

Zh. Tashtanov ^{*1}, Vezhikhi Sefa Fut Hekimoglu ²

¹*M. Auezov South Kazakhstan University Shymkent, Kazakhstan;*

²*Kutahya Dumlupinar University, Kutahya, Turkey*
(E-mail: z_tashtanov@mail.ru; sefafuat@hotmail.com)

Methodological foundations of the study of everyday history (on the example of Sayram district in the 30–60s of the XXth century)

The article is devoted to the analysis of methodological foundations of one of the modern trends in historical science — the history of everyday life on the example of Sairam district. The authors attempt to analyse the achievements of representatives of foreign and domestic historiography in determining the conceptual and methodological foundations of the history of everyday life. As a result of the analysis of scientific problems of the article the author comes to the conclusion that the works of foreign and Kazakhstani authors in general positively assess the heuristic abilities of the new methodological approach in the study of everyday life of a certain city, district, society and an individual person. Also, the object of scientific interest of the author became the subjects of socio-economic history and everyday life of citizens of Sairam district in 30–40 years of the twentieth century. This chronological period is of particular interest from the point of view of studying the process of transformation of everyday life of the population of Sairam district. Since it is in this period, along with the already rooted traditions in the everyday life of the population began to appear elements of a new life space. These changes were caused by collectivization, which began with confiscation of cattle, property and personal property from the Bai, further, changes in the territorial structure of the district, development of construction industry, etc.

Keywords: history, history of Kazakhstan, everyday history, history of Sairam district, Soviet Union, collectivization.

Introduction

In recent years, the history of everyday life has become the most popular field of research in the modern social sciences, especially history. Moreover, everyday life has firmly established itself as a serious academic study. In Soviet historiography, the attention of scientists was focused on the study of the major military-political, socio-economic events of the period. And the issues of the “life-world” of the common human were developed as illustrative material for global historical events, or were not studied at all. In this direction, the most important studies are those related to the study of social problems of social development, especially the reflection of the facets of everyday life: the world of people, private histories, the socialization of personality, the behaviour of people in various extreme situations, etc. After all, man is an integral part of a vast socio-cultural world, and the study of the internal motivations of human activity, of emotional reactions to certain events, allows us to judge the peculiarities of the mental structure of society at a certain chronological stage.

It should be noted that the relevance of the research topic is determined by the increased scientific interest in the problems of social history in recent years, the separation of the history of everyday life into a branch of historical knowledge, and the history of everyday life in cities (districts) into an independent direction of modern domestic historical science. Urban everyday life, as in a mirror, reflected the peculiarities of the reforms carried out in the country. Looking at historical processes through the prism of everyday life of a particular region allows to show the diversity of the general historical process, to enrich historical science with new specific facts and events. The relevance of the topic is also determined by the regional approach. A comprehensive study of the history of everyday life in the Sayram district during the period under consideration has not been carried out, without which our understanding of the region’s past is incomplete.

The knowledge of traditions, peculiarities of historical experience in the organization of everyday life of Sayram district will allow to solve many social problems of modern society by mechanisms that best take

* Corresponding author’s e-mail: z_tashtanov@mail.ru

into account regional specifics. All this shows the importance of studying the everyday life of Sayram district.

Research methods

The methodological basis of this article is the scientific principles of objectivity and historicism, based on the recognition of the variability of the historical process. The study is based on the principles of critical interpretation of sources, systematization and comparative analysis of data. A comprehensive approach to the study of the scientific problem required the application of methods of system analysis and microanalysis, comparative, chronological and evaluation methods.

Discussion

Everyday life is a relatively new branch of historical research, the subject of which is human in his everyday life, in its activities in historical-cultural, political, ethnic and other directions. The problem of the study of everyday life requires the consideration not only of historical historiography, but also of studies in other sciences. In the beginning, philosophers were not so much concerned with the history of everyday life as with its everyday aspect. They were concerned with the problem of human existence, the problem of human perception of the world, the problem of human adaptation to society. The concept of “everyday life” first appeared in the works of A. Schütz [1]. He saw it as “the world of human immediacy”. The study of the history of everyday life can be based on the phenomenological approach of E. Husserl (lifeworld). The American sociologists P. Berger and T. Lukman were the first to introduce the concept of “everyday world” into scientific circulation. They raised the question of the language of “everyday encounters”, of the ways of “memorizing typical everyday actions”, thus giving impetus to the concepts of social construction of identities, gender, disability, psychiatry, etc. Another way of analyzing everyday life was developed by the American sociologists A. Sicurel and G. Garfinkel. They studied not only the actions of individuals in social processes, but also the role of their experiences and thoughts. This allowed them to lay the foundations of the sociology of everyday life (or ethnomethodology), which aims to discover the methods used by people in society to carry out everyday actions by analyzing the rules and prejudices that exist in society, the interpretation by “some” people of the speech, behaviour and gestures of “others” [2].

Another American sociologist from Stanford University, Mark Granovetter, shows that urban everyday life is actually a “force of weak ties” [3; 31]. According to him, weak ties are the most important factor in a person’s occupational and career mobility. Moreover, it is the communication in the network of weak ties that is the most informative. Strong ties are the ties of formalized communities, family, close friends and others. It can be said that a city is a set of positive and negative qualities. These qualities reflect the level of development of the human community, its traditions and needs. Each individual city and each individual citizen are inextricably linked by social relationships. This interaction creates a special everyday atmosphere that surrounds us. The modern city is subject to constant changes, qualitative changes that determine the internal and external environment of a person [2].

The German classic Georg Simmel gave a special dimension to the theme of “urban everyday life”. For him, the city dweller is above all neurotic. “The psychological basis of the individuality of a large city is the heightened nervousness of life, resulting from the rapid and constant change of external and internal impressions” [4].

Thus, everyday life as a phenomenon is of great interest in the global scientific environment. In Western historiography, the study of everyday life is one of the popular trends, the interest in which arose after the so-called anthropological turn in history in the 60–70s of the XX century. First of all, the study of the history of everyday life within the framework of a new direction — microhistory — is connected with the advanced ideas of the representatives of the French school of annals M. Blok and L. Fevr [5, 6]. Later it was their follower F. Brodel, who for the first time defined the importance of the material world and its reflection in the everyday life of people in history [7], who purposefully addressed the problem of everyday life. The great merit of F. Brodel is the development of a universal methodology for the study of the history of everyday life, which has not lost its relevance for more than half a century. The study of the material side of people’s everyday life is still carried out on the basis of the structure of everyday life defined by F. Brodel.

It should be noted that the most comprehensive statement on the content of the concept of “everyday history” to date was made by the Russian researcher N.L. Pushkareva: “The history of everyday life is a branch of historical knowledge, the subject of which is the sphere of human everyday life in its historical and cultural, political and event-related, ethnic and confessional contexts”. The focus of the history of everyday

life is “the reality that is interpreted by people and has a subjective meaning for them as a whole life world”, a comprehensive study of this reality (life world) of people of different social strata, their behaviour and emotional reactions to life events [8].

The history of everyday life is a relatively new direction in Kazakhstan history. While in the 1990s there were practically no studies that focused on the problems of everyday life, in the 2000s local history studies devoted to everyday life in individual regions of Kazakhstan began to appear. Thus, the researches of Z.G. Saktaganova [9], K.K. Abdrakhmanova [10], M.M. Kozybaeva [11], E.A. Kozachenko [12] were devoted to the study of urban everyday life. The everyday life of the Kazakh population in the late 18th and early 20th centuries is reflected in the work of N.H. Dzhumaniyazova [13]. The study of the everyday life of the “special contingent” in Kazakhstan was studied by D.U. Khamidullina [14]. These studies reflect the life and everyday life of the Kazakh people in different historical periods.

Moreover, the analysis of existing studies shows that many aspects of everyday life remain understudied. For example, the study of everyday life at the micro level involves the study and description of everyday life in the context of representatives of different age, occupational, gender and other social groups, and such a perspective is not yet practiced in Kazakh research. This approach to research cannot be ignored. After all, the study of microhistory is important not least because this methodological approach to the reconstruction of the past is of great historical significance, and the results of the research can have practical significance — the analysis of the everyday life of individual social groups allows to identify hidden trends in this environment, and gives an opportunity to prevent their negative consequences.

An important feature of the methodology of the history of everyday life is the coexistence of two approaches to understanding everyday life. The first approach considers everyday life as a reconstruction of the mental macro-context of the history of events, an approach attractive to philosophers and cultural historians; the second — as an application of the methods of micro-historical analysis, shared by sociologists and most historians. Microhistory as a method of history prevails among German researchers of everyday life. A number of Italian historians, such as K. Ginzburg, D. Levi, supported this interpretation of the history of everyday life, created a journal and started the scientific series “Microhistory”. In the 1990s, the German-Italian school of micro-historians was extended by American researchers of the past [15].

There are many definitions of microhistory, with which local history is primarily associated. Almost every author of works on microhistory gives a different definition of his subject. “Event history” (as in F. Brodel), “local history” (L. Gonzalez y Gonzalez), “small history” (Richard Cobb). “The most common is the following: microhistory — as a historiographical trend that studies the past social reality on the basis of microanalytical approaches, including both the choice of research objects and the corresponding methods (theoretical and empirical tools)” [16]. An important feature of microhistory or, in our case, local history, is a change in the scale of the study: researchers use microanalysis to see the essential features of the phenomenon under study as if under a magnifying glass. Microanalysis allows us to see the refraction of general processes “at a particular point in real life”.

The history of everyday life is thus another attempt to understand history as a multifaceted process, reproduced and transformed by those who are at once the object and the subject of history. The traditional historian seeks to use a reliable source in his research without distortion, while the historian of everyday life seeks to read the text more carefully in order to reflect on the circumstances of the ideas expressed in it. Such a methodological approach makes it possible to penetrate the meaning of what is expressed and to take into account hidden meanings that have accidentally emerged from the depths of consciousness. The history of everyday life studies not only everyday life but also people’s everyday consciousness and behaviour, using the psychological technique of feeling to interpret other people’s thoughts and words, giving them its own “translation”. When studying everyday life, it is important to combine methods used at both the micro and macro levels of historical research. The study of people’s everyday lives, therefore, involves a number of methodological problems: it is difficult to generalize mutually exclusive data that reveal the internal heterogeneity and changing dynamics of the course of people’s everyday lives. The history of everyday life studies reality as such and people’s perceptions of it.

Sayram is one of the oldest settlements in Kazakhstan. It lies in the valley between Talas and the middle reaches of the Syr Darya. Today, the center of this valley and the whole of southern Kazakhstan is the city of Shymkent. But in the Middle Ages, the main city there was Sayram — Isfijab — Akkala. It stood at the easternmost point of the Silk Road and was the eastern gateway to Turkestan. It was an amazing city that perished and rose again many times, changing its name with each reincarnation, reflecting like a mirror the ethno-cultural changes in the region.

During the Middle Ages, Sayram had a significant influence on the spread of Islam in the south. The birth and maturation of Ahmet Yassawi, who was a major contributor to the Islamic movement in Sayram, and the location of the graves of his parents, Ibrahim and Karashash, in the region speak volumes. The Sayram area also witnessed the invasion of the Kokan Khanate [17; 27]. As a result of Soviet collectivisation and repression, as well as the indiscretions of local activists, the region suffered serious consequences. In January 1928 the Belovodsky district was created as part of the Syr Darya district. In December 1930 it was renamed the Mankent-Sayram district, and in 1935 it became the Sayram district. According to the Kazkhoz plan of 1 June 1930, the district had 6771 hectares and 36255 inhabitants. The centre of the district was Aksu village until 1930, then Mankent until 1935, and finally Sayram village. Sayram had over 2000 farms with over 10,000 people. The district lies along the Mashat, Sayramsu, Badam and Arys rivers [18; 34].

Archive documents show that the Belovodsk district consisted of 5 villages, 3 village councils and 7 collective farms. The farms grew wheat, barley, oats, cotton, alfalfa, potatoes, vegetables and melons. In the mountainous areas and on the steppes beyond Arys, sheep-breeding was successfully developed, especially the breeding of Merino sheep. The local population mainly kept dairy cows. The milk was transported to the town for sale.

In terms of population, Sayram district was the largest in Syrdarya district. The district was run by the district party committee, the district council of workers' deputies and its executive committee. The court, the prosecutor's office and the police reinforced the internal order of the state. Youth affairs were administered by the Komsomol, and women's affairs by the Women's Council. The interests of the poor and working class were defended by the local organization created under the trade union "Kosshy". Its representatives, activists and groups of red agitators were also present in other districts. Under the leadership of the district party committee, they formed a united and strong political system. In the years following the October Revolution, the Soviet power enjoyed great authority among the people, especially among the poor, as the representative of the interests of the workers and peasants, the disadvantaged and the humiliated, as the representative of the end of the exploitation of man by man, of slavery and oppression, as the social formation that established universal equality and justice, and as the herald of a bright and happy future. The party relied on the authority of the new government. To strengthen its political position, it exploited the accumulated class hostility and intransigence of the people.

Of particular political importance was the collectivization that took place in the 1920s and 1930s, which began with the confiscation of cattle, property and personal belongings from the Bai. It is historically reliable that this political campaign was often violent on the ground. The chronicles of Aul tell of activists taking everything from the locals, even poultry.

"The autumn of 1929 also saw the start of active grain harvesting in the steppe regions of Kazakhstan, and a "major turning point" in the process of establishing collective farms in the Syr Darya region. Although the necessary economic and political conditions were not yet in place in some regions, they were included in the list of areas subject to mass collectivisation. For example, areas such as Keles, Maktaaral and Sayram, which developed agriculture for many years, as well as semi-nomadic areas such as Shayan and nomadic areas such as Kyzylkum, Shauldir and Sozak, which remained outside the unification for a long time" [17; 36-37] says historian S. Zholdasov.

On 1 May 1930, the Mankent peasants openly resisted the unjust actions of the authorities. On 1 May 1930, the Mankent peasants openly resisted the unjust actions of the authorities.

The famine that broke out at the beginning of the 1930s brought great suffering to the villages of Kaynarbulak, Arys, Badam, Karatobe and others. Nevertheless, in 1933 the district officially announced the successful completion of collectivization. We must recognise that this period was an era of severe pressure of the Soviet power.

In the 1930s, the urgent issue of strengthening the material and technical base of collective farms was put on the agenda, in connection with which the settlements of Sayram, Kainarbulak, Karatobe, Aksu, Mankent, Karamurt began to receive "Fordzon", "STZ", "UNB" tractors, "Kommunar" combine harvesters, trucks and other agricultural machinery. The technical equipment of the farms made it possible to carry out the seasonal works in time and in quality, to increase the production and yield of cereals, cotton, vegetables, to fully master the available sown areas. In a short time, a third of the district, including large villages, was fully electrified, and small power stations were built and put into operation in four settlements — Sayram, Mankent, Chernovodsk and Belye Vody. Three machine and tractor stations (MTS) were opened. And the establishment of a machine and tractor workshop on the basis of the Mankent MTS, which became a large regional center for technical services, laid the foundation for the district's industry. Thus, even before the

war, Sayram was a fairly prosperous district, with more than 11,000 hectares of irrigated land, a reliable resource and manufacturing base, and good technical facilities.

Due to various political and economic factors, the internal structure of the raion changed several times. The number of village councils that were part of it increased and decreased, and the territory of the region changed accordingly. Thus, the current structure and model of the region was not established at once. In the course of its development, the territorial structure of the region underwent various transformations. It is known that the district was established in 1928. In 1932, the districts of Bazar-Kakpa, Karabulak, Kara-Murt, Sultanrabat, Chimkent-Kapka and Zhargaly were attached to Sayram district. In 1954, the Bazar-kakpa and Chimkent district rural councils were merged into a single Sayram rural council, with the village of Sayram as its centre. Similarly, the Pritraktovoye and Mankent District Councils were merged to form the Mankent District Council. Its centre was Mankent. In November 1957 the Kyzylsu, Komeshtublak, Kaynarbulak districts were transferred from the Chimkent district to the Sayram district. In 1960, the Chirkinsk District Council was renamed the Kyzylkystau District Council and, less than a year later, the Arys District Council [19; 56–90].

Conclusion

The complexity of the study of the history of everyday life is caused by a number of methodological problems: a variety of interpretations of the subject of the history of everyday life, which determine the approaches and principles of the study of the object of knowledge; the diversity of the source base, both in form and content; methodological pluralism. Since the history of everyday life uses data from a number of humanities, such as sociology, philosophy, ethnology, in its research, it applies not only historical, but also special scientific methods, such as sociological. Consequently, we can refer to interdisciplinarity as a fundamental principle in researching the history of everyday life. It is essential to acknowledge that emphasizing the variety of methodologies for examining local everyday life highlights the complexity of solutions within this emerging field of historical inquiry. This complexity arises, firstly, from the multitude of interpretations and techniques employed in constructing the historical context of daily life, which complicates the establishment of a singular methodology and renders it nearly impossible to standardize or generalize the various approaches at this point. Secondly, this diversity enables us to identify the most effective strategies and apply them to the analysis of everyday life in Sayram.

References

- 1 Шюц А. Структура повседневного мышления / А. Шюц // Социологические исследования. — 1988. — № 2.
- 2 Дмитриевская М.С. Городская повседневность как отдельная составляющая изучения обыденности человека / М.С. Дмитриевская. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: <https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=39148640>
- 3 Грановеттер М. Сила слабых связей / М. Грановеттер // Экономическая социология. — 2009. — № 4. — С. 31–51.
- 4 Зиммель Г. Большие города и духовная жизнь / Г. Зиммель // Логос. — № 3–4. — 2002. — С. 1–12.
- 5 Блок М. Апология истории, или Ремесло историка / М. Блок. — М.: Наука, 1986. — 256 с.
- 6 Февр Л. Бои за историю / Л. Февр. — М.: Наука, 1991. — 632 с.
- 7 Бродель Ф. Материальная цивилизация, экономика и капитализм, XV–XVIII вв. — Т. 1. Структуры повседневности: возможное и невозможное / Ф. Бродель. — М.: Прогресс, 1986. — 623 с.
- 8 Пушкарева Н.Л. История повседневности как направление исторических исследований / Н.Л. Пушкарева. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа: <http://www.perspektivy.info>.
- 9 Сактаганова З.Г. Повседневная жизнь городов Центрального Казахстана в 1945–1953 гг.: моногр. / З.Г. Сактаганова. — Караганда, 2010. — 251 с.
- 10 Абдрахманова К.К. Повседневная жизнь городов Центрального Казахстана в 1945–1953 гг.: автореф. дисс. ... канд. ист. наук / К.К. Абдрахманова. — Караганда, 2009.
- 11 Козыбаева М.М. Повседневная жизнь городского населения Северного Казахстана в 1920–1930-е годы: дисс. ... д-ра филос. / М.М. Козыбаева. — Астана, 2000.;
- 12 Козаченко Е.А. Жилищно-бытовая повседневность людей в 70-х годах XX века на примере Усть-Каменогорска / Е.А. Козаченко // Сб. материалов Междунар. науч.-практ. конф. «Республика Казахстан и Евразийское пространство: современность и перспективы развития», посвящ. 25-летию Независимости РК. — Ч. 2. — Астана, 2016. — С. 176–178.
- 13 Джуманиязова Н.Х. Повседневная жизнь казахского населения в конце XVIII–начале XX вв. (на материалах Оренбургской губернии) / Н.Х. Джуманиязова // Сб. материалов Междунар. науч.-практ. конф. «Республика Казахстан и Евразийское пространство: современность и перспективы развития», посвящ. 25-летию Независимости Республики Казахстан. — Ч. 2. — Астана, 2016. — С. 89–92.

- 14 Хамидуллина Д.Ұ. Қазақстандағы «арнайы контингенттің» күнделікті өмірі (XX ғ. 30–50-шы жылдары): филос. д-ры ... дайынд. дисс. / Д.Ұ. Хамидуллина. — Алматы, 2014.
- 15 Анисимова И.Ю. История повседневности как направление исторических исследований: предмет, источники, методы / И.Ю. Анисимова, Ф.С. Рамазанова, К.Б. Болатова // «edu.e-history.kz» Электрон. науч. журн. — 2021. — № 3 (27).
- 16 Heller A. Can Everydey Life be Endangered? / A.Heller // Can Modernity Survive. T.J. Press Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall, 1990. — P. 46.
- 17 Жолдасов С. Шежірелі Оңтүстік / С. Жолдасов. — Алматы: ҚазАқпарат баспасы, 2002. — 152 б.
- 18 Бабенко С.М. На земле Ахмеда Яссави / С.М. Бабенко. — Белье Воды: Сайрам. район. типогр., 1994. — 272 с.
- 19 Мирхалдаров М. История Сайрама / М. Мирхалдаров. — Алматы, 2000.

Ж.А. Таштанов, Вежихи Сефа Фұат Хекимоглу

Күнделікті өмір тарихын зерттеудің әдіснамалық негізі (XX ғасырдың 30-60 жылдарындағы Сайрам ауданының мысалында)

Мақала Сайрам ауданының мысалында тарихи ғылымдағы қазіргі заманғы бағыттардың бірі — күнделікті тарихтың әдіснамалық негіздерін талдауға арналған. Авторлар шетелдік және отандық тарихнама өкілдерінің күнделікті тарихтың тұжырымдамалық және әдіснамалық негіздерін анықтаудағы жетістіктерін талдауға тырысты. Мақаланың ғылыми мәселелерін талдау нәтижесінде шетелдік және қазақстандық авторлардың жұмыстары белгілі бір қаланың, ауданның, қоғамның және жеке адамның күнделікті өмірін зерттеудегі жаңа әдіснамалық тәсілдің эвристикалық қабілеттерін оң бағалайды деген қорытындыға келеді. Сондай-ақ, XX ғасырдың 30-40 жылдарындағы Сайрам ауданы тұрғындарының әлеуметтік-экономикалық тарихы мен күнделікті өмірінің сюжеттері авторлардың ғылыми қызығушылығының объектісі болды. Бұл хронологиялық түйін Сайрам ауданы халқының күнделікті өмірін өзгерту процесін зерттеу тұрғысынан ерекше қызығушылық тудырады. Дәл осы кезеңде халықтың күнделікті өмірінде қалыптасқан дәстүрлермен қатар жаңа өмір кеңістігінің элементтері пайда бола бастады. Осы өзгерістер байлардың мал, меншік және жеке мүлікті тәркілеуден басталған ұжымдастыруға, бұдан әрі ауданның аумақтық құрылымының өзгеруіне, құрылыс индустриясының дамуына және т.б. байланысты еді.

Кілт сөздер: Қазақстан тарихы, тарих, күнделікті тарих, Сайрам ауданының тарихы, Кеңес Одағы, ұжымдастыру.

Ж.А. Таштанов, Вежихи Сефа Фұат Хекимоглу

Методологические основы исследования повседневной истории (на примере Сайрамского района в 30–60-е годы XX века)

Статья посвящена анализу методологических основ одного из современных направлений в исторической науке — истории повседневности на примере Сайрамского района. Авторами сделана попытка проанализировать достижения представителей зарубежной и отечественной историографии в определении концептуальных и методологических основ истории повседневности. В результате анализа научной проблематики статьи авторы приходят к выводу, что работы зарубежных и казахстанских авторов в целом положительно оценивают эвристические способности нового методологического подхода при изучении повседневной жизни определенного города, района, социума и отдельно взятого человека. Также объектом научного интереса автора стали сюжеты социально-экономической истории и повседневной жизни горожан Сайрамского района в 30–40-е годы XX века. Данный хронологический отрезок представляет особый интерес с точки зрения изучения процесса трансформации повседневной жизни населения Сайрамского района. Поскольку именно в этот период, наряду с уже укоренившимися традициями, в повседневной жизни населения стали появляться элементы нового жизненного пространства. Эти изменения были обусловлены коллективизацией, начавшейся с конфискации у баев скота, собственности и личного имущества, территориальной структурой района, развитием строительной индустрии и т.д.

Ключевые слова: история, история Казахстана, повседневная история, история Сайрамского района, Советский Союз, коллективизация.

References

- 1 Schütz, A. (1988). Struktura povsednevnogo myshleniia [The structure of everyday thinking]. *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniia — Sociological studies*, 2 [in Russian].
- 2 Dmitrievskaia, M.S. Gorodskaiia povsednevnost kak otdelnaia sostavliaiushchaia izucheniia obydenosti cheloveka [Urban everyday life as a separate component of the study of human everyday life]. Retrieved from elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=39148640 [in Russian].
- 3 Granovetter, M. (2009). Sila slabykh svyazei [The strength of weak ties]. *Ekonomicheskaiia sotsiologiia — Economic sociology*, 4, 31–51 [in Russian].
- 4 Zimmel, G. (2002). Bolshie goroda i dukhovnaia zhizn [Big cities and spiritual life]. *Logos — Logos*, 3–4, 1–12 [in Russian].
- 5 Blok, M. (1986). *Apologiia istorii, ili Remeslo istorika [Apology of history or the craft of a historian]*. Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].
- 6 Fevr, L. (1991). *Boi za istoriiu [Fights for history]*. Moscow: Nauka [in Russian].
- 7 Brodel, F. (1986). *Materialnaia tsivilizatsiia, ekonomika i kapitalizm, XV–XVIII vv. Struktury povsednevnosti: vozmozhnoe i nevozmozhnoe [Material civilization, economy and capitalism, XV–XVIII centuries. Structures of everyday life: possible and impossible]*. Moscow: Progress [in Russian].
- 8 Pushkareva, N.L. Istoriia povsednevnosti kak napravlenie istoricheskikh issledovaniia [History of everyday life as a direction of historical research]. Retrieved from <http://www.perspektivy.info> [in Russian].
- 9 Saktaganova, Z.G. (2010). Povsednevnaia zhizn gorodov Tsentralnogo Kazakhstana v 1945–1953 gg.: monografiia [Everyday life of the cities of Central Kazakhstan in 1945–1953: monograph]. Karaganda [in Russian].
- 10 Abdrakhmanova, K.K. (2009). Povsednevnaia zhizn gorodov Tsentralnogo Kazakhstana v 1945–1953 gg. [Everyday life of the cities of Central Kazakhstan in 1945–1953]. *Extended abstract of candidate's thesis*. Karaganda [in Russian].
- 11 Kozybaeva, M.M. (2000). Povsednevnaia zhizn gorodskogo naseleniia Severnogo Kazakhstana v 1920–1930-e gody [Everyday life of the urban population of Northern Kazakhstan in the 1920–1930s]. *Extended abstract of Doctor's thesis*. Astana [in Russian].
- 12 Kozachenko, E.A. (2016). Zhilishchno-bytovaia povsednevnost liudei v 70-kh godakh XX veka na primere Ust-Kamenogorska [Everyday life of people in the 70s of the XX century on the example of Ust-Kamenogorsk]. *Sbornik materialov Mezhdunarodnoi nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii “Respublika Kazakhstan i Evraziiskoe prostranstvo: sovremennost i perspektivy razvitiia”, posviashchennoi 25-letiiu Nezavisimosti RK. Chast 2 — Collection of materials of the international scientific and practical conference “The Republic of Kazakhstan and the Eurasian space: modernity and development prospects”, dedicated to the 25th anniversary of Independence of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Part 2*. Astana [in Russian].
- 13 Dzhumaniyazova, N.Kh. (2016). Povsednevnaia zhizn kazakhskogo naseleniia v kontse XVIII–nachale XX vv. (na materialakh Orenburgskoi gubernii) [Everyday life of the Kazakh population in the late 18th — early 20th centuries (based on the materials of the Orenburg province)]. *Sbornik materialov Mezhdunarodnoi nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii “Respublika Kazakhstan i Evraziiskoe prostranstvo: sovremennost i perspektivy razvitiia”, posviashchennoi 25-letiiu Nezavisimosti Respubliki Kazakhstan. Chast 2 — Collection of materials of the international scientific and practical conference “The Republic of Kazakhstan and the Eurasian space: modernity and development prospects” dedicated to the 25th anniversary of Independence of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Part 2*. Astana [in Russian].
- 14 Khamidullina, D.U. (2014). Qazaqstandagy «arnaiy kontingenttin» kundelikti omiri (XX g. 30-50-shy zhyldary) [The Kazakh population's “contingent” of the 20th century (30–50s)]. *Extended abstract of Doctor's thesis*. Almaty [in Kazakh].
- 15 Anisimova, I.Yu., Ramazanova, F.S., & Bolatova, K.B. (2021). Istoriia povsednevnosti kak napravlenie istoricheskikh issledovaniia: predmet, istochniki, metody [Everyday life history as a direction of historical research: subject, sources, methods]. *Elektronnyi nauchnyi zhurnal «edu.e-history.kz» — “edu.e-history.kz” electronic scientific journal*, 3 (27) [in Russian].
- 16 Heller, A. (1990). Can Everyday Life be Endangered? Heller A. *Can Modernity Survive*, 46. T.J. Press Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall.
- 17 Zholdasov, S. (2002). Shezhireli Ontustik [Genealogical South]. Almaty: QazAqparat baspasy [in Kazakh].
- 18 Babenko, S.M. (1994). Na zemle Akhmeda Yassavi [On the land of Ahmed Yassawi]. Belye Vody: Sairamskaia raionnaia tipografiia [in Russian].
- 19 Mirkhaldarov, M. (2000). Istoriia Sairama [History of Sairam]. Almaty [in Russian].

Information about the authors

Tashtanov Zhanabek — Master of historical sciences, PhD student, Senior lecturer of the Department of General history and museum affairs, M. Auezov South Kazakhstan University, Shymkent, Kazakhstan; <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3741-9721>

Vezhikhi Sefa Fut Hekimoglu — PhD, Kutahya Dumlupinar University, Kutahya, Turkey; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6095-7512>