

**REPORTS OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES  
OF THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN**

ISSN 2224-5227

<https://doi.org/10.32014/2019.2518-1483.128>

Volume 4, Number 326 (2019), 136 – 143

UDC 332.6

**A.Sansyzbayev, Zh. Kenzhalina, Zh. Malgaraeva**

Narxoz University Almaty, Kazakhstan

[almas.sansyzbayev@narxoz.kz](mailto:almas.sansyzbayev@narxoz.kz); [zhanna.kenzhalina@narxoz.kz](mailto:zhanna.kenzhalina@narxoz.kz); [zhanat.malgaraeva@narxoz.kz](mailto:zhanat.malgaraeva@narxoz.kz)

**THE ROLE OF THE INTERSUBJECTIVE  
SOCIAL PARTNERSHIP IN THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN**

**Abstract.** Nowadays, approaches in the theory of social partnership and social responsibility of business are developing intensively. This is due to the ongoing processes in the country. Today, the second stage of social modernization is being implemented. Therefore, this article timely examines approaches to the problem of intersubject social partnership.

Since at present social management still poorly takes into account the resources of local communities, and above all the human, social and cultural potential, for the disclosure of these potentials, the priority is to transform the local community from an object of social policy into its subject.

This implies the involvement of its active members in the formation of partner interaction systems and thereby reinforces the intersubjective significance of social partnership, which is still interpreted primarily as intersectoral. Thus, in modern conditions, the sociological analysis of social partnership should be directed not to the study of the sectors, but to the subjects of this interaction.

The purpose of the article is to conduct a theoretical analysis of approaches to the formation of intersubjective social partnership, which allows to improve the foundations of local governance.

**Keywords.** Intersubjective social partnership, social business responsibility, collective bargaining agreement, industry agreement, labor code.

**Introduction**

Foreign science began to study the problem of intersectoral social partnership only in the 1980s, when “in place of the old traditional tripartism, where the interests of society were exclusively represented by trade unions, arised a new tripartism, or new social partnership, where the public interests are no longer just as many trade unions as organizations and structures of civil society. ”

Taking into account the relatively short time period of the scientific study of the problems of social partnership, nowadays there is an existence of quite diverse methodological grounds for studying this phenomenon and its interpretations, as well as about different formulations of the definition itself.

The subject of the study was the direction of development of intersubjective social partnership.

**Main Body**

The problem of social partnership is relatively recently raised in both domestic and foreign economic science. For example, according to the well-founded conclusion of one of the pioneers, and now one of the most recognized Russian authorities of scientific research of intersectoral social partnership, Professor V.N. Yakimtsov, who devoted his doctoral thesis to this problem, was a work in which for the first time in Russian science the main elements of the concept of intersectoral social partnership in Russia were identified and the important problem of interaction between government, business and non-profit organizations was raised a collection of articles by a group of researchers published in 1996. Up to this point, i.e. from the beginning of the 1990s, when in Kazakhstan the study of social partnership became possible, this phenomenon was interpreted only from the traditional positions of tripartism, i.e. relations between the state, employers and workers, including those represented by trade unions.

For example, Ekaterinburg researcher N.V. Sobchuk believes that there are many terms in scientific works that are related to the term of intersectoral social partnership. In particular, these are “multilateral dialogue”, “multilateral processes”, “multilateral governance”, “global public policy networks”, “partnerships of three sectors”, “multi-sector partnerships”, “new social partnerships”, “public-private partnerships” and many others, and thus different terms are often used simultaneously [1].

The analysis of research undertaken by us reveals that, along with the above-mentioned nominations, the most frequently used are:

- “local-territorial social partnership” (S.A. Alekseev), “intersectional interaction” (A.S. Avtonomov, E.M. Osipov, E.N. Sidorova),
- “newsocialpartnership”,
- “competitive corporatism” (S.P. Peregodov),
- “state-public social partnership” (L.A. Ivanov), - “private-state partnership”(I.M. Borodachev),
- “social dialogue and social responsibility” (MP Sitkov) [2].
- In foreign science, as acknowledged by A.I. Plotnikov, adopted an excellent terminology base.
- So, social partnership is called:
- cross-sector partnership (cross-sector partnership),
- multi-sector partnership (multi-stakeholder partnership) (M. Jorgensen, J. Selski and B. Parker, R. Andrews and T. Entwessel).

In addition, one of the approaches to the analysis of the concept of social partnership in the western scientific tradition is its correlation with the popular term “public policy” (T. Birkland), which came from political and managerial theory and practice [3].

The reasons for the considered terminological difference, having a diverse and multi-level character, are caused, in our opinion, not only by the fact that the definition of the basic concepts of the phenomenon under study has not yet entered naturally into the “established” state and generally accepted interpretations for the theory and practice. The case, most likely, consists in the fact that in this case the factors of a theoretical-methodological or gnoseological nature prevail.

It is necessary to fully agree with the argumentation of the famous expert A.N. Mikheev, who convincingly proves that:

first, the types of intersectoral partnership differ from each other by goals, scope, complexity, level of activity (from local to global), size and diversity of partners;

secondly, they relate to a variety of problems that require the attention of interested target groups, not only related to the area of sustainable and balanced development of the territory;

thirdly, intersectoral partnership of various forms is included in the process of determining the perspective tasks of the development of territories and implementing the decisions taken, it can exist at the local, national and global levels, or at several levels simultaneously;

fourthly, the duration of the functioning of intersectoral partnerships is also different (from single events to processes that take place over several years);

fifth, various intersectoral partnership options may cover a different number of stakeholders and, based on this, vary in the degree of diversity, with an increase in diversity, on the one hand, opens up new opportunities, and on the other, is fraught with new challenges.

That is why, in our opinion, the summarizing conclusion of A.I. Plotnikov that “the study of the accumulated scientific reserve in the analyzed subject area indicates a significant variety of interpretations of the concept of “intersectoral social partnership”, caused both by the difference in disciplinary approaches from the standpoint of which it is considered and by the depth of scientific analysis of the phenomenon itself. At the same time, the authors single out various spheres of the social partnership and its essential characteristics. This indicates that the phenomenon under consideration has a complex nature, is multifunctional, polysubject, manifested in various spheres of social life”[3].

Based on the above, it becomes necessary to conduct a historical and scientific analysis of the main stages and leading scientific directions, as well as more “narrow” specialized approaches in defining the concept of “social partnership”, which creates theoretical prerequisites for identifying the functional characteristics of the phenomenon under study.

Despite the fact that the history of the study of social partnership in the CIS countries has more than fifteen years, in published publications and, especially, in separate articles, original systematization in the study of this phenomenon is already proposed.

One of the most detailed and reasoned classifications of the scientific study of social partnership was proposed in the fundamental work of S.A. Ivanov. This author not only singled out various approaches to the phenomenon under study for various reasons, describing each of the directions thus formed in detail, but also summed up the general results of systematization of the main interpretations of the social partnership category, identifying promising directions in this sense. So, S.A. Ivanov highlighted the definition of social partnership:

- a) by disciplinary affiliation;
- b) in terms of scope, coverage, coverage area;
- c) to assess the conditions and prerequisites for objectification;
- d) by subject, object and subject characteristics.

The author considers it necessary to single out philosophical, sociological, economic, political and other interpretations of social partnership.

The philosophical approach, in his opinion, interprets social partnership from the position of combining state and public principles in the categories of "solidarity", "progress", "social relations", "objective needs". As an example, the following definition is given: social partnership is "a specific type of relationship between social communities, groups, classes, and strata. This is the process of forming a common sociocultural space in which various actors function, being agreeable, not paying attention to the difference of interests, to follow the general "partnership rules, rules of the game".

**Sociological approach** comes down to the consideration of primarily socio-structural components, sociocultural functional features of the phenomenon under study. S.A. Ivanov, for example, gives a definition given in a special textbook by V.A. Mikheev: "social partnership is a system of relations of its main subjects, institutions regarding the status, conditions, content and forms of activity of various social and professional groups, communities, and strata". According to S.A. Ivanov, the researchers, who analyze the political aspects of the development of society, the processes of spreading democratic values, see in the social partnership a political institution, pointing to its greater role in maintaining the political stability of society, in reaching agreement among various social communities on political interests.

This context implies that social partnership:

- a) or is interpreted as an institution that provides for the "granting" to various target groups of appropriate rights to participate in the processes of developing and adopting decisions on topical issues of territorial development;
- b) either its indissoluble connection is declared, the internal interdependence of its functioning with political processes and political institutions [4].

The second basis for the systematization of interpretations of social partnership, as the above author believes, is its sphere, scope, and coverage area. It proceeds from the fact that in the scientific literature two superpositions are formed in this connection, opposing each other. First, it is a social partnership, understood as interaction within the whole society, a way of interaction of all its individuals and social communities.

In this sense, social partnership is considered as a condition for the sustainable development of society. With this approach, the field of partnerships is the entire social space.

Secondly, it is an interpretation implying a limitation of the range of subjects of social partnership.

In this context, there are two basic models of social partnership - the so-called trade unionism and intersectoral. At the same time, the trade union model means the system of "tripartism" that has developed in the social and labor sphere, i.e. relations between employers, employees and the state, and the intersectoral model means the interaction of three sectors of society: government, business and non-profit organizations.

The third significant basis for systematizing the definitions of social partnership, according to S.A. Ivanova, serves as the subject, objective and objective characteristics of this phenomenon. On this basis in scientific works there are two main research positions. The first group of authors believes that homogeneous social groups can be subjects of social partnership. At the same time, the subjects of social partnership are not individual individuals, but community of people. For their part, individuals belonging

to these communities recognize their social identity, which determines their unity within this group and distinguishes them from other similar groups of individuals. In most cases, this social identity is reinforced by the value unity, common needs and interests.

The second approach is that as partners, not the social strata or groups themselves are considered, but the institutions that represent the interests of these groups, i.e. institutions of power, civil society and others.

Despite the fact that, as noted above, the majority of dissertations defended in recent years have relevant sections, including attempts to systematize approaches to the analysis of intersubjective social partnership, and also, despite the involvement in this process of well-known scientific authorities in this field adequate models of scientific research of this phenomenon remains relevant for several reasons.

For the first time in Russia, in the another collective theoretical work of V.N. Yakimets, along with other authors, were directly involved in the activities of non-profit organizations, presented the results of a theoretical analysis of the third sector of the country, outlined the periods of formation and development of this sector, formulated and characterized four concepts: service, community of self-development groups, civil society building, social actions, led the empirical classification of the organization of the third sector, studied in detail the role of the third sector in the formation of human resources, organizational development, promoting the interests of society.

Finally, in another of his extensive publications V.N. Yakimets first leads author detailed definition, actively used subsequently. By social partnership, he means "constructive interaction of organizations from two or three sectors (government, business, nonprofit sector) in solving social problems, providing a synergistic effect from the "addition" of different resources and "beneficial" to each of the parties and the population.

As the author notes, the meaning of social partnership concludes in providing the constructive interactions between three forces that operate in the social space of a country, region, municipality, or other territory - government agencies, commercial enterprises and commercial organizations in transforming the social environment [5].

M.I. Liborakina and V.N. Yakimets in 1998, offered an original interpretation of intersectional social partnership B.S. Model and I.M. Model, arguing that the mechanism of partnership interaction between civil society and the state is a "new paradigm" and remains as a phenomenon still poorly studied in Russian sociology and political science, is a type of social interaction between various institutions of government, business and civil society, which allows them to defend their interests, selecting civilized ways of their harmonious realization as they move towards a common goal. The well-known Russian sociologist, one of the "patriarchs" of the Saratov sociological school A.I. Sukharev, who believes that the space of social partnership is "a joint activity of social actors to achieve their, but mutually overlapping interests, inevitably expanding all areas of social relations - economic, political, social, cultural, ethnic, etc."

Filenko, who determined that "social partnership acts as a process of interaction, as a catalyst for cooperation and mutual agreement more in the social sphere than in the sphere of social and labor relations, in which there are more grounds for conflict situations because it is here that the redistribution of economic resources of society" [6]. The action model received further logical development in the definition proposed by E.P. Chernobrovkina, which is based on the fact that "intersectoral social partnership is a constructive mutually beneficial interaction of state institutions and civil society, in which each of the parties is interested". It is not by chance that the institutionalization of social partnership is seen as "the process of discovering, fixing and formalizing the system of norms, rules, statuses, roles and procedures that arise when using increasingly complex social partnership mechanisms, when solving socially important tasks by representatives of non-profit organizations and authorities". The positively creative nature of the action model of social partnership is emphasized by E.N. Sidorova, who suggested that the intersectional interaction from the position of sociology is the sum of the relations between the authorities, business and public groups in the realization of their interests in the space of society. Conflict, which is understood in a functional way, serves as a condition for harmonizing relations, understanding intersectional interaction as an acute interaction of social subjects, to a certain extent independent and implementing independent interests and goals, aimed at meeting the needs that are due to the specifics of their life activities in society.



While an intersectoral social partnership must be understood as a constructive interaction of government institutions, entrepreneurs and public groups.

It is the behavioral approach that was recorded in the Labor Code, where social partnership is defined as “a system of relationships between employees (employee representatives), employers (employers representatives), government bodies, local governments, aimed at ensuring coordination of the interests of employees and employers on labor relations and other relations directly connected with them” [8]. This Labor Code limits the number of subjects whose interests are subject to coordination through social partnership, employers and employees. The authorities in this case are only intermediaries, guarantors of the implementation of the agreements reached.

By the way, in contrast to the legislative definition, fixed in the Labor Code, within the framework of the above-considered approach, V.A. Mikheev's authorities act not only as an intermediary between employers and employees, but also as independent carriers of interests in the system of interaction that are not limited to the interests of both workers and employers. So, in the definition of V.A. Mikheev emphasizes the whole range of issues of social development, not limited to the framework of social and labor sphere [7].

Table 1– The main approaches to the characterization of subjects of intersubjective social partnership

Authors	Highlighted by the subjects of the partnership
Yakimets V.N.	Power structures, commercial firms and enterprises, non-profit organizations
Lovkova L.L.	Local government institutions, business and public organizations
Chernobrovkina Ye.P.	Institutions peculiar to the state and civil society
Louhov N.V.	State authorities and associations of the non-profit sector
Alekseev S.A.	Municipalities, given that intersubjective social partnership has a local character
Filenko V.I.	Government institutions and local governments
Akramovskaya A.G.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the first sector, including government bodies;</li> <li>• the second sector, which consists of corporate charitable foundations, business associations, companies and enterprises directly, etc. ;</li> <li>• the third sector, which includes design, representative, service, supervisory, expert and infrastructure organizations.</li> </ul>
Borodina A.V.	State power, entrepreneurs and youth organizations, including youth commissions and councils in the composition of trade unions, youth policy bodies
Arcer T.V. [9]	In the narrow sense - social partnership in the sphere of social and labor relations. In a broad sense - intersectoral interaction of the business sector, government and non-governmental non-profit organizations, which constitutes complementary unity
Ivanova L.A.	Social technology of the end-to-end application of a program-target nature, which allows to realize promising tasks of ensuring cooperation between large social groups formed on the basis of economic interests, as well as the tasks of joint action of movements, parties, associations

Researcher A.A. Lovkova among the principles of intersectoral social partnership at the municipal level highlights the following [9]:

1. the principle of the development of network communications, the establishment of trust and social responsibility between the participants of the partnership;
2. the principle of constantly increasing the productivity of the system by increasing the level of professionalism of the participants;
3. the principle of matching the interests of the interacting parties with the social environment of the local community;
4. the principle of testing and applying a variety of partnership mechanisms, as well as approaches, technologies, procedures, methods and techniques of interaction;
5. the principle of synergy of resources;
6. the principle of complementarity and interdependence of factors

Let's consider a conceptual model of intersubjective social partnership at the level of local self-government (developed by the author)

The goal of such a partnership could be the harmonious development of local society and society as a whole.

Highlight the tasks of this tandem:

*economic*- attracting domestic and foreign investment, support and development of small and medium businesses, consolidation of financial resources;

*social*- improving the quality of life overcoming the problems of vulnerable groups of the population, youth, medical care, affordable education and housing, cultural spheres;

*political*- the formation of a dialogue relationship between the community, business and government, strengthening the institution of local government as the basis of modern civil society.

Table 2– Elements of intersubjective social partnership

Levels	Types	Priorities
state	Social programs State support for vulnerable groups of the population, State social order, Social incentives for sponsors, Stimulating social activity with direct funding	Social modernization of society
interregional		Social problems solving
regional		Proportional development of regions
local government level		Urban Development Program
entrepreneurship level		Support for small and medium businesses
social group level		Providing and supporting different social groups, pensioners, youth, gender policy
personality level		Availability of medical care, education, housing

#### *Conclusion, research results, practical suggestions and recommendations*

It is important to emphasize that the model proposed by us is based on the neoclassical paradigm of social partnership, subject relations at the regional level. However, in order for the local community to become a subject of activity, a modern methodological substantiation of this phenomenon is necessary. If the non-classical paradigm of social partnership sheds light on the theory of the question, then the corresponding methodology is designed to answer questions of synthesis, dynamics, managerial, labor and social relations that objectively develop and develop at the local level.

- So, during the study, the following conclusions can be determined:
- the feasibility of using the category of intersubject social partnership in the framework of the paradigm of post-non-classical rationality to substantively increase the effectiveness of local governance was theoretically justified;
- the elements of the intersubject social partnership model in the system of local self-government are substantiated;
- identified the stages of the development of inter-entity social partnership in the Republic of Kazakhstan, the level of readiness of various subjects of the local community for partnership interaction.

**А. Сансызбаев, Ж. Кенжалина, Ж. Малғараева**

Нархоз Университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан Республикасы

#### **ҚАЗАҚСТАН РЕСПУБЛИКАСЫНДАҒЫ СУБЪЕКТИВАРАЛЫҚ ӘЛЕУМЕТТІК ӘРІПТЕСТІКТІҢ РӨЛІ**

**Аннотация.** Қазіргі уақытта әлеуметтік әріптестік теориясымен бизнестің әлеуметтік жауапкершілігі қарқынды дамып келеді. Бұл елде болып жатқан процестерге байланысты. Бүгінде әлеуметтік жаңғыртудың екінші кезеңі жүзеге асырылуда. Сондықтан бұл мақалада пәнаралық әлеуметтік әріптестік мәселесіне көзқарастар дер кезінде қарастырылады.

Қазіргі уақытта әлеуметтік басқару жергілікті қоғамдастықтардың ресурстарын, ең алдымен адами, әлеуметтік және мәдени әлеуетті әліде нашар ескеретіндіктен, осы әлеуетті ашу үшін жергілікті қоғамдастықты әлеуметтік саясат объектісінен оның мәніне айналдыру басым болып табылады. Бұл оның белсенді мүшелерінің өзара іс-қимылдың серіктестік жүйелерін қалыптастыруға қатысуын білдіреді және сол арқылы әлеуметтік әріптестіктің субъектив аралық маңызын күшейтеді, ол әлі күнге дейін негізінен сектор аралық

ретінде түсіндіріледі. Осылайша, қазіргі жағдайда әлеуметтік әріптестікті социологиялық талдау салаларды зерттеуге емес, осы өзара іс-қимылдың субъектілеріне бағытталуы тиіс.

Мақаланың мақсаты – жергілікті басқару негіздерін жақсартуға мүмкіндік беретін объективаралық әлеуметтік әріптестікті қалыптастыру тәсілдеріне теориялық талдау жүргізу болыпта былады.

**Түйін сөздер.** субъективаралық әлеуметтік әріптестік, бизнестің әлеуметтік жауапкершілігі, Ұжымдық шарт, салалық шарт, Еңбек кодексі

**А.Сансызбаев, Ж. Кенжаліна, Ж. Малғараева**

Университет Нархоз, Алматы, РеспубликаКазахстан

## **РОЛЬ МЕЖСУБЪЕКТИВНОГО СОЦИАЛЬНОГО ПАРТНЕРСТВА В РЕСПУБЛИКЕ КАЗАХСТАН**

**Аннотация.** В наше время подходы в теории социального партнерства и социальной ответственности бизнеса интенсивно развиваются. Это связано с происходящими в стране процессами. Сегодня реализуется второй этап социальной модернизации. Поэтому в данной статье своевременно рассматриваются подходы к проблеме межпредметного социального партнерства.

Поскольку в настоящее время социальное управление все еще слабо учитывает ресурсы местных сообществ и, прежде всего, человеческий, социальный и культурный потенциал, для раскрытия этих потенциалов приоритетным является превращение местного сообщества из объекта социальной политики в его предмет. Это подразумевает участие его активных членов в формировании партнерских систем взаимодействия и тем самым усиливает межсубъективное значение социального партнерства, которое до сих пор интерпретируется преимущественно как межсекторальное. Таким образом, в современных условиях социологический анализ социального партнерства должен быть направлен не на изучение отраслей, а на субъектов этого взаимодействия.

Целью статьи является проведение теоретического анализа подходов к формированию межсубъективного социального партнерства, что позволяет улучшить основы местного управления.

**Ключевые слова.** Межсубъектное социальное партнерство, социальная ответственность бизнеса, коллективный договор, отраслевой договор, трудовой кодекс.

### **Information about authors:**

Sansyzbayev A. - PhD student, NarxozUniversity email : [almas.sansyzbayev@narxoz.kz](mailto:almas.sansyzbayev@narxoz.kz)<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6464-2710>;

Kenzhalina Zh. - Candidate of Economics, Associate Professor, Narxoz University email: [zhanna.kenzhalina@narxoz.z](mailto:zhanna.kenzhalina@narxoz.z), <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5057-1571>;

Malgaraeva Zh. - Candidate of Economics, Associate Professor, Narxoz University email : [zhanat.malgaraeva@narxoz.kz](mailto:zhanat.malgaraeva@narxoz.kz)<sup>3</sup> <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4783-5438>

### **REFERENCES**

- [1] Sobchuk N.V. Osnovnye podhody k interpretacii ponyatiya mezhsektornogo social'nogo partnerstva v sovremennom mire// Nauchnyj vestnik UrAGS. 2008. №4- S.38-42.
- [2] Peregudov S.P. Tripartizmilinovie social'noe partnerstvo // Rossijskaya model' social'nogo partnerstva: perspektivy razvitiya. Materialy mezhtsektornoj NPK. M., 2007. S 126-127.
- [3] Plotnikov A.I. Mezhsektornoe partnerstvo kak social'naya innovaciya dlya municipal'noj vlasti Rossii // Sovremennye nauchnye issledovaniya i innovacii. 2011. №5.
- [4] Ivanov S.A. Social'noepartnerstvokakfenomencivilizacii. URL [www.jourssa.ru/2005](http://www.jourssa.ru/2005)
- [5] V.N. YAkimec Social'noe partnerstvo. Zametki o formirovanii grazhdanskogo obshchestva v Rossii. M.: SHkolakul'turnoj politiki, 2006. S.46.
- [6] Filenko V.I. Social'noe partnerstvo kak vzaimodejstvie organov vlasti i mestnogo samoupravleniya. M., 2000. S.15.
- [7] Miheev V.A. Osnovysocial'nogopartnerstva: teoriya i praktika: Uchebnikdlyavuzov/ RAGS priPrezidente RF. M., 2015. S.23.
- [8] Amirbekuly Ye., Manuel Fernandez Grela, Tazabekova A. Entrepreneurship as a driver of competitiveness of the city of Almaty /Reports of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan., №5, 2018, <https://doi.org/10.32014/2018.2518-1483.6>
- [9] Arcer T.V. Gosudarstvo, biznes i nekommercheskieorganizacii. Tomsk, 2009. S.33-36.
- [10] Lovkova A.A. Vzaimodejstvie organov mestnogo upravleniya, obshchestvennyhorganizacij i biznesakak forma social'nogopartnerstva. Diss. k.s.n. Saratov, 2009. S.9-12.
- [11] Kassymova G.K., Tokar O.V., Tashcheva A.I., Slepukhina G.V., Gridneva S.V., Bazhenova N. G., Shpakovskaya E.Yu., Arpentieva M. R. Impact of stress on creative human resources and psychological counseling in crises. International journal of education and information technologies. Volume 13, 2019. Pp.: 26-32.



- [12] Stepanova G. A., Tashcheva A. I., Stepanova O. P., Menshikov P. V., Kassymova G. K., Arpentieva M. R., Tokar O. V. The problem of management and implementation of innovative models of network interaction in inclusive education of persons with disabilities. *International journal of education and information technologies*. ISSN 2074-1316. Volume 12, 2018. P. 156-162.
- [13] Kassymova G. K., Stepanova G. A., Stepanova O. P., Menshikov P. V., Arpentieva M. R., Merezchnikov A. P., Kunakovskaya L. A. Self-development management in educational globalization. *International journal of education and information technologies*. ISSN 2074-1316. Volume 12, 2018. P. 171-176.
- [14] Stepanova O. P., Gridneva S. V., Menshikov P. V., Kassymova G. K., Tokar O. V., Merezchnikov A. P., Arpentieva M. R. Value-motivational sphere and prospects of the deviant behavior. *International journal of education and information technologies*. ISSN 2074-1316. Volume 12, 2018. P. 142-148.
- [15] Kassymova G. K., Tyumaseva Z. I., Valeeva G. V., Lavrinenko S. V., Arpentieva M. R., Kenzhaliyev B. K., Kosherbayeva A. N., Kosov A. V., Duvalina O. N., Dossayeva S. K. Integrative model of student and teacher stress coping: the correction of relations in educational, professional and personal interaction. *Bulletin of National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan*. ISSN 1991-3494. Volume 3, Number 379 (2019), p. 169-179. <https://doi.org/10.32014/2019.2518-1467.83>
- [16] Kassymova G. K., Kosherbayeva A. N., Sangilbayev O. S., Schachl H., Cox, N. (2018). Stress management techniques for students. *Proceedings of the International Conference on the Theory and Practice of Personality Formation in Modern Society (ICTPPFMS 2018)*. <https://doi.org/10.2991/ictppfms-18.2018.10>
- [17] Arpentieva M. R., Kassymova G. K., Lavrinenko S. V., Tyumaseva Z. I., Valeeva G. V., Kenzhaliyev O. B., Triyono M. B., Duvalina O. N., Kosov A. V., Dossayeva S. K. Environmental education in the system of global and additional education. *Bulletin of National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan*. ISSN 1991-3494. Volume 3, Number 379 (2019), p. 158 – 168. <https://doi.org/10.32014/2019.2518-1467.82>
- [18] Nailya K. Nurlanova, Anel A. Kireyeva, Rashid M. Ruzanov / *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business* Vol 4 No2 (2017) 37-44 37 Print ISSN: 2288-4637 / Online ISSN 2288-4645 Evaluation of Economic Potential and Level of Concentration of the Regions of Kazakhstan Received: March 8, 2017. Revised: April 25, 2017. Accepted: May 2, 2017. doi:10.13106/jafeb.2017.vol4.no2.37
- [19] Sagiyeva R., Zhuparova A., Ruzanov R., Doszhan R., Askerov A. 2018. Intellectual input of development by knowledge-based economy: problems of measuring in countries with developing markets, *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues* 6(2): 711-728. [https://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2018.6.2\(17\)](https://doi.org/10.9770/jesi.2018.6.2(17))
- [20] Azatbek T., Panzabekova A., Bekenova L., Yegizbyeve Zh. The share of drug trafficking in Kazakhstan's GDP: methods for evaluation / *Economic Annals-XXI* (2017), 166(7-8), C. 31-36(Scopus). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21003/ea.V166-06>
- [21] Khalitova M. M., Praliev G. S., Panzabekova A. Z., Andreeva Z. M., Dzhubaliyeva Z. A. Financial instruments of state regulation industrial and innovative development of Kazakhstan economy. *Life Sci J* 2014;11(10s):369-378. (ISSN:1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com.70>