

EVERYDAY CULTURE AND CULTURAL STUDIES

¹*Narymbaev Kuandyk*, ²*Sirin Yilmaz*, ³*Ismagambetova Zuchra*

¹*narymbaev.kgu@mail.ru*, ²*sirinyo@hacettepe.edu.tr*, ³*zuchra-50@mail.ru*

^{1,3}*Al-Farabi Kazakh National University (Almaty, Kazakhstan)*

²*Turkish Folk Education at Hacettepe University (Ankara, Turkey)*

¹*Нарымбаев Қуандық Датхабайұлы*, ²*Сирина Йылмаз*,

³*Исмагамбетова Зухра Нұрланқызы*

¹*narymbaev.kgu@mail.ru*, ²*sirinyo@hacettepe.edu.tr*, ³*zuchra-50@mail.ru*

^{1,3}*Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті*

(Алматы, Қазақстан)

²*Түрік Халық Білім бөлімі Хаджеттене университеті (Анкара, Түркия)*

Annotation. One of the little-studied and, at the same time, most important problems of cultural studies and cultural anthropology is the topic of everyday culture. During the development of science, history, politics, and technical development could not absorb everyday culture. The fact that everyday culture itself is increasingly becoming a complex problem is the main subject of research. As a phenomenon of everyday culture, it has been presented as a theoretical problem justifying social and cognitive value in human sociocultural life.

Cultural study is relevant to understanding the constant signs of life in sociocultural objects over many years. Therefore, substantiating methodological orientations for analyzing the development of social life was an important methodological position of cultural study.

The main nature of the interest in cultural study lies in the analysis of standard developing systems, as well as in determining their patterns and causes. The main features of objects found in everyday culture were recognized as their material stability and physical materiality. Understanding the deeper meanings of everyday life is the subject of the leading research experience of the proverb. In the article, the authors point out that the importance of understanding everyday life is that it shapes a person's daily actions not only depending on his social position but also on the cultural conditions in which he works.

The primary practical significance of everyday culture lies in the fact that during research work, a person pays attention to his activities and the order in his daily culture and considers actions that have become part of everyday culture.

Therefore, the study used a structural-functional approach. The materials of cultural research were used in the modern practice of everyday culture.

Keywords: everyday culture, culture, everyday life, life, cultural analysis.

Introduction

The topic of everyday culture is one of the little-developed cultural, philosophical, and theoretical problems in our domestic science of culture and foreign works. For a long time, this topic did not act as a subject and object of research in cultural science and the philosophy of culture. There are certain established scientific stereotypes for this. Many phenomena in our everyday culture represent executive function

activities in everyday life. If everyday life is so unknown, the question arises: why should we write about it, and is it worth exploring in the context of social science? But it turns out that there are several reasons for its study, among which it is necessary to indicate not only what it represents but also, as recent studies show, there is more meaning in everyday life and the unexplored than we think about it ourselves.

This fascinating topic was first brought to the attention of theorists at the Birmingham School of Cultural Studies, and the Raymond Williams Center for the Study of Contemporary Culture, established in 1964, was one of the first pioneers to problematize and justify the need for research on this topic. The work of this Center was to define the concept of a scientific direction based on a new understanding of culture. As a result of the clarifications, everyday culture was recognized as a way of life for a particular community. From this point of view, the understanding of everyday culture has expanded significantly within the framework of the object of study and the framework of the methods used. Since then, everyday culture's sustainable and active development has become visible from other directions. Any activity experienced in the everyday culture of an ordinary person contains social and cultural meanings. In this regard, it has become possible not only to analyze hidden meanings but to study in the context of culture, such as mass movements, social attacks, and practices; it becomes possible to study their hidden intentions through the behavior of their leaders.

According to scientists, the nature of everyday culture has become a condition for the free acceptance of norms, values, and ideologies transmitted through everyday activities. A common task inherent in everyday culture is to define the relationship between people and power, primarily through implicit descriptions of popular media culture.

Cultural studies at the micro and macro levels are analyzed based on the methodological features of the sociocultural systems considered. Researchers have focused on power strategies and underlying ideologies in society, as well as on people's everyday experiences and life positions. Thus, studying everyday life allows us to reconstruct the sociocultural systems that form its primary environment. At the same time, the connection of any phenomenon of everyday culture with political function and ideology makes us think about the issues under consideration.

Another critical aspect of the problematization of this topic is the apparent fact that recently the discipline of "everyday culture" has begun to be included in the university curriculum as an elective course, not only as a subject of scientific research, but also to develop competencies and the ability of young scientists to analyze essential artifacts everyday culture, as well as to provide theoretical and methodological foundations that make it possible to study various phenomena of everyday culture, taking into account the current state of social science, and to consider different points of view that unite modern knowledge on this most critical area of human existence.

Degree of Development of the Problem

The topic of everyday culture as a subject of scientific research constantly attracts the attention of domestic and foreign scientists. K.K. Abdrakhmanova [1, c. 177], B Nurzhanov [2, c. 128], L.A. Bisembaeva [3, c. 230-236], T.Kh. Gabitov [4, c. 89-96], Z.N. Ismagambetova [5, c. 177-180], D. Khamidullina [6, c. 175] represent cultural and historical materials for studying the everyday life of the Kazakh people.

The following works should be noted among Russian scientists: L.V. Belovinsky [7, c. 84-96], N.P. Lukash [8, c. 140], S.M. Florova [9, c. 74-79], and N.B. Semenov [10, c. 170], who focused their attention on solving cultural and social problems of everyday life in the city.

Suppose we dwell on the works of foreign researchers who are devoted to the problem of everyday life. In that case, we should note the work of Professor Megan Morris [11, c. 41-47]. She pays attention to cultural events experiencing an unprecedented boom. Researchers need to see how long this breakthrough lasts and what impact it will have on modern life. Cultural studies attempt to intersect various social and political interests and address many issues on the contemporary scene. In her research, Lata Mani pays attention to these aspects [12, c. 152-153]. She believes that cultural studies focus on integrating and conceptualizing racial, sexual, cultural, and transnational diversity, all their new facets.

Indeed, cultural studies is more than just interdisciplinary; it provides a more or less permanent relationship with academic disciplines that are actively and aggressively anti-disciplinary. In his essay, Graham Turner writes, “At least partly because of the criticism of the disciplines, cultural studies did not want to be united”.

The same problem is paid attention to by theorists of the Birmingham School of Cultural Studies in Great Britain, Richard Hoggart [13, c. 178-180], and Stuart Hall [14, c. 19-37]. Analyzing this aspect of the problem and the acquired experience of cultural research in this area, they note the need for interdisciplinary connections, which will allow Cultural study to extract knowledge from various areas of life, which is necessary for the development of knowledge required for a specific project on the topic of everyday culture.

This is also noted by Georg Simmel [15, c. 231-235], who argued that “the simplest external phenomena of life” are an expression of the social and cultural order in everyday culture, as well as Max Weber [16, c. 54-56], who defined culture “the final segment of the meaningless infinity of the world process,” a segment to which people attach significance. Both Weber and Durkheim mean the same thing in different ways: the culture of each group provides endless opportunities for certain people to understand the world.

Rationale for Choosing a Research Topic

As follows, everyday culture is relatively new based on the degree of development of the problem. It is the focus of scientific interest in the social sciences, especially the science of culture. The complexity of studying this problem is because, on the one hand, being a mass, collective phenomenon, it is difficult to reflect not only by scientists (philosophically, theoretically), but also by the carriers themselves, and therefore many of its elements are often poorly tracked by the everyday consciousness but can be recorded in repeated types of cultural activity and everyday life.

On the other hand, as a specialized form of culture, it is characterized by its national, social, historical, and cultural specificity and, therefore, can become the subject of cultural research. In modern conditions, the topic of everyday culture is becoming an increasingly relevant and engaged topic not only for cultural scientists but also for specialists in the fields of sociology, psychology, and several humanities. This topic becomes especially interesting in connection with drawing attention to the problem of traditional culture and its state not only in our society but also in connection with the growing interest in the study of urban culture, in connection with globalization and the pressure of mass culture, in connection with the need to preserve cultural heritage and understanding of the problems of revival of traditional culture. In this regard, a logical question arises: where are the elements of our traditional culture focused, and who are its bearers and translators? In this regard, there is a need to study not only the niche where elements of traditional culture are manifested and preserved, but also to analyze those forms of everyday life that are reproduced in various sociocultural practices of everyday human life, to identify the typological features of everyday culture, its functions and structural components. However, it is necessary first to determine the phenomenon itself.

Therefore, the novelty of this article is that it is an attempt to substantiate the topic of everyday culture in its correlation with cultural studies and show those basic components that form the theoretical basis for understanding the problems of everyday culture. In this study, the authors put forward a basic hypothesis, the essence of which is to define the idea that people not only continue to live in everyday life but also make a kind of reconstruction of everyday life. This article aims to determine the main theoretical and methodological approaches in the study of the phenomenon of everyday culture, the essence, structure, and the main aspects of activity used in everyday culture.

Materials and Research Methods

When writing this article, the authors were based on the research of representatives of the Birmingham school R. Hoggart, S. Hall, as well as on the ideas presented in the works of L. Althusser [17, с. 121-123]. In writing this article, the authors relied on materials from the works of representatives of the “Annals

school” about everyday life in the second half of the 19th - early 20th centuries, on the works of M. Blok [18, c. 184], F. Brodel [19, c. 366-369], J. Le Goff [20, c. 420-424], on the textbook “Cultural Studies” Lawrence Grossberg, Carey Nelson, Paula A. Treichler [21, c. 46-50] presented by the Routledge collection. This collection was presented at the international conference “Cultural Studies Now and in the Future” (New York, London). The work of David Inglis’s Culture and Everyday Life is noteworthy as a particular area of sociological analysis of everyday culture [22, c. 89-93].

The main work of the author M.V. Kapkan entitled “The Culture of Everyday Life,” was selected as research material from the works of Russian scientists as an object of everyday culture in the social and human sciences.

The paper presents some field research materials collected as part of the study of objects of everyday culture.

The authors’ methodology during the study was based on structural-functional and cultural research; during the work, the authors used a structural method that allowed them to expand the conceptual apparatus of the work and characterize activities in everyday culture.

Discussion and Results Obtained

A significant problem for cultural, media, and social theorists studying “everyday culture” is the great ambiguity of the term. Everyday culture as a concept was initially ignored in the social sciences. According to the concept, the fact that a person pays attention to his actions and order in his everyday culture and considers the actions that have become part of everyday culture shows that everyday culture considers the constant repetitions in social life. In other words, everyday life consists of repeating and developing into larger cycles. Everyday culture also focuses on the cultural practices that occur in social life. In this regard, everyday culture indicates sociocultural development, and to understand this area, it is necessary to understand the practices that make up this development.

According to De Certeau, standardized power becomes permanent in everyday culture through the strategies implemented by individuals and societies. In everyday culture, a person develops anti-authority tactics and strategic areas of power. Everyday culture is a category that is reflected in the needs of everyday life, expressing for the individual the essence of a complex culture [23, c. 289-295]. Attention to it is due to the trend of cultural interest in development, which is currently visible in all spheres of existence.

As scientific research shows, the general character of everyday culture lies in the real way of life, which is generated by traditions, customs, language, religion, and reason, based on various situations closely related to the environment, with its climatic and natural features, etc. Because everyday life is constantly being reproduced, new components are continually added. As a result, models are created that

adapt to the surrounding everyday life and become suitable for everyday use. The objectification of their vitality determines the values of everyday life. These features are manifested in the lifestyle of a certain group of people, who are arranged according to the chronotopic principle. During everyday practice, a person invests the cultural components of everyday life into a semiotic system, creating his symbolic microcosm. The model of everyday culture is especially clearly manifested in such a chronotopic environment, which is formed in common areas of activity of a particular group and is associated with the place of residence.

One of the most important problems in studying everyday life in modern cultural studies and cultural anthropology is determining its structural stability. Understanding the meaning of everyday life allows us to expand the scope of human research and examine the relationship between man and society from the point of view of its repetition and stability [13].

It should be noted that revealing the essence of everyday culture is based on understanding the complex forms of social relations. The study of society appears as a special element of everyday culture, requiring precise scientific justification. Such elements are essential within the life of an ethnic group; that is, they are reflected in neighborly and family relationships. Respect for older people, hospitality, holiday parties, and a sustainable ritual culture can be developed.

The study of everyday life, starting with recording the elements of everyday life and their repetition, gradually leads scientists to identify and determine connections with images from the history of everyday life. The main stage in the development of the study of the phenomenon of everyday culture begins with the conceptualization of everyday life in the present, that is, it involves overcoming the inertia of thinking in everyday life and a false attitude towards everyday activities, consists of the development of a conceptual apparatus, justification of methods that allow us to reveal aspects of the everyday culture of people associated with socio-cultural phenomena. Researchers are interested not only in problems of everyday life's historical development but also in modern culture's current problems, which are applied at the level of everyday experience. Currently, such objects of research as everyday food, clothing, apartment rentals, and shopping are considered areas of interest in the study of the culture of everyday life [8, 9, 10].

The meaning of our modern everyday culture is considered to be the totality of our daily activities. These include daily repetitive actions, that is, getting up early, brushing your teeth on time, morning exercises, breakfast, driving a car, a walk in the garden, delivering children to school, meeting neighbors, behavior in public transport, communication at work, speedy lunch, daily sharing and receiving information through televisions, reading your favorite book, etc. Almost all these simple actions, as well as many other things, are all phenomena that we do in our daily lives.

Scientists draw attention to the fact that each person's daily life, in a certain sense, appears as a unique phenomenon. But to put it another way, most people

know that the customs of everyday life exist not only in the simple sense but also in the sense that most people share. If someone asks us to describe our daily life, it is difficult to say what interests us. Everyday life in society involves everyday life, and everyday life includes things and actions, which are unusual. And, as our personal experience shows, like the experience of many other people, all events, actions, communication, behavior, and other aspects, we can note the mental, dialogical relations of everyday culture, their repetition, their relative immutability throughout the lives of many or several generations, as well as their uniqueness and differences, which can be identified as a result of comparisons and comparisons between representatives of different social groups. Thus, the relatively privileged daily life of a person from the upper class is slightly different from the daily life of a person (man, woman, youth) from the working class. Also, everyday culture can be described as a particular sphere of human life. In this case, it completely covers the entire human environment in society. This considers the sphere of direct consumption, the sphere of satisfying material and spiritual needs, customs, superstitions, forms of behavior, habits of mind, etc. These situations are found in various spheres of everyday life. If we consider more specifically, we consider stereotypes and manners that occur in normal work activities, etiquette forms of behavior, ways of solving professional and everyday problems, entertainment segments and everyday activities [21, 23, 13].

In this case, the cultural aspect of the study of everyday life is associated with the culture of everyday life, which represents the value-symbolic aspect of everyday life. Among the various interpretations of culture, the meaning of everyday life corresponds to the idea of culture as the way of life of a people, group, or era. It shows the material and spiritual levels of norms, values, beliefs, convictions, ideas, and principles.

Another perspective aimed at reconceptualizing the individual as an active agent of meaning creation in everyday life is the phenomenological perspective, developed in the work of theorists such as Schutz, Berger, and Luckmann [24].

The famous sociologist Alfred Schutz described everyday life in its concrete form while he placed everyday life next to religion, games, and scientific theory. He defines six signs of daily life:

- 1) active work aimed at changing the outside world
- 2) natural setting
- 3) tense attitude towards life
- 4) accurate perception of time
- 5) a person's personal confidence
- 6) typical world

Erving Goffman further developed the interpretation of everyday life using a dramaturgical model of everyday interaction of cultures; Goffman defined the internationalization of social roles through the "practical experience" of everyday

culture, which individuals manage by creating their roles and adapting to this environment [25, c. 357-361].

In fact, according to Gardiner, everyday culture is a relatively homogeneous and indeterminate set of relationships, practices, and structures. A dialogical system between an individual and everyday culture is considered only if it allows for a relatively reflexive revival of previously limited roles and expectations or provides an area of marginal conflict and division.

In the conditions of late modernism, according to researchers, human daily life is becoming increasingly fragmented and specialized. Therefore, when studying this problem, it is necessary to analyze not only the convergence between the local and the global but also between the ethnic and national identity of certain people, historically established way of life, rituals, work, and leisure. Under these conditions, “everyday culture” can no longer be seen as a homogeneous term that reflects an important truth about how people perceive the world around them. On the contrary, “everyday culture” can be considered a culturally constructed and highly contested field. The fragmentation of everyday cultural experience is further aggravated by global development and the influence of spatial characteristics.

If the “space” of everyday culture was once relatively stable, communities were clearly demarcated and ethnically homogeneous, then this becomes very controversial in modern conditions. Moreover, it is constantly modified and restructured through displacement and cultural hybridization systems. This becomes especially evident in cities and other areas with high population densities. As the local population of a place becomes increasingly multi-ethnic and multicultural, and their physical spaces are increasingly subject to movement and use by temporary groups such as tourists, migrating groups, and migrants, as a result, the identity of that place becomes fragmented.

As research shows, everyday culture reflects a particular way of life of a person and society. The culture of everyday life itself represents the value-symbolic aspect of everyday life. Among the various interpretations of culture, the essence of everyday culture is consistent with the idea of a people, group, or way of life during that period. It shows the material level of these things and the spiritual level of norms, values, beliefs, ideas, and principles.

At the same time, everyday life, as the essence of culture, consists of solving practical problems that require, first of all, physical ones. However, in everyday life, a person does not think in such a way as to act based on subconscious attitudes. Everyday life involves less intense thought and effort to achieve maximum personal freedom. Everyday culture does not allow a person to doubt the world’s existence. Such beliefs are reinforced in everyday culture by how we share our thoughts with others like us and how we think. Authenticity in relationships becomes the key to successful living in the everyday world and stability in everyday life. Unlike other worlds of everyday cultural experience, not only are individual social roles required, but a person can participate in everyday life with his own

identity. In the system of activity, all the individual's social roles are integrated into a holistic personality.

The authenticity of everyday culture is regulated by classifying its objects into certain types or stereotypes. They provide great opportunities to interact with the everyday world and act successfully and freely. No one can come up with these types of stereotypes on their own. They are derived from general knowledge, that is, they are created and stored by people in the process of intersubjective interaction in the world of everyday life. Our entire everyday world is based on the idea of predictability and a system of repetition of actions. However, the more predictable our behavior and the behavior of the people around us, the more comfortable we feel in this world, the easier it is for us to maintain our social environment and find our place in it.

Everyday events, phenomena, and objects are inevitably aimed at achieving structural and practical goals, but their significance is not limited to utilitarian considerations. Many objects used in everyday life reflect the necessary values and types of relationships, thereby facilitating the memory of important events in personal life. Likewise, it is safe to say that many everyday activities have an existential meaning distinct from life's purpose. We can create our place in the environment in which we live and establish it as we wish.

And in any of our actions, in addition to the practical meaning, there is also a value-symbolic dimension. Symbolic authenticity, as evidence of the cultural character of everyday life, depends on its proximity to nature. The culture of everyday life is closely related to the biological needs of a person, that is, it is based on the basic requirements of life. In the course of historical development, the forms of everyday culture become more complex and sophisticated but remain connected with basic human needs.

Thus, everyday culture is the implementation of economic, socio-cultural, and historical practices formed within a society because of changes in time and space, overlapping each other during a certain period of history. Nowadays, everyday culture has become a very complex and fragmented concept. Instead of accepting singular and essentialist meanings, in modern conditions, culture and everyday life present a plurality of complex meanings that find their basis in competing knowledge and understandings of an increasingly heterogeneous society. Thus, the history of the study of everyday culture is rapidly developing from descriptive studies of everyday life to the concepts of basic generalizations and the search and definition of their connections, mutual influences, and interactions.

Today, the study of everyday culture is interdisciplinary in nature and, at the same time, includes various concepts, approaches, and methods that allow for static and dynamic analysis of a methodological nature.

Based on the issues discussed above, it is clear that interest in the structural components of everyday culture has yet to bypass any of the social sciences, which has influenced the search for various directions in research and new methods. It is also

interesting to consider everyday life in the context of cultural studies in connection with other areas of culture and the nature of their relationship to more specialized varieties of culture, such as philosophy, science, art, politics, morality, and religion.

Conclusion

In this article, the authors tried to consider various methodological approaches to understanding everyday culture, including identifying some aspects of this problem in the context of cultural studies and outlining its impact on modern cultural practice. Considering the history of change and development of the scientific understanding of everyday culture, we conclude that everyday culture includes everyday conditions of life and behavior, as well as experiences and ways of perceiving the world that occur in ordinary life. The scientific study of everyday culture has evolved from descriptions of everyday life into stable conceptual generalizations. Changes in people's norms, values, rules, and ideas directly impact everyday life. As a result, contemporary studies of everyday culture are interdisciplinary and connected to various fields of cultural studies.

The methodology of everyday culture includes many concepts, approaches, and methods that allow for its static and dynamic analysis. In our opinion, the most comprehensive and complete study of everyday culture can be carried out within the framework of cultural study since the cultural approach involves identifying cause-and-effect relationships and is also holistic and systemic. However, the period we live in is complex and uncertain for many people. The authors of this article are confident that initiating cultural studies of everyday culture, identifying latent, implicit, and symbolic phenomena and phantoms, will allow us to identify the direction and factors that will allow us to analyze the foundations and causes of transformation as well as to analyze the relationship between the authorities and the people, and develop models of culture everyday life, when the latter can become a determining actor in the configuration of culture, identify cultural practices and mental structures that influence the symbolic forms through which people express themselves. In conclusion, it should be noted that this topic, in which Kazakh researchers are interested, opens great initiatives and events in the future.

List of references

- 1 Абдрахманова К.К. Повседневная жизнь городов Центрального Казахстана в 1945-1953 гг. – М.: Мысль, 2009. – 177 с.
- 2 Нуржанов Б.К. Культурология. – М., 1994. – 128 с.
- 3 Бисембаева Л.А. Жетісу қазақтарының күнделікті өміріндегі тосын құбылыстар ХІХ ғас. ІІ жартысы – ХХ ғас. басы // ҚазҰУ Хабаршысы. Тарих сериясы. – №1. – 2017. – 230-236 бб.
- 4 Ғабитов Т.Х. Мәдениеттану негіздері / Тұрсын Хафизұлы Ғабитов, Маргарита Шаяқынқызы Өмірбекова. – Алматы. – 2003. – 240 б.
- 5 Исмагамбетова З.Н. Тема повседневности в культурфилософском измерении // ҚазҰУ хабаршысы. Философия сериясы. Мәдениеттану сериясы. Саясаттану сериясы. – № 1. – 2010. – С. 177-180.

- 6 Хамидуллина Д. Қазақстандағы «арнайы контингенттің» күнделікті өмірі. XX ғ. 30-50 жж. – Алматы, 2014. – 175 б.
- 7 Беловинский Л.В. Сущность и структура повседневности // *Философские науки*. – №3. – 2012. – С. 84-96
- 8 Лукаш Н.П. Культура и человек в советской повседневности 60-70-х годов. – М.: Мысль, 2008. – 140 с.
- 9 Флорова С.М. Город как пространство повседневного бытия // *Вестник ПАГС. Философия и культура социума: подходы, концепции, мнения*. – № 5. – 2014. – С. 74-79.
- 10 Семенов Н.Б. Повседневность как элемент социальной реальности. – М.: Мысль, 2006. – 170 с.
- 11 Morris Meaghan. “At Henry Parkes Motel” // *Cultural Studies*. – № 2 – 1988. – P. 41-47.
- 12 Mani Lata. Contentious traditions: The debate on sati in colonial India // *Cultural Critique*. – №7. – 1987. – P. 152-153.
- 13 Hoggart R. ‘Humanistic Studies and Mass Culture’ // in *An English Temper: essays on education, culture, and communications*. – London, 1982. – P. 178-180.
- 14 Hall S. Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms, in T. Bennett, G. Martin, C. Mercer and J. Woollacott (eds) *Culture // Ideology and Social Process: a Reader*. – London. – 1981. – P. 19-37.
- 15 Simmel G. ‘Metropolis and Mental Life’, in Kurt H. Wolff (trans. and ed.) *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*. – New York: Free Press, 1950. – 413 p.
- 16 Weber M. ‘The Nature of Social Action’, in W.G. Runciman (ed.) *Weber: Selections In Translation // Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978. – 146 p.*
- 17 Althusser. L. Ideology and ideological state apparatuses // *Notes towards an investigation*. – №3. – 1971. – P. 121-123.
- 18 Блок М. Апология истории, или Ремесло историка / Пер. с фр.- Таллин: Ээсти раамат. – М.: Наука, 1983. – 184 с.
- 19 Бродель Ф. Материальная цивилизация, экономика и капитализм, XV–XVIII вв. Т. 1: Структуры повседневности: возможное и невозможное / Ф. Бродель ; пер. с фр. Л. Е. Куббеля. – М.: Прогресс, 1983 – 624 с.
- 20 Ле Гофф Ж. Существовала ли французская историческая школа «Annales». – М.: Французский ежегодник, 1970. – 630 с.
- 21 Grossberg Lawrence, Cary Nelson, Paula A. Treichler, *Cultural Studies*. // New York London. – М.: Routledge, 1992. – 153 p.
- 22 David I. *Culture and everyday life // London and New York. – М.: Routledge, 1997. – 107 p.*
- 23 Де Серто М. Изобретение повседневности. I. Искусство делать / пер. с фр. Д. Калугина, Н. Мовниной. – СПб.: Изд-во Европейского университета в Санкт-Петербурге, 2013. – 330 с.
- 24 Berger P. L., Luckmann T. *The Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise on Sociology of Knowledge / Бергер П., Лукман Т.: Социальное конструирование реальности. Трактат по социологии знания. Перевод на русский язык: Е. Руткевич. – М.: Наука, 1995. // Электронная публикация: Центр гуманитарных технологий. – 16.02.2011. URL: <https://gtmarket.ru/library/basis/4783/4785>*
- 25 Goffman I. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. // University of Edinburgh Social Sciences Research Centre. – 1959. – 470 p.*

Transliteration

- 1 Abdirahmanova. K.K. *Povsednevnyaya zhizn gorodov Sentralnogo Kazakhstana v1945-1953 gg. [Everyday Life of the Cities of Tsentral Kazakhstan in 1945-1953] – М.: Mysl', 2009. – 177 s.*
- 2 Nurzhanov B.K. *Kulturalogija [Cultural Studies]. – М.:, 1994. – 128 s.*
- 3 Bisembaeva L.A. *Zhetysy qazaqtarynyn gundelikti omirindegi tosyn kubulystar XIX fas. II zhartysy – XX fas. Basy [Surprising Events in the Everyday Life of Zhetysy Kazakhs, the Second Half of the 19th Century - the Beginning of the 20th Century] // Kazakh Khabarshysy. Tarih seriasy. – №1. – 2017. – S. 230-236.*
- 4 Gabitov T.H. *Mәdeniеттанu negizderi / [Fundamentals of Cultural Studies] Tursyn Khafizuly Gabitov, Margarita Shayakynkyna Omirbekova. – Almaty, 2003. – 240 s.*
- 5 Ismagambetova Z.N. *Tema povsednevnosti v kulturfilosovskom izmerenii [The Theme of Everyday Life in Culture and the Philosophical Dimension] // Kazakh Khabarshysy.Series philosophy. Mәdeniеттанu seriasy. Sayasattanu seriasy. – № 1. – 2010. – S. 177-180.*

- 6 Hamidullina D. Kazakhstandagy «arnaiy kontingenttin» kundelikti omiri XX g. 30-50. [Dissertasiyalyk Zhumys] [Everyday Life of the “Special Contingent” in Kazakhstan in the 30-50 of the 20th Century]. – Almaty, – 2014. – 175 s.
- 7 Belovinski L.V. Sucnost i struktura povsednevnosti [The Essence and Structure of Everyday Life]. *Philosophskie nauki.* – №3. – 2012. – S. 84-96
- 8 Lukash N.P. Kultura i chelovek v sovetskoj povsednevnosti 60-70-h godov. – M.: Mysl', 2008. – 140 s.
- 9 Florova S.M. Gorod kak prostranstvo povsednevnogo bytija [The City as a Space of Everyday life] // *Vestnik PIGS. Filosofhija i kultura sociuma: podhody, koncenii, mneniya.* – № 5. – 2014. – S. 74-79.
- 10 Semenov N.B. Povsednevnosti kak element socialnoi realnosti [Everyday Life as an Element of Social Reality] – M.: Mysl', 2006. – 170 s.
- 11 Morris Meaghan. “At Henry Parkes Motel.” // *Cultural Studies.* – № 2. – 1988. – P. 41-47.
- 12 Mani Lata. “Contentious traditions: The debate on sati in colonial India.” // *Cultural Critique.* – №7. – 1987. – P. 152-153.
- 13 Hoggart R. ‘Humanistic Studies and Mass Culture’. // in *An English Temper: essays on education, culture, and communications,* – London, 1982. – P. 178-180
- 14 Hall S. ‘Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms’, in T. Bennett , G. Martin , C. Mercer and J. Woollacott (eds) *Culture // Ideology and Social Process: a Reader,* – London. – 1981. – P. 19-37.
- 15 Simmel G. ‘Metropolis and Mental Life’, in Kurt H. Wolff (trans. and ed.) *The Sociology of Georg Simmel.* – New York: Free Press, 1950. – 413 p
- 16 Weber M. (1978) ‘The Nature of Social Action’, in W.G. Runciman (ed.) *Weber: Selections In Translation,* // Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978. – 146 p.
- 17 Althusser L. Ideology and ideological state apparatuses. // *Notes towards an investigation.* – №3. – 1971. – 121 p .
- 18 Blok M. Apologia istorii, ili Remeslo istorika. [Apology of History, or the Craft of the Historian] / Per. s fr. – Tallin: Eesti raamat. – M.: Nauka, 1983. – 184 s.
- 19 Brodel F. Materialnaya civilizatsia, ekonomika I capitalism, XV-XVIII vv. [Material Civilization, Economics and Capitalism, XV–XVIII centuries.] T.1.: *Struktury povsednevnosti: vozmozhnoe i nevozmozhnoe / F. Brodel ; per. s fr . L.E. Kubbelya. M. : Progress. 1983 – 624 s.*
- 20 Li Goff Zh. Sucestvovala li frantsuzskaja istoriceskaja scola «Annales» – M.: Frantsuzski ezhegodnik. – 1970. – 630 s.
- 21 Grossberg Lawrence, Cary Nelson, Paula A. Treichler, *Cultural Studies // New York London – M.: Routledge, 1992. – 153 p.*
- 22 David I. *Culture and everyday life // London and New York.* – M.: Routledge, 1997. – 107 p.
- 23 De Serto M. *Izobretenije povsednevnosti. 1. Iskusstvo delat' / per. s fr. D. Kalugina, N. Movninoy. SPb.: Izd-vo Yevropeyskogo universiteta v Sankt-Peterburge. 2013. – 330 s*
- 24 Berger P. L., Luckmann T. *The Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise on Sociology of Knowledge / Berger P., Lukman T.: Sotsial'noye konstruirovaniye real'nosti. Traktat po sotsiologii znaniya. Perevod na russkiy yazyk: Ye. Rutkevich. – M.: Nauka, 1995. // / Elektronnaya publikatsiya: Tsentr gumanitarnykh tekhnologiy. – 16.02.2011. URL: <https://gtmarket.ru/library/basis/4783/4785>*
- 25 Goffman I. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. // University of Edinburgh Social Sciences Research Centre. – 1959. – 470 p.*

**Нарымбаев Қ.Д., Сирин Ылмаз, Исмагамбетова З.Н.
Күнделікті мәдениет және мәдени зерттеулер (cultural studies)**

Аңдатпа. Мәдени зерттеулер мен мәдени антропологиядағы аз зерттелген және сонымен бірге қазіргі уақытта негізгі мәселелердің бірі - күнделікті мәдениет тақырыбы. Ғылымның дамуы барысында күнделікті мәдениетті тарихта, саясатта, техникалық өркендеу де өз бойларына сіңіре алмады. Күнделікті мәдениет барған сайын өз алдына күрделі мәселеге айналуы зерттеу жұмысының негізгі бағыты болып табылады. Күнделікті мәдениет феномені ретінде адамның әлеуметтік-мәдени өміріндегі танымдық құндылықты негіздейтін теориялық мәселе болып ұсынылды.

Cultural study үшін ұзақ жылдар бойы әлеуметтік-мәдени нысандарда өмірдің тұрақты белгілерін түсіну мәселесі өзекті болып келеді. Сондықтан cultural study үшін маңызды әдіснамалық ұстаным әлеуметтік өмірді дамыту аналитикасы жүзеге асырылатын әдіснамалық бағдарларды негіздеу болды.

Cultural study қызығушылығының негізгі сипаты стандартты дамушы жүйелерді талдауды қамтамасыз ету, сонымен қатар олардың заңдылықтары мен себеп салдарларын анықтауға мүмкіндік береді. Күнделікті мәдениетте көрінетін объектілердің негізгі белгілері олардың материалдық тұрақтылығы және физикалық материалдылығы деп танылды. Күнделікті өмірдің терең мағыналарын түсіну мақалының негізгі зерттеу тәжірибесінің нысанын білдіреді. Мақалада авторлар күнделікті өмірді түсінудің мәні ретінде ол адамның күнделікті іс-әрекетін тек әлеуметтік жағдайы ғана емес, сонымен бірге оның ішінде жұмыс істейтін мәдени жағдайларда қалыптастыратынына назар аударды.

Зерттеу жұмысы барысында жеке адамның күнделікті мәдениетіндегі іс-әрекеті мен тәртібіне назар аударып, күнделікті мәдениеттің бір бөлігіне айналған әрекеттерді қарастыруы күнделікті мәдениеттің басты практикалық маңызы болып табылады.

Демек, зерттеу тәсілі барысында құрылымдық әдіс қолданылды. Күнделікті мәдениеттің заманауи тәжірибесі бойынша cultural study материалдары пайдаланылды.

Түйін сөздер: күнделікті мәдениет, мәдениет, тіршілік, өмір, мәдени зерттеулер.

Нарымбаев К.Д., Сирин Йылмаз, Исмагамбетова З.Н.

Повседневная культура и культурные исследования (cultural studies)

Аннотация. Одной из малоизученных и в то же время важнейших проблем культурологии и культурной антропологии является тема повседневной культуры. В ходе развития науки история, политика и техническое развитие не могли поглотить бытовую культуру. Тот факт, что повседневная культура сама по себе все больше становится сложной проблемой, является основным предметом исследования. Как феномен бытовой культуры она была представлена как теоретическая проблема, обосновывающая социальную и познавательную ценность в социокультурной жизни человека.

Проблема понимания постоянных признаков жизни в социокультурных объектах на протяжении многих лет является актуальной для культурных исследований (cultural study). Поэтому важной методологической позицией культурных исследований (cultural study) было обоснование методологических ориентаций анализа развития общественной жизни.

Основной характер интереса культурных исследований (cultural study) заключается в анализе стандартных развивающихся систем, а также в определении их закономерностей и причин. Основными особенностями предметов, встречающихся в повседневной культуре, были признаны их материальная устойчивость и физическая материальность. Понимание глубинных смыслов повседневной жизни составляет предмет основного исследовательского опыта пословицы. В статье авторы указывают, что важность понимания повседневной жизни состоит в том, что оно формирует повседневные действия человека не только в зависимости от его социального положения, но и от культурных условий, в которых он работает.

Основное практическое значение повседневной культуры заключается в том, что в ходе исследовательской работы человек обращает внимание на свою деятельность и порядок в своей повседневной культуре и рассматривает действия, которые стали частью повседневной культуры.

Поэтому в ходе исследования был использован структурно-функциональный подход. Материалы культурного исследования были использованы в современной практике повседневной культуры.

Ключевые слова: повседневная культура, культура, быт, жизнь, культурный анализ.