

The Opinion Leader*

Ejder Ulutaş¹
Muş Alparslan University

Abstract: The study analyzes the communal type by utilizing the technical and intellectual infrastructure that qualitative research proposes, being one of the two main approaches used in the social sciences. It proceeds along the traces of the everyday world and its meanings produced in this world under a wide phenomenological umbrella. In this way, a few different techniques have been seen appropriate for accompanying the research: The snowball and theoretical sampling techniques have been taken advantage of in selecting the sample. The study has additionally been nourished from a theoretical substructure. Discussions on what opinions are in and of themselves, how opinions are produced, who the leaders of opinions and debates on producing or directing opinions are, what roles and boundaries they are assigned, the changing nature and functions of the types of opinion leaders, and their position and visibility in society have been opened around a theoretical evaluation of the initiatives and dilemmas.

Keywords: social type • opinion leader • clans • open and closed communities

* This is an extended abstract of the paper entitled “Kanaat önderi” published in *toplumsal deęişim*.

1 **Correspondence to:** Ejder Ulutaş, Department of Sociology, Muş Alparslan University, Ağrı Turkey.
Email: ejderulutas@gmail.com

To cite this article: Okumuş, E. (2019). Kanaat önderi [The opinion leader]. *toplumsal deęişim*, 1, 25–45.

One aspect of this study is also found turned towards application. This study, which focuses on a specific city (Ağrı), attempts to present a descriptive analytical framework on the how and where of the types of opinion leaders in the city. In order to be able to perform a typological inference about opinion leaders, a good analysis of the regional or territorial history's political and sociocultural formation is required. Who or what these determinative actors are has great important, as much as the references that design everyday life from the rough paths of the relationship between history and society or that turn into chaos. Attempting to see this within the framework of the opportunities that a most basic siphoning approach presents is an important starting point in studying these processes. One of the reasons triggering the choice of universe is the fact that the researcher is also a part of the universe. Additionally regarding the research, references to the extended case method have also been influential in the choice of universe. In researching the universe, which this approach determined using its possibilities, the approach has focused on uniqueness in the universe. Therefore the research's uniqueness contained within its own context gains more importance than its claims of comprehensively representing a group or society that the study has attempted on and around what has been implemented. This approach is one that foresees a theoretical reconstruction where the study processes and contexts are put forth instead of reliability and universality.

Attempting to pull out the rough outlines of a social type makes possible understanding a great deal of the logic of the framework in which this type finds life. The existence of types that wander both in the center and at the edges of the community is important in terms of showing what is respectable and what is excluded in that society. The question of where social types correspond to a state that maintains daily life on one hand and on the other in reproducing at any moment the social relations that reach to the archaic makes capturing the reference points that these relations reference possible.

The most important starting point of subjecting a society or culture to a good studying is the current acceptance of embarking on understanding that community's logic, which constitutes one of the foundations of this study. The traces of one type are put forth that come side by side, reference, or integrate with positive concepts like persuasion, reputation, and legitimacy and sometimes negative concepts like taking revenge and bloodshed. The research takes on the topics of who the influential people, or "Opinion Leaders," are, what sorts of tasks they are charged with in society, on which points of sociality they remark and on which ones they do not appear, where they subside in community life, why society legitimizes these people, and what their opinions are concerning themselves and society.

How does one define an opinion leader? Who is an opinion leader? What are opinion leaders' characteristics and what thing(s) separate them from other people? What gap do these people identified as opinion leaders fill in society? Or to what needs do

they respond? What task or tasks do they have? What are modern opinion makers? Where does Social Media stop at work? What things feed opinion leaders' intellectual substructures? What are the needs and requirements of being an opinion leader? These and similar questions are important in getting an idea about the identity of an opinion leader as a social typology.

The concept of opinion leader, which finds counterparts with compounds like the opinion leader and the effective person, and the typology that brings it into existence has a different meaning in Turkey. Particularly when concerning Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia, attention is seen drawn to these so-called opinion leaders. People whose opinions are consulted regarding social issues in the region and who are informed about what needs to be done are present in almost every province. These people, who are generally religious leaders, become the authorities that state dignitaries accredit in particular and refer to both on the general trend of the country and political matters.

In order to see or understand how important opinions are at the most general level in today's society, referencing both the basic routines of daily life and some of what the communicative world shows is sufficient. As a result of humans' being social entities, the limits of what they do and make are also shaped around what the social world rejects and accepts. Questions such as what we think about someone else or what someone thinks about us are indicative of human sociality. Situations are also reflected where information inseminates or dictates what opinions should not be respected, such as cases where opinions are given prominence while excluding information. Being scientific, which modern knowledge imposes, calls for having a crisis of legitimacy experienced in self-styled opinions through the rhetoric that they belong to an archaic world. Because of this, while doctrines developed in the social sciences fields are perceived as the doctrinal study of a type of thought style, one who realizes the instance of thinking can also be labeled as a "doksozof" [doctrine philosopher] or pedantic. Likewise, inquiries wherein opinions are sometimes made about the legitimacy of scientific knowledge can thrust this type of information into various dilemmas by way of legitimacy (e.g., social conscience). What aspects dissociate and distinguish concepts such as science-knowledge-opinion-wisdom is important on this point. People in whom knowledge or opinion become apparent are the centers where this ambiguity is entangled. People who are consulted and whose opinions are taken on many issues as much as they are on many long-term problems from the routines of everyday life are seen to have a key worth.

While the side of debates on scientific knowledge and opinion facing the social world point out their efforts to understand society by staging this dichotomy, what style of conservation the types (opinion leaders) who personally experience this in society's ongoing course of existence also possess forms another alluring aspect of the debate. This master of opinion, which appears and disappears on specific points of

social relations, more or less also determines people's discourses and actions as well as the framework of social thought. The person or people with reputable opinions, for example in situations where businesses are in deadlock and problems cannot be resolved and whose opinions have been put forth as valuable (correct) knowledge of the problems, enter the circuit and are brought together to resolve the case. The belief that the solution process of these problems will be sped up through the intervention of a third party in situations that are paralyzed with problems and where the will to solve has been exhausted is also closely related to the cultural, religious, political, and economic codes of a society.

Opinion leaders have the position of leaders in the functioning of society, in the realization of everyday routines, and in solving the problems that come up; they go in front of society in normal cultural functions (weddings, funerals, etc.) and make a state of looking after important people in society. These leaders, embodied with specific qualities in the opinions of society and the community and in the world of meaning, are re-legitimized each day in the social imagination through different aspects. This process of legitimization is not one-sided; it indicates a loop where opinion leaders also open new areas of legitimization in society. These mentioned points have been a justification in the research for a longitudinal evaluation of the types of opinion leaders.

The study aims to address the forming, managing, and directing of opinions; the perceptions of opinion leaders; and their identities/types by also taking the past and future into account based on the available literature. It attempts to describe the place of opinion leader types in the course of society's existence by including the changes, interruptions, integrations, and innovations that occur in the social structure and to understand the typology of the opinion leader and society in a framework viewed apart from the rhetoric that is produced by sentimental motivations through the exceptional intellectual restructuring of rejection or glorification. Only in this way can finding the reference points that hold the dynamics of society and social life and exploring their effects become possible.

How does one go about analyzing a type? Or, how does one measure perceptions about the typology of opinion leaders? What is the possibility of revealing the typology of opinion leaders and shaping this typology around a specific analysis? How is the structure of a society that brings the type of opinion leader into existence, or in which social structures are opinion leaders and the practices that embody them felt necessary? These and similar question are located at the heart of the study.

Many valuable studies have been conducted in Turkey on clans and clan leaders. However, a section of the studies have been conducted in the shadow of pejorative thoughts, such as how the political dynamics of Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia manifest where people (!) live who have placed quotas on their decrees, how to swe-

ep up the last crumbs of feudalism, and what are the opportunities for domesticating the genealogy of stressfulness. Large-scale studies focused on structure have prevented seeing the human, an important subject of sociology. This study focuses entirely on the human factor. Thus this study aims to focus on humans, their world, and the things they make and do in their daily relations. Motion is also made for this from the types of opinion leaders.

The research puts emphasis especially on what the general perception and ideas of opinions are and what qualities give this name to opinion leaders. What humans think about the role of opinion leader and how they identify the opinion leader has been queried. The research goes after questions like who can be the opinion leader or is being the opinion leader possible, where does their authority and area of effect start and end, and what determines the content of their limits and applications; it seeks to dwell on which elements are produced/consumed by cultural codes through elements that nurture society's general cultural codes. This study, which attempts to draw forth a typology of the opinion leader with an eye on the ethnographic qualities and topography of the region, earnestly desires to present a new and different perspective to the field.

Kaynakça/References

- Akşit, B., Şentürk, R., Küçükural, Ö. & Cengiz, K. (2012). *Türkiye'de dindarlık sosyal gerilimler ekseninde inanç ve yaşam biçimleri* (2. basım). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Aktay, Y. (2011). *Karizma zamanları*. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları.
- Almog, O. (1998). The problem of social type: A review. *Electronic Journal of Sociology*. Retrieved August 4, 2015 from <https://www.sociology.org/ejs-archives/vol003.004/almog.html>
- Alver, K. (2013). Gelenek: Derin akış. *Bizim Külliye*, 55, 47–48.
- Avcı, Ö. (2012). İki dünya arasında: İstanbul'da dindar üniversite gençliği. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Ayan, Y. E. (2013). *Twitter, dönüşen kamusal alan ve kanaat oluşumu* (Yüksek lisans tezi, Kadir Has Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul). <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/> adresinden edinilmiştir.
- Aydemir, M. A. (2014). Sosyal alanın tipeştirilmesi: Toplumsal tipler. *Sosyoloji Divanı*, 3, 9–12.
- Baker, U. (2012a). *Beyin ekran* (2. basım, E. Berensel, Ed.). İstanbul: Birikim Yayınları.
- Baker, U. (2012b). *Kanaatlerden İmajlara* (2. basım, H. Abuşoęlu, çev.). İstanbul: Birikim Yayınları.
- Bakırıcı, M. (2014). Doęu Karadenizde bir köy imamı: Balcı Hoca (Hasan Balcıoęlu). *Journal of International Social Research*, 7(32), 355–371.
- Berger, P. L. & Luckmann, T. (2008). *Gerçeklięin sosyal inşası* (V. S. Öęütle, çev.). İstanbul: Paradigma Yayınları.
- Bourdieu, P. (2014). *Seçilmiş metinler* (2. basım, L. Ünsaldı, çev.). Ankara: Heretik Yayınları.
- Çebi, M. S. (2012). Yeniliklerin yayılmasında sosyal taklidin ve kanaat önderlerinin işlevsel önemi: Gabriel Tarde'nin sosyal taklit teorisi açısından bir inceleme. *İletişim Kuram ve Araştırma Dergisi*, 34, 1–18.
- Çiftlikçi, R. (2000). Türk romanında tip ve karakter problemi. *Yedi İklim*, 123, 42–52.

- Fındıkçı, İ. (2009). *Hizmetkar liderlik* (2. basım). İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları.
- Geertz, C. (2007). *Yerel bilgi* (K. Emiroğlu, çev.). Ankara: Dost Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Kılıç, A. F. (2007). Din sosyolojisinde dini grup tipolojileri. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 5(13), 37–58.
- Klapp, O. E. (1958). Social types: Process and structure. *American Sociological Review*, 23(6), 674–678.
- Klapp, O. E. (1964). *Symbolic leaders*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Co.
- Ortatepe, E. (2014). *Terörle mücadelede sivil toplumun rolü: Doğu ve Güneydoğu Anadolu bölgelerinde kanaat önderleri* (Doktora tezi, Polis Akademisi Güvenlik Bilimleri Akademisi, Ankara). <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/> adresinden edinilmiştir.
- Özensel, E. (2015). Sosyal medyanın Mısır devrimindeki rolü. *Sosyoloji Divanı*, 5, 69–86.
- Roberts, S. (2010). *Düzen ve kargaşa: Hukuk antropolojisine giriş* (A. E. Koca, çev.). Ankara: Birleşik Yayınları.
- Sartori, G. (2004). *Görmenin iktidarı*. İstanbul: Kara Kutu Yayınları.
- Snow, D. A., & Machalek, R. (1983). The convert as a social type. *Sociological Theory*, 1, 259–289.
- Stycos, J. M. (1965). The potential role of Turkish village opinion leaders in a program of family planning. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 29(1), 120–130.
- Türk, H. B. (2012). AKP ve kanaat teknisyenleri. *Birikim*, 276, 29–37.
- Weimann, G. (1994). *The influentials: People who influence people*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.