IJBMC
International Journal of Body, Mind and Culture

Volume 13, Issue 10, Article e2026-1740
DOI: 10.61838/ijbmc.v13i10.1740

Article type:
Conceptual Review

# Festivals as Psychological and Cultural Phenomena in Kazakhstan: A Conceptual Analysis of Aesthetic Experience, Ritual, and Belonging

Alibek. Islambekov[1*], Ainur. Zhiyenbekova[2], Aziz. Azizov[3], Kulimkhan. Arymbayeva[2], Marzhan. Alikbayeva[1]

1 Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan.
2 M. Auezov South Kazakhstan University, Shymkent, Kazakhstan.
3 LLP Central Asian Innovation University, Shymkent, Kazakhstan.

Corresponding author email address:
Islambekov.alibek@proton.me




Article history:

Received 12 Feb 2026
Revised 15 Mar 2026
Accepted 03 Apr 2026
Published online 01 Oct 2026

How to cite this article:
Islambekov, A., Zhiyenbekova, A., Azizov, A., Arymbayeva, K., & Alikbayeva, M. (2026). Festivals as Psychological and Cultural Phenomena in Kazakhstan: A Conceptual Analysis of Aesthetic Experience, Ritual, and Belonging. International Journal of Body, Mind and Culture, 13(10), Article e2026-1740. https://doi.org/10.61838/ijbmc.v13i10.1740

© 2026 the authors. This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License.

## ABSTRACT

**Objective:** To clarify how festivals may organize aesthetic expression, ritual meaning, and social belonging, using Kazakh Nauryz as a bounded contextual illustration rather than an empirical case study.

**Methods and Materials:** A critical integrative conceptual analysis was organized around cultural anthropology, philosophical aesthetics, ritual theory, and social psychology. Foundational scholarship was read alongside relevant contemporary research and institutional descriptions of Nauryz. No interviews, field observations, surveys, or experimental data were collected for this article.

**Findings:** Four interpretive dimensions are differentiated: the aesthetic transformation of ordinary space and time; symbolic and ritual communication; collective performance and play; and potential experiences of emotional synchrony and belonging. The proposed relations are conceptual and context-sensitive, not measured psychological pathways.

**Conclusion:** Festivals can be understood as culturally situated performances that make values and identities perceptible. Psychological outcomes depend on participation, interpretation, exclusion, and institutional conditions and require dedicated empirical assessment.

**Keywords:** Festival, Nauryz, Ritual, Cultural Identity, Collective Emotion, Aesthetic Experience, Kazakhstan.

## Introduction

Festivals have long been interpreted as more than scheduled occasions of leisure. They condense collective symbols, organize public time, and transform ordinary gestures into culturally recognizable performances. In the original problem formulation, the festival is approached as an aesthetic relation to reality: music, dance, attire, food, staged space, ceremonial speech, and movement lend sensory form to shared understandings of the world. The question is not whether every participant undergoes a psychological transformation but how a festive situation makes particular emotions, identities, and relationships available for interpretation (Bakhtin, 1984) (Huizinga, 1955). Classical accounts of collective ritual also frame shared ceremonial attention as a potential source of social solidarity (Durkheim, 2001).

Anthropological and sociological accounts distinguish ritual ordering from everyday routine. Turner (1969) describes liminality and communitas as analytic categories for examining transitional relations, whereas Bell (1997) emphasizes the variety and contextual specificity of ritual practices. Collins (2004) similarly theorizes interaction rituals through shared attention and emotional energy. These perspectives help explain why celebrations may be experienced as socially distinctive without implying that all festivals suspend hierarchy or produce the same emotional outcomes.

The Kazakhstan context makes this inquiry pertinent. Nauryz, associated with spring renewal and a New Year in several regional traditions, is recognized in Kazakhstan through public festivities, communal food, games, and ceremonial gatherings (Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2022). Its multinational heritage designation also situates Kazakh celebrations in a wider, shared regional tradition (UNESCO, 2016). The present article uses these documented features to illustrate interpretive possibilities, not to establish national representativeness or the psychological effects of Nauryz participation.

The objective is therefore to build a bounded interpretive synthesis of festivals as aesthetic, symbolic, and psychosocial phenomena. Three questions guide the analysis: Which festival practices reorganize ordinary time and space into recognizable aesthetic forms? How do ritual signs and shared performance render cultural meanings publicly available? Which psychological experiences might plausibly accompany participation, and what evidence would be needed to test them?

## Methods and Materials

### *Study design and materials*

This is a critical integrative conceptual article, not an empirical study or a systematic review. Its primary material is a set of theoretical propositions from aesthetics, ritual studies, cultural semiotics, and the psychology of collective behavior. Sources include foundational published books; peer-reviewed conceptual, qualitative, longitudinal, and meta-analytic research; UNESCO heritage documentation; and a governmental account of Nauryz customs. The source set was assembled for conceptual relevance and complementary perspectives rather than exhaustive retrieval, and no claim is made about systematic coverage.

### *Analytic procedure and inferential rules*

The synthesis followed five transparent steps in the preparation of this manuscript: (1) isolate the article's original aesthetic and ritual claims; (2) distinguish observable festival forms from meanings attributed to them; (3) group claims under spatial-temporal transformation, symbolic communication, collective participation, and psychological appraisals; (4) compare the resulting categories with established ritual theory and available empirical studies; and (5) specify alternative explanations and boundaries for each proposed relation. The approach is interpretive and theory-guided; it does not generate participant-level codes, inter-rater reliability, or tested causal paths.

Three inference levels are kept separate throughout. Descriptive claims concern documented practices or the features of relevant theoretical texts. Interpretive claims identify possible meanings of these practices within an


ijbmc.org
E-ISSN: 2345-5802

explicit framework. Empirical psychological claims—such as an increase in belonging or emotional well-being—require independent participant observations, valid measurements, and appropriate comparison designs. Findings from studies outside Kazakhstan are not treated as outcomes established among Kazakh festivalgoers.

*Kazakh contextual boundary*

Nauryz is used as an illustrative case because public information identifies relevant components such as festive dishes, yurt displays, and communal games (Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2022). No festival event was observed, and the article does not claim that its selected elements exhaust regional, generational, religious, or urban-rural differences. Likewise, UNESCO recognition establishes heritage status but cannot by itself demonstrate psychological benefits (UNESCO, 2016).

## Findings and Results

The result of the analysis is a four-part conceptual classification, not original quantitative or ethnographic findings. Each component distinguishes a publicly describable festival form, a proposed cultural interpretation, and a psychological question requiring empirical testing. The categories are summarized in Table 1.

*Aesthetic reorganization of ordinary time and space*

The first dimension concerns the temporary marking of time, space, and conduct. Decorations, special clothing, ritual meals, music, and processions create discontinuity with routines and place participants in a legible festive setting. Rather than treating the festival simply as an artwork, Huizinga (1955) makes it possible to examine rule-governed play and a demarcated experiential domain. Bell (1997) adds that the selection and sequencing of practices can make otherwise ordinary activities culturally marked. An aesthetic atmosphere is therefore not an inherent property of a site but a situated achievement created through patterned social action.

The original manuscript describes this transformation as "sacralization." Here, sacralization is retained only as an interpretive category: participants or traditions may set certain times and places apart from routine use. It does not mean that all festival participants report transcendent experiences, nor that celebratory settings become sacred in a uniform religious sense. The relevance of the category depends on the ritual, participant position, and prevailing norms (Turner, 1969).

*Symbolic communication and cultural continuity*

Music, dress, food, gesture, and performance can work as signs whose meaning depends on convention and shared histories. A festive dish may index hospitality; an annual return may signify continuity; a procession may position the individual within a wider social body. These readings are plausible cultural interpretations, but no single meaning should be ascribed to all participants. Ritual symbols are actively interpreted, contested, and reworked as circumstances change (Bell, 1997).

Cultural continuity is therefore better treated as a process of enactment than as an automatically successful transfer of a fixed "national code." Family and community settings may mediate how traditions acquire meaning, a point broadly consistent with research on the differentiated role of cultural beliefs in family well-being (Seyed Alitabar, 2023). This reference supplies comparative context for cultural appraisal; it does not provide evidence about Nauryz specifically.

*Collective performance, play, and participation*

The third dimension is performative. Music, coordinated movement, games, and shared meals allow participants to occupy roles that may differ from everyday statuses. Bakhtin (1984) provides a historically situated account of festive laughter and the carnival as a space in which social conventions can be inverted or reframed. Such inversion is neither universal nor invariably emancipatory: access, gender roles, class, commercialization, and official

sponsorship can constrain whose performance is recognized.

Studies of interaction rituals locate potential social effects in shared attention, coordination, symbolic focus, and emotional resonance (Collins, 2004). Because audience members, performers, organizers, and excluded groups can encounter the same event differently, "participation" should not be equated with a single communal experience. The cultural value of a festival can coexist with social inequality or conflict over authenticity.

*Affective experience and belonging as empirical possibilities*

The fourth dimension is psychological and must be specified more cautiously than in a purely philosophical reading. The review by Hobson et al. (2018) distinguishes possible emotion-regulation, goal-related, and social-connection functions of rituals. A meta-analysis of diverse collective gatherings reports associations involving shared emotional activation, social identification, and collective outcomes (Pizarro et al., 2022). These findings make emotional synchrony an appropriate question for future festival research, but their pooled associations do not establish an effect for contemporary Kazakhstan.

Longitudinal work on religious and secular gatherings suggests links between perceived emotional synchrony and self-transcendent emotions (Włodarczyk et al., 2023); research on Diwali similarly addresses ritual time investments, bonding, and affect (Singh et al., 2020). A culturally specific ethnography of the San Yue San Festival links ritual participation with reported belonging and ethnic identification (Li et al., 2026). The cross-context convergence is informative but cannot justify transplanting measured outcomes to Nauryz without comparable instruments, sampling, and locally grounded interpretation.

**Table 1.**

Conceptual categories, indicators, and appropriate inferential limits

| Analytic category | Observable or documentable form | Interpretive question / limit |
|---|---|---|
| Aesthetic marking | Decoration, dress, planned spatial arrangement, music | Does the event feel distinct from routine? Not a measured emotional effect. |
| Symbolic and ritual meaning | Festive food, ceremonial language, recurring gestures | Which local meanings are invoked or contested? Not an invariant national code. |
| Collective performance | Games, dance, processions, shared meals | Who participates, leads, or remains excluded? Communitas cannot be assumed. |
| Psychological appraisal | Would require self-reports, interviews, behavioral observations | Belonging and synchrony are hypotheses, not outcomes measured here. |

*Nauryz as an explicitly bounded contextual illustration*

Public descriptions of Nauryz in Kazakhstan mention yurts, customary food such as nauryz-kozhe, and communal festivities (Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2022). Within the conceptual categories above, these practices can be read as spatial marking, material symbolism, and occasions for public participation. The multinational designation of Nowruz/Nauryz under the UNESCO intangible heritage framework highlights the importance of transmission across communities and borders (UNESCO, 2016). Neither source, however, reports an experimentally established increase in national identity, family attachment, or life satisfaction.

A stronger Kazakhstan-specific research design would compare diverse celebration settings, recruit participants as well as nonparticipants, elicit meanings rather than assume them, and measure immediate and delayed affect with appropriate controls. Cross-generational and regional variation should be examined before any claims about a unified Kazakh aesthetic or psychological experience are made.

## Discussion and Conclusion

*Integrative contribution*

The four dimensions suggest that festivals need not be defined only by public entertainment or by sacred repetition. They combine aesthetic differentiation, culturally



Ijbmc.org
E-ISSN: 2345-5802

interpreted signs, collective performance, and potentially consequential individual appraisals. The framework brings an analytic distinction that was blurred in the earlier manuscript: festival form can be described, its meaning interpreted, and its psychological effects investigated—but these are different levels of claim.

In this view, the role of play discussed by Huizinga (1955) complements ritual theorists rather than competing with them. Aesthetic devices attract attention, ritual framing makes actions recognizable, and participants assign meaning within social relationships (Bell, 1997). Collective emotion research then offers measurable outcomes and potential mediators, rather than a license to equate festive atmosphere with improved mental health (Hobson et al., 2018) (Pizarro et al., 2022).

*Competing accounts and exclusion*

At least three rival interpretations must be entertained. First, people with strong prior community attachment may choose to attend festivals, producing selection rather than festival effects. Second, positive mood may be driven by food, leisure, social contact, or holidays more generally rather than culturally specific symbolism. Third, identity affirmation may coexist with exclusion or pressure to display a preferred version of heritage. Research on extreme ritual behavior demonstrates that ritual participation may have prosocial correlates under specific conditions (Xygalatas et al., 2013); such contexts are not interchangeable with routine public celebrations. Consequently, the notion that festivals necessarily improve psychological functioning should not be adopted as a conclusion of this synthesis.

*Limitations and research priorities*

This article offers a purposive theoretical synthesis and one documentary illustration. It does not contain a fieldwork corpus, qualitative interview data, coded festival observations, or participant psychometrics. Its chosen frameworks reflect selective reading rather than a systematic database search. Nauryz is not representative of the full range of Kazakh festivals, and secondary evidence from other cultural settings cannot be used as a Kazakhstan-specific effect estimate.

Future research could examine (1) participants' own interpretations of culturally important signs; (2) within-event changes in emotion and belonging, measured prospectively; (3) variation by age, language, region, and position within the event; and (4) comparison between festivals and nonfestive gatherings. Ethnographic analysis would benefit from specified sites, sampling, documented coding, reflexivity, and disconfirming cases; quantitative hypotheses would require preregistered measures, baselines, comparison groups, and follow-up. None of these activities are claimed as having been carried out here.

Festivals in Kazakhstan may be understood as cultural performances in which ordinary time and space are reorganized through aesthetic form, ritual symbols, and collective activity. Nauryz offers a documented illustration of these formal possibilities while belonging to a wider shared heritage. The most defensible contribution of the present article is an interpretive differentiation of festival form, cultural meaning, and potential psychological experience. Cultural and psychological consequences should be established through context-sensitive empirical research rather than inferred directly from ritual symbolism.

## Declaration of Interest

The authors of this article declared no conflict of interest.

## Funding

This research was carried out independently with personal funding and without the financial support of any governmental or private institution or organization.

## Authors' Contributions

All authors equally contribute to this study.

## References

Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). *Rabelais and his world*. Indiana University Press. https://books.google.com/books?id=SkswFyhqRIMC

Bell, C. (1997). *Ritual: Perspectives and dimensions*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195110517.001.0001

Collins, R. (2004). *Interaction ritual chains*. Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt13x0rs3

Durkheim, E. (2001). *The elementary forms of religious life* (C. Cosman, Trans.). Oxford University Press. https://books.google.com/books?id=3j5tyWkEZSYC

Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan. (2022). *Traditions and holidays*. https://www.gov.kz/memleket/entities/mfa-budapest/press/article/details/73529?lang=en

Hobson, N. M., Schroeder, J., Risen, J. L., Xygalatas, D., & Inzlicht, M. (2018). The psychology of rituals: An integrative review and process-based framework. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *22*(3), 260–284. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868317734944

Huizinga, J. (1955). *Homo ludens: A study of the play-element in culture*. Beacon Press. https://www.beacon.org/Homo-Ludens-P128.aspx

Li, G., Singyabuth, S., Song, W., Hu, W., & Kong, R. (2026). Embodied ritual participation and ethnic identity in Guangxi's San Yue San Festival: A qualitative ethnographic study. *International Journal of Body, Mind and Culture*, *13*(5), Article e2026-1398. https://doi.org/10.61838/ijbmc.v13i5.1398

Pizarro, J. J., Zumeta, L. N., Bouchat, P., Włodarczyk, A., Rimé, B., Basabe, N., Amutio, A., & Páez, D. (2022). Emotional processes, collective behavior, and social movements: A meta-analytic review of collective effervescence outcomes during collective gatherings and demonstrations. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, Article 974683. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.974683

Seyed Alitabar, S. H. (2023). Cultural beliefs and family well-being: A narrative review. *Journal of Psychosociological Research in Family and Culture*, *1*(2), 25–32. https://doi.org/10.61838/kman.jprfc.1.2.4

Singh, P., Tewari, S., Kesberg, R., Karl, J. A., Bulbulia, J., & Fischer, R. (2020). Time investments in rituals are associated with social bonding, affect and subjective health: A longitudinal study of Diwali in two Indian communities. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *375*(1805), Article 20190430. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2019.0430

Turner, V. W. (1969). *The ritual process: Structure and anti-structure*. Aldine. https://www.routledge.com/The-Ritual-Process-Structure-and-Anti-Structure-1st-Edition/Turner-Abrahams-Harris/p/book/9781315134666

UNESCO. (2016). *Nawrouz, Novruz, Nowrouz, Nauryz, Nooruz, Navruz and related traditions [Intangible cultural heritage inscription]*. https://ich.unesco.org/en/decisions/11.COM/10.B.1

Włodarczyk, A., Zumeta, L., Basabe, N., Rimé, B., & Páez, D. (2023). Religious and secular collective gatherings, perceived emotional synchrony and self-transcendent emotions: Two longitudinal studies. *Current Psychology*, *42*, 4754–4771. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-01826-0

Xygalatas, D., Mitkidis, P., Fischer, R., Reddish, P., Skewes, J., Geertz, A. W., Roepstorff, A., & Bulbulia, J. (2013). Extreme rituals promote prosociality. *Psychological Science*, *24*(8), 1602–1605. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612472910