

E.E. Alzhanova

*Kh.A. Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University, Kazakhstan
(E-mail: elmira.alzhanova@ayu.edu.kz)*

Indicators of a living level of the population of Kazakhstan for the last ten years of XXth century

Social indicators of a living level of the population of Kazakhstan for the last ten years of the 20th century are considered in this article. One of the most important tasks of social policy is the problem of growth of level and quality of life of the population. In Kazakhstan, as well as on all former Soviet Union during a transition period there was a sharp falling of a level of living of the population; all social infrastructure was almost destroyed. Certainly, it was connected with crisis of economy and lack of concrete social policy. The level of living is rather difficult and many-sided category. In spite of the fact that many elements of living standards are interconnected among themselves, they have considerable features, specifics and their complex characteristic requires use of the corresponding system of specific indicators. Due to the lack of a rational way of association of diverse indicators of such system in a certain uniform indicator in domestic and international practice the impossibility of use of one indicator which is comprehensively characterizing a level of living is recognized.

Keywords: social structure of society, employment of the population and working condition, income of the population, compensation, social and consumer services of the population.

The living level of the population as social and economic category represents the level and degree of a requirements satisfaction of people in material benefits, household and cultural services. Material benefits are food, clothes, footwear, objects of culture and life, the dwelling.

Household services - in a broad sense - include utilities, including transportation and communications services, household services, as well as medical services. Services in the field of culture are rendered by cultural institutions, art and education.

The level of living as the characteristic of welfare of the people is the most important element of wider concept «conduct of life». When studying a level of living the following indicators are allocated:

- 1) general and comprehensive characteristic of social and economic welfare of the population;
- 2) assessment of extent of social and economic differentiation of society, degree of differences on welfare between separate social, demographic and other national groups;
- 3) analysis of the nature and degree of influence of various socio-economic factors on the standard of living, the study of their composition and dynamics;
- 4) allocation and the characteristic of the lower-income segments of the population needing social and economic support.

The level of living, its dynamics and differentiation substantially are defined by the level of development of productive forces, volume and structure of a national wealth, production and use of gross national product, the nature of distribution and redistribution of income.

The level of living is rather difficult and many-sided category. In spite of the fact that many elements of living standards are interconnected among themselves, they have considerable features, specifics and their complex characteristic requires use of the corresponding system of specific indicators. Due to the lack of a rational way of association of diverse indicators of such system in a certain uniform indicator in domestic and international practice the impossibility of use of one indicator which is comprehensively characterizing a level of living is recognized.

It is possible to divide the indicators used for the characteristic of a level of living with some degree of convention into three look:

- the first – synthetic cost indexes (GNP, fund of consumption, the total revenues of the population, etc.);
- the second – the natural indicators measuring the volume of consumption of concrete material benefits (security with personal property, consumption of food, number of the transported passengers, etc.);
- the third – the indicators showing proportions and structure of distribution of welfare (distribution of the population on profitable groups, indicators of concentration and differentiation of income and consumption, etc.).

The level of living, is characterized first of all by consumption indicators, however the level and structure of consumption are substantially determined by those resources which are at the disposal of the certain person, family and society in general. Therefore along with indicators actually of consumption of indicators of a level of living is a part of the system also a number of the indicators characterizing possibilities of consumption. The fund of consumption or income level treats them, for example.

In 1988 Goskomstat of the USSR accepted the «System of statistics of social and economic development of the USSR» incorporating section «Social Development and Level of Living of the People». It is the most in details developed system of indicators from among applied in practice of the state statistics – in it 284 key indicators reduced in 20 theme groups.

1. Social structure of society.
2. Employment of the population and working condition.
3. Participation of workers in government and public life.
4. Income of the population.
5. Monetary savings of the population.
6. Compensation.
7. Public funds of consumption.
8. Social and consumer services of the population. Including: a) trade, public catering; b) transport and communication; c) housing and communal services and consumer services of the population; d) healthcare, physical culture, tourism; social assistance; e) national education; e) culture and art.
9. Consumption of material benefits and services by the population.
10. Property of the population.
11. Budget of family.
12. Budget of time of the population.
13. Moral statistics. Including:
 - a) Crime;
 - b) Administrative offenses;
 - c) Socially dangerous phenomena promoting commission of crimes and offenses.

The given system of indicators, its volume and, the main thing, the structure including along with welfare measures of the characteristic of social aspects of life are more suitable for the description of an image rather than actual level of living. Earlier, in the years of «the developed socialism», such approach was very convenient for justification of essential lag of the USSR on many indicators of a level of living from developed capitalist and the majority of the European countries of the socialist camp. However in modern conditions to use this system of indicators is impossible, having even removed from it ideological loading and having allocated only those indicators which characterize a level of living. It is impossible, first of all for the following reasons: social and economic bases of social development in the country changed, differentiation considerably increased, moreover, there was even a polarization of the population on a level of living, at last, there were changes and in practice and methodology of statistics and account.

Therefore, it was necessary and logical to develop a system of indicators of living standards, adapted to modern socio-economic conditions in Kazakhstan. This system includes the following sections:

- 1) The generalizing indicators (GNP, fund of consumption, a cost of living index, etc.);
- 2) Income of the population;
- 3) Consumption and expenses of the population;
- 4) Monetary savings of the population;
- 5) The saved-up property and the dwelling;
- 6) Social differentiation of the population;
- 7) lower-income strata.

The standard of living is largely determined by the incomes of the population, the size of which mainly depends on the degree of satisfaction of personal needs. The main sources of income of the population are: the salary and other payments which workers receive for the work (in a monetary or natural form); income from individual work; payments and privileges from public funds of consumption, special funds, annual payments for life insurance; income from property (for example, payments for use of financial assets, buildings, earth, author's rights, patents, etc.); income from personal subsidiary farm, garden, kitchen garden (cost of net production). Also other sources of income are possible (a prize in a lottery, a prize for a victory in a competition, a competition, etc.).

From a legal point of view, the incomes are divided into legal and illegal, received within a hidden economy. The latter include income received from activities not registered in accordance with the established procedure, concealed from taxation and control by the state. To measure the level and structure of household incomes, a number of indicators characterizing them in various aspects are used. One of the main indicators is the amount of personal income of the population - all types of income of the population, received in cash or in kind. This indicator can be calculated directly for individual households on the basis of statistics on family budgets, but it does not reflect either the general or real incomes of the population. Aggregate (total) income (VOS) is determined by summing the individual incomes and the cost of free or concessional services to the public through public consumption funds. The cost of services is determined by calculation [1].

The above figures, calculated in the prices of the current period, are called nominal income indicators. They do not determine the real content of income, i.e. Do not show how much material goods and services are available to the population at the current level of income. For the calculation of the price index and tariffs for paid services, statistical authorities conduct monthly registration of prices for food and non-food products-representatives and services since 1989. The survey is conducted on a fairly wide range of goods (up to 650 positions), sold through various channels. It should be noted, however, that the prices of supply of goods are recorded, which in many cases differ from the purchase prices.

The result, also called the cost-of-living index, shows how much the population began spending to buy food, goods and services (that is, consumer spending) in the current period compared to the basic one if the level of consumption remained unchanged when prices changed, basic. Such a calculation is correct if there are no significant changes in the structure of consumer spending during the analyzed period.

The subsistence minimum is an indicator of the volume and structure of consumption of the most important material goods and services at the minimum acceptable level, which provides the conditions for maintaining the active physical condition of adults, social and physical development of children and adolescents. The budget of the subsistence minimum is the valuation of the subsistence level of the subsistence minimum; in addition, it includes the costs of taxes and other mandatory payments.

The needs of the population are significantly differentiated depending on its socio-demographic characteristics and living conditions, so the subsistence minimum is calculated not only on average per capita or family, but also separately for different categories: children (up to 7 years), adolescents (7-15 years), able-bodied citizens, pensioners. The subsistence minimum of a particular family can be determined on the basis of its actual composition and magnitude. The basis of all calculations is a set of food for the subsistence minimum, including food products, combined into 10 aggregated groups: bakery products; potatoes; vegetables; fruits and berries; meat products; milk products; fish products; eggs; sugar and confectionery; vegetable oil, margarine. The cost estimate of the cost of the subsistence minimum budget for food is carried out by evaluating the natural set for each group of goods at the average purchase prices of the corresponding goods. Average prices are determined by household statistics.

The total amount of the budget of a subsistence minimum includes expenses on nonfoods, services, taxes and other obligatory payments besides expenses on food and is defined by adjustment on the basis of the cost of food set and approximate structure of the budget of a subsistence minimum. The structure of the budget depends on the size of a household income. For calculations actually developed costs breakdown of 10 % of the least wealthy families in the basic period is used.

The analysis of income of family (household) begins with calculation of their general levels that already represents the difficult economic task including logical coordination of their results along with computing operations. Then the role of various sources in formation of income and also factors on which their level and structure depend are analyzed. Income of different social national groups, the groups differing on the status in employment, to the structure of families, etc. are compared.

In revenue breakdown the following main sources are allocated:

- 1) compensation and income from an entrepreneurial activity, including separately compensation employed;
- 2) Pensions (labor and social);
- 3) Grants;
- 4) Grants (by types);
- 5) Dividends and payments per shares and to other securities and also income from property;
- 6) Receipts from insurance;
- 7) Receipts from bank accounts;
- 8) Receipts from property sale (by types);

- 9) Receipts from sale of shares and other securities;
- 10) Receipts from foreign currency sales;
- 11) Credits, loans, debts;
- 12) Other receipts.

The balance of money at the beginning of the analyzed period is also taken into account - the so-called carry-over sums.

These cash incomes are a mobile part of the aggregate income. This part at the discretion of the owners is spent on the acquisition of various material benefits, as well as payment for consumer services or can accumulate in the form of savings. Incomes received in the form of free or partially paid benefits, free services consumed by the population through public or trust funds, are an immobile part of the aggregate income. They also determine the standard of living, but are strictly targeted, i.e. cannot be replaced by the amount of money equivalent to the cost of these services and benefits. Statistical data also for the purpose of studying of the directions of use of income by the population are analyzed in great detail. The enlarged expenditure structure for the intended purpose includes the following groups:

1. Purchase of food products and - separately - expenses for public catering.
2. Purchase of non-food products, including: a) clothes, linen, shoes, fabrics; b) durable goods; c) hygiene products, medicines, building materials, etc.
3. Monetary expenses for payment of services.
4. Other expenses.
5. Accumulation (accounts in banks, purchase of securities, foreign currency, etc.).
6. Cash money.

The analysis is carried out in the context of individual socio-demographic and income groups of the population, in a territorial aspect, as well as using detailed cost estimates by types and methods of consumption. The values of incomes and expenditures of the population not only characterize the budgets of families, but are also used to build balances of money incomes and expenditures of the population and to determine the indicators of the household account in the system of national accounts.

Thus, not only the volume of accumulation towards increase, but also the relation to forms of accumulation of money – first of all in favor of purchase of currency changed.

Let's note that so it turned out that the calculated indicators of level and quality of life standardized and ranked according to separate characteristics of developed countries of the world (and, first of all, the USA and Europe) and expressed in a quantitative monetary form, absolutely closed the fact that the quality of life is a concept multidimensional and not reduced to individual techno-organizational characteristics.

The quality of life and its various indexes are used for the characteristic of welfare and wellbeing of society. Unlike «level of living» which characterizes only economic and external living conditions of the person «the quality of life» reflects a condition of the person in economic and social reality of his actual life. These indicators are close to the Index of Human Development (IHD) admitted to the UN since 1990 which is calculated as the average weighed longevity, of education and material well-being and allows to range the countries on the basis of comparison of the actual situation with the best and worst achievements both other indexes and criteria existing and already rather well tested in world practice.

Under the quality standards of life extremely variable standards, extremely various, multiple-address and typologically organized for different national groups and under different schemes of work mean. Such standards include the following indicators:

- Birth rate and mortality;
- Number of marriages and stains;
- Feasibility of the right of the child to live and be brought up in family;
- Prospects of the childhood and life;
- Availability of education;
- Quality of education;
- Variety of educational services;
- Availability of subjects to cultural appointment;
- Development of a social infrastructure and social services;
- Development of a social security system poor and elderly;
- Availability of medical services and their quality;

- Variety of systems of professionalizing;
- Existence of prospects of employment.

Thus one of the most important tasks of social policy is the problem of growth of level and quality of life of the population. In Kazakhstan, as well as on all former Soviet Union during a transition period there was a sharp falling of a level of living of the population; all social infrastructure was almost destroyed. Certainly, it was connected with crisis of economy and lack of concrete social policy.

According to various estimates (including sociological polls of the population), the size of fall of income for separate categories of the population for years of reforming of economy fluctuates from 5 to 20 times and more than [2]. Decrease in a level of living causes growth of social tension, refusal of support of reforms from a certain part of the population. Meanwhile, as international experience testifies, success of social and economic transformations depends in many respects on behavior and active participation of a general population. For 1997-2000 rather steady tendency of the sizes of income gained by lower-income strata remained: according to results of inspections of households, 51-62 % of the population of Kazakhstan had average monetary per capita income lower than 3000 tenge a month. A third of the population these years had the average per capita income of 3001-6000 tenge a month, or less than 70 US dollars at the rate of 1997-1998. The difference in income at an urban and rural population is most noticeable. In particular, if in 1999 in the cities the specific weight of the needy population (with the average located per capita income less than 3000 tenge a month) was 49,1 %, then in the rural zone - 83,3 %, by 2000 respectively - 33,1 % and 73,2 %. Results of the conducted sociological survey confirm these data: income of 3-5 thousand tenge in a mudflow has 27 % answering in the city - 22,9 %; income to 3 thousand tenge - according to 14,9 % and 11,4 %; 5-8 thousand tenge - 10,8 % and 19,6 %; the people having income of 8-12 thousand tenge in the village are twice less, than in the city, and income over 16 thousand tenge in the village was not noted by any of answering. Differentiation on income and on regions is also high. The highest is the average per capita income of residents of the cities of Almaty and Astana. For March, 2000 monetary income in these cities made respectively 7061 and 6176 tenge. The lowest income at residents of the Southern Kazakhstan and Almaty regions are 2333 and 2027 tenge.

Although nominal cash incomes in 2000 increased almost threefold on average in the republic in 1995, in 2000, compared to the previous year, this growth amounted to 17.5 %, real incomes for the year increased only by 3.2 %. Nominal cash incomes of townspeople are twice higher than those of villagers, and in 2000, respectively, amounted to 4145 and 2044 tenge on average for the month. One of the reasons for such a significant gap is the natural forms of economic management common in the countryside in recent years and the non-monetary forms of exchange that accompany them.

To estimate the average level of incomes of the population, we compare them with the subsistence minimum. The average monthly subsistence minimum exceeds the average monthly income per capita by an average of 1.1 times. The ratio of per capita income of the population to the subsistence level gives an indicator of the purchasing power of monetary incomes. This ability of the main part of the population in comparison with the pre-reform period has significantly decreased. As of March 2000, the level of purchasing power was 0.9 times the subsistence level (for comparison: in Russia this figure is 1.41). The change in incomes occurs simultaneously with the increase in prices, and their material content largely depends on the level and state of prices for specific goods and services. In recent years, there has been a trend towards a decrease in the rate of inflation, although of the factors that could worsen the material situation, the respondents most often identified inflation (36.2 % of the townspeople and 25.7 % of the villagers). However, the growth rates of prices for socially important goods and services remain quite high. Prices for housing maintenance and utilities remain high. The consumer price index in 2000 to the previous one was 13.2 %, and by 1995 - 88.5 %.

Also, prices and tariffs for services grew, which grow much faster than prices for goods: for 1996-1999, services grew 4-fold, and goods became more expensive only 1.4 times. Passenger transport services went up by 11.4 %, institutions of culture and sports - by 5.3 %, education - by 3.3 %, housing and communal services by 7.8 %, healthcare - by 5.1 %. The growing differentiation of the population in terms of monetary income has led to an increase in the proportion of the population that has incomes below the subsistence level. If we compare the level of poverty in the United States, countries of Western Europe, Russia and Kazakhstan by the situation for 1996, then for our country this picture is more than depressing. The poverty level in the United States, Belgium, the Netherlands, and France is about the same level (13-14 %), Russia is roughly on the same level as countries such as Italy, Spain, Great Britain, Greece (20-22 %), in Denmark (6 %) [3]. In Kazakhstan, the poverty rate is more than twice as high as the US, 1.5 times higher than in Russia, and almost 6 times higher than in Denmark. The tool for determining the monetary income required for an ade-

quate standard of living is usually the consumer budget of the minimum standard of living, containing quantitative sets of goods and services and valued at retail prices. In the US in 1996, the real cost of living was almost \$ 8,000, which roughly corresponds to the same indicator in the developed countries of Western Europe. This indicator is more than 300 times higher than the officially established subsistence level in Kazakhstan, which in 2000 was equal to 4007 tenge.

Over the years of reforms, the structure of the population's incomes has not undergone significant changes, as it was ten years ago, the share of income from work is the most significant part, the income from all types of sales has grown. The structure of incomes in urban and rural areas differs significantly. One of the most important sources of income for rural residents is the sale of products produced in their own economy. The share of this income for rural residents is 21 % and for urban residents - 7 %. The share of wages in the total income of urban residents exceeds the mark of 76 %, and in rural areas - only 59 %.

As can be seen from the structure of the monetary incomes of the population, the basis for the reproduction of the worker and his family is the salary. The trend of growth in wage differentiation in the social sphere is related to the existing imbalance in the existing wage system in various sectors financed from budgets of various levels. Although nominal wages also tended to increase, but the rate of its growth did not keep pace with the rate of price growth. According to the Ministry of Labor Protection of the Republic of Kazakhstan, the average monthly real wages of employees have decreased by 50 % since 1991. The minimum wage for the past few years remains very low relative to the size of the subsistence minimum. Another condition for the polarization of income is an increase in the wage gap. Here you can observe the following types of differentiation. First, the differences in wages of the main part of employees and administration in the same enterprise reach 10-20 times. Secondly, sectional differences in wages are 15 times, and regional - 3 times. Thirdly, the difference in wages between public and private enterprises, including joint ventures, is 7.2-fold. There is a big difference between the minimum and maximum average monthly accrued wages of employees by types of economic activity. So, in 2000, the minimum wage was only 15.7 % of the maximum wage, whereas in 1990 the lowest wage was 54.5 % compared to the highest. The lowest wages are in those areas that ensure the reproduction of human capital - education, health, social services. The highest wages are in the mining industry and financial institutions. In Kazakhstan, before the transition, the distribution of income was more even, this was due to the fact that almost all income in the form of wages or transfers was received by the population through state bodies. At present, the question of the uneven distribution of incomes is acute before us. The limits of optimal income differentiation, tested by world practice, are 4-6 times. Thus, the degree of inequality in the 90s among the developed countries was the smallest in Japan - 4.3 times, in Germany - 5.7, in Italy - 6, in France - 6.5, in the United Kingdom - 6.8, in the United States - 8.9 times. In Kazakhstan, the gap in the level of monetary incomes of 10 % of the wealthiest and poorest segments of the population in 2000 was 11.9 times, while before the reforming years this figure was 4; if in the city this coefficient was 10.4 times, in rural areas - 18.4 times. The richest 20 % of the population accounted for 43.1 %, while the less well-off - only 6.1 % of the income.

In developed countries, no more than 50 % of household incomes go to purchase goods and services, and in our country in 2000, 83 % was spent on consumer spending, which is more than 10 % more than in 1990. Consumer spending includes food expenses - in 2000, 50 % was spent, in 1990 - 30.3 %, for non-food products, respectively, 26 % and 35 %, for payment of various services - 24 % and 9.4 %. By the share of the family budget used for food, it is possible to judge the level of well-being. According to international statistics, the family is considered poor if it spends more than 50 % of its income on food. The share of food products in the structure of consumer spending of the villagers is 51 %.

It should be noted that in the structure of consumption there is a shift in costs from the purchase of goods to pay for services. More than half of the total payment for services goes to utilities, housing maintenance and repairs (51 %). Half of the population, having an average income of up to 3000 tenge per month, is forced to choose between buying food and essential goods and paying for utilities, the average cost of which varies between 2-4 thousand tenge. As evidenced by the experience of industrial countries, in order to stimulate effective demand and economic development, it is necessary to increase wages. At the same time, the growth of the purchasing power of the population should be accompanied by moderate inflation, which will not hamper economic development if the growth of wages is countered by an increase in the commodity mass.

More than a quarter of the costs for services are transport and communications, 11 % for education services, 5 % for health, 3 % for individual services. Practically there are no costs for cultural events and leisure activities, which lead to spiritual improvement of the population. Absolutely nothing remains on the accumu-

lation of savings on deposits and securities, in such circumstances, the state cannot remove from itself the solution of most of the problems of life support for the population. If at the present time all the burden of caring for the increase of «consumer wealth» (primarily housing and communal reforms) on the shoulders of the population is shifted, the result of this will be a reduction in the real disposable incomes of the population, especially the poorest sections of the population will lose much.

The number of economically active population in 2000 remained at the level of about 47.8 % of the total population. Analysis of data over a number of years shows that the ratio of employed to the entire population of the country increases with positive economic growth. According to labor force surveys conducted in a number of countries, approximately 10 % of the total numbers of economically inactive people are job seekers who do not have the opportunity to start immediately, and those who are desperate to find work [4]. The number of employed decreased from 1991 to 2000 by 19.6 %, men by 17.3 %, and women by 22.1 %. The same trend is observed in the ratio of employed to the total population, which decreased from 47.2 % to 46.1 %. And this trend is accompanied by a drop in the total number of residents of the republic by 1,462.1 thousand people, or 1.1 times. It should be noted that the largest part of the employed population by sector - in the private sector (76.7 %), by industry - in the service sector (59.6 %). As of the end of December 2000, the number of unemployed was 906.4 thousand people, the unemployed, who were officially registered with the employment agencies, 231.4 thousand people. The level of officially registered unemployment at the same time was 3.7 % of the working-age population of the country. In rural areas, as of the end of June 2001, unemployed people accounted for 38.7 % of the total number. At the same time, in comparison with 1999, the level of official unemployment increased by 1.3 percentage points, the total number of unemployed decreased slightly. It should be noted that the data provided by the Agency on Statistics and the data provided in the Human Development Report of the Republic of Kazakhstan for 1997 on unemployment have significant differences: for example, the difference for 1994 was 42.9 thousand people, in 1995 - 63, 4 thousand, in 1996 - 109,3 thousand people.

In 2000, the total unemployment was 906.4 thousand people, which is equal to 12.8 % of the economically active population. The modern labor market is characterized by a high level of hidden unemployment. The average duration of unemployment in mid-2001 was 8.2 months, while the same figure in 1998 was only 6 months. At the same time in search of work for more than 12 months in 2001 there were 73.2 thousand people (one in three of the registered ones), which is twice as much as at the end of 1998. From 6 to 12 months, 59.4 thousand people (that is, every fourth registered unemployed) were looking for a job, which is 6.8 % less than in the same period last year. The longest unemployment among the CIS countries in Armenia is 14 months, in Ukraine -11, the lowest in Uzbekistan - 4 months. From the distribution of the unemployed by duration, it can be seen that it is increasing; this indicates that the employment of people is small, as well as the small number of people applying to employment agencies. The effectiveness of the employment service for the retraining of the unemployed raises serious doubts. So, in 1999, only 12.8 thousand people were employed, which is 3.6 % of the number of applicants.

Considering the problem of unemployment in Kazakhstan, it is necessary to separately note that at present the female and youth human capital is the most vulnerable on the labor market. Thus, at the end of 2000, women accounted for 57.2 % of the total number of officially registered unemployed, and 29.1 % for young people (aged 19-29). The level of official unemployment among women is 1.5 times higher than among men (for 2000, respectively, 4.3 % and 3.0 %), and among youth - 0.6 percentage points higher than the general official level. Women among job seekers with the assistance of employment services at the beginning of 2000 were 63-57 % in Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, 60-69 % in Belarus and Russia. The share of young people in the number of unemployed varied from 30-36 % in Kyrgyzstan and Russia, 40-53 % in Belarus, and up to 60-62 % in Tajikistan. State programs should stimulate the creation and transformation of jobs in more promising and developed sectors of the economy, attracting not only budgetary funds, but also means of business owners and investors.

Thus, since 1999 GDP growth has been observed and accordingly there have been slow, but progressive changes towards the growth of the material well-being of the country's population. In 2003-2005, high growth rates of the economy of Kazakhstan were achieved, raising living standards and welfare of the population, against the backdrop of a stable socio-political situation in the society. In 2003-2006, it was planned to ensure an average annual real increase in gross domestic product of 7-7.5 %. However, the balanced economic policy of the Government and dynamic carrying out reforms allowed to provide average annual growth rate of GDP during 2003-2005 of 9,4 % a year. In 2005, according to preliminary data of the Agency of the Republic of Kazakhstan on Statistics, GDP growth compared to the previous year was 9.4 %. Ade-

quate economic growth is increasing the welfare of the people of Kazakhstan. In this area, the goal was to raise the level of GDP per capita in 2006 to \$ 2,600. However, the high growth rates of the economy made it possible to surpass this figure by the results of 2005. According to preliminary data, per capita GDP in 2005 amounted to 3620 US dollars. In general, for 2003–2005, per capita GDP increased by 1.3 times.

So, in the last decade of the 20th century, the state of human capital in the Republic of Kazakhstan was characterized by a number of negative phenomena: low incomes of the majority of the population, weak social protection and labor market regulation, a violation of the connection between the price of labor and the cost of worker reproduction, lack of guarantees in the spheres of education and health, culture. In turn, the low quality of human capital has had a negative impact on economic development, destabilizing the socio-economic situation. Under these conditions, the increase in the level of human capital must be the main guideline of the state's social and economic policy.

References

- 1 Суриков А. Основные показатели уровня жизни населения в условиях рыночной экономики / А. Суриков // Вестн. статистики. — 1992. — № 12. — С. 11–15.
- 2 Кривко Н.И. Оценка уровня бедности в Республике Казахстан / Н.И. Кривко // Экономика и статистика. — 2000. — № 2. — С. 9–16.
- 3 Лебедева Л.Ф. Экономическая безопасность человека / Л.Ф. Лебедева // США и Канада: экономика, политика, культура. — 1999. — № 9. — С. 66–78.
- 4 Мухамедиева А.Д. Тенденции развития современного международного рынка труда / А.Д. Мухамедиева, З.А. Коканбаева, Ж.Ж. Айгазин // Экономика и статистика. — 2000. — № 2. — С. 94–99.

Э.Е. Әлжанова

Қазақстан халқының өмір сүру деңгейінің XX ғ. соңғы он жылдығындағы көрсеткіштері

Мақалада Қазақстан халқының әлеуметтік индикаторлар мен халықтың өмір сүру деңгейінің XX ғасырдың соңғы он жылдығындағы көрсеткіштері қарастырылған. Әлеуметтік саясаттың ең маңызды міндеттерінің бірі халықтың өмірлерінің сапасы мен деңгейлерінің арту проблемасы болып табылады. Қазақстанда және бүкіл посткеңестік кеңістіктегі өтпелі кезеңде халықтың өмір сүру деңгейінің күрт құлдырап, барлық әлеуметтік инфрақұрылымдары іс жүзінде жойылды. Әрине, бұл дағдарыс экономика мен нақты әлеуметтік саясаттың болмауына байланысты болды. Өмір сүру деңгейі жеткілікті күрделі және көпқырлы категория болып табылады. Өмір сүру деңгейінің көптеген элементтерінің бір-бірімен өзара байланыстылығына қарамастан, олар елеулі ерекшеліктер мен спецификаларға ие және олардың кешенді сипаттамалары үшін тиісті жүйелердің ерекше көрсеткіштерін пайдалану талап етіледі. Мұндай жүйелердегі әртүрлі көрсеткіштерді қандай да бір бірыңғай көрсеткішке ұтымды жинақтаудың тиімді тәсілдерінің жоқтығына байланысты, отандық және халықаралық тәжірибеде танылған өмір сүру деңгейін жан-жақты сипаттайтын дербес бір көрсеткішті пайдалану мүмкін емес.

Кілт сөздер: қоғамның әлеуметтік құрылымы, халықты жұмыспен қамту және еңбек шарттары, халықтың табысы, еңбек төлем ақысы, әлеуметтік және халыққа тұрмыстық қызмет көрсету.

Э.Е. Альжанова

Показатели уровня жизни населения Казахстана за последние десять лет XX века

В статье рассмотрены социальные индикаторы и показатели уровня жизни населения Казахстана за последние десять лет XX в. Одной из наиболее важных задач социальной политики является проблема роста уровня и качества жизни населения. В Казахстане, как и на всем постсоветском пространстве, в переходный период произошло резкое падение уровня жизни населения, практически была уничтожена вся социальная инфраструктура. Безусловно, это было связано с кризисом экономики и отсутствием конкретной социальной политики. Уровень жизни является достаточно сложной и многогранной категорией. Несмотря на то, что многие элементы жизненного уровня взаимосвязаны между собой, они имеют значительные особенности, специфику и для их комплексной характеристики тре-

буется использование соответствующей системы специфических показателей. Автором сделан вывод, что из-за отсутствия рационального способа объединения разнородных показателей такой системы в некий единый показатель в отечественной и международной практике признано невозможным использование одного показателя, всесторонне характеризующего уровень жизни.

Ключевые слова: социальная структура общества, занятость населения и условия труда, доходы населения, оплата труда, социальное и бытовое обслуживание населения.

References

- 1 Surikov, A. (1992). Osnovnye pokazateli urovnia zhizni naseleniia v usloviakh rynochnoi ekonomiki [The main indicators of living standards of the population in a market economy]. *Vestnik statistiki – Bulletin of statistics*, 12, 11–15 [in Russian].
- 2 Krivko, N.I. (2000). Otsenka urovnia bednosti v Respublike Kazakhstan [Poverty assessment in the Republic of Kazakhstan]. *Ekonomika i statistika – Economics and statistics*, 2, 9–16 [in Russian].
- 3 Lebedeva, L.F. (1999). Ekonomicheskaiа bezopasnost cheloveka [Economic human security]. *SSHA i Kanada: ekonomika, politika, kultura – USA & Canada: economy, politics, culture*, 9, 66–78 [in Russian].
- 4 Mukhamediyeva, A.D., Kokanbayeva, Z.A., & Aygazin, Zh.Zh. (2000). Tendentsii razvitiia sovremennoho mezhdunarodnoho rynka truda [Trends in the development of the modern international labourmarket]. *Ekonomika i statistika – Economics and statistics*, 2, 94–99 [in Russian].