

E. Yessengarayev*, c.h.s., assoc. professor¹

A. Taubayev, d.e.s., professor²

T. Pupysheva, PhD student¹

Karaganda university of Kazpotrebsoyuz¹

Karaganda, Kazakhstan

Establishment «Esil University»²

Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan

* – main author (author of correspondence)

e-mail: esetkar@mail.ru

INSTITUTIONAL CONDITIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIETIES

Many works are devoted to the issues of transformation of institutions and social systems. Basically, the authors of these works rely on the concepts of economic or technological determinism and consider institutions and social systems, their evolution through the prism of one of the decisive factors. Such factors do not explain the reasons why they have had a positive impact on society in some cases, nor why they have not in most countries.

The authors of the article argue that reductionism in studying the transformations of institutions and social systems is a limited approach. An alternative to it is a structural approach, according to which society is not reduced to one beginning, but is viewed as a historically formed structure of institutions. This approach explains the differences in the structure of societies through the ratio of institutions. The institutional structure determines the type of social system, and the modernization of a traditional society is possible only if its institutional structure is transformed. The required level of theoretical concretization and more accurate empirical confirmation of this approach allows to achieve cognitivism.

In this article, the authors consider the development of social systems, explaining modernization by changes in the institutional structure, which, in turn, determines the type of society. The reasons why in developing countries, despite the fact that they borrow modern institutions from developed countries, there is no organic development are analyzed. The authors show that it is the synthesis of the ideas of institutionalism with cognitivism that makes it possible to concretize the mechanisms of the work of institutions.

Keywords: institution, institutionalization, institutional conditions, society, social system, legitimation, social identity, differentiation, diversification, structure.

Кілт сөздер: институт, институционализация, институционалдық жағдайлар, қоғам, қоғамдық жүйе, заңдастыру, әлеуметтік сәйкестік, саралау, әртараптандыру, құрылым.

Ключевые слова: институт, институционализация, институциональные условия, общество, общественная система, легитимация, социальная идентичность, дифференциация, диверсификация, структура.

JEL classification: A 14

Introduction. One of the fundamental problems in science is the problem of development. It is relevant both for individuals and for society as a whole. In the modern era, there are significant gaps in the level of development between different countries, which leads scientists to ask questions: why do some countries prosper and lead, while others live in dire need. They are also interested in questions that explain the reasons why some of the countries are stuck in the second tier for decades, and others even for centuries.

The development of societies occurs due to changes in their structure. At the same time, structural changes in the social system are considered as the ability of society to form certain institutions and achieve their more complex configurations. History shows that most of those countries of the world that

have not been able to provide structural changes and transform their socio-cultural systems, with all the individual and even large-scale achievements, have not solved the problem of development, since they have not created an institutional structure that ensures sustainable growth. This growth is achieved due to the institutional structure, which is distinguished by a high level of autonomy of its elements and a general complication of its characteristic socio-cultural processes. Taken together, these processes of differentiation and diversification make it possible to change the traditional hierarchical order to a more complex polycentric type.

On this basis, the purpose of the scientific article is to analyze the institutional conditions for the development of modern societies.

Due to the multidimensionality of the research topic, to ensure the relevance of the theoretical analysis, used an integral approach, which allows combining the following methods: induction and deduction, analysis and synthesis, descriptive methods and the method of comparative analysis.

Literature review. Institutionalism has become the main concept that makes it possible to explain the structure of society and its transformation. Its foundation was laid by Herbert Spencer [1], Emile Durkheim [2], Thorstein Veblen [3]. The subsequent concretization of the institutional theory took place under the influence of the ideas of Talcott Parsons [4], whose institutional theory is of great importance in our time. Institutionalism acquired a new impetus thanks to the constructivist concept of Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann [5]. In addition, among the literature on institutions, it is necessary to highlight the works of Gilles Deleuze [6], whose vision is distinguished by the understanding of institutions as primary and positive social constructs.

Since the 80s of the twentieth century, a huge amount of work on institutionalism has appeared, as a result of which there has been a diversification of ideas about social institutions. Paul DiMaggio and Walt Powell note that at the moment it is easier to say that it is not an institution than to say the opposite [7]. Thus, it should be emphasized that most of the contemporary works are a detailing of the basic approaches to institutions and do not carry any special theoretical novelty. For large-scale explanations of sociocultural processes and social transformations, a narrower range of concepts is of significant importance. Among them, apart from the followers of Parsons and constructivism, the works of economic institutionalists are the most widely represented. The most famous representatives of this trend are Douglass North [8], Avner Greif [9], Daron Acemoglu, James Robinson [10]. Economic institutionalists have played a large role in popularizing the ideas of this direction, but they are distinguished by a limited understanding of institutions, since they reduce their analysis of institutions only to their rules, costs and benefits.

Main part. Modern institutional theory has received a new impetus from the work of Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann «The social construction of reality» [5]. The authors have succeeded in synthesizing the classical ideas of institutionalism with the achievements of cognitivism. Such a synthesis

made it possible to create a new concept of institutions, in which the understanding of the structuring and coercive power of institutions inherent in classical institutionalism is combined with the ideas of cognitivism, which made it possible to concretize the mechanisms of institutions.

Berger P. and Luckmann T. consider institutions and society as a whole, as social constructs formed and reproduced on the basis of certain knowledge arrays. What type of knowledge pools dominate in a particular society determines what scenarios will determine the solution to existing problems and the motivation for institutional behavior. Institutionalization, in their opinion, takes place wherever there is a mutual typification of habitual actions by actors of various kinds. In other words, all kinds of such typifications are institutions [5, p. 92]. Institutions form such interconnectedness when an action of type X is performed by agents of type X. Revealing such interconnectedness has the most important theoretical value.

Institutions need legitimation, understood as a way to explain and justify institutions [5, p. 103], providing them with a protective veil of cognitive-normative interpretations, thanks to which they acquire the status of «legal», «correct», «for granted» within a certain socio-cultural system. In addition, legitimate institutions effectively assert the power of institutions over individuals by preserving and maintaining the priorities of institutional definitions of situations, which become unquestionable and effectively coercive. Such a mechanism of coercion, according to Berger and Luckmann, leads to the formation of a person with the ability to «spontaneous» behavior within the framework of institutionally established modes of activity.

Institutions ensure the stability of societies. They not only determine the basic ways in which social actors interact, but also produce these actors themselves. Based on such ideas, institutions are historically formed ways of sustainable collective interaction of people [11, p. 288]. At the same time, they form the identity of their members, and identity in this case is understood as a relatively stable result of processes associated with the achievement of a certain level of identifications of social actors, allowing them to more or less consistently define themselves and their belonging to communities.

Institutions acquire their specific meaning as elements of a certain institutional structure. It is the institutional structure, not individual institutions,

determines the type of society. Based on the role of institutional structures, two macrotypes of society can be distinguished on their basis: hierarchical and polycentric [12, p. 218-219].

The first macrotype of social systems can be defined as hierarchical; it has become the most widespread in history. Due to the fact that such societies historically preceded modern ones and their reproduction for a long time was determined by the desire to maintain existing institutional structures. With all the peculiarities of individual countries, the first type of social system is characterized by the dominance of two institutions: power and religion. In the modern period, in social systems of this type, religion in some cases is replaced by ideology. Relations between institutions in this system are hierarchical, leading to the fact that all other institutions occupy subordinate positions in relation to the two dominant ones. Historically, a later phenomenon is the social system of the polycentric type. It arises as a consequence of modernization. It is characterized by a pluralistic nature of relations between institutions and the absence of a dominant center. This type of relationship between institutions distinguishes all societies of a given macrotype, despite their inherent differences.

The theory of social macrotypes is concretized in the concept of Eisenstadt, who recognizes the multiplicity of variations in social systems, but at the same time distinguishes two macrotypes: pluralistic, or liberated, and monistic, or combining. In his opinion, in monistic societies there is a steady tendency to form numerous carefully designed systems of rank hierarchies. In such societies, the prerequisites for the formation of communities that would have a consciousness of a national identity do not arise or are weak. Instead, there are many small territorial, professional and other local groups striving for the reproduction of closed statuses. In pluralistic societies there is autonomy of institutions, there is a plurality of cultural patterns, elites hold positions that are pluralistic and open. Also, this type of society is distinguished by a focus on the future, the concept of not cyclical, but irreversible time [13, p. 114-115].

Developing countries borrow modern institutions from developed countries. However, in most cases, with the exception of a few countries in Southeast Asia, this borrowing does not lead to the formation of a modern institutional system. The main reason is that institutions are borrowed and

reproduced on the basis of their narrowly technical interpretation, on the basis of understanding them only as technologies that ensure economic development. However, institutions are not a simple set of technical operations, but complex cognitive normative formations. Borrowed institutions are only fragments in comparison with their original models, devoid of similar volumes of necessary sociocultural knowledge, as well as types of figures formed over a long time. Often, borrowed institutions in developing countries coincide with their counterparts in modern societies only in name, and the actual content of their activity, if they do, coincides only in some aspects. Such a state of borrowed institutions is an objective consequence of a complex of reasons, among which the most basic is the lack of a cognitive resource that is basic for them.

Significantly inferior in their productivity and members of borrowed institutions. An institutional actor in rooted institutions is highly productive not only because of his abilities, but also because his efficiency is a consequence of socialization in a certain context. While in the context of borrowed institutions, actors are limited in the knowledge necessary to carry out operational activity. At the same time, there are no conditions for the formation of this knowledge in the recipient countries. This is especially true for complex and implicit aspects of institutional knowledge.

In addition to the necessary amount of special and general knowledge about institutional norms and interactions, institutional actors must also have «descriptive competence» in relation to themselves [14, p. 13]. However, since the members of borrowed institutions in most developing countries cannot be provided with the necessary amount of special and general knowledge, they are characterized by a low level of competence in understanding of institutional problems and difficulties in developing descriptive competence regarding their role and institutional identity.

A more complex legitimation is needed for the recognition and rooting of modern institutions. Institutions need it, but it cannot be provided only on the basis of determining the necessity for the development of society. Proponents of modernization in developing countries are content with fragmentary theories of institutional activity, so borrowed institutions cannot achieve the required level of legitimacy, and due to the lack of legiti-

macy of modern institutions, they are too open to conflicting interpretations. As a result, behavioral practices that deviate from institutional norms are widespread among the members of these institutions. These practices cannot be called deviant, since they are rooted in the socio-cultural context of developing countries, and due to their massiveness and regularity, they suppress the norms of borrowed institutions. As a result, it is adherence to the norms of borrowed institutions that can become a deviation, while deviation from institutional norms is perceived as the basic ways of typifying the interactions of members of the institution.

Conclusions. Institutional practices that have become a matter of course for modern societies are difficult to achieve, and sometimes unattainable, for most developing countries. Most countries with inorganic modernization are characterized by chronic problems with the development of socio-cultural cognitions necessary for the formation of modern institutions. They experience the same difficulties due to the discrepancy between the

pace of development of the technical aspects of modern institutions and the spheres of society, which should become the socio-cultural basis for new institutions.

Modern institutions in developing countries do not have the necessary legitimacy, and are even denied by most members of these societies. In addition, in these societies there is a significant discrepancy between the social roles implemented in modern institutions and the absence of typical actors to fulfill them. In order for an institution to be able to typify actors effectively, a certain level of its fixation in the social context is necessary, but this is a long process. Developing countries are characterized by difficulties associated with achieving the consolidation of borrowed institutions, which is why in these societies modern institutions do not reach the required level of legitimation, so traditional institutions remain the most influential in them. All this together leads to the fact that developed countries retain the traditional type of society at their core.

The article was written as a part of a study funded by the Science Committee of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Grant №AP09259979).

REFERENCES

1. Спенсер Г. Синтетическая философия. – Киев: Ника-Центр, 1997. – 513 с.
2. Дюркгейм Э. О разделении общественного труда. Метод социологии. – М.: Наука, 1991. – 575 с.
3. Веблен Т. Теория праздного класса. Издание 4-е. – М.: ЛИБРОКОМ, 2011. – 365 с.
4. Парсонс Т. О структуре социального действия. – М.: Академический Проект, 2000. – 880 с.
5. Бергер П., Лукман Т. Социальное конструирование реальности. Трактат по социологии знания. – М.: Медиум, 1995. – 323 с.
6. Делез Ж. Мая 68-го не было. – М.: Ад Маргинем Пресс, 2016. – 96 с.
7. DiMaggio P.J., Powell W.W. The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991. – 486 p.
8. Норт Д. Понимание процесса экономических изменений. – М.: ГУ ВШЭ, 2010. – 256 с.
9. Грейф А. Институты и путь к современной экономике. Уроки средневековой торговли. – М.: ГУ ВШЭ, 2013. – 536 с.
10. Аджемоглу Д., Робинсон Дж. Почему одни страны богатые, а другие бедные. Происхождение власти, процветания и нищеты. – М.: АСТ, 2016. – 704 с.
11. Есенгараев Е.Ж. Переходное общество: институциональный анализ // Проблемы теоретической социологии. – Выпуск 4. – СПб.: НИИХ СПбГУ, 2003. – С. 284-294.
12. Есенгараев Е.Ж. Структурный подход к типологии обществ // Стратегия «Казахстан – 2050»: сборник материалов V Конгресса социологов Казахстана. – Алматы, 2014. – С. 215-223.
13. Эйзенштадт Ш. Революция и преобразование обществ. Сравнительное изучение обществ. – М.: Аспект-Пресс, 1999. – 416 с.
14. Рикер П. Герменевтика, этика, политика. Московские лекции и интервью. – М.: КАМІ АCADEMIA, 1995. – 160 с.

REFERENCES

1. Spenser G. Sinteticheskaja filosofija [Synthetic philosophy]. – Kiev: Nika-Centr, 1997. – 513 s. [in Russian].
2. Djurkgejm Je. O razdelenii obshhestvennogo truda. Metod sociologii [On the division of social labor. The method of sociology.]. – M.: Nauka, 1991. – 575 s. [in Russian].
3. Veblen T. Teorija prazdnogo klassa. Izdanie 4-e [The theory of the leisure class]. – M.: LIBROKOM, 2011. – 365 s. [in Russian].
4. Parsons T. O strukture social'nogo dejstvija [On the structure of social action]. – M.: Akademicheskij Proekt, 2000. – 880 s. [in Russian].
5. Berger P., Lukman T. Social'noe konstruirovanie real'nosti. Traktat po sociologii znaniya [Social construction of reality. A treatise on the sociology of knowledge]. – M.: Medium, 1995. – 323 s. [in Russian].
6. Delez Zh. Maja 68-go ne bylo [There was no May 68]. – M.: Ad Marginem Press, 2016. – 96 s. [in Russian].
7. DiMaggio P.J., Powell W.W. The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991. – 486 p.
8. Nort D. Ponimanie processa jekonomicheskikh izmenenij [Understanding the process of economic change]. – M.: GU VShJe, 2010. – 256 s. [in Russian].
9. Grejf A. Instituty i put' k sovremennoj jekonomike. Uroki srednevekovoj trgovli [Institutions and the way to a modern economy. Lessons of medieval trade]. – M.: GU VShJe, 2013. – 536 s. [in Russian].
10. Adzhemoglu D., Robinson Dzh. Pochemu odni strany bogatye, a drugie bednye. Proishozhdenie vlasti, procvetaniya i nishhety [Why some countries are rich and others are poor. The origin of power, prosperity and poverty]. – M.: AST, 2016. – 704 s. [in Russian].
11. Esengaraev E.Zh. Perehodnoe obshhestvo: institucional'nyj analiz [Transitional society: institutional analysis] // Problemy teoreticheskoy sociologii. – Vypusk 4. – SPb.: NIIH SPbGU, 2003. – S. 284-294 [in Russian].
12. Esengaraev E.Zh. Strukturnyj podhod k tipologii obshhestv [Structural approach to the typology of societies] // Strategija «Kazahstan – 2050»: sbornik materialov V Kongressa sociologov Kazahstana. – Almaty, 2014. – S. 215-223 [in Russian].
13. Jezhenshtadt Sh. Revoljucija i preobrazovanie obshhestv. Sravnitel'noe izuchenie obshhestv [Revolution and transformation of societies. Comparative study of societies]. – M.: Aspekt-Press, 1999. – 416 s. [in Russian].
14. Riker P. Germenevtika, jetika, politika. Moskovskie lekcii i interv'ju [Hermeneutics, ethics, politics. Moscow lectures and interviews]. – M.: KAMI ACADEMIA, 1995. – 160 s. [in Russian].

Е.Ж. Есенгараев, А.А. Таубаев, Т.Н. Пупышева

ҚОҒАМДАРДЫҢ ДАМУЫНЫҢ ИНСТИТУЦИЯЛЫҚ ЖАҒДАЙЫ

Аңдатпа

Көптеген еңбектер институттар мен әлеуметтік жүйелердің трансформациясы мәселелеріне арналған. Негізінен бұл еңбектердің авторлары экономикалық немесе технологиялық детерминизм концепцияларына сүйеніп, институттар мен әлеуметтік жүйелерді, олардың эволюциясын шешуші факторлардың бірінің призмасы арқылы қарастырады. Мұндай факторлар кейбір жағдайларда қоғамға неліктен оң әсер еткенін және неге бұл елдердің көпшілігінде болмағанын түсіндіре алмайды.

Мақала авторлары институттар мен әлеуметтік жүйелердің трансформациясын зерттеудегі редукционизм шектеулі көзқарас болып табылады деп тұжырымдайды. Оған балама – құрылымдық көзқарас, оған сәйкес қоғам бір бастауға қысқармайды, институттардың тарихи қалыптасқан құрылымы ретінде қарастырылады. Бұл көзқарас қоғамдардың құрылымындағы айырмашылықтарды институттардың арақатынасы арқылы түсіндіреді. Институционалдық құрылым әлеуметтік жүйенің түрін анықтайды, ал дәстүрлі қоғамның модернизациясы оның институционалдық құрылымы трансформацияланған жағдайда ғана мүмкін болады. Теориялық нақтылаудың қажетті деңгейі және осы тәсілді дәлірек эмпирикалық растау когнитивизмге жетуге мүмкіндік береді.

Бұл мақалада авторлар элеуметтік жүйелердің дамуын қарастырады, модернизацияны институционалдық құрылымның өзгеруімен түсіндіреді, бұл өз кезегінде қоғамның түрін анықтайды. Дамушы елдерде дамыған елдерден заманауи институттарды алғанымен, органикалық дамудың болмауының себептері талданады. Авторлар институционализм идеяларының когнитивизммен синтезі институттардың жұмыс механизмдерін нақтылауға мүмкіндік беретінін көрсетті.

Е.Ж. Есенгараев, А.А. Таубаев, Т.Н. Пупышева

ИНСТИТУЦИОНАЛЬНЫЕ УСЛОВИЯ РАЗВИТИЯ ОБЩЕСТВ

Аннотация

Вопросам трансформации институтов и общественных систем посвящено множество работ. В основном авторы данных работ опираются на концепции экономического или технологического детерминизма и рассматривают институты и общественные системы, их эволюцию через призму одного из решающих факторов. Такие факторы не объясняют причин, по которым в некоторых случаях они оказали позитивное воздействие на общество, и того, почему в большинстве стран этого не произошло.

Авторы статьи утверждают, что редукционизм в изучении трансформаций институтов и общественных систем является ограниченным подходом. Альтернативой ему выступает структурный подход, согласно которому общество не сводится к одному началу, а рассматривается как исторически сформированная структура институтов. Такой подход объясняет различия в устройстве обществ через соотношение институтов. Институциональная структура определяет тип общественной системы, а модернизация традиционного общества возможна лишь при условии трансформации ее институциональной структуры. Необходимого уровня теоретической конкретизации и более точного эмпирического подтверждения данному подходу позволяет достичь когнитивизм.

В данной статье авторы рассматривают вопросы развития общественных систем, объясняя модернизацию изменениями институциональной структуры, что, в свою очередь, определяет тип общества. Проанализированы причины, по которым в развивающихся странах, несмотря на то, что они заимствуют современные институты у развитых стран, не происходит органического развития. Авторами показано, что именно синтез идей институционализма с когнитивизмом позволяет конкретизировать механизмы работы институтов.

