

DOI 10.52260/2304-7216.2022.3(48).36  
UDC 330.1:316.7  
SCSTI 06.01.07

**T. Pupyshva\***, PhD student<sup>1</sup>  
**E. Yesengarayev**, c.h.s., assoc. professor<sup>1</sup>  
**A. Taubayev**, d.e.s., professor<sup>2</sup>  
**Y. Puntus**, postgraduate student<sup>3</sup>  
*Karaganda university of Kazpotrebsoyuz  
Karaganda, Kazakhstan<sup>1</sup>  
Esil University, Astana, Kazakhstan<sup>2</sup>  
Peoples' Friendship University of Russia  
Moscow, Russia<sup>3</sup>*  
\* – main author (author for correspondence)  
e-mail: ptn7@mail.ru

## PUBLIC MANAGEMENT: THE IMPACT OF CULTURE

*Public management plays a special role in the system of public administration in modern developed countries. During its implementation, the emphasis is on the use of business technologies that improve its efficiency and effectiveness. Despite all its advantages, many countries experience difficulties in implementing public management due to cultural peculiarities and differences.*

*In this article, the authors describe approaches that consider the influence of sociocultural factors on the development of management in general, and public management, in particular. They show that the models of public management are formed under the influence of sociocultural cognitions and norms inherent in certain societies and civilizations, and specialists focused on the sociocultural vision of management distinguish many models, the main ones being western "rationalistic" and southeastern "humanistic" models of management, based on which they single out their basic principles.*

*The authors analyzed that among the sociocultural factors, the most important are discursive practices and the types of habitus and identities based on them, fixed in the form of social institutions. They are the ones who determine the development of public management through the formation of the dominant type of socio-cultural logic and the types of social actors.*

**Keywords:** public administration, culture, society, management, cognition, norm, value, social institution, identity, philosophy.

**Кілт сөздер:** мемлекеттік басқару, мәдениет, қоғам, басқару, таным, норма, құндылық, әлеуметтік институт, тұлға, философия.

**Ключевые слова:** государственный менеджмент, культура, общество, менеджмент, когниция, норма, ценность, социальный институт, идентичность, философия.

**JEL classification:** M 19

**Introduction.** In modern market conditions, new approaches to the organization of activities in this sector are being formed in the public administration system of the Republic of Kazakhstan – "new public management", is applied a model of public administration, focused on optimizing the forms of state participation. This model is aimed at avoiding excessive funding of the public sector and minimizing the shortcomings of the state, including increasing the satisfaction of citizens as beneficiaries. Despite the fact that this model has proven its effectiveness in many developed countries, many problems and difficulties arise during its implementation in practice. One of the obstacles in the way of its realization may be the peculiarities of culture.

It is an undeniable fact that the geography of the level of development of modern management, including the public, coincides with the geography of developed countries. Consequently, modern development and professional public management are mutually presupposing each other. At the same time, the ratio of society and its individual institutions, including management, are not equivalent, but asymmetric. In this ratio, in terms of its scale, society is always more significant than any individual institution, since any institution is based on general sociocultural norms, is formed and based in the social context, and the influence of culture is very wide.

Proceeding from this, the purpose of this scientific article is to analyze various approaches to understanding public management, focused on the influence of the whole variety of sociocultural factors. The tasks are: analysis of approaches that describe the influence of socio-cultural factors on the development of public

management; determination of the impact of sociocultural cognitions and norms that form the basic principles of thinking and behavior of public managers; explanation of the development of public management through the formation of the dominant type of socio-cultural logic and types of social actors.

Due to the multidimensionality of the research topic, was used an integral approach, which allows combining a set of methods, such as: induction and deduction, analysis and synthesis, descriptive methods, comparative analysis, methods of rationalization and logical interpretation.

**Literature review.** The influence of sociocultural rules on all aspects of life, including public management, is noted by many authors.

Joseph Schumpeter in his work "Theory of economic development. Capitalism, socialism, democracy" [1] one of the first draw attention to the importance of established norms in people's behavior, emphasized the importance of the influence of sociocultural cognitions on the thinking and behavior of social subjects.

The famous American economist Peter Drucker, highlighting the main task of management, such as the integration of people into a single enterprise, emphasized that "management cannot be separated from culture" [2, p. 29].

The significance of the societal effect in the economy and its ever-increasing influence was paid attention to in his work "The application of management theory to economic growth" by Kenneth Arrow. [3]. The same culturological position is shared by Richard E. Nisbett [4]. George Lakoff and Mark Johnson [5], [6] concretized the influence of culture on management through the category of basic metaphors, which are cultural phenomena, and at the same time defining people's ideas and ways of thinking. Nicole Biggart and Mauro Guillen [7] in management analysis, they emphasized that society influences management practices through the development of basic ideas about management, but, more importantly, through the formation of norms of legitimacy. Differences in management practice related to cultural characteristics and described with specific examples are presented in the work of Mats Alvesson "Organizational culture" [8].

Also, great attention was paid to the importance of the cultural context in the analysis of management in their works by practitioners Konosuke Matsushita [9], scientists Mitchell Abolafia [10], Manuel Castells [11], Masahiko Aoki [12] and other authors, focusing on various socio-cultural aspects and phenomena.

**Main part.** Peter Drucker, noting the inseparability of management from culture, comes to the following conclusion: "Managers in Germany, Great Britain, the United States of America, Japan or Brazil are, generally speaking, doing the same thing. But the way they perform these general tasks has its own characteristics in each individual case. Thus, one of the most important problems that managers in any developing country face is to identify elements of their own tradition, history and culture that can be used in management. The difference between the Japanese "economic miracle" and the current relative weakness of the Indian economy is due to the fact that Japanese managers managed to instill "imported" management concepts on their cultural soil and ensure that these concepts yield a rich harvest" [2, p. 29]. Consequently, management as a whole, as well as its models, are inseparable from culture, and directly depend on it.

The same opinion is shared by a number of other specialists, who define the dependence of the development of organizations, companies and institutions on the social organization of society as a societal effect. This is true for both private and public organizations, companies and institutions.

Thus, one of the famous economists of our time, Kenneth Arrow, emphasized that "... social variables that are not related to individuals are essential for studying the economy or any other social system. An irremovable social element, the importance of which is growing more and more over time, is endowed, first of all, with knowledge and technical information" [3, p. 8].

Richard E. Nisbett, when analyzing human behavior, considers it necessary to take into account that people are representatives of various cultures. And this means, in his opinion, that: "Their "metaphysics" should be revealed, that is, fundamental views on the nature of things" [4, p. 19]. In various societies, thanks to their metaphysical foundations, models of explaining the world and human behavior are formed. Because of the social nature of man, "people resort to the means of thinking appropriate to their systems of the world" [4, p. 19]. This inevitably leads to the fact that managers, both in public and private organizations, are guided in their own activities and decision-making by the cultural ideas that are embedded in them.

For orientation in the world and for solving managerial problems, managers rely not only on theories and clearly defined categories, but also on images, on metaphorical thinking. Research by George Lakoff and his colleagues made it possible to understand the importance of metaphors as the basis of human thinking, as the foundation not only of implicit knowledge, but also as a central element of any concepts [5], [6]. These metaphors actually define the theory and practice of management. And of particular importance among them are those related to the consideration of organizations as machines, or living

organisms. Recognizing the importance of metaphors, it should be noted that they are primarily cultural phenomena. The peculiarity of each culture, including organizational culture, is determined by a set of its basic metaphors that define its inherent ideas and ways of thinking.

In general, various management models are formed under the influence of sociocultural cognitions and norms inherent in certain societies and civilizations. There are many such models, but specialists focused on the socio-cultural vision of management distinguish between western "rationalistic" and southeastern "humanistic" management models. Based on the differences between western "rationalist" and southeastern "humanistic" management, they highlight their basic principles.

"Rationalistic management", characteristic of the West, is based on the following principles:

- Abstractness: the desire to impose formal ideas and principles on reality.
- Objectivism: the vision of non-personal events, processes and objects as independent of the individual who perceives them.
- Mechanicism: as a view of the processes taking place in the world as a system that is reproduced on the basis of universal laws.
- Dualism: seeing the world and human actions by contrasting their properties with the causes that affect them.

– Absolutism: deductive, linear and unidirectional nature of management.

The basic principles of the southeastern "humanistic management" include:

- Concreteness: the object of management is a specific holistic personality.
- Subjectivism: the ability to identify and base non-rational human functions.
- Organicism: taking as a starting point a living organism in the complex integrity of its existence.
- Holism or non-duality: focus on the wholeness of life and the harmonization of human functions instead of opposing the human mind to nature.
- Relativism or avoidance of absolutization: focus on the interaction of people, respect for the will and opinion of others [13, p. 105].

As a result of these differences and their impact on management, the visions of problems, methods of interpretation, behavioral attitudes and practices of Western and Far Eastern managers are significantly differed. Based on their characteristics, approaches to public management will naturally differ.

The conceptualization of management tasks does not occur only on the basis of the individual efforts of individual managers, but is the result of their interpretation of the basic ideas about the state, management, economy, labor and relations in these areas that have developed in a particular society. Each society endows its members with concepts and interpretive frameworks, thanks to which the subjects, largely forcibly, are placed in a common semantic environment and stable and predictable communications are formed between them.

Joseph Schumpeter noted the influence of established norms on people's behavior, on their potential for framing human activity. The frames and concepts that guide government leaders are not the product of only academic developments. Basic cognitive models are a product of culture, and they are more successfully assimilated by members of society than the theoretical constructs offered by the academic community. First of all, Schumpeter believed: "Outside the usual framework, economic entities lack the indicators necessary for making decisions and determining the rules of conduct, which, under normal conditions, are usually well known to him. This, of course, does not mean that he is generally outside the sphere of experience, or only outside the sphere of social experience. He must and can make predictions and estimates based on his experience, and in many things even rely on it. But in some things he cannot be so sure, there are still some things he can determine only in wide intervals, and about the rest, he can probably only guess [1, p. 154].

Drawing attention to the importance of the habitual context for human activity, Schumpeter also identified two consequences of such habituation. The first consequence is the emergence of "automatizations" that make it possible to ensure "energy saving" within the framework of any habitual activity. The second consequence is dogmatization, "immunity to criticism" of such habits [1, p. 154].

In addition to the above two factors generated by the established social context, Schumpeter also singled out his third consequence: "The third point is the opposition that the social environment renders to the attempts of everyone who intends to introduce something new in general or something new in the economy in particular. This resistance can manifest itself primarily in the form of the existence of various obstacles of a legal or political nature. But besides this, the society condemns any deviation in the behavior of one of its members, however, to a different degree – depending on how this society is accustomed to such deviations" [1, p. 156].

Schumpeter, proceeding from the inevitable conservatism inherent in any society to one degree or another, believed that the degree of openness or closeness to change depends on the level of development of society. So, in more primitive societies, the reaction to attempts at innovation is sharper than in modern societies, but the rejection of social innovations by the main mass of people, in his opinion, "always exists in one form or another" [1, p. 156].

Within the framework of modern concepts based on the ideas of cognitivism, empirically more specific confirmations of the significance of the influence of sociocultural cognitions on the thinking and behavior of social subjects have been achieved. It has been confirmed that cognitive models rooted in culture have an incomparably greater coercive potential than theoretical recipes broadcast by statesmen, scientists and consulting organizations. It is the knowledge and values rooted in traditions that not only have a greater impact on solving the problems facing managers, but also on the formation of their basic discourse.

Sociocultural knowledge forms a cognitive basis, a kind of context for a particular society. They are implicit in nature, and at the same time they set the framework for the perception and methods of action of managers. The possibilities for the development of specialized managerial knowledge depend on them, since sociocultural knowledge acts as a cultural basis.

Culture establishes certain limits indicating what is legitimate and what is not. Concepts of control arise historically, on the basis of ideas and practices about management and the patterns of interactions that are characteristic of certain societies. So in the Anglo-Saxon world since the seventies of the twentieth century, the concept of financial control has prevailed, and in continental Europe and Southeast Asia, due to the peculiarities of their traditions, financial instruments and the concept of control based on them could not occupy such a dominant position.

Comparative and historical studies of organizations and practices lead to the conclusion that the most appropriate practices can be approved only when they do not contradict the institutional logic of a given country and correspond to its cultural traditions.

According to Nicole Biggart and Mauro Guillen, organizations are permeated with meaning models of the society around them, of which they are a part. Society influences on management practices not only through the development of fundamental ideas about management, but also through the formation of norms for the legitimacy of various types of activities, and therefore the authors emphasize that: "Economic and managerial practices that are not consistent with the institutional logic of a given society, even if theoretically they are "better" or "more efficient, cannot be easily recognized and implemented" [7, p. 48].

Cultural characteristics specific to different countries, even if they are neighboring and belong to the same civilization, may determine differences in the understanding and practice of management. On the example of the ideas and attitudes of German and Danish managers, Mats Alvesson [8] comes to the conclusion that the differences in guidelines and in the way of understanding when making public decisions can be very profound. There were many cultural differences between German and Danish government officials, which significantly complicate mutual understanding. The Germans were more inclined towards an authoritarian style of leadership, while the Danes were characterized by an orientation towards collegiality and pluralism. As Alvesson emphasizes, "In this example, we see that the decision-making process – from preparation to implementation – reflects the culture's beliefs and meanings of rational, natural, and efficient. This example contains two opposing systems of meaning for the decision-making process, but even in a "company with one culture" this process is not completely rational. Thus, the example "successfully reflects the cultural nature of the decision-making process in general" [8, p. 25].

M. Alvesson explains the central importance of culture by its ability to influence the formation of thinking, feelings and actions of members of any organizations, even those where the influence of culture is considered insignificant. As a consequence, organizations, including public ones, exist and operate within a certain organizational culture, which itself is a consequence of interpretations and practices occurring in the context of the basic cultural meanings and symbols of a particular society. Thus, the sociocultural context and its metaphysical foundations, inevitably influencing the perceptions and behavior of a person, also affect the formation of the behavior of managers. This is a manifestation of the influence of the social context on people's behavior.

Managers, including those in the public sector, need theory, but at the same time they do not and cannot work as pure theorists. They have to solve practical problems that inevitably require the ability to think and act situationally, be flexible, spontaneous and open to seeing new ways to solve emerging problems. However, despite all the situations that arise and the ability to be open to making situational decisions,

managers are not and cannot be people who only react to emerging problems and interpret them only on the basis of quantitative data and the principle of efficiency.

Moreover, the practical effectiveness of managers largely depends on their theoretical preparedness, on their ability to conceptualize the problem and flexibly interpret it depending on the specific situation. But without general theoretical prerequisites it is impossible to ensure the development of such abilities. The basic theoretical prerequisites for any type of activity are embedded in culture, in its concepts and their historically formed relationships.

Understanding the need for non-utilitarian ideas and values for the development of successful management in its broadest sense is typical not only for researchers, but also for practitioners. So, one of the largest businessmen of the twentieth century, Konosuke Matsushita, believes that a manager needs to have many qualities and skills. For successful work in management, a combination of various factors is necessary, but Konosuke Matsushita calls the decisive factor "the presence of a coherent management philosophy" [9, p. 10]. Such an understanding of the management philosophy means that the organization and its members need not only the knowledge necessary to fulfill their functional duties, but also the knowledge that allows them to achieve a holistic understanding of themselves and their purpose in this world. It is also necessary to have a broad understanding of the state strategy, a vision of the state in the future. Only in this case it can be said that public management will be successful.

Considering the problem of applying various concepts of management, the American sociologist Mitchell Abolafia emphasizes that: "The development of an understanding of the situation is the conclusion of various and often indefinite elements of information into semantic schemes" [10, p. 256]. Semantic schemes, writes Abolafia, "act as filters that allow actors to organize and interpret the information received, act as hints or guides to action" [10, p. 256]. Such semantic schemes and models of interpretation are elements of the mental tradition of a certain society, since the development of an understanding of what is happening and oneself does not occur in a community of specialists isolated from others, but is based on a broader sociocultural context.

Noting the importance of the sociocultural context, one of the leading sociologists of our time, Manuel Castells, notes that "societies are cultural constructs. I understand culture as a set of values and beliefs that inform, guide and motivate people's behavior" [11, p. 54]. As the author of the concept of the network society, Castells attaches particular importance to the phenomenon of communication. At the same time, he defines communication as "a collective definition of meanings in the process of information exchange" and, listing all the main aspects of communication, emphasizes the factor of social significance as the most important aspect of this process. And meaning, Castells believes, "can only be understood in the context of social relations in which the processes of information exchange and communication take place" [11, p. 73].

According to Masahiko Aoki, the possibilities of choosing activity strategies and using various organizational models of "organizational architecture" depend on cognitive prerequisites, defined as "cognitive assets" [12, p. 105]. The cognitive resources of society, its basic cultural values and norms, serve not only as a basis for solving problems in certain areas of society, but also as an inevitable limiter, allowing you to see some aspects of problems, they may also not allow you to see other possibilities. At the same time, the form of organizational architecture that dominates in a particular society has a decisive impact on the perceptions and preferences of managers, effectively inducing them to recognize the advantages inherent in this culture, thereby reproducing it.

Professor of the London School of Economics David Graeber, after analyzing the history of human relations for five thousand years, comes to the conclusion that the concept of "economic life" is a historical, not an a priori category. He reasonably argues that "three hundred years ago, the "economy" did not exist, at least in the sense that people did not talk about it as a separate sphere with its own laws and principles" [14, p. 405]. Graeber's conclusion is that the economy as a separate institution was formed not only as a result of the solution of practical needs, but also as a result of historical ways of conceptualizing them. The same is true with respect to public management.

The role of ideas and concepts in any sphere of life, including public administration, was accurately described by the English economist John Keynes: "Practical people who consider themselves immune from intellectual influences are usually the slaves of some economist of the past. The madmen in power derive their wild ideas from the writings of some academic scribbler who composed a few years ago" [15, p. 24].

**Conclusions.** Thus, the development of public management depends on many socio-cultural factors and is determined by the cultural characteristics of a particular society. Among them, the most important are discursive practices and the types of habitus and identities based on them with consolidation in the form of

social institutions. Their significance for the formation and development of any sphere of human activity, including management, lies in the fact that they determine the dominant type of socio-cultural logic and certain types of social actors.

Despite some differences in the approaches of the authors described above, they are united by an integrated understanding of the indisputable influence of the social environment on the activities of managers, as a result, it is necessary to consider public management as a sociocultural phenomenon, which, like management in general, is also based on certain social and civilizational foundations. Its effectiveness and efficiency crucially depends on the way the work is organized, but it is also determined by the underlying values.

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. Шумпетер Й. Теория экономического развития. Капитализм, социализм, демократия. – М.: Эксмо, 2007. – 864 с.
2. Друкер П. Энциклопедия менеджмента. – М.: Вильямс, 2004. – 432 с.
3. Эрроу К. Дж. Применение теории управления к экономическому росту // Математическая экономия. – М.: Мир, 1974. – С. 7-45.
4. Нейсбит Р. География мысли. – М.: Астрель, 2012. – 286 с.
5. Лакофф Дж., Джонсон М. Метафоры, которыми мы живем. – М.: Эдиториал УРСС, 2004. – 256 с.
6. Лакофф Дж. Женщины, огонь и опасные вещи. Что категории языка говорят нам о мышлении. Книга 1. Разум вне машины. – М.: Гнозис, 2011. – 512 с.
7. Биггарт Н., Гиллен М. Выявление различий: социальная организация и формирование автомобильных производств в Южной Корее, Тайване, Испании и Аргентине // Анализ рынков в современной экономической социологии. – Т.7. – №2. – М.: Издательский дом ГУ ВШЭ, 2006. – С. 23-55.
8. Элвессон М. Организационная культура. – Харьков: Гуманитарный Центр, 2005. – 458 с.
9. Мацусита К. Философия менеджмента. – М.: Альпина Паблишер, 2018. – 190 с.
10. Аболафия М. Как вырабатывается понимание экономического спада: интерпретативная теория хозяйственного действия // Анализ рынков в современной экономической социологии. – М.: ВШЭ, 2008. – 423 с.
11. Кастельс М. Власть коммуникации. – М.: ВШЭ, 2016. – 568 с.
12. Аоки М. Корпорации в условиях растущего многообразия: познание, руководство и институты. – М.: Издательство института Гайдара, 2015. – 368 с.
13. Малявин В. Китай управляемый: старый добрый менеджмент. – М.: Европа, 2007. – 304 с.
14. Гребер Д. Долг: первые 5000 лет истории. – М.: Ад Маргинем, 2017. – 616 с.
15. Кэссиди Дж. Как падают рынки. Логика экономических катастроф. – М.: Международные отношения, 2014. – 520 с.

## REFERENCES

1. Shumpeter J. Teorija jekonomicheskogo razvitija. Kapitalizm, socializm, demokratija [Theory of economic development. Capitalism, socialism, democracy]. – М.: Jeksmo, 2007. – 864 s. [in Russian].
2. Druker P. Jenciklopedija menedzhmenta [Encyclopedia of Management]. – М.: Vil'jams, 2004. – 432 s. [in Russian].
3. Jerrou K.Dzh. Primenenie teorii upravlenija k jekonomicheskomu rostu [The application of management theory to economic growth] // Matematicheskaja jekonomija. – М.: Mir, 1974. – S. 7-45. [in Russian].
4. Nejsbit R. Geografija mysli [Geography of thought]. – М.: Astrel', 2012. – 286 s. [in Russian].
5. Lakoff Dzh., Dzhonson M. Metafori, kotorymi my zhivem [Metaphors we live by]. – М.: Jeditorial URSS, 2004. – 256 s. [in Russian].
6. Lakoff Dzh. Zhenshhiny, ogon' i opasnye veshhi. Chto kategorii jazyka govorjat nam o myshlenii. Kniga 1. Razum vne mashiny [Women, fire and dangerous things. What the categories of language tell us about thinking. Book 1. Mind outside the machine]. – М.: Gnozis, 2011. – 512 s. [in Russian].
7. Biggart N., Gillen M. Vyjavlenie razlichij: social'naja organizacija i formirovanie avtomobil'nyh proizvodstv v Juzhnoj Koree, Tajvane, Ispanii i Argentine [Identification of differences: Social organization and formation of automobile production in South Korea, Taiwan, Spain and Argentina] // Analiz rynkov v sovremennoj

jekonomicheskoy sociologii. – Т.7. – №2. – М.: Izdatel'skij dom GU VShJe, 2006. – S. 23-55. [in Russian].

8. Jelvesson M. Organizacionnaja kul'tura [Organizational culture]. – Har'kov: Gumanitarnyj Centr, 2005. – 458 s. [in Russian].

9. Macusita K. Filosofija menedzhmenta [Philosophy of management]. – М.: Al'pina Pabliher, 2018. – 190 s. [in Russian].

10. Abolafija M. Kak vyrabatyvaetsja ponimanie jekonomicheskogo spada: interpretativnaja teorija hozjajstvennogo dejstvija [How an understanding of the economic downturn is developed: an interpretative theory of economic action] // Analiz rynkov v sovremennoj jekonomicheskoy sociologii. – М.: VShJe, 2008. – 423 s. [in Russian].

11. Kastel's M. Vlast' kommunikacii [The power of communication]. – М.: VShJe, 2016. – 568 s. [in Russian].

12. Aoki M. Korporacii v uslovijah rastushhego mnogoobrazija: poznanie, rukovodstvo i instituty [Corporations in the context of growing diversity: cognition, leadership and institutions]. – М.: Izdatel'stvo instituta Gajdara, 2015. – 368 s. [in Russian].

13. Maljavin V. Kitaj upravljaemyj: staryj dobryj menedzhment [Managed China: good old management]. – М.: Evropa, 2007. – 304 s. [in Russian].

14. Greber D. Dolg: pervye 5000 let istorii [Debt: the first 500]. – М.: Ad Marginem, 2017. – 616 s. [in Russian].

15. Kjessidi Dzh. Kak padajut rynki. Logika jekonomicheskikh katastrof [How markets are falling. The logic of economic disasters]. – М.: Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenija, 2014. – 520 s. [in Russian].

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

## **МЕМЛЕКЕТТІК БАСҚАРУ: МӘДЕНИЕТТІҢ ӘСЕРІ**

### **Аңдатпа**

Қазіргі дамыған елдердің мемлекеттік басқару жүйесінде мемлекеттік басқарудың алатын орны ерекше. Оны жүзеге асыру барысында оның тиімділігі мен тиімділігін арттыратын бизнес-технологияларды пайдалануға баса мән беріледі. Барлық артықшылықтарға қарамастан, көптеген елдер мәдени ерекшеліктер мен айырмашылықтарға байланысты мемлекеттік басқаруды жүзеге асыруда қиындықтарды бастан кешіреді.

Бұл мақалада авторлар жалпы менеджменттің, атап айтқанда, мемлекеттік менеджменттің дамуына әлеуметтік-мәдени факторлардың әсерін қарастыратын тәсілдерге сипаттама береді. Мемлекетті басқару үлгілері белгілі бір қоғамдар мен өркениеттерге тән әлеуметтік-мәдени танымдар мен нормалардың әсерінен қалыптасатындығы көрсетілген, менеджменттің әлеуметтік-мәдени көзқарасына бағдарланған мамандар көптеген үлгілерді ажыратады, олардың негізгілері басқарудың батыстық «рационалистік» және оңтүстік-шығыс «гуманистік» үлгілері болып табылады, солардың негізінде олардың негізгі қағидаларын бөліп көрсетеді.

Авторлар әлеуметтік-мәдени факторлардың ішінде ең маңыздысы дискурсивтік тәжірибелер және әлеуметтік институттар түрінде бекітілген хабитус түрлері мен соларға негізделген сәйкестіктер болып табылатынын талдады. Дәл солар әлеуметтік-мәдени логиканың басым түрін және әлеуметтік қайраткерлер типтерін қалыптастыру арқылы мемлекеттік басқарудың дамуын анықтайды.

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

## **ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ МЕНЕДЖМЕНТ: ВЛИЯНИЕ КУЛЬТУРЫ**

### **Аннотация**

Государственный менеджмент играет особую роль в системе государственного управления современных развитых государств. В ходе его реализации акцент делается на применении технологий бизнеса, позволяющих повышать его эффективность и результативность. Несмотря на все его преимущества, многие страны испытывают трудности с внедрением государственного менеджмента, связанные с культурными особенностями и различиями.

В данной статье авторы описывают подходы, рассматривающие влияние социокультурных факторов на развитие менеджмента в целом, и государственного менеджмента, в частности. Показано, что модели государственного менеджмента формируются под воздействием социокультурных когниций и норм, присущих определенным обществам и цивилизациям, а специалисты, ориентированные на социокультурное видение менеджмента, различают множество моделей, основными из них выступают западные «рационалистические» и юго-восточные «гуманистические» модели менеджмента, исходя из которых, они выделяют их базовые принципы.

Авторами проанализировано, что среди социокультурных факторов наиболее важными являются дискурсивные практики и основанные на них типы габитуса и идентичностей, закрепленные в виде социальных институтов. Именно они определяют развитие государственного менеджмента через формирование господствующего типа социокультурной логики и типы социальных деятелей.