



ҚАЗАҚСТАН РЕСПУБЛИКАСЫ БІЛІМ ЖӘНЕ ҒЫЛЫМ МИНИСТРЛІГІ
Л.Н. ГУМИЛЕВ АТЫНДАҒЫ ЕУРАЗИЯ ҰЛТТЫҚ УНИВЕРСИТЕТІ



Студенттер мен жас ғалымдардың
«ҒЫЛЫМ ЖӘНЕ БІЛІМ - 2014» атты
IX халықаралық ғылыми конференциясы

IX Международная научная конференция
студентов и молодых ученых
«НАУКА И ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ - 2014»

The IX International Scientific Conference for
students and young scholars
«SCIENCE AND EDUCATION-2014»

2014 жыл 11 сәуір
11 апреля 2014 года
April 11, 2014



**ҚАЗАҚСТАН РЕСПУБЛИКАСЫ БІЛІМ ЖӘНЕ ҒЫЛЫМ МИНИСТРЛІГІ
Л.Н. ГУМИЛЕВ АТЫНДАҒЫ ЕУРАЗИЯ ҰЛТТЫҚ УНИВЕРСИТЕТІ**

**Студенттер мен жас ғалымдардың
«Ғылым және білім - 2014»
атты IX Халықаралық ғылыми конференциясының
БАЯНДАМАЛАР ЖИНАҒЫ**

**СБОРНИК МАТЕРИАЛОВ
IX Международной научной конференции
студентов и молодых ученых
«Наука и образование - 2014»**

**PROCEEDINGS
of the IX International Scientific Conference
for students and young scholars
«Science and education - 2014»**

2014 жыл 11 сәуір

Астана

УДК 001(063)
ББК 72
Ғ 96

Ғ 96

«Ғылым және білім – 2014» атты студенттер мен жас ғалымдардың IX Халықаралық ғылыми конференциясы = IX Международная научная конференция студентов и молодых ученых «Наука и образование - 2014» = The IX International Scientific Conference for students and young scholars «Science and education - 2014».
– Астана: <http://www.eni.kz/ru/nauka/nauka-i-obrazovanie/>, 2014. – 5831 стр.
(қазақша, орысша, ағылшынша).

ISBN 978-9965-31-610-4

Жинаққа студенттердің, магистранттардың, докторанттардың және жас ғалымдардың жаратылыстану-техникалық және гуманитарлық ғылымдардың өзекті мәселелері бойынша баяндамалары енгізілген.

The proceedings are the papers of students, undergraduates, doctoral students and young researchers on topical issues of natural and technical sciences and humanities.

В сборник вошли доклады студентов, магистрантов, докторантов и молодых ученых по актуальным вопросам естественно-технических и гуманитарных наук.

УДК 001(063)
ББК 72

ISBN 978-9965-31-610-4

©Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық
университеті, 2014

бағдарлама жасап, әлеуметтік қызмет күшін жұмылдырады. Яғни, әйел бала проблемасымен жеке бетпе-бет қалмайды. Мұндай тәжірибе АҚШ-та, Батыс Еуропа елдерінде кеңінен таралған. Германия көп балалы шаңырақтарды салықтан босатады, жалғызділікті анаға мың еуро төленеді. Алысқа бармай-ақ, Ресейдің өзінде бұл жалғызбасты әйел санаты сол кеңес дәуірінен бері жойылған жоқ [3; 48].

Ал бізде өмір өгейсіткен әйел мен өкпелі балаларға қамқорлық жетпей жатыр. Жалғызбасты аналар санының көбеюіне әкеліп соқтыратын тағы бір фактор — оң босағада отырған қыздарымыздың жүкті болуы. Мәліметтерге қарағанда, елімізде жыл сайын әрбір бесінші бала некеден тыс өмірге келеді екен. Қазақтың менталитетіне жат, жабық тақырып болып келгендігінен де, үйде отырып бала туған қыздар жөнінде еш жерден нақты ресми мәлімет таба алмайсың. Бұл қыздар көп жағдайда қоғамнан оқшауланып, өз проблемасымен өзі бетпе-бет қалады. Мұндай аналардың қатарын негізінен отырып қалған кәрі қыздар толтырады. Мәліметтер бойынша, елімізде оң жақта отырып қалған 25-55 жастағы кәрі қыздардың саны 350-мыңнан асып жығылыпты.

Барлығы да ананың жалғыз өзі баланы бағып-қағу қаншалықты қиын екенін басына түссе сезінетін шығар деп ойлаймын. Некеде, некесіз туылған бала. Бәрі де сәби емеспе. Егер қыз бала білместікке ұрынып, қателік жасаса оны бетіне баспау керек. Еліміздің халқы әніміне көбейеді деп жүр. Ал, жесір қалып жатқан аналарға берер жәрдемақысы сәбиінің киіміне не тамағына жетпейді. Егер қыз қателік жасап аяғы ауыр болып, түсік жасатпай осы дүниеге жарық сыйлайтын батыл аналарды қолдау керек деп ойлаймын.

Қазақтың ер-жігіттері нәзік жандылардың ішінде Құдай қосқан қосағын ғана өзімен тең көрген. Ал, әженің ұлағатын ұйып тыңдап, оның өнегесін ұдайы ұлықтай білген. Әулет кейуанасын пір тұтып, оны патшасындай сыйлаған. Аналарды «пейіш ананың аяғының астында» деп ардақтаған. Әпке - қарындастарын екі бетімнің ары деп аялап, олардың өтінішін екі етпеген. Қызын аз күнгі қонағым деп, шұғаның қиығы, алтынның сынығы деп, бөркіне үкі тағып, еркелетіп өсірген. Сайып келгенде айтпағымыз, әйел затын желеп-жебейтін қастерлі рухқа балап, оның нәзік болмысын космогониялық жаратылыспен байланыстырып, тіпті жер-су атауларын да әйел затымен атаған жаһандағы бірегей ұлтпыз. Яғни, әлем әйел затын сыйлауда бізден үлгі алса болар еді.

Қарап отырсақ, жалғызбасты аналардың санының көбеюінің себебі көп. Салдары одан асып түседі. Жоғарыда айтылған мәселелердің барлығы айтылудай-ақ айтылып келеді. Бұл қазіргі қоғамның әсерінен, батысқа еліктеушілікпен, адамдардың қатыгездік танытуынан болып отыр. Шыбын жаны шырқырап бала-шағасын жетілдіремін деп жүрген аналар да, жетімдер де, көрдемшелер де, баласының нәпақасын төлемей қашып жүрген әкелер де көбейіп барады. Қазағым қайда сүнгіп барасын, бұрынғы қазан қайнатқан қазіргі қазақ әйелінің бейнесін жоғалтып алмайық.

Қолданылған әдебиет

1. Агафонов А.Н., Менлибаев К.Н. Основы социальной работы. Караганда, 2003.
2. «Неке және отбасы туралы» ҚР Заңы. - № 23. - Астана, 1998.
3. Социальная работа / Под ред. В.И. Курбатова. – Р./н./Д., 2004.

УДК 316.72

THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN BRITAIN AND KAZAKHSTAN

Сатымбекова Райхан Нурланқызы

raikhansatymbekova@mail.ru

Л.Н.Гумилев атындағы ЕҰУ Филология факультеті

Аударма ісі кафедрасы, Астана, Қазақстан

Ғылыми жетекшісі – А.Қызырова

THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN BRITAIN AND KAZAKHSTAN

The changes of the role of women in social, political and economic spheres of the country entail not only the drawing more attention to the women's role in society, in addition they are accompanied by breaking of gender stereotypes that had been shaping through decades. Free market capitalism and democratization in all spheres of life are creating the basis for eventual equal social rights for any human being regardless of sex, for both men and women. From a legal point of view, a man and a woman in most developed countries are equal. Even though most of them have plenty of mechanisms, laws and institutions of women's rights fulfillment, the equality cannot be achieved simply through passing them.

Such questions as women and their place in the society, their political and social activity as well as enlightening of those problems in mass media, also the maternity and childhood cannot be effectively solved by governmental bodies, especially in the situation of economic crisis. That is why it is important today to assist the creation of such mechanisms through the activation of women's public organizations, such as: *Women Against Violence Europe Organization*, *Association of the Independent Women's Organizations*, *The Association for Women's Rights in Development (AWID)*, *Women's Environment & Development Organization (WEDO)*, *Women Living Under Muslim Law Organization*.

Women comprise 51 percent of the world population, 51.7 percent of contemporary Kazakh society and 51 percent of Britain society. However, the number of women taking part in each country's political, economic and civic life shows that women are restricted in the spheres of politics and government. A lack of state financing in social programs has caused further tightening in the labor market, particularly for women. According to the United Nations Gender Organization data female unemployment is rising at a catastrophically high rate in both countries. Women have less access to retraining programs than men, while women entrepreneurs are a rarity. Women's social status is a serious problem. Few female decision-makers can be found in positions of social importance. This strengthens the stereotype of "male superiority" and hinders the creation of true partnerships between men and women.

One of the most important reflections of equity is equal rights in the labor market. Analysis of existing legislation of Kazakhstan and Britain confirms its prohibition on gender discrimination. However, many women still experience barriers, including lack of female role models, the cost of childcare, lack of workplace flexibility, and a lack of transparency around recruitment for senior positions. Thus, the main goals of the governments of both countries should be protection of women's rights and elimination of discrimination in society; widening women's participation in policy decision-making processes on the local, regional and national levels; support for cooperation between women's organizations on the national and international arenas; widening access to international resources and experience of women's organizations on an international level.

According to some authors, the usefulness of the concept of culture to explain cultural differences depends on being able to unpack it and identify its components as "Culture is too global a concept to be meaningful as an explanatory variable". The use of a limited number of dimensions to compare cultures has anthropological roots. Early scholars in this field argued that cultural diversity results from different answers in different societies to similar universal questions: "the existence of two sexes; the helplessness of infants; the need for satisfaction of the elementary biological requirements such as food, warmth and sex; the presence of individuals of different ages and of differing physical and other capacities". Parsons and Shills (1951) delineated cultural pattern variables or cultural dilemmas that define and categorize cultures: affectivity versus affective neutrality; self-orientation versus collectivity orientation; universalism versus particularism; ascription versus achievement and specificity versus diffuseness. These contributions have influenced modal personality studies, focusing on "to what extent do the patterned conditions of life in a particular society give rise to certain distinctive patterns in the personality of its members?"

Inkeles and Levinson (1969) proposed the terms social character, basic personality structure, and national character.

Identifying reliable dimensions to synthesize major distinguishing aspects of culture could be a major contribution to cross-cultural research. They would provide an alternative to conceptualise and measure culture as a complex, multidimensional structure rather than as a simple categorical variable. Nonetheless, using dimensions to capture the multidimensional culture construct has not been without criticism. Namely, this approach has been criticized for its failure to fully capture all relevant aspects of culture: "It would be a triumph of parsimony if many diverse cultural differences in decision making could be explained in terms of a single cultural disposition, such as individualism–collectivism." For this reason, the dispositional approach has attracted many advocates. Yet, the existing evidence for the dispositional view falls short (Briley et al., 2000: 159). While this criticism is valid, the benefits of this approach for international marketing and cross-cultural research outweigh its limitations:

The identification of reliable dimensions of cultural variation should help to create a nomological framework that is both capable of integrating diverse attitudinal and behavioral empirical phenomena and of providing a basis for hypothesis generation (Smith et al., 1996: 232).

Several scholars discuss the choice of dimensions most appropriate for conceptualizing and operationalizing culture. However, Hofstede's framework is the most widely used national cultural framework in psychology, sociology, marketing, or management studies. Hofstede used 116,000 questionnaires from over 60,000 respondents in seventy countries in his empirical study. He created five dimensions, assigned indexes on each to all nations, and linked the dimensions with demographic, geographic, economic, and political aspects of a society, a feature unmatched by other frameworks. It is the most comprehensive and robust in terms of the number of national cultures samples. Moreover, the framework is useful in formulating hypotheses for comparative cross-cultural studies. Consequently, Hofstede's operationalization of cultures (1984) is the norm used in international marketing studies compares Hofstede's dimensions to other approaches for unpacking the concept of culture. It shows a high level of convergence across approaches, supports the theoretical relevance of Hofstede's framework, and justifies further use of his dimensions. Hofstede's identifies five dimensions of national cultures. He uses the term *subcultures* for groups within societies.

1. *Individualism–collectivism* describes the relationships individuals have in each culture. In individualistic societies, individuals look after themselves and their immediate family only whereas in collectivistic cultures, individuals belong to groups that look after them in exchange for loyalty.

2. *Uncertainty avoidance* refers to "The extent to which people feel threatened by uncertainty and ambiguity and try to avoid these situations" (Hofstede, 1991: 113). This dimension deals with the need for well-defined rules for prescribed behavior.

3. *Power distance* reflects the consequences of power inequality and authority relations in society. It influences hierarchy and dependence relationships in the family and organizational contexts.

4. *Masculinity–femininity*. Dominant values in masculine countries are achievement and success and in feminine countries are caring for others and quality of life.

5. *Long-term orientation* "stands for the fostering of virtues oriented towards future rewards, in particular perseverance and thrift" (Hofstede, 2001: 359).

According to Hofstede's cultural dimension of *power distance* British women are members of society where power distance is low. They expect that unevenly distributed power will be equalised and justified in some way. Also, the superordinate-subordinate patterns may appear in male-female relations, as well as in politics, religion, work and education. For instance, equal rights between man and woman, and high value on independence.

In contrast, Kazakh women relate more to the high power distance. They are more willing to accept concentration of authority and a hierarchical order in which they all have a place. Kazakhstan's independence in 1991 brought new opportunities for women. The time when women

were just cooks and kept away from running the country are long gone. In our secular and dynamic Muslim country, Kazakh men have learned to value the brainpower and ambitions of their female partners. Kazakh women are involved in both running the country and running their households. It is not rare to meet Kazakh female government ministers, members of parliament, mayors, professors, judges and prosecutors, and executives at leading companies, including such industries as oil, construction, retail, real estate and banking. For instance, the membership of women in Parliament's Majilis is 19 women among 107 members (which makes 17.8 percent of the total number of Parliament members). In the Senate this figure is lower and constitutes 4.3 percent: from the total number of 47 Senate members only two are women. However, Kazakh women do not often express disagreement towards someone with higher status and disagreement is generally less tolerated, as this is closely connected with the following of traditions. The discrimination had its roots in the distant past and in an old view that a woman's duty was to stay at home, keep hearth, bring up kids and be a good wife. Relatives historically celebrated the birth of a son, not so much of a daughter. This was a source of great frustration for all women. Today, such problem no longer exists. The Kazakh wives follow the traditions, respect their husbands, in exchange receiving respect from husband's side. They have an ability to combine some qualities together: respect for people, friendship and independence without pretense and aggression. Traditionally the Kazakh woman esteems the man, puts him on the first place, considers him as the head of the family, but it does not mean that she has no rights and she cannot give him an advice, as she has a right to make her own decision. Concerning practical matters such as equal pay and employment rights, in most cases the woman is responsible for childcare and gets custody of children when there is a divorce.

British women relate to the low degree of *uncertainty avoidance*, as they are more flexible and tolerant, and value generalists, common sense and experience. They have strong achievement motivation and more personal ambition; they are more likely to be prepared to compromise with opponents and the sense of competition between female employees is natural as it contained by fair play and used constructively. For example, there are now almost 1.5 million women self-employed which represents an increase of around 300,000 since before the economic downturn (Women in Enterprise: A Different Perspective, RBS Group 2013).

The result of analysis shows that Kazakh women refer to the level of high uncertainty avoidance. Thus, they want stability, structure and security, trying to establish as much regulations and rules as possible to reduce ambiguity and to make relationships and events clear and predictable. However, this does not coincide with how they conduct business. Kazakhs are polychronic and so not follow an agenda.

Women from Britain are individualistic, everyone is entitled to their own opinion and everyone is able to be the smith of their own happiness and they work for their own self-interest. When making business the focus is on the task and not the relationship that might follow the task. Women from Kazakhstan are collectivistic with strong relations to family and colleagues, the interests of group prevail over the interests of individual, people define themselves as members of a group. Everybody knows to what tribe and zhuz (clan, there are three zhuzes called senior, medium, and junior) her family belongs. To know one's tribe, the names of one's predecessors (at least seven) is the kind of one's pride and dignity for Kazakh people. To help one's relative is one's duty, moral obligation; this leads more to nepotism rather than corruption. In Kazakh society every woman knows her neighbors and a key element is loyalty. If you gain trust from a Kazakh woman partner she would most definitely recommend you to others and would not leave you as a partner, even though if she receives a better offer by another company. Relationships prevail over task or orders. In a collectivistic society companies make join decisions. However, this is not the case in Kazakhstan, the female manager might listen to her employees. In short Britain is a middle rated individualistic country and Kazakhstan is a high rated collectivistic country.

According to Hofstede Britain is rated as a masculine society. British woman strives towards achievement and material reward for success, and are more competitive. However, it should be noted that the UK ranks high on the masculinity index but does quite well in terms of equal opportunities and combating sexism. The Kazakh society is a mix of both masculine and feminine

society. It is feminine as in the Kazakh society men and women are equal to each other, women have top manager positions in Kazakh companies, which is very rare in Muslim countries. On the other hand, status and power is important in Kazakh society. Children from successful parents need at least reach jobs ranked as high their parents and attend in the same exclusive universities. If this is not the case it would be a disaster because they have to be competitive and get a step higher on the social ladder. In case of social failure no sympathy would be gained.

The role of women in Kazakh homes has also changed drastically. Women share with men responsibilities for the families' well-being, and women are often the breadwinners. Half of the families' budgets are often provided by women who have to balance running their affairs outside the home with taking care of their elderly parents and children. Having a paying job is not only a necessity for a modern Kazakh woman, but one of the main values in her life. 49.58% shows the extent to which women are active in the total labor force. Many women feel happy and independent only when they do productive work, also they enjoy spending their own money on themselves in the ever increasing number of boutiques. Nevertheless, a Kazakh woman understands that her career is not the main thing. Following the age-old traditions, she accepts the fact that the family, home and children still come first. The family is the core of Kazakh society, and it is women's responsibility to bring up the children as good citizens. They will continue their work of building a better Kazakhstan.

Long-Term Orientation is the fifth dimension added by Hofstede. Within this analysis British women tend to have a great respect for history and tradition as well as a focus on quick results in the future. Thus they are short term oriented. They are very focused on short term quarterly goals and quick results. Humility is a feminine virtue and status is not a major issue in relationships among women. In contrast, Kazakh women see truth as dependent on the situation, context and time, the relationships between women are ordered by status. Despite the fact, that Kazakhstan is a long-term oriented country, women do not change their traditions and norms in response to the changing situation and achieve results through persistence and caution. They have a strong propensity to save and invest.

All cultures are different, there are no two cultures that live according to the exactly the same norms, seeing the world in the same way. People of one culture apprehend another culture through their perspective. Parochialism which is "viewing the world solely through one's own eyes and perspective" (Adler, 1986, p.5) is something that is extremely difficult to avoid. That is why, while getting acquaintance with Kazakh and British nation, one should take into account the cultural diversities and different perception of the world. The Hofstede's framework should be viewed as a general guide, useful for a deeper understating the cross-national interactions.

The role of women has varied considerably over time, depending on their social status. Britain is far from being a fair and equal society. Class is still an issue, while race can impact upon people's life chances. Gender also continues to influence the way individuals are treated, since women continue to struggle to make it to the most powerful and influential positions in society. In politics, business and finance, there is the concept of "glass-ceiling", when the men run the show, which may have something to do with in-built prejudices concerning women's abilities in the workplace.

One must be careful not to overgeneralize about the position of women in Kazakh society, however, because significant differences exist between women based on ethnicity, geographic location, and other characteristics. As this is true in other developing countries, women in the cities tend to have more opportunities for social enrichment and economic advancement than women living in the countryside, and almost always enjoy a higher standard living as well. There is naturally established responsibility for a family and children in the essence of the woman, than in the man's. Depending on the social and cultural factors, Kazakh women intuitively aspire to create a strong marriage, preferring responsible, strong and solicitous men. However, Kazakh women do not concede in anything to men, they are hardworking, responsible and modest.

It is hard to know what women's role in the society actually is, since there is no one path that women are expected to follow. Women can get an education and pursue a career, if this is what they want, or they can get married and leave the workplace to stay at home to raise their children, if they

can afford to do so. Some women decide that they want both a career and a family life, which obviously requires good time management skills. What is clear is that there are many options available to all the women about how they live their lives.

1. Critchlow, J (1992) Kazakhstan : *The outlook for ethnic relations*, RFE :RL Research Report, January.
2. Demos Report, (1999) *Tomorrow's Women*, quoted in R Coward, *Sacred Cows*, London.
3. Hofstede G. (1991) *Cultures and organizations – software of the mind*. New York:McGraw Hill.
4. Hofstede G. (2001) *Culture's consequences*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
5. Hoover R, Green R, Saegert J. (1978) *A cross-national study of perceived risk*. J Mark.
6. <http://www.leanneevalee.hubpages.com/hub/Women-In-Todays-Society>
7. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/home/search.html?sel=site&searchPhrase=the+role+of+women>
8. <http://www.nationmaster.com/country/kz-kazakhstan/lab-labor>
9. <http://www.prowess.org.uk/facts>
10. Inkeles A, Levinson D.(1969) *National character: the study of modal personality and sociocultural systems*. In: Lindzey G, Aronson E, editors. *The handbook of social psychology*, 2nd ed., vol. 4. Reading- Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
11. Kroeber, A.L., Kluckhohn, C. (1952) *Culture. A critical review of concepts and definitions*, Peabody Museum Papers.
12. Leung K. (1989) *Cross-cultural differences: individual-level vs. culture-level analysis*.
13. Parsons T, Shills EA. (1951) *Toward a general theory of action*. New York: Harper and Row.
14. Schwartz S, Bilsky W. (1990) *Toward a theory of the universal content and structure of values: extensions and cross-cultural replications*. J Pers Soc Psychol.
15. Smith P, Dugan S, Trompenaars F.(1996) *National culture and the values of organizational employees—a dimensional analysis across 43 nations*. J Cross-Cult Psychol.
16. Taylor R. (2001) *More Women In Paid Employment*, *Financial Times*.
17. *The rights of women of Kazakhstan to economic freedom* (2001) Association of business women of Kazakhstan, Almaty.
18. Trompenaars, Fons and Charles Hampden (1998) *Riding the waves of Culture. Understanding Cultural Diversity in Business*, Nicholas Brealey Publishing, London, Second Edition.
19. Weeks.J, (1981) *Sex, Politics and Society*, London.
20. *Women in local authority bodies*. (2000) Materials of seminars. United Nations bureau the *Gender and development*, Almaty.

УДК 316.774

СОВРЕМЕННОЕ ТЕЛЕВИЗИОННОЕ ПРОСТРАНСТВО: ЛОГИКА СТРУКТУРАЦИИ И ХАРАКТЕРНЫЕ ЧЕРТЫ

Сафроненко Татьяна Валериевна

tanya.safronenko@mail.ru

магистрант, Днепропетровский национальный университет имени Олеся Гончара,

Украина

Научный руководитель – Ходус Е.В.