ISSN 2224-5294

ҚАЗАҚСТАН РЕСПУБЛИКАСЫ
ҰЛТТЫҚ ҒЫЛЫМ АКАДЕМИЯСЫНЫҢ

Абай атындағы Қазақ ұлттық педагогикалық университетінің

Х А Б А Р Л А Р Ы

ИЗВЕСТИЯ

НАЦИОНАЛЬНОЙ АКАДЕМИИ НАУК
РЕСПУБЛИКИ КАЗАХСТАН
Казахский национальный
педагогический университет им. Абая

N E W S

OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF CIENCES
OF THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN
Abay kazakh national
pedagogical university

SERIES
OF SOCIAL AND HUMAN SCIENCES

1 (323)

JANUARY – FEBRUARY 2019

PUBLISHED SINCE JANUARY 1962

PUBLISHED 6 TIMES A YEAR

ALMATY, NAS RK

«Қазақстан Республикасы Ұлттық ғылым академиясының Хабарлары. Қоғамдық және гуманитарлық ғылымдар сериясы». ISSN 2224-5294

Меншіктенуші: «Қазақстан Республикасының Ұлттық ғылым академиясы» РҚБ (Алматы қ.)
Қазақстан республикасының Мәдениет пен ақпарат министрлігінің Ақпарат және мұрағат комитетінде 30.04.2010 ж. берілген **№ 10894-Ж** мерзімдік басылым тіркеуіне қойылу туралы куәлік

Мерзімділігі: жылына 6 рет.
Тиражы: 500 дана.

Редакцияның мекенжайы: 050010, Алматы қ., Шевченко көш., 28, 219 бөл., 220, тел.: 272-13-19, 272-13-18,
http://soc-human.kz/index.php/en/arhiv

Типографияның мекенжайы: «Аруна» ЖК, Алматы қ., Муратбаева көш., 75.

Известия Национальной академии наук Республики Казахстан. Серия общественных и гумани-тарных наук. ISSN 2224-5294
Собственник: РОО «Национальная академия наук Республики Казахстан» (г. Алматы)
Свидетельство о постановке на учет периодического печатного издания в Комитете информации и архивов Министерства культуры и информации Республики Казахстан **№ 10894-Ж**, выданное 30.04.2010 г.

Периодичность 6 раз в год
Тираж: 500 экземпляров

Адрес редакции: 050010, г. Алматы, ул. Шевченко, 28, ком. 219, 220, тел. 272-13-19, 272-13-18,
http://soc-human.kz/index.php/en/arhiv

Адрес типографии: ИП «Аруна», г. Алматы, ул. Муратбаева, 75

News of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Series of Social and Humanities.
ISSN 2224-5294
Owner: RPA "National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan" (Almaty)
The certificate of registration of a periodic printed publication in the Committee of information and archives of the Ministry of culture and information of the Republic of Kazakhstan **N 10894-Ж**, issued 30.04.2010

Periodicity: 6 times a year
Circulation: 500 copies

Editorial address: 28, Shevchenko str., of. 219, 220, Almaty, 050010, tel. 272-13-19, 272-13-18,
http://soc-human.kz/index.php/en/arhiv

Address of printing house: ST "Aruna", 75, Muratbayev str, Almaty

N E W S
OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OF THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN
SERIES OF SOCIAL AND HUMAN SCIENCES
ISSN 2224-5294 **https://doi.org/10.32014/2019.2224-5294.37**
Volume 1, Number 323 (2019), 252 – 256

UDC 349.2

A.Z. Issayeva[1], Z.A. Issayeva [2]

[1]ZhansugurovZhetysu State University, Taldykorgan, Kazakhstan;
[2]Korkyt Ata Kyzylorda State University, Kyzylorda, Kazakhstan
ayim_09@mail.ru, Jannat1701@mail.ru

IMPLEMENTATION OF PRINCIPLE OF PARTIES COMPETITIVENESS ON LABOR DISPUTESIN THE COURT

Abstract. The work deals with the problems of the implementation of the principle of competitiveness in civil procedure while considering labor disputes. Based on the research done, the authors state that evidentiary presumptions may be indirect. Despite the current rule of sharing the burden of proof between the parties, the authors justify the needto exclude from the general rule and apply general or special rules of evidence (evidentiary presumptions)to resolve labor disputes. Therefore, in labor disputes the distribution of the burden of proof must be based on the previously known rules, and not at the discretion of the parties.

Keywords: principle of competitiveness, civil procedure, labor disputes, burden of proof, negative facts, evidentiary presumptions.

The properresolution of the issue regarding the distribution of the burden of proof directly affects the effectiveness of judicial protection. This problem is complicated, since the distribution of burden ofproofis rarely directly defined in the law. Moreover, the parties choose their position, methods and means of defending it independently and regardless of the court and other persons involved in the case during the civil procedure. In this case, such form of exclusion from the general rule is required according toArticle 15 of the Civil Procedure Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan (CPC RK) [1]. Of course, there are laws where this issue is solved quite easily. For example, in China “the judge distributes the burden of proof at his own discretion according to the category of cases for which the rules of evidence do not regulate this distribution” [2, p.105].

In our opinion, in labor disputes the distribution of the burden of proof should be based on previously known rules, and not on the discretion of the parties. Therefore, there is a need to consider the issue concerning the fact whether general or special rules of evidence (evidentiary presumptions) are applied to solve various labor disputes. For this purpose, it is also important to determine how such exceptions to the general rule can be justified.

As it was already mentioned,Article 15 of CPC RK establishes a general rule which saysthat everyone proves what he refers to,unless otherwise provided by law. Therefore, first of all, it is necessary to refer to labor legislation.

Thus, in the literature there is a statement which says “in the legislation on labor disputes ... no presumptions are established” [3, p.117]. It should be noted that this judgment is too categorical. For example, in disputes about financial liability there is a guilt presumption of an employee, who an agreement on full financial liability is concluded with [4, p.65]. This thesis is based on part 3 of Article 123 of the Labor Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan [5], which states that an employee is obliged to compensate the direct actual damage caused to the employer. Therefore, laborlegislationstillprovidesforsomeevidentiarypresumptions.

In addition, M.K.Treushnikovnotes that, although the literature denied the availability of special rules on the allocation of evidentiary dutiesin labor legislation, the courts developed such rules based on the specific features of labor relations [4, p.70].

Therefore, the following question arises: can exceptions to the general rule be expressedindirectly in the law? To do this, let us turn to the literature devoted to the particular rules of allocation of the burden of proof - legal presumptions. As noted, there are direct presumptions (for example, the presumption that the consumer does not have special knowledge) and indirect prescriptions obtained when interpreting the norms) [6, p.73]. Before that,V.K. Babayev considered the presumptions derived from the meaning of the norms as indirect presumptions (cited on: [7, p.114]. Thus, the presumption does not have to be directly legislated and can be derived from the meaning of the law.

In this regard, the opinion of M.A. Fokinaseems quite reasonable, whonotes that evidentiary presumptions should be secured by “the rule of law or the legal position of the highest judicial bodies” [8, p.40].

It should be noted that there is a significant number of such legal positions on labor disputes. For example, in most cases of reinstatement, an employer must prove the legality of dismissal (paragraphs 13, 24, 26, 28, 30, 31 of the Decree of the Plenary session of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan No.9 of October 6, 2017 “On some issues of the application of legislation by courts while solving labor disputes "(hereinafter - DPSSC No.9) [9]), whereas the employeeprovesforced self-dismissal. In cases of recognition of the transfer as illegal, the employer is obliged to prove the existence of legal grounds for the transfer (paragraph 17 of DPSSC No.9). When challenging a disciplinary sanction, the employer proves compliance with the general principles of legal liability (paragraph 16 of DPSSC No.9). In cases of bringing to financial liability, the employer proves the availability of conditions for the occurrence of liability and the absence of grounds for excluding it.

At the same time, the courts of general jurisdiction and in other cases reallocate the burden of proof. For example, this can be found in disputes concerningsalary recovery, recognition of employment records as invalid, changes in the wording of the basis for dismissal, as well as in the cases regarding the determination of the fact of labor relations [9].

Does this mean that in these cases the courts have allocated the burden of proof in violation of Article 15 ofCPC RK?

Similar conclusion seems to be at least untimely, since if indirect evidentiary presumptions are derived from the meaning of the law, any court can formulate a special rule for the allocation of the burden of proof. Therefore, it is necessary to determine the basis of the supreme judicial authority when it established special rules for the allocation of the burden of proof. If this source is determined, it will be possible to conclude how the burden of proof is distributed in other labor disputes.

To do this, first of all we define the general rule, and then try to understand the possible causes of deviation from it.

The general rule of distribution of the burden of proofwhich is stated in Article 72 of the Civil Procedure Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan, confirms that the party proves the circumstances on which its claims or objections are based. Nevertheless, it is not obvious from this rule who (the plaintiff or the defendant), as a general rule, is obligated to prove, since both parties usually base their claims or objections on something. At the same time, the burden of proof is always placed on someone; otherwise the court will not be able to resolve the case essentially if the evidenceis insufficient.

This contradiction can be eliminated easily if we take into account the fact that the distribution of the burden of proof is of great importance if there is a shortage of evidence [4, p.51]. In such situation, the court determines the circumstances on the basis of evidentiary presumptions. Consequently, further consideration of the case is possible through the application of an evidentiary presumption of the groundlessness of the plaintiff’s claims. If the plaintiffdoes not contradict it, and the defendant does not use his right to prove, the claim will not be satisfied. The general rule sounds like this: the plaintiffis responsible for the burden of proof.

However, a person who hasthe evidence can send it to the court, and this person does not always coincide with the plaintiff. To solve this problem, let us turn to the theory of legal presumptionsagain. As V.M.Baranov, V.B.Pershin, I.V.Pershina reasonably state that the presumption is praxeological in nature [10, p.28]. They propose to consider the presumption as a technique used in a situation of lack of knowledge in order to achieve specific goals. As M.A.Fokinanotes,the purpose of proof is “correct and timely” determination of the circumstances included in the subject of proof [8, p.50]. Thus, evidentiary presumptions are introduced in order to determine the circumstances that are essential for the solution of

the case, that is, to get evidence from the person who has it. So, O.S.Ioffe wrote that the presumption imposes the burden of proving exactly those circumstances that it may be known to it first of all (cited on: [11, p.112].

Therefore, for further discussion it is necessary to determine which of the parties has evidence. In labor relations, the employer draws up the personnel documentation, and the employee only gets acquainted with most documents and receives a small part in available (mainly the employment contract).

At the same time, the issue of collecting evidence by the employee is legally regulated. According to the request of the employee,the employer is obliged to give him certified copies of documents related to the work (Article 62 of the Labor Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan) [5].

However,the given norms do not solve the problem of providing an employee with evidence completely since the list of such documents is limited although it is not comprehensive.

Thus, the employer is not obliged to provide certified copies of the salary and collective agreement, since the employee only gets acquainted with them. Moreover, if the employer fails to fulfill his obligation, the employee will be forced to apply to the court with a request to issue copies of such documents. However, due to the fact that the non-receipt of copies of documents is a negative fact, it is difficult to prove, that is why the employee is often denied in satisfaction of requirements. Consequently, an employee is often unable to provide all the necessary evidence in a labor dispute.

The activity of the court in modern domestic legal proceedings should be taken into account. The court cannot require the party to provide evidence, and they can only propose to do it (part 3 of Article 73 of CPC RK). Also, a party cannot be fined if they avoid issuing evidence (part 7 and 8 of Article 73 of CPC RK). Thus, the full powers of the court do not imply sufficient evidentiary activity.

There is also no doubt that the employee should not be responsible for the improper conducting the personnel case by the employer.

Based on the above mentioned, in order to protect the rights of employees, it is necessary to establish a rule in which the employer will be interested in using his right to submit the necessary personnel documentation to the court, namely: to put the burden of evidence on the employer, that is, to establish a private rule of distribution of the burden of proof. The essence of such rules of evidence consists in the fact that they transfer evidentiary obligation to the opposite side from that one which this fact confirms [4, p.61]. As M.K. Treushnikov states, they are established in the interests of protecting the rights of the party that is placed in more difficult conditions in terms of evidence (ibid.).

In this regard, the following question arises: what is the general idea, in accordance with which specific rules for the distribution of the obligation to prove are determined.Let us considertwobasicassumptions.

1. For example, there is an opinion that negative facts are not subject to proof. The rule concerning the impossibility of proving negative facts was formulated in Ancient Rome, and was also used by the pre-revolutionary lawyerY.A.Nefedyevin the form of the presumption “the absence of negative facts in reality” [12, p.63].

For example, in cases of employment reinstatement, the application of this rule will result in the fact that it is not the employee who proves the illegality of the dismissal (a negative fact), but the employer proves his legality (positive facts). At the same time, the illegality of dismissal is a negative fact, as it is expressed in non-compliance with the order of dismissal (i.e. in the failure of certain actions) or in the absence of legal grounds for dismissal, and the legality of dismissal is characterized as a positive fact (i.e. for dismissal). In general, this corresponds to the legal regulations of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan, however, in our opinion, this assumption requires further research.

The special opinion of the judge N.V.Pavlova to this decree is also of great interest. According to this opinion,in this category of cases, proving a negative fact (absence of a contract) by the plaintiff must be transformed into proving a positive fact by the defendant. Otherwise, due to the objective impossibility to prove the absence of legal relations (especially in the case of the intentional withdrawal of assets), the plaintiff would be deprived of an adequate way to protect his rights. At the same time, such a redistribution of the evidentiary duty is feasible for the defendant and is balanced by the possibility of recovering court costs (including the costs of proof) if there were unsubstantiated claims.The judge N.V. Pavlova also referred to A.F. Kleinman, who noted that in claims concerning the non-performance of

contracts, the creditor proves the existence of the contract, and the debtor makes it enforceable, since it is easier to do it for the defendant [13].

Based on the given position, some negative facts should be established by the presumption of their absence, i.e. by imposing the dutyto disprove this presumption on the defendant (to prove a positive fact).

At the same time, as I.M. Zaitsev and M.A. Fokina noted that despite the viewpoint that negative facts are not subject to proof, no exceptions are provided for them [14].

Based on the above mentioned, they conclude that negative facts of a substantive nature must be proved through indirect evidence, which can be used to establish a positive fact, just as an alibi is proved, for example. Therefore, as the authors continue to reason, not the transfer of property can be proved by the fact of acquiring a thing elsewhere. Therefore, according to the opinion of these scientists, the negative facts should be established logically on the basis of indirect evidence.

It should be noted that in Article 73 of Civil Procedure Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan [1] there are no exceptions for negative facts. As D.A. Shitikov stated, in this case the exclusion of negative facts from the subject of proof results in a direct violation of the rules that imperatively establish the burden of proof (for example, in cases of administrative and other public legal relations) [15, p.33-35].

Thus, on the one hand, one cannot agree that the proof of negative facts is often objectively difficult, but on the other hand, the rule “negative facts are not subject to proof” is not based on law. Thisconclusionmakesusturntoanotherassumption.

2. To do this, let us consider the distribution of responsibilities on the proof according to the “doctrine of pre-procedural interest” of S.V.Kurylev. He expressed the opinion that the parties should take care of the possible proof (cited on: [4, p.62]), on pain of not being able to defend their rights in the court in future. Such rule can be used for relations between commercial organizations, which must properly conduct document circulation and be ready to participate in a dispute because of their contracts concluded by them.

The documentary support of labor relations is carried out by the employer. Thus, in accordance with the law, he is obligated to hire an employee (Article 34 of the Labor Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan), bring to disciplinary responsibility (Article 64 of the Labor Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan), terminate the employment contract (Article 56 of the Labor Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan), determinethe damage and its causes before the employee is brought to the financial liability (Article 120 of LC RK), etc.

Therefore, regarding to labor disputes, it is the employer who has the opportunity to submit documentation to the court and, if he does not submit it, it means that it is not conducted properly, which may mean violation of labor laws. In such situationthe evasion of submitting the written evidence by the employertestifies to the illegality of his actions with a high degree of probability. Therefore, it seems logical to impose the burden of proving the legality of his actionson the employer.

The evidentiary presumption of the illegality of employer’s actions is derived from the legislation, and in accordance with it, the employer is obliged to document the movement of labor relations. It is important to note that in the given cases, when in the absence of an explanation from the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan,the courts of general jurisdiction redistributed the obligation to prove, they most often referred to the “nature of labor relations”. It seems that the incomprehensible "nature" of such relations is expressed in the one-sided duty of the employer to conduct personnel workproperly.

This approach allows us to take into account the objective impossibility of proving some negative facts and at the same time, relying on the legally established basis, explain most of the evidentiary presumptions developed by judicial practice (illegality of dismissal on the initiative of the employer, innocence of an employee in disciplinary and in some cases of financial liability).

As M.K. Treushnikov noted, “the doctrine of pre-procedural interest” is applied only for those cases, where the law indicates the need to perform an action in the prescribed written form, and the general rule should be applied in other cases [4, p.62]. Thus, due to the practically unlimited number of labor disputes within the jurisdiction of the courts, this reasoning remains a hypothesis that requires further verification.

Based on the above, it appears that when resolving most labor disputes, special rulesshould be applied for the distribution of the burden of proof, which may be in the form of direct or indirect evidentiary presumptions. Moreover, the latter are based on the clauses of the labor legislation, which establish the employee’s obligation to keep personnel recordsproperly.

УДК 349.2

А.Ж.Исаева[1], Ж.А.Исаева[2]

[1] І.Жансүгіров атындағы Жетісу мемлекеттік университеті, Талдықорған, Қазақстан
[2] Қорқыт ата атындағы Қызылорда мемлекеттік универистеті, Қызылорда, Қазақстан

ЕҢБЕК ДАУЛАРЫ БОЙЫНША ТАРАПТАРДЫҢ ЖАРЫСПАЛЫЛЫҒЫ ҚАҒИДАСЫН СОТТА ІС АСЫРУ

Аннотация. Жұмыста еңбек дауларын қарау кезінде азаматтық процестегі жарыспалылық қағидатын іске асыру мәселелері зерттеледі. Жүргізілген зерттеу негізінде авторлар дәлелдемелік презумпцияның жанама сипаты болуы мүмкін екендігін көрсетеді. Тараптар арасындағы дәлелдеу уақытын бөлудің қазргі ережесіне қарамастан, авторлар еңбек дауларын шешу кезінде жалпы ережеден алып тастау және дәлелдеудің жалпы немесе арнайы ережелерін (дәлелді презумпциялар) қолдану қажеттілігін негіздейді. Бұл еңбек даулары тараптардың қалауы бойынша емес, дәлелдеу уақытын бөлу алдын ала белгіленген ережелеріге негізделуі тиіс.

Түйін сөздер: жарыспалылық қағидасы, азаматтық процесс, еңбек даулары, дәлелдеу уақыты, отрицательные факты, дәлелдемелер презумпциясы.

УДК 349.2

А.Ж.Исаева[1], Ж.А.Исаева[2]

[1] Жетысуский государственный университет имени Ильяса Жансугурова, Талдыкорган, Казахстан;
[2] Кызылординский государственный университет имени Коркыт ата, Кызылорда, Казахстан

РЕАЛИЗАЦИЯ В СУДЕ ПРИНЦИПА СОСТЯЗАТЕЛЬНОСТИ СТОРОН ПО ТРУДОВЫМ СПОРАМ

Аннотация. В работе исследуются проблемы реализации принципа состязательности в гражданском процессе при рассмотрении трудовых споров. На основании проведенного исследования авторами указывается, что доказательственные презумпции могут иметь косвенный характер. Не смотря на существующее правило распределения времени доказывания между сторонами, авторами обосновывается необходимость при разрешении трудовых споров исключения из общего правила и применение общих или специальных правил доказывания (доказательственные презумпции). В силу этого в трудовых спорах распределение бремени доказывания должно быть основано на заранее известных правилах, а не на усмотрение сторон.

Ключевые слова: принцип состязательности, гражданский процесс, трудовые споры, бремя доказывания, отрицательные факты, доказательственные презумпции.

RESOURCES

[1] Civil Procedure Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated October 31, 2005 No. 377-VRK // http://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/K1500000377

[2] ChenP.Evolution of the role of the judge in the process of establishing the factual circumstances of the case in the Chinese civil procedure //Russian legal journal, **2013**. No.5. P.105-116.

[3] Nurgaliyeva E.N., YermagambetovaZh.B. Individual labor disputes– Almaty, **2004**. P.117.

[4] Treushnikov M.K. Judicial evidence.M.: Gorodets, **1997**. P.320.

[5]Labor Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated November 23, **2015**. No. 414-V ЗRK // http://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/K1500000414

[6]Ukolova T.N., Shevchenko A.A. Rules of distributing evidentiary duties in civil proceedings //Bulletin of the Volga University named after V.N. Tatishchev **2010**. P.69-80

[7]GolovinaS.Yu. Presumptions in labor law //Legal technology, **2010**. No. 47 P.114-118

[8]Fokina M.A. Reforming and developing the institutions of evidence law in Russia: the results of a decade //Bulletin of the civil process 2013. No 4. P. 40-55.

[9]Resolutions of the Plenary session of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated October 6, 2017 No.9."On some issues of using legislation by courts in resolving labor disputes"//Bulletin of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan **2017**, No.10

[10]Baranov V.M., Pershin V.B., Pershina I.V. Methodological background for the formation of the theory of legal presumptions //Legal technology, **2008**. No.2. P.18-30

[11] Galiakbarova G.G. Legal regulation of individual labor disputes: the theory and practice of their resolution. Dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD).Astana: **2016**. P.112

[12]Afanasyev S.F., KatukovaS.Yu. On proving negative facts and the possibility of using fiction of recognition in their justification in civil cases //Russian justice, **2011**. No. 3P. 69-72

[13]Kleinman A.F. The main issues of the theory of evidence in the Soviet civil process, L., **1950**.

[14]Zaitsev I., Fokina M. Negative facts in civil cases//Russian justice 2000, No. 3 //Reference system "ConsultantPlus"

[15]Shitikov D.A. Proving negative facts in civil and arbitration proceedings //Arbitration and civil proceedings.**2013**,No 7. P. 33-38.

PUBLICATION ETHICS AND PUBLICATION MALPRACTICE IN THE JOURNALS OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OF THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN

For information on Ethics in publishing and Ethical guidelines for journal publication see http://www.elsevier.com/publishingethics and http://www.elsevier.com/journal-authors/ethics.

Submission of an article to the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan implies that the work described has not been published previously (except in the form of an abstract or as part of a published lecture or academic thesis or as an electronic preprint, see http://www.elsevier.com/postingpolicy), that it is not under consideration for publication elsewhere, that its publication is approved by all authors and tacitly or explicitly by the responsible authorities where the work was carried out, and that, if accepted, it will not be published elsewhere in the same form, in English or in any other language, including electronically without the written consent of the copyright-holder. In particular, translations into English of papers already published in another language are not accepted.

No other forms of scientific misconduct are allowed, such as plagiarism, falsification, fraudulent data, incorrect interpretation of other works, incorrect citations, etc. The National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan follows the Code of Conduct of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), and follows the COPE Flowcharts for Resolving Cases of Suspected Misconduct (http://publicationethics.org/files/u2/New_Code.pdf). To verify originality, your article may be checked by the originality detection service Cross Check http://www.elsevier.com/editors/plagdetect.

The authors are obliged to participate in peer review process and be ready to provide corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed. All authors of a paper should have significantly contributed to the research.

The reviewers should provide objective judgments and should point out relevant published works which are not yet cited. Reviewed articles should be treated confidentially. The reviewers will be chosen in such a way that there is no conflict of interests with respect to the research, the authors and/or the research funders.

The editors have complete responsibility and authority to reject or accept a paper, and they will only accept a paper when reasonably certain. They will preserve anonymity of reviewers and promote publication of corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed. The acceptance of a paper automatically implies the copyright transfer to the National Academy of sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

The Editorial Board of the National Academy of sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan will monitor and safeguard publishing ethics.

Правила оформления статьи для публикации в журнале смотреть на сайте:

www:nauka-nanrk.kz

http://soc-human.kz/index.php/en/arhiv

Редакторы *М.С. Ахметова, Т.А. Апендиев, Д.С. Аленов*
Верстка на компьютере *А.М. Кульгинбаевой*

Подписано в печать 10.02.2019
Формат 60x881/8. Бумага офсетная. Печать – ризограф.
п.л. Тираж 500. Заказ 1.