1999) We would add to all this that the representations of Kazakhs on the notion of "political culture" is very weak, none of the respondents could give the full definition, 86.7% of respondents left the question unanswered, the rest were given incomplete and inaccurate responses, such as, for example: political culture - a view views; freedom of choice; values, experiences, etc.

Conclusions

Kazakhstan is having trouble of transition not only in the political sphere, but also in the economic, cultural, spiritual, educational, however, the country has sufficient capacity for the development of a democratic political culture. To further developing of citizens' political culture should be fully brought into life values, norms, rules, standard samples of behaviors characteristic of a democratic state and civil society, the principles of humanism, solidarity, free competition and cooperation of equal partners. Our country should focus not only on cash Western model on this issue, but based on the characteristics of the national reality. (Kadyrzhanov 1999).

REFERENCES

- Almond, G. The Civic Culture; Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations. Princeton: Princeton University Press. / G. Almond., S. Verba. — 1963.-P. 135.
- Almond, G., Verba S. The Civil Culture. Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations / G. Almond, S. Verba. — Boston, 1965. P. 13.
- Divine D. The political Culture of the United State. - Boston, 1972. - 187p
- Inglehart, R. Renaissance of Political Culture / R. Inglehart. The American Political Science Review, 1988, vol. 82, N4. P. 1224.
- Kadyrzhanov R.K. State law// Politology/ under edition Nysanbaeva A.H. -A. 1999. 367p.
- Kavanagh, D. Political Science and Political Behaviour / D. Kavanagh London, 1983. P. 48.
- Lipset S.V. Political Sociology // American sociology. Perspectives, Problems, Methods. - M.:Progress, 1972. — 392p.
- Pye L., Verba S. Political Culture and Political Development. - Princeton, 1965. - 107p.
- Rosenbaum, W.A. Political Cultur: Basic Concept in Political Science / W.A Rosenbaum. N.Y., Praeger publ. 1975. - P. 6., 67.
- Tucker, R. Political Culture and Leadership in Soviet Russia: From Lenin to Gorbachev / R. Tucker. Brighton, 1987. - P. VIII.
- Verba, S, Conclusions: Comparative Political Culture // Pye L., Verba S. Political Culture and Political Development Princeton, 1965. P. 516.
