

NEWS

OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OF THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN
SERIES OF SOCIAL AND HUMAN SCIENCES

ISSN 2224-5294

<https://doi.org/10.32014/2020.2224-5294.99>

Volume 4, Number 332 (2020), 29 – 36

UDC 323:353

IRSTI 06.73

A.E. Kokenova¹, G.I. Adbikerimova²,
S.Kuashbayev³, M.A. Kanabekova⁴, M.S. Madi⁵

¹ International humanitarian and technical University, Shymkent, Kazakhstan;

² Miras University, Shymkent, Kazakhstan;

³ Shymkent University, Shymkent, Kazakhstan;

⁴ Abai Kazakh national pedagogical university, Almaty, Kazakhstan;

⁵ M.Auezov South Kazakhstan State University.

E-mail: abdikerimova71@mail.ru

INTEGRATION OF KAZAKHSTAN'S AGRO-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF ECONOMIC PROCESSES GLOBALIZATION

Abstract. The material conditions of production underlying the formation and development of a single economic complex dictate both the opportunity and the need to improve methods of regulation and management of the economy in accordance with changing conditions and factors of production. They require a reorientation of enterprises, industrial associations and intermediate performance in the final results. Agro-industrial complex (AIC), as well as other cross-sectoral national economy, should effectively fulfill its operational requirements.

The paper examines the impact of economic integration on the national economy, including agro-industrial complex of the country. The positive and negative effects of integration. The dynamics of economic indicators of Agriculture of Kazakhstan, Russia and Belarus. Refined performance, reflecting the competitiveness of agriculture. The authors believe that the assessment of the competitiveness of the agro-industrial complex should be no absolute and relative performance: productivity of crops, livestock and poultry, the index of net exports, profitability, degree of depreciation of fixed assets, the amount of per capita output. On the basis of the analysis the authors concluded that each partner country for the EAEC has its comparative advantages to be taken into account in the formation of a common food market in the framework.

The agricultural sector of the economy in market conditions occupies a special position that does not allow participating fully and on equal terms in global competition without state intervention. It is difficult to expect stabilization of the agricultural sector only because of its market self-organization. First, in this sector, unlike sectors in other functional complexes, a very low elasticity between price changes and the demand for food products, as well as between the dynamics of prices and range of goods. Secondly, the lack of balanced approaches and a mechanism for coordinating interaction between the sectors of the agricultural economy of Russia and Kazakhstan hinders trade in food and agricultural raw materials, production and scientific and technical cooperation, and annually reduces the food security of countries. With the current model of state participation in the development of agriculture, the role of States and their authorized bodies remains uncertain, not only in ensuring interstate integration, determining measures of national and supranational regulation, but also in matters of sufficiency and structure of domestic support for agriculture in the integrating countries themselves. The way out can be found in the direction of forming an effective system of state regulation of the agricultural sector in Russia and Kazakhstan, focused on using the economic advantages of integration and stimulating the dynamic development of the agro-industrial complex of the integrating countries.

Key words: agriculture, strategy, development, productivity, economy, efficiency.

Introduction. In the new conditions, the main issue of further development of the Kazakh economy is the interregional division of labor within the EEU and the implementation of a unified foreign economic policy towards third countries. A fundamental point in this context is to give domestic and foreign businesses the freedom to choose the best conditions for financial and production activities.

Thus, the most important function of the Government is to conduct an economic policy that stimulates business and investment activity aimed at creating and expanding existing manufacturing facilities on the territory of Kazakhstan. This should also be facilitated by the implementation of the second five-year program of industrial and innovative development, taking into account the experience of previous years.

Kazakhstan should become a center of attraction for foreign capital and new technologies in the EEU, which will create new jobs and increase labor productivity, thereby ensuring further improvement of the population's welfare. The new export potential of the country should be directed, first of all, to the EEU countries, and in the future-to foreign markets within the WTO.

The EEU is a challenge for domestic businesses to improve their efficiency, which allows them to strengthen themselves in fair competition in the common economic space. And there is no alternative to economic integration, because only in a competitive environment can we ensure stable economic growth.

Methods. Methodological research is General scientific methods of cognition-analysis and synthesis, analysis and synthesis, Content-Media analysis, sociography, system and comparative-historical methods, allowing determining the Genesis, sequence and functioning of the stage of digitization and indicators of investment attractiveness and efficiency of the agricultural sector.

Research and development work in the field of marketing in the agricultural sector of the economy.

Mainpart. Today, the expert community of the three countries has no significant arguments against the fact that the creation of the Eurasian economic Union has no alternative both in terms of regional economic security and the overall prospects for the growth and prosperity of the post-Soviet countries within the single market. Nevertheless, along with the positive perception of integration processes by the majority of the population of our countries, there are many judgments in a polarized society, the essence of which is that integration satisfies the geopolitical ambitions of only one country.

However, this view of the natural processes of development is subjective, if we consider that even in nature itself, whether it is the cosmos or the microcosm, there is no other principle of consolidation, as the grouping of matter around celestial bodies and microparticles with the highest mass and gravity. But mass is the energy that is spent, including on ensuring the balanced development of the entire system. Therefore, in the long term, no separate state in the world, no matter how powerful in the military and economic sense it may be, can act as a locomotive if there is no unity of interests of the integration entities that bear certain physical costs. Therefore, there can be no diktat poles in the economic alliances of our time, including participants who receive the lion's share of material and other benefits from this. Otherwise, the destructive forces of friction and resistance will sooner or later break the vicious circle of interaction, distribution, and consumption.

Today, despite the contrasts of global politics, the caravan of the world economy continues its journey through time, filling the oases of civilization with the main content - material meaning. At the same time, the world's trade and investment vectors are steadily moving to where capacious markets stretch and new points of economic growth are being formed. This is their essence, and nothing has power over this pattern yet. Therefore, the huge markets of the Eurasian economic Union, China, and the countries of South-East and Central Asia have not only a powerful gravity of investment capital, but also the ability to accelerate objective historical processes that carry global geo-economic transformations.

Currently, the main priorities of the country's national security are not only countering internal and external threats (extremism and terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, inter-ethnic and inter-confessional conflicts, etc.). Along with public, military, political, and information security, economic security is recognized as a key factor in state policy. An important role in ensuring the normal functioning of the country is played by economic factors - the competitiveness of production, well-being and quality of life of the population, ensuring financial, energy, food and transport security, stability and sustainability of the national economy, including its industrial and innovative component, as well as preventing the isolation of Kazakhstan from the world economic system. The Concept of foreign policy of the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2014-2020 defines «further integration into the system of regional and international trade and economic relations» as one of the main goals [1].

Not only for Kazakhstan, but also for all participants in the integration process, the importance of the strategy for deepening integration is objectively increasing. According to the First President N.A. Nazarbayev, it is the common strategic interests of the CU and CES countries, the essence of which is to increase the competitiveness of their industries, move away from the raw material orientation, the critical need for innovative and technological breakthrough, that creates a space for joint actions and the

opportunity to ensure real economic growth and bring the emerging EEU to the leading positions in the global world.

It is in the interests of all countries to make maximum use of the transit potential of the Eurasian economic Union and to create international corridors with a modern transport and logistics system that can ensure a multiple reduction in the delivery time of goods to European and Asian markets.

Kazakhstan's interest in active actions on creation of international economic associations - the customs Union and the common economic space and the Eurasian Union, defined the specific economic needs and longer-term priorities. At the same time, the creation of regional integration structures is considered not as an end in itself, but as a mechanism and tool for implementing important tasks related to providing basic needs - forming the fundamental conditions for a successful transition to the neo-industrial stage of social progress. [3].

It is in the interests of Kazakhstan to participate in the formation of the Common economic space. The implementation of the CES freedom of movement of goods, services, financial and human capital across the borders of the member States creates an opportunity to address many issues that can not be resolved in other conditions. Thus, the implementation of free movement of goods provides for the replacement of anti-dumping, compensatory, special and protective measures in mutual trade with common rules in the field of competition and subsidies.

The implementation of the «four freedoms» – freedom of movement of goods, services, capital and labor - involves ensuring mutual access to services of natural monopolies in the field of electricity, gas transportation, including the basics of pricing and tariff policy. The formation and operation of the CES is carried out taking into account the rules and regulations of the WTO, which creates prerequisites for the unification of national rules and regulations with international standards.

Mutual cooperation with the CES countries in the field of agriculture is of great interest for Kazakhstan. This interest is reinforced by the fact that Kazakhstan has the largest share of rural residents in the total population compared to other CU-CES countries (45.3%) [5].

The economic mechanism for attracting resources in agriculture should contribute to the formation of competitive and stable agricultural production.

To do this, first of all, we need favorable conditions for the inflow of investments in the fixed capital of the industry, which are based on promising production technologies, and a set of measures to financially support their implementation.

An overview of statistical data of the statistics Agency for the 2017-2019 biennium. shows that the development of competitive agricultural production and the food market food of the population of the Republic should increase the volume of investments for the purchase of high-performance agricultural machinery, taking into account the need for 2018-2019. (tractors, 22 thousand units, harvesters - 12 thousand units, sowing complexes -1680 PCs, etc.) on 1266,4 billion tenge; to build 16 dairy farms, 9 feedlots, 18 poultry farms, 183 hectares of greenhouses, 24 vegetable stores, 250 slaughterhouses, 8 processing complexes, 3 pig complexes for 386.8 billion tenge, to purchase 9 thousand heads. introduction of drip irrigation in the production of vegetables on 6560 hectares of arable land. [6].

In the structure of investments, the share of budget funds will be 8.8%, own funds-68.3%, foreign investments-0.3% and borrowed funds-22.6%. State support for rural producers through centralized investments should be carried out taking into account the transition from non-refundable budget financing to credit on a returnable and paid basis. At the same time, the allocated funds must be returned to the state in the prices of the year in which they are returned. They should be directed to the implementation of training programs, the implementation of major environmental measures, the development of the veterinary service and the chemical protection service, etc.

Starting from 2020, it is planned to implement similar projects without importing high-yielding cattle heads through reproduction of breeding stock on previously funded dairy farms.

Equipment from world manufacturers Agralix (Germany), DeLaval (Sweden) and others will be used, and poultry farms in the meat sector will be expanded and modernized using computer control and control of all production processes, which will reduce the level of poultry meat imports in the domestic market by 20% [6].

When creating a network of modern feedlots, it is assumed to use modern fattening technologies with the production of environmentally friendly beef, covering 35 thousand heads and supplying standard batches of up to 11 thousand tons per year.

It is planned to increase the number of fine-wooled sheep and bring their specific weight in 2020 to 35% (from the current 26%) with the receipt of export products with high added value, in particular, the production of up to 3.7 thousand tons of high-quality woolen tops [6].

As part of the development of Kazakhstan's grain exports, a project is being implemented to build an Elevator with a capacity of one-time storage of 100 thousand Goni: grain, which will ensure the transshipment of at least 1.5 million tons of grain for export to the Caspian region, Central Asia and the Middle East.

All projects will be implemented using modern technologies for production and processing of agricultural products based on high-performance equipment from leading manufacturers from Germany, the Netherlands, Israel, and Russia.

The activities of the National Fund of the Republic of Kazakhstan, JSC «Development Bank of Kazakhstan», JSC «Investment Fund of Kazakhstan», JSC «national innovation Fund» are aimed at implementing targeted investment and scientific and technical programs, regulating investment and stimulating innovation activity. In General, these institutions will be aimed at investing in the creation of new and development of existing industries with high added value and support for scientific and technical research and development based on a comprehensive analysis of promising industries, identifying the most important elements of them. Development institutions should form a single system, whose sustainable functioning will be based on the principles of decentralization, specialization, competition and transparency.

Kazakhstan's accession to the WTO is considered from the point of view of overcoming the main obstacles in the development of the agro-industrial sector: low productivity, imperfect technological base and small-scale agricultural production [7].

In this regard, it is of great interest for Kazakhstan to develop common approaches to subsidizing the agricultural sector within the CES, similar to the requirements of the WTO Agreement on agriculture. This will help to create additional opportunities for gradual preparation of agricultural enterprises to operate in the most competitive conditions when entering world markets.

At the same time, the existing differences in the provision of state support to the CES member States (in Belarus, the level of state support is about 18%, in Russia – about 6%, in Kazakhstan – about 4 %) are considered as an additional opportunity for Kazakhstan to increase the volume of support for the agricultural sector. The creation of equal conditions of state support for Kazakh companies engaged in processing of agricultural products should lead to a reduction in the share of imports of products of deep processing of milk, sugar in domestic consumption and have a positive impact on the economic-financial activity of enterprises, which generally has a positive impact on the development of processing industries of AIC. This approach will also be effective if subsidies are provided to industrial enterprises.

Over the past 10 years, agricultural output has increased by 41%, in real terms. Exports of agricultural products and their processing increased by 59% and amounted to more than 2.0 billion US dollars, including exports to the EAEU countries amounted to 379 million US dollars. At the same time, investments in fixed capital of agriculture increased only in 2015 to 167.0 billion tenge, or almost 3.4 times.

However, the potential of the domestic agricultural sector is much higher. And in most cases, our products compete on an equal footing in the Eurasian market. This is good, but it should be noted here that in many ways the production of these competing products is subsidized by the governments of the EAEU countries, that is, in fact, we reduce the effectiveness of state support for each other or, in other words, we Finance trade confrontations.

World practice and science show that integration does not guarantee only a positive effect. It can lead to the aggravation of contradictions that have accumulated in the economy, and to a decrease in competitiveness. Everything depends on the right economic policy, the right assessment of the economic and political situation in the country, and the availability or absence of economic resources.

An assessment of the development indicators of an important sector of the economy that ensures the country's food security shows that in many positions in terms of competitiveness, Kazakhstan lags behind Russia and, especially, Belarus.

In terms of grain and legume yields, Kazakhstan lags behind Belarus by almost 3 times, Russia by almost 2 times, and sugar beet by 1.8 and 1.7 times, respectively. The potato yield is 1.15 times higher in Belarus compared to Kazakhstan. Kazakhstan has a slight advantage in vegetable yield, but this is due to the fact that the Republic is located to the South than the Russian Federation and Belarus.

In Kazakhstan, the average milk yield per 1 dairy cow in 2019 was 2280 kilograms, or 2.2 times less than in Russia, and 2 times less than in Belarus (in Russia – 5001 kg, in Belarus-4638 kg) [10, p. 15; 12; 5; 14, p. 288]. The volume of state support for agriculture to the gross volume of agricultural output in Belarus is 16%, in Russia it is 8%, while in Kazakhstan it is 4% [8]. State support rates differ significantly per 1 hectare of land and per 1 worker employed in agriculture.

Kazakhstan occupies an intermediate position between Russia and Belarus, however, it lags far behind the indicators of Belarus: in terms of state support for 1 hectare of acreage, it is 5.4 times, and for 1 agricultural worker it is almost 8 times. One of the main indicators that reflect the competitiveness of products is its cost.

In almost all the commodity items under consideration, except for cattle, the cost of agricultural products in Kazakhstan is higher than in Russia. These and many other data show that Kazakhstan and its partners in the EEU need to pursue a joint agricultural policy in order for neither side to suffer, but, on the contrary, to receive mutual benefits from integration into the common market. The world practice has accumulated considerable experience in solving agricultural problems of partner countries of integration groups.

Special attention should be paid to EU experience, where since 1957, when the common market was created, the common agricultural policy (cap) has been implemented throughout the European Union. And until 1992, agricultural expenditures represented 49% of the EU budget [13].

Conclusion. Key values that can be learned from the experience of the EU Common agricultural policy:

First, the goals of the cap. The main objectives of the Common agricultural policy are:

1. Providing farmers with an acceptable standard of living. In other words, the EU's agricultural policy is aimed at maintaining farm prices and incomes. It is known that agriculture is the only industry where the laws of free competition apply. Therefore, in the environment of a monopolized industrial, commercial, etc. market, to engage in farming is to doom yourself to incommensurable low incomes. Without strong government support that guarantees an acceptable income, agricultural business is unattractive.

2. Providing consumers with quality products at fair prices. The products of European farmers are divided into three groups: those intended for export to third world countries, those intended for export to developed countries, and those intended for domestic consumption (the highest quality). As a rule, we produce higher-quality goods for export than for our own population. This is a legacy of the Soviet past. In Europe, on the contrary, agricultural production is aimed at providing its population with the highest quality products at fair prices.

3. Preservation of agricultural heritage. Agricultural heritage consists not only in preserving traditions in production activities, but also cultural and historical values.

Second, the harmonization of policies and their transfer to the supranational level. Currently, each partner country of the EEU conducts its own agricultural policy. Even the volume of state aid is 4 times more in Belarus and 2 times more in Russia than in Kazakhstan. Therefore, the formation of a single food market without the harmonization of agricultural policy does not seem real.

Third, the principles of agricultural policy. In the EU, by 1962, was established three main principles of the holding cap:

– the integrity of the market. The agricultural market of partner countries should function as a whole. Only in this case can comparative advantages be realized for the benefit of the entire Union;

- preference for community products. Agricultural policy should be aimed at creating a healthy population. Therefore, products for domestic consumption must be of high quality, environmentally friendly, without various gene changes and harmful additives. And the population of partner countries should be confident in this and prefer the products of the Union;

– financial solidarity. In this regard, the EU's experience is invaluable. Germany and France are donors to the EU budget, while agricultural countries such as Spain, Greece and Portugal are the largest recipients.

Fourth, the need to take into account the social structure of agriculture and both structural and natural differences between different agricultural regions. Kazakhstan, Belarus and Russia are three major countries. Their territories are located in various natural areas. National traditions differ, which are especially preserved in rural areas. Therefore, it is impossible to completely neutralize all forms and methods of support for all regions of these countries, but also to act in accordance with their characteristics.

Fifth, a set of mechanisms for implementing agricultural policy. In the West, have long been tested and successfully used methods such as:

- taxation of imports;
- import quotas to limit the number of imported products;
- internal intervention prices. If the domestic market price falls below the intervention level, the EU buys goods to raise the price to the intervention level;

- direct subsidies for farmers. Moreover, subsidies were a tool to encourage farmers to grow crops that are not enough in the EU countries, that is, a tool to reduce the economic incentives for overproduction.

Subsidies were mainly paid for the land on which a particular crop was grown, rather than for the total number of crops produced. In the West, it is considered a waste of resources to store and dispose of surplus production.

Sixth, harmonization of legislation. Existing differences on such items as the authorization or prohibition of preservatives, food dyes, hormones and other substances in food products, labeling rules, animal diseases, etc. should be leveled, since they can create problems both in the internal trade of partner countries and in trade with third countries.

Seventh, transparency of agricultural support costs. The financial resources allocated from the General budget to support agricultural producers in a particular country should be controlled, transparent, well-known and not infringe on the interests of any party.

The experience of the Common agricultural policy shows that thanks to its implementation, EU countries have become major exporters of agricultural products, fully providing their population with food.

**А.Т. Кокенова¹, Г.И. Абдикеримова², С. Куашбаев³,
М.А. Канабекова⁴, М.С. Мади⁵**

¹ Международный гуманитарно-технический университет, Шымкент, Казахстан;

² Университет Мирас, Шымкент, Казахстан;

³ Шымкентский университет, Шымкент, Казахстан;

⁴ КазНПУ имени Абая, Алматы, Казахстан;

⁵ Южно-Казахстанский государственный университет им. М. Ауезова, Шымкент, Казахстан

ИНТЕГРАЦИЯ АПК КАЗАХСТАНА В РАМКАХ ГЛОБАЛИЗАЦИИ ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКИХ ПРОЦЕССОВ

Аннотация. Материальные условия производства, лежащие в основе формирования и развития единого народнохозяйственного комплекса, диктуют одновременно возможность и необходимость совершенствования методов регулирования и управления экономикой в соответствии с меняющимися условиями и факторами производства. Они требуют переориентации предприятий, производственных объединений и промежуточных показателей работы на конечные результаты. Агропромышленный комплекс (АПК), как и другие межотраслевые народно-хозяйственные комплексы, должен эффективно выполнять свои функциональные задачи.

В статье рассматривается влияние экономической интеграции на национальную экономику, в том числе на агропромышленный комплекс страны. Выявлены положительные и отрицательные эффекты интеграции. Проанализирована динамика экономических показателей сельского хозяйства Казахстана, России и Беларуси. Уточнены показатели, отражающие конкурентоспособность сельского хозяйства.

Авторы считают, что оценка конкурентоспособности агропромышленного комплекса должна осуществляться не абсолютными, а относительными показателями: урожайность сельхозкультур, продуктивность скота и птицы, индекс чистого экспорта, рентабельность производства, степень износа основных средств, объем продукции на душу населения. На основе проведенного анализа авторы пришли к выводу, что каждая страна-партнер имеет свои сравнительные преимущества, которые необходимо учитывать при формировании единого рынка продовольствия.

Аграрный сектор экономики в условиях рынка занимает особое положение, не позволяющее без государственного вмешательства в полной мере и на равных условиях участвовать в глобальной конкуренции. Трудно рассчитывать на стабилизацию аграрного сектора лишь на основе его рыночной самоорганизации. Во-первых, в этом секторе экономики в отличие от секторов в других функциональных комплексах, очень низкий уровень эластичности между динамикой цен и спросом на продовольственные товары, а также между динамикой цен и предложением товаров. Во-вторых, отсутствие сбалансированных подходов и механизма координации взаимодействия секторов аграрной экономики Казахстана и России сдерживает торговлю продовольствием и сельскохозяйственным сырьем, производственное и научно-техническое сотрудничество, ежегодно снижает продовольственную безопасность стран. При действующей модели государственного участия в развитии АПК остается неопределенной роль государств и их уполномоченных органов не только в обеспечении межгосударственной интеграции, определении мер национального и наднационального регулирования, но и в вопросах достаточности и структуры внутренней поддержки сельского хозяйства самих интегрирующихся стран. Выход может быть найден в направлении формирования в Казахстане и России эффективной системы государственного регулирования аграрного сектора, ориентированной на использование экономических преимуществ интеграции и стимулирующей динамичное развитие АПК интегрирующихся стран.

Ключевые слова: сельское хозяйство, стратегия, развитие, производительность, экономика, эффективность.

**А.Т. Кокенова¹, Г.И. Абдикеримова², С.Куашбаев³,
М.А. Канабекова⁴, М.С. Мадиганов⁵**

¹Халықаралық гуманитарлық-техникалық университеті, Шымкент, Қазақстан;

²Мирас университеті, Шымкент, Қазақстан;

³Шымкент университеті, Шымкент, Қазақстан;

⁴Абай атындағы Қазақ ұлттық педагогикалық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан;

⁵М.Әуезов атындағы Оңтүстік Қазақстан мемлекеттік университеті, Шымкент, Қазақстан

ЭКОНОМИКАЛЫҚ ҮДЕРІСТЕРДІҢ ЖАҢА ДАМУ АЯСЫНДАҒЫ ҚАЗАҚСТАН АӨК ИНТЕГРАЦИЯСЫ

Аннотация. Мақалада біртекті халықшаруашылық кешенін құру және дамыту негізіндегі өндірістің материалдық жағдайы, өндіріс жағдайы мен шараларының өзгермелі шарттарына сәйкес бір уақытта экономикалық реттеу және басқаруды қамтамасыз етудің қажеттілігі мен мүмкіншіліктері көрсетілген. Олар кәсіпорындар мен өндірістік бірлестіктердің соңғы жұмыс көрсеткіштерінің қайта бағдарлануын талап етеді. Агроөндірістік кешен (АӨК), басқа да салааралық халықшаруашылық кешен сияқты өзінің құрылымдық міндеттерін тиімді орындауы қажет. Бұл мақсаттың жетістігі өзіне сәйкес өндірістің кешендік қызметтік-салааралық құрылымына әсер ету.

Мақалада ұлттық экономика, оның ішінде АӨК, бәсекеге қабілеттілікке экономикалық интеграцияның әсері бойынша мәселелер қаралған. Оң және кері әсер тигізуші эффектілер анықталған. Қазақстан, Ресей және Беларусь елдері ауылшаруашылығының экономикалық көрсеткіштерінің динамикасы талданған. Ауылшаруашылығының бәсекеге қабілеттілігінің өзгеруін көрсететін көрсеткіштер анықталған. Авторлардың пікірінше, аграрлық-өнеркәсіптік кешеннің бәсекеге қабілеттілігін абсолютті емес, ауылшаруашылық өнімділігі мал және құс өнімділігі, таза экспорт индексі, өндіріс тиімділігі, негізгі қорлардың тозуы, жан басына шаққандағы өнім көлемі сынды салыстырмалы көрсеткіштермен талдаған жөн. Жүргізілген зерттеулер нәтижесінде авторлар келесі қорытындыға келді: әрбір елдің салыстырмалы артықшылықтары бар, оларды экономикалық қоғам жағдайында біртұтас азық-түлік нарығын қалыптастыру кезінде ескеру қажет.

Экономиканың аграрлық секторы нарық жағдайында мемлекеттің араласуынсыз жаһандық бәсекеге толық көлемде және тең жағдайда қатысуға мүмкіндік бермейтін сипатқа ие. Аграрлық секторды нарықтық өзін-өзі ұйымдастыруы негізінде тұрақтандыруға сену қиын. Біріншіден, экономиканың осы секторында басқа функционалдық кешендердегі секторлардан басқа, баға серниі мен азық-түлік тауарларына сұраныс

арасындағы, сондай-ақ баға серпіні мен тауарлар ұсынысының арасындағы икемділік деңгейі өте төмен. Екіншіден, Ресей мен Қазақстанның аграрлық экономика секторларының өзара іс-қимылын үйлестірудің теңдестірілген тәсілдері мен тетігінің болмауы азық-түлік пен ауылшаруашылығы шикізат саудасы мен өндірістік және ғылыми-техникалық ынтымақтастықты тежейді, жыл сайын елдердің азық-түлік қауіпсіздігін төмендетеді. АӨК дамытуға мемлекеттік қатысудың қолданыстағы моделі кезінде мемлекеттер мен олардың уәкілетті органдарының мемлекетаралық интеграцияны қамтамасыз етуде, ұлттық және ұлттықтан жоғары реттеу шараларын айқындаумен қатар, интеграцияланған елдердің өздерінің ауылшаруашылығын ішкі қолдаудың жеткіліктігі мен құрылымы мәселесінде де рөлі айқындалмаған. Бұдан шығудың амалы Ресей мен Қазақстанда интеграцияның экономикалық артықшылықтарын пайдалануға бағдарланған және интеграцияланатын елдердің АӨК серпініді даму жағдайын ынталандыратын аграрлық секторды мемлекеттік реттеудің тиімді жүйесін қалыптастыру бағытында табылуы мүмкін.

Түйін сөздер: ауылшаруашылығы, стратегия, даму, өнімділік, экономика, тиімділік.

Information about authors:

Kokenova A.T., candidate of economic Sciences, docent, International Humanitarian and Technical University, Shymkent, Republic of Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8805-5924>, E-mail: aiganymk7676@gmail.com;

Adbikerimova G.I., candidate of economic Sciences, docent sector Economy and management, Miras University, Shymkent, Republic of Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4206-0901>, E-mail: abdikerimova71@mail.ru;

Kuashbayev S., doctor of economic sciences, Professor, Shymkent University, city of Shymkent, Republic of Kazakhstan <https://orcid.org/0000-0055-9104-4522>;

Kanabekova M. A., candidate of economic Sciences, Senior Lecturer of the Department of «Economic specialties», KazNPU named after Abai, Almaty <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7573-1812>;

Madi M. S., master's degree in «Economics», South Kazakhstan State University named after M. Auezov, city of Shymkent, Republic of Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0000-0008-1424-X724>, e-mail: madi.myntemir@mail.ru

REFERENCES

[1] Bludova S. N. Assessment of the dynamics of comparative advantages in foreign trade of the EAEU countries // Bulletin of the North Caucasus humanitarian Institute. 2016. - No. 1. - P. 30-34.

[2] Kokenova A.T., Abylkasym A.B., Shalbaeva A.R., Abdurazakov N.S., Bekmanova N.M. (2019) Innovation in agriculture: digitization as a factor of new opportunities // NEWS OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OF THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN SERIES OF SOCIAL AND HUMAN SCIENCES ISSN 2224-5294 <https://doi.org/10.32014/2019.2224-5294.236> Volume 6, Number 328 (2019), 226-236.

[3] Balassa B. Trade Liberalization and Revealed Comparative Advantage // The Manchester School of Economic and Social Studies. 1965. Vol. 33. P. 99-123.

[4] K.K. Dzhaparova, R.M. Rgebayeva, S.M. Iskakova (2020) THE ROLE OF THE EURASIAN ECONOMIC UNION IN SOLVING PROBLEMS OF THE ECONOMY OF KAZAKHSTAN // NEWS OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OF THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN SERIES OF SOCIAL AND HUMAN SCIENCES ISSN 2224-5294 <https://doi.org/10.32014/2020.2224-5294.17> Volume 1, Number 329 (2020), 152-157.

[5] Bogdański M. Modern theories of regional development – a review of some concepts // Oeconomia Copernicana. 2012. No. 2. P.25-41.

[6] Assessment of the efficiency of using the resource potential of the agro-industrial complex of the EAEU member States (in collaboration with Nurpeisova A. A.) // international journal of applied and fundamental research. 2016. No. 10, part 2. P. 305-309.

[7] The Agribusiness 2020 program is underfunded by 30-40% annually. The competitiveness of Kazakhstan's agricultural sector is declining-the Ministry of agriculture. – <http://margin.kz/news/1880/programma-agrobiznes-2020>

[8] Speech of The Minister of agriculture at the Parliamentary hearings on the topic: «Improving the competitiveness of the domestic agricultural sector in the conditions of the EEU and the WTO-legislative regulation and its practical implementation»

[9] Prospects for the development of the Eurasian economic Union. – <http://kazorta.org/perspektivy-razvitiya-evrazijskogo-ekonomicheskogo-soyuza/>

[10] The Treaty on the Eurasian economic Union (signed in Astana 29.05.2014) (as amended on 08.05.2015). http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_163855/

[11] Agro-industrial policy of the Eurasian economic Union / edited by S. S. Sidorsky, member of the Board (Minister) for industry and agro-industrial complex of the Eurasian economic Commission. - Moscow, 2015. P. 20.

[12] Dzhusibalieva A. K. Directions of implementation of the agricultural policy of Kazakhstan [Text] / A.K. Dzhusibalieva, N. T. Baykadamov, B. Z. zhmagalieva // Problems of the agricultural market. 2019. No. 3. P. 34-42.

[14] Mukasheva A. J. Social infrastructure of rural territories: status and problems [Text] / A. J. Nukusheva, S. I. Kasymbaev, Abdieva S. R. // Problems of agricultural market. 2019. No. 1. P. 34-42.