

- United Nations University, UNU/WIDER,
<http://www.soc.iastate.edu/>
9. Jason Beckfield. European Integration and Income Inequality. *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 71, No. 6 (Dec., 2006), pp. 964-

- 985
10. UNDP (2011) International Human Development Indicators [<http://hdrstats.undp.org/en/indicators/71606.html>] assessed 01.03.12

Т.В. Кудашева

**ҚАЗАҚСТАН РЕСПУБЛИКАСЫНДА ТҮРҒЫНДАРДЫҢ ТАБЫСЫНДАҒЫ ТЕҢСІЗДІККЕ
 ЭКОНОМИКАЛЫҚ ӨСУІ МЕН ҒАЛАМДАНУДЫҢ ӘСЕРІ**

Мақалада Қазақстан Республикасы халқының табыстарының теңсіз бөлінуінің факторлары ретінде жаһандану процесі мен экономикалық өсу қарастырылады. Қазақстан үшін Кузнецтің болжамы статистикалық түрде дәлелденген.

T.V. Kudasheva

**IMPACT OF ECONOMIC GROWTH AND GLOBALIZATION ON INCOME INEQUALITY POPULATION IN THE
 REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN**

The article deals with globalization and economic growth as factors affecting the distribution of income inequality in the population of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Statistically, the hypothesis is confirmed for the Kuznets Kazakhstan.

Social innovation: concepts, research fields and international trends

M. Sharapiyeva, R. Danabayeva

Казахский национальный университет им. аль-Фараби, г. Алматы, Казахстан

Abstract. In the article the substantive distinction between social and technical innovations are found in their immaterial intangible structure. While the changed and intensified social and economic problems identified in public discourse are increasingly prompting a call for extensive social innovation, the topic continues to remain a largely under-explored area in the social sciences as well as government innovation policies.

With the development of a new innovation paradigm, so too a change in the subject matter of innovation occurs. At the heart of the industrial society innovation paradigm are technical innovations relating to products and processes that "are regarded as (almost) the only hope of societal development" [1]. Non-technical and "social innovations, however, although they exist constantly and widely in social systems, are largely ignored as a topic and are a little-recognized phenomenon", though this offers them no protection from enormous expectations of providing answers to problems given that issues such as massive unemployment, the erosion of the social security system or the intensification of ecological risks cannot be overcome without implementing social innovation.

And in light of the current and extensive financial and economic crisis, it is becoming increasingly clear that social innovations, as they relate to extensive change in both the leading cultures that influence behavior and the social practices in the economy and consumption, determine "in what sort of world the next generation of the citizens of free societies will be living» [2].

The substantive distinction between social and technical innovations can be found in their immaterial intangible structure. The innovation does not occur in the medium of technical artifact but at the level of social practice. A social innovation is new combination¹⁶ and/or new configuration of social practices in certain areas of action or social contexts prompted by certain actors or constellations of actors in an

intentional targeted manner with the goal of better satisfying or answering needs and problems than is possible on the basis of established practices. An innovation is therefore social to the extent that it, conveyed by the market or “non/without profit”, is socially accepted and diffused widely throughout society or in certain societal sub-areas, transformed depending on circumstances and ultimately institutionalized as new social practice or made routine. As with every other innovation, “new” does not necessarily mean “good” but in this case is “socially desirable” in an extensive and normative sense. According to the actors’ practical rationale, social attributions for social innovations are generally uncertain.

In this sense, social innovation (borrowing from Crozier/Friedberg) can be “interpreted as a process of collective creation in which the members of a certain collective unit learn, invent and lay out new rules for the social game of collaboration and of conflict or, in a word, a new social practice, and in this process they acquire the necessary cognitive, rational and organizational skills” [3]. Social innovations, understood as innovations of social practices, are (examined in terms of their substantive aspect) an elementary part of sociology, and therefore – in contrast to technical innovations – can be not only analyzed, but also engendered and shaped; they are oriented toward social practice and require reflection on the social relationship structure.

In the face of the depth and development of change in modern societies and the rising dysfunction in established practice, social innovations are gaining greater importance, also in terms of economic factors, over technical innovations. They are not only necessary, but also can contribute proactively with regard to anticipated developments, such as demographic developments or the effects of climate change “to modify, or even transform, existing ways of life should it become necessary so to do” (Giddens 2009, p. 163; cf. also Hochgerner 2009a).

Within his innovation typology, Brooks (1982) distinguishes between innovations that are almost purely technical (such as new materials), socio-technical innovations (such as transportation infrastructure) and social innovations. These are further classified and separated within the larger and unspecific definition. Brooks makes distinctions between the following types of social innovations: market innovations (such as leasing), management innovations (such as new working

hour arrangements), political innovations (such as summit meetings) and institutional innovations (such as self-help groups). On the relationship between social and technical innovation, he states: “The supermarket has resulted in the invention of new types of check-out counters, stackable grocery carts, optical labeling of cans for automatic check-out, etc. McDonald’s developed a whole host of minor but important inventions such as a special scoop and bag of French fries. The thrust however, comes from the market, and the technology is usually incidental and rather mundane in technical terms though no less ingenious. The organizational invention comes first, and technical innovations are gradually introduced to improve it, rather than the reverse.” (Brooks 1982, p. 10)

Hochgerner (2009) identifies social innovations in businesses, civil society, government and social milieus whose content relates to participation, procedural rules and behavior as a special type of innovation to be distinguished from technological and non-technological business innovations (products, processes, organization, marketing) (cf. OECD/Eurostat 2005). Just like technological innovations, they are integrated into innovation cultures or social-cultural formations of innovation, each with their own specific character, and influence these in turn; they are a “component of social change” but not identical to it. “Social innovations are new concepts and measures that are accepted by impacted social groups and are applied to overcome social challenges.” (Hochgerner 2009) This may concern a new solution for a previously identified problem, a recognized solution that has not yet been applied in a certain spatial social context or a solution responding to problems arising in the wake of social change.

In the context of their literary research on the diffusion of innovation in health care-related service organizations, Greenhalgh et al. define innovation in this area as “a novel set of behaviors, routines, and ways of working that are directed at improving health outcomes, administrative efficiency, cost effectiveness or users’ experience and that are implemented by planned and coordinated actions” (Greenhalgh et al. 2004, p. 1). *Collectively* this definition and others (cf. also Zapf 1989; Lindhult 2008; Moulaert et al. 2005) indicate that social innovations are distinct from technical innovations and are an independent and different type of innovation. What is in essence innovation occurs on the level of social behavioral patterns, routines, practices and

settings. This, and not on the level of material production, is where the decisive new combination of (social) factors and the pursuit of socially recognized goals with different means occurs where social innovation is concerned (Merton 1968). The innovation of social interaction, forms of transportation and behavioral patterns as the true subject matter, purpose and “decisive/competitive” factor demarcates social innovation from technical innovation.

In assessing their overview on the use of the concept of social innovation in different fields of research, Moulaert et. Al. come to the conclusion: “In all above approaches, the definitions of social innovation are both analytical and normative. (...) We especially stress three dimensions, preferably occurring in interaction with each other.

- Satisfaction of human needs that are not currently satisfied, either because ‘not yet’ or because ‘no longer’ perceived as important by either the market or the state (...)

- Chances in social relations, especially with regard to governance, that enable the above satisfaction, but also increase the level of participation of all but especially deprived groups in society

- Increasing the socio-political capability and access to resources needed to enhance rights to satisfaction of human needs and participation (empowerment dimension)” (Moulaert et al. 2005, p. 1976).

Mulgan et al. [4] define “social innovations as the development and implementation of new ideas (products, services and models) to meet social needs.” A distinction is made between social needs and “merely personal needs or demands”. At the same time, the authors assert that social innovations become more important precisely in the areas where commercial and existing public sector organizations have failed. In this perspective the things they evidence include: an information and news portal based on the web 2.0 created by internet users in South Korea; an internet forum Australia established for youths to combat depression; a social company in London that produces a magazine commercially run by the homeless; an initiative that offers a broad range of services and activities related to the regular school day; a partnership between health care authorities and the Institute for the Deaf in England to distribute new digital hearing aids. Most of the social innovations evidenced distinguish themselves by virtue of their orientation towards social goals and

needs and that they have also succeeded in establishing themselves commercially.

It is very apparent that the scope of the topics that social innovations and sustainability intersect has expanded in conjunction with the rising acceptance of the need for sustainability and has also become more socio-politically relevant [5]. The topics are no longer simply missions and visions, but also the political, institutional and social requirements and innovations necessary to realize them. If non-sustainable development is the result of an extensive institutional, systematic and management crisis, then the transition to sustainable development can only occur with social innovation and governance structures that foster sustainability. The subsequent demand in research on the way social and sustainable innovation interact will primarily concern: To what extent social innovations themselves can expand on sustainability innovations, what social innovations conflict with what sustainability criteria and what sustainability criteria are critical for the success of social innovations?

This overview of the central application fields for a (theoretically and conceptually developed) concept of “social innovation” makes it clear that the topic has gained traction in a series of research fields and social contexts and has provided proof of its explanatory faculty in the emergence, establishment and mutability of social practices and routines. However there has only been a rudimentary level of synergistic penetration and cross-pollination in different fields of research [6].

An initial conclusion can be made that phenomena of social change are consistently looked at in connection with technological innovation in techno-sociology and technical research in the prevailing paradigm of a social-technical system but not from the perspective of an independent type of innovation that can be demarcated from technical innovations.

From the perspective of techno-sociology and its central field, this is not only possible but necessary. The conflation of innovation as a term becomes problematic when the concepts for innovation developed in techno-sociology and technical research are universalized into a comprehensive theory of innovation. This is inadequate in light of the declining functionality of the technology-oriented paradigm shaped by the industrial society.

While the changed and intensified social and economic problems identified in public discourse are increasingly prompting a call for

extensive social innovation, the topic continues to remain a largely under-explored area in the social sciences as well as government innovation policies. “The field of social innovation remains relatively undeveloped” (Mulgan et al. 2007, p. 3).

References

- Gillwald, Katrin (2000): Konzepte sozialer Innovation. WZB paper: Querschnitts-gruppe Arbeit und Okologie. Berlin. Download from: WZB (<http://bibliothek.wzb.eu/pdf/2000/p00-519.pdf>, 27/01/2010).
- Dahrendorf, Ralf (2009): Nach der Krise: Zurück zur protestantischen Ethik? Sechs Anmerkungen. In: Merkur. Deutsche Zeitschrift für europäisches Denken, 63 (720), pp. 373-381.
- Crozier, Michel/ Friedberg, Erhard (1993): Die Zwänge kollektiven Handelns – Über Macht und Organisation. Frankfurt (Main): Hain. Mulgan, Geoff/ Ali, Rushanara/ Halkett, Richard/ Sanders, Ben (2007): In and out of sync. The challenge of growing social innovations. Research report. London. Download from: The Young Foundation (http://www.youngfoundation.org/files/images/In_and_Out_of_Sync_Final.pdf, 27/01/2010)
- Rickards, T (1985), Stimulating Innovation: A Systems Approach, London, Palgrave MacMillan
- Mulgan, G (2006), The Process of Social Innovation, Innovations, Spring, MIT Press, pp145-62 mitpress.mit.edu/innovations
- Bornstein, D (2004), How To Change the World: Social Entrepreneurs and the Power of New Ideas, Oxford University Press, Oxford

М.Д. Шарапиева, Р.И. Данабаева

ӘЛЕУМЕТТІК ИННОВАЦИЯЛАР: МАҒЫНАСЫ МЕН ӘЛЕМДІК ТЕНДЕНЦИЯЛАР

Бұл мақалада әлеуметтік жаңашылдықтың маңыздылығы мен теориялық түсініктері берілген. Сондай-ақ әлеуметтік саладағы елеулі тенденциялар қарастырылған. Жаңа инновациялар парадигмасы әлеуметтік инновацияның негізі болып келеді. Әлеуметтік жаңашылдық – техникалық жаңашылдықтың нәтижесі болып табылады. Осы құбылыстың арнайы ерекшеліктерін ескере отырып, әлеуметтік және технологиялық жаңашылдықтың жүйелік бірігуі мен өзара байланысын жасауға болады.

М.Д. Шарапиева, Р.И. Данабаева

СОЦИАЛЬНЫЕ ИННОВАЦИИ: ПОНЯТИЕ, ОБЛАСТЬ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ И МИРОВЫЕ ТЕНДЕНЦИИ

В данной статье рассмотрены важности и теоретические понятия социального новшества. А также рассмотрены заметные тенденции в сфере социального новшества. Парадигма новых инноваций порождает социальные инновации. Социальное новшество является побочным эффектом и результатом технического новшества. Принимая во внимание специфические особенности социального новшества – это возможность сделать систематическое соединение и взаимозависимость социального и технологического новшества.

Қазақстан Республикасында ұлттық инновациялық жүйенің қалыптасуы

А.А. Абсадыкова

оль-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы қаласы, Қазақстан

Түйін. Жұмыстың негізгі мақсаты - Қазақстанның ұлттық инновациялық жүйесінің қазіргі жағдайын қарастыру. Бұл үшін біз SWOT-талдау жүргізіп, замануи кезеңдегі Қазақстанның инновациялық жүйесінің даму тенденциясын анықтадық.

Мемлекеттің инновациялық процеске араласу қажеттігі оның ғылыми-өндіріс циклінің ұзақ, шығын мен анықталмағандық жоғары

болғандықтан туындайды. Нарық ұзақ мерзімді, тәуекелі жоғары инвестициялар мәселелерін реттей алмайды, сондықтан ол реттеу