

2025. 12 (4)

Asian Journal

"STEPPE PANORAMA"



ISSN 2710-3994

ISSN 2710-3994 (online)

Құрылтайшысы және баспагері: Қазақстан Республикасы Ғылым және жоғары білім министрлігі Ғылым комитеті Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты ШЖҚ РМК

Ғылыми журнал Қазақстан Республикасы Инвестициялар және даму министрлігінің Байланыс, ақпараттандыру және ақпарат комитетінде 2025 ж. 5 сәуірде тіркелген. Тіркеу нөмірі № KZ91VPY00116246. Жылына 6 рет жарияланады (электронды нұсқада).

Журналда тарих ғылымының *келесі бағыттары* бойынша ғылыми жұмыстар жарияланады: тарих, этнология.

Жарияланым тілдері: қазақ, орыс, ағылшын.

Редакция мен баспаның мекен-жайы:

050010 Қазақстан Республикасы, Алматы қ., Шевченко көш., 28-үй

ҚР ҒЖБМ ҒК Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты ШЖҚ РМК

Тел.: +7 (727) 261-67-19, +7 (727) 272-47-59

Журнал сайты: <https://ajspiie.com>

© Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы
Тарих және этнология институты 2025
© Авторлар ұжымы, 2025

БАС РЕДАКТОР

Қабылдинов Зиябек Ермұқанұлы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА академигі, ҚР ҒЖБМ ҒКШ.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының бас директоры. (Қазақстан)

РЕДАКЦИЯЛЫҚ АЛҚА

Аутрам Алан (Outram Alan) — археология ғылымдарының докторы, Эксетер университеті, тарих және археология кафедрасының профессоры. (Ұлыбритания)

Аширов Адхамжон Азимбаевич — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Өзбекстан Республикасы Ғылым академиясының Тарих институтының Этнология және антропология орталығының меңгерушісі. (Өзбекстан)

Әбіл Еркін Аманжолұлы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР БҒМ ҒК Мемлекет тарихы институтының директоры. (Қазақстан)

Әлімбай Нұрсан — тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, профессор, Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының бас ғылыми қызметкері. (Қазақстан)

Вернер Кунтһиа (Werner Cynthia) — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Техас университеті. (АҚШ).

Дайнер Александр (Diener Alexander) – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор. Канзас университеті, (АҚШ)

Көкебаева Гүлжауһар Какенқызы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Абай атындағы Қазақ ұлттық педагогикалық университеті. (Қазақстан)

Кригер Виктор (Kriege Viktor) — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, Нюрнбергтегі Бавариялық немістер мәдени орталығының (BKDR) ғылыми қызметкері. (Германия)

Оайон Изабель (Ohayon Isabelle) — тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, профессор, CERCEC директорының орынбасары, Францияның Ұлттық ғылыми зерттеу орталығының (CNRS) қызметкері. (Франция)

Сабурова Татьяна — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Индиана университеті. (АҚШ)

Моррисон Александр (Morrison Alexander) — PhD, Оксфорд университетінің профессоры. (Ұлыбритания)

Муминов Ашірбек Құрбанұлы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Ислам тарихы, өнер және мәдениет ғылыми-зерттеу орталығының аға ғылыми қызметкері IRCICA – İslam Tarih, Sanat ve Kültür Araştırma Merkezi. (Түркия)

Римантас Желвис (Želvys Rimantas) — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Вильнюс педагогикалық университеті. (Литва)

Смағұлов Оразақ Смағұлұлы – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА академигі, Балон ғылым академиясының корр.-мүшесі, Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы сыйлықтың лауреаты, ғылым мен техниканың еңбек сіңірген қайраткері, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университетінің профессоры. (Қазақстан)

Таймағамбетов Жәкен Қожахметұлы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, ҚР ҰҒА академигі, ҚР Ұлттық музейі. (Қазақстан)

ЖАУАПТЫ РЕДАКТОР

Қаипбаева Айнагүл Толғанбайқызы — тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, қауымдастырылған профессор, Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының жетекші ғылыми қызметкері. (Қазақстан)

ҒЫЛЫМИ РЕДАКТОРЛАР

Қапаева Айжан Тоқанқызы — тарих ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының Бас ғылыми қызметкері. (Қазақстан)

Күбеев Рустем Жаулыбайұлы — Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының ғылыми қызметкері. (Қазақстан)

ТЕХНИКАЛЫҚ ХАТШЫ

Копеева Сания Жуматайқызы — магистр, Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институтының қызметкері. (Қазақстан).

ISSN 2710-3994 (online)

Учредитель и издатель: РГП на ПХВ «Институт истории и этнологии им.Ч.Ч. Валиханова»
Комитета науки Министерства науки и высшего образования Республики Казахстан

Научный журнал зарегистрирован в Комитете связи, информатизации и информации
Министерства по инвестициям и развитию Республики Казахстан, свидетельство
о регистрации:

№ KZ91VPY00116246 от 03.04.2025 г. Публикуется 6 раз в год (в электронном формате).

В журнале публикуются научные работы *по следующим направлениям* исторической науки:
история, этнология.

Языки публикации: казахский, русский, английский.

Адрес редакции и издательства:

050010 Республика Казахстан, г. Алматы, ул. Шевченко, д. 28

РГП на ПХВ Институт истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова КН МНВО РК

Тел.: +7 (727) 261-67-19, +7 (727) 272-47-59

Сайт журнала: <https://ajspiie.com>

© Институт истории и этнологии
имени Ч.Ч. Валиханова, 2025
© Коллектив авторов, 2025

ГЛАВНЫЙ РЕДАКТОР

Кабульдинов Зиябек Ермуханович — доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик НАН РК, генеральный директор Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова КН МНВО РК. (Казахстан)

РЕДАКЦИОННАЯ КОЛЛЕГИЯ

Абиль Еркин Аманжолович — доктор исторических наук, профессор, директор Института истории государства КН МНВО РК. (Казахстан)

Алимбай Нурсан — кандидат исторических наук, профессор, главный научный сотрудник Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова. (Казахстан)

Аутрам Алан (Outram Alan) — доктор археологических наук, профессор департамента археологии и истории Университета Эксетера. (Великобритания)

Аширов Адхамжон Азимбаевич — доктор исторических наук, профессор, заведующий Центром этнологии и антропологии Института истории Академии наук Республики Узбекистан. (Узбекистан)

Вернер Синтия (Werner, Cynthia) — доктор исторических наук, профессор. Техасский университет. (США)

Дайнер Александр (Diener Alexander) — доктор исторических наук, профессор. Канзасский университет (США)

Исмагулов Оразак Исмагулович — доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик НАН РК, член-корр. Болонской академии наук, лауреат премии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова, заслуженный деятель науки и техники, профессор Евразийского национального университета имени Л.Н. Гумилева. (Казахстан)

Кокебаева Гульжаухар Какеновна — доктор исторических наук, профессор Казахского национального педагогического университета имени Абая. (Казахстан)

Кригер Виктор (Kriege Viktor) — доктор исторических наук, научный сотрудник Баварского культурного центра немцев (BKDR) в Нюрнберге. (Германия)

Моррисон Александр (Morrison Alexander) — PhD, профессор Оксфордского университета. (Великобритания)

Муминов Аширбек Курбанович — доктор исторических наук, профессор, старший научный сотрудник Исследовательского центра исламской истории, искусства и культуры. IRCICA – İslâm Tarih, Sanat ve Kültür Araştırma Merkezi. (Турция)

Оайон Изабель (Ohayon Isabelle) — кандидат исторических наук, профессор, заместитель директора CERCEC, сотрудник Национального центра научных исследований Франции (CNRS). (Франция)

Римантас Желвис (Želvys Rimantas) — доктор педагогических наук, профессор, Вильнюсский педагогический университет. (Литва)

Сабурова Татьяна — доктор исторических наук, профессор, Университет Индианы. (США)

Таймагамбетов Жакен Кожаметович — доктор исторических наук, профессор, академик НАН РК, Национальный музей РК. (Казахстан)

ОТВЕТСТВЕННЫЙ РЕДАКТОР

Каипбаева Айнагуль Толганбаевна — кандидат исторических наук, ведущий научный сотрудник Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова. (Казахстан)

НАУЧНЫЕ РЕДАКТОРЫ

Капаева Айжан Токановна — доктор исторических наук, профессор, главный научный сотрудник Института истории этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова. (Казахстан).

Кубеев Рустем Джаулыбайулы — научный сотрудник Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова. (Казахстан).

ТЕХНИЧЕСКИЙ СЕКРЕТАРЬ

Копеева Сания Жуматаевна — магистр, сотрудник Института истории и этнологии им. Ч.Ч. Валиханова. (Казахстан).

ISSN 2710-3994 (online)

Founder and publisher: RSE on REM "Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology" of the Committee of Science of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan

The scientific journal is registered at the Committee for Communications, Informatization and Information of the Ministry for Investments and Development of the Republic of Kazakhstan, registration certificate: No. KZ91VPY00116246 dated 03.04.2025. The journal is published 6 times a year (in electronic format).

The journal publishes scientific works in the *following areas* of historical science: history, ethnology.

Publication languages: Kazakh, Russian, English.

Editorial and publisher address:

28 Shevchenko Str., 050010, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan

RSE on REM Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology CS MSHE of the Republic of Kazakhstan

Tel.: +7 (727) 261-67-19, +7 (727) 272-47-59

Journal website: <https://ajspiie.com>

© Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute
of History and Ethnology, 2025
© Group of authors, 2025

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Kabuldinov Ziabek Ermukhanovich — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, General Director of Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology SC MSHE RK. (Kazakhstan)

EDITORIAL BOARD

Abil Yerkin Amanzholovich — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Director of the Institute of History of the State CS MES RK. (Kazakhstan)

Alimbay Nursan — Candidate of Historical Sciences, Professor, Chief Researcher at the Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology. (Kazakhstan)

Azimqulov Javohir — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Head of the Center for Ethnology and Anthropology at the Institute of History, Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (Uzbekistan)

Diener Alexander — Doctor of Political Science, Professor, University of Kansas. (USA)

Ismagulov Orazak Ismagulovich — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Corresponding Member of Bologna Academy of Sciences, winner of Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Award, Honored Worker of Science and Technology, Professor of L.N. Gumilyov University. (Kazakhstan)

Kokebayeva Gulzhaukhar Kakenovna — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor at the Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University. (Kazakhstan)

Kriege Viktor — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Researcher at the Bavarian Cultural Center of Germans (BKDR) in Nuremberg. (Germany)

Morrison Alexander — PhD, Professor, University of Oxford. (UK)

Muminov Ashirbek Kurbanovich — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Senior Researcher at the Research Center for Islamic History, Art and Culture. IRCICA (İslâm Tarih, Sanat ve Kültür Araştırma Merkezi). (Turkey)

Ohayon Isabelle — Candidate of Historical Sciences, Professor, Deputy Director of CERCEC, Researcher at the French National Center for Scientific Research (CNRS). (France)

Outram Alan — Doctor of Archaeological Sciences, Professor in the Department of Archaeology and History at University of Exeter. (Britain)

Rimantas Želvys — Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor, Vilnius Pedagogical University. (Lithuania)

Saburova Tatiana — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Indiana University. (USA)

Taimagambetov Zhaken Kozhakhmetovich — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, National Museum of the Republic of Kazakhstan. (Kazakhstan)

Werner, Cynthia — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Texas university. (USA)

EXECUTIVE EDITOR

Kaipbayeva Ainagul Tolganbayevna — Candidate of Historical Sciences, leading researcher at Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology (Kazakhstan).

ACADEMIC EDITOR

Kapaeva Aizhan Tokanovna — Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Chief Researcher at the Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology. (Kazakhstan)

Kubeyev Rustem Dzhaulybayuly — researcher at Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology. (Kazakhstan)

TECHNICAL SECRETARY

Kopeyeva Saniya Zhumataevna — Master's, researcher at Ch.Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology. (Kazakhstan)


ТАРИХ / ИСТОРИЯ / HISTORY

Published in the Republic of Kazakhstan
 Asian Journal "Steppe Panorama"
 Has been issued as a journal since 2014
 ISSN 2710-3994.
 Vol. 12. Is. 4, pp. 960-973, 2025
 Journal homepage: <https://ajspiie.com>

FTAXP / MPHTI / IRSTI 03.20
https://doi.org/10.51943/2710-3994_2025_12_4_960-973

FORMATION OF NATIONAL IDENTITY AND CURRENT ISSUES OF NATIONAL HISTORY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE EXPERIENCE OF KAZAKHSTAN AND TURKEY

*Azretbergenova Elmira Zharylkasynovna*¹

¹Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University
 (13, Dostyk Ave., 050010, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan)
 Candidate of Historical Sciences
 <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-5876-7312>. E-mail: eazret@mail.ru

© Ch.Ch. Valikhanov IHE, 2025

© Azretbergenova E.Zh., 2025

Abstract. *Introduction.* The formation of national identity through the lens of national (domestic) history is one of the key directions of modern humanities scholarship. Historical memory, interpretations of the past, and the content of the official historical narrative directly influence political orientations, cultural values, and educational priorities in any nation-state. In this context, a comparative analysis of the Kazakh and Turkish experience constitutes a scientifically significant task, as both countries have undergone a complex transformation, from an imperial and ideologically driven perception of history to attempts at constructing a sovereign and pluralistic historical discourse. The relevance of the research is determined by the necessity of critically rethinking the processes of postcolonial and post-totalitarian reinterpretation of national history in Kazakhstan and Turkey. Contemporary Kazakh historiography strives to go beyond Soviet ideology by turning to Turkic and local cultural heritage, whereas Turkey is re-evaluating its Kemalist legacy and expanding the historical narrative to include Ottoman and Islamic components. *Goals and objectives.* To identify the particularities of national history formation in the context of national identity through the example of Kazakhstan and Turkey, and to carry out a comparative analysis of key methodological, substantive, and institutional approaches. *Research Objectives* include: describing the main stages of the development of historical narrative in each country; analyzing official and academic interpretations of the past; identifying factors influencing historical policy; and comparing educational strategies in the field of history teaching. *Research Hypothesis.* Despite differing historical contexts, Kazakhstan and Turkey exhibit a common trend toward rejecting centralized and ideologically saturated conceptions of history in favor of more flexible, multilayered, and culturally contextualized approaches. *Theoretical and Methodological Framework.* The theoretical foundation of the research is based on theories of cultural memory, postcolonial studies, as well as comparative and historiographical analysis. The study employs methods of content analysis, narrative interpretation, and the comparative-historical approach. *Results.* The findings of this study suggest that in both countries, national history serves as a key tool for legitimizing contemporary values and as a platform for intellectual decolonization. In Kazakhstan, there is growing interest in national origins that were previously silenced during the Soviet era, while in Turkey, there are discernible shifts away from the Kemalist canon toward a more complex and relevant historical memory. *Conclusion.* The comparative analysis carried out confirms that national history in Kazakhstan and

Turkey is not merely an academic discipline, but a dynamic mechanism for identity formation that responds to contemporary challenges. In both cases, there is a gradual departure from ideological dogmas and a development of diverse approaches to interpreting the past, which opens new horizons for cultivating civic culture, historical consciousness, and strengthening national self-awareness.

Keywords: Kazakhstan, Turkey, national history, Kemalism, national identity, comparative analysis, historiography, post-Soviet space

For citation: Azretbergenova E.Zh. Formation of national identity and current issues of national history in the context of the experience of Kazakhstan and Turkey // Asian Journal “Steppe Panorama”. 2025. Vol. 12. No. 4. Pp. 960–973. (In Eng.).

DOI: 10.51943/2710-3994_2025_12_4_960-973

ҚАЗАҚСТАН МЕН ТҮРКИЯ ТӘЖІРИБЕСІ КОНТЕКСТІНДЕ ҰЛТТЫҚ БІРЕГЕЙЛІКТІ ҚАЛЫПТАСТЫРУ ЖӘНЕ ОТАНДЫҚ ТАРИХТЫҢ ӨЗЕКТІ МӘСЕЛЕЛЕРІ

Азретбергенова Эльмира Жарылқасынқызы¹

¹Абай атындағы Қазақ ұлттық педагогикалық университеті
(13-үй, Достық даңғылы, 050010, Алматы, Қазақстан Республикасы)
Тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты

 <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-5876-7312>. E-mail: eazret@mail.ru

© Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы ТЭИ, 2025

© Азретбергенова Э.Ж., 2025

Аңдатпа. *Kırpıne.* Ұлттық бірегейлікті қалыптастыру мәселелері отандық тарих шеңбері арқылы қазіргі гуманитарлық білімнің негізгі бағыттарының бірі болып табылады. Тарихи сана, өткенді интерпретациялау және ресми тарихи баяндаудың мазмұны кез келген ұлттық мемлекеттің саяси бағдарларына, мәдени құндылықтарына және білім беру басымдықтарына тікелей ықпал етеді. Осы тұрғыдан алғанда, Қазақстан мен Түркияның тәжірибесін салыстыру ғылыми тұрғыдан маңызды міндет болып табылады. Себебі екі ел де тарихты империялық және идеологияланған қабылдаудан арынып, плюралистік тарихи дискурс құруға бағытталған күрделі жолдан өтті. *Зерттеудің өзектілігі* Қазақстан мен Түркиядағы отандық тарихты отарлық пен тоталитарлық саясаттан кейін қайта пайымдау үдерістерін сыни тұрғыда зерделеудің қажеттілігімен түсіндіріледі. Қазіргі қазақстандық тарихнама кеңестік идеология шеңберінен шығып, түркілік және жергілікті мәдени мұраға бет бұруда. Ал Түркия кемализм мұрасын қайта пайымдап, тарихи баяндауды османдық және исламдық компоненттер есебінен кеңейтіп келеді. *Зерттеудің мақсаты.* Қазақстан мен Түркия мысалында ұлттық бірегейлік контексіндегі отандық тарихтың қалыптасу ерекшеліктерін айқындау және негізгі әдіснамалық, мазмұндық және институционалдық тәсілдерді салыстырмалы түрде талдау болып табылады. *Зерттеудің міндеттері:* әр елдегі тарихи баяндаудың қалыптасу кезеңдерін сипаттау; өткенді ресми және академиялық интерпретациялауды талдау; тарихи саясатқа әсер ететін факторларды анықтау; тарихты оқыту саласындағы білім беру стратегияларын салыстыру. *Зерттеу гипотезасы,* тарихи контекстілерінің айырмашылықтарына қарамастан, Қазақстан мен Түркия тарихты орталықтандырылған әрі идеологияланған түсініктен бас тартып, икемді, көпдеңгейлі және мәдени негізделген тәсілге бет бұруда ұқсас үрдіс байқатады. *Теориялық негізі мен әдіснамасы.* Мәдени сана теориясына, постколониялық зерттеулерге, сондай-ақ компаративті және тарихнамалық талдауға сүйенеді. Контент-талдау, баяндауды интерпретациялау және салыстырмалы-тарихи әдістер қолданылған. *Зерттеудің ғылыми нәтижелері.* Қос елде де отандық тарих заманауи құндылықтарды заңдастыруда маңызды құралына, сонымен қатар интеллектуалдық отарлық санадан арыну платформасына айналып отыр. Қазақстанда кеңестік кезеңде тұншықтырылған ұлттық тарихты қайта жазуға бет бұрып отыр, ал Түркияда кемалистік идеялардан неғұрлым күрделі әрі өзекті тарихи

жадыға қарай бетбұрыс байқалады. *Қорытынды.* Жүргізілген салыстырмалы талдау отандық тарихтың Қазақстан мен Түркияда академиялық пән ретінде емес, заман талаптарына жауап беретін бірегейлік қалыптастырудың динамикалық тетігі екенін растайды. Екі жағдайда да идеологиялық догмалардан біртіндеп арылу және өткенді интерпретациялаудың сан қырлы тәсілдерін дамыту үрдісі жүріп жатыр. Бұл азаматтық мәдениетті, тарихи сананы және ұлттық өзіндік сананы қалыптастырудың жаңа көкжиектерін ашады.

Түйін сөздер: Қазақстан, Түркия, отандық тарих, кемализм, ұлттық бірегейлік, салыстырмалы талдау, тарихнама, посткеңестік кеңістік

Дәйексөз үшін: Азретбергенова Э.Ж. Қазақстан мен Түркия тәжірибесі контекстінде ұлттық бірегейлікті қалыптастыру және отандық тарихтың өзекті мәселелері // Asian Journal “Steppe Panorama”. 2025. Т. 12. № 4. 960–973 бб. (Ағылш.).

DOI: 10.51943/2710-3994_2025_12_4_960-973

ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ НАЦИОНАЛЬНОЙ ИДЕНТИЧНОСТИ И АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ ОТЕЧЕСТВЕННОЙ ИСТОРИИ В КОНТЕКСТЕ ОПЫТА КАЗАХСТАНА И ТУРЦИИ

Азретбергенова Эльмира Жарылкасыновна¹

¹Казахский национальный педагогический университет имени Абая

(д. 13, просп. Достык, 050010, Алматы, Республика Казахстан)

Кандидат исторических наук

 <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-5876-7312>. E-mail: eazret@mail.ru

© ИИЭ имени Ч.Ч. Уалиханова, 2025

© Азретбергенова Э.Ж., 2025

Аннотация. *Введение.* Вопросы формирования национальной идентичности через призму отечественной истории являются одним из ключевых направлений современного гуманитарного знания. Историческая память, интерпретации прошлого и содержание официального исторического нарратива напрямую влияют на политические ориентиры, культурные ценности и образовательные приоритеты в любом национальном государстве. В этом контексте сопоставление казахстанского и турецкого опыта представляет собой научно значимую задачу, поскольку обе страны прошли сложный путь от имперского и идеологизированного восприятия истории к попытке построения суверенного и плюралистического исторического дискурса. Актуальность исследования обусловлена необходимостью критического осмысления процессов постколониального и посттоталитарного переосмысления отечественной истории в Казахстане и Турции. Современная казахстанская историография стремится выйти за рамки советской идеологии, обращаясь к тюркскому и локальному культурному наследию, в то время как Турция переосмысляет кемалистское наследие и расширяет исторический нарратив за счет османской и исламской составляющей. *Цели и задачи исследования.* Выявить особенности формирования отечественной истории в контексте национальной идентичности на примере Казахстана и Турции, провести сравнительный анализ основных методологических, содержательных и институциональных подходов. Задачи исследования включают: описание ключевых этапов формирования исторического нарратива в каждой стране; анализ официальных и академических интерпретаций прошлого; выявление факторов, влияющих на историческую политику; сопоставление образовательных стратегий в сфере преподавания истории. Гипотеза исследования заключается в том, что Казахстан и Турция, несмотря на различие исторических контекстов, демонстрируют общую тенденцию к отказу от централизованного и идеологизированного понимания истории в пользу гибкого, многоуровневого и культурно обусловленного подхода. Теоретическая основа и методология исследования базируются на теориях культурной памяти, постколониальных исследованиях, а также на компаративистском

и историографическом анализе. Используются методы контент-анализа, интерпретации нарратива, сравнительно-исторический подход. *Результаты.* В обеих странах отечественная история становится важным инструментом легитимации современных ценностей, а также платформой для интеллектуальной деколонизации. В Казахстане нарастает интерес к национальным истокам, ранее замалчиваемым в советское время, а в Турции происходят подвижки от кемалистского канона к более комплексной и релевантной исторической памяти. *Заключение.* Проведенный сравнительный анализ подтверждает, что отечественная история в Казахстане и Турции, не просто академическая дисциплина, а динамичный механизм формирования идентичности, реагирующий на вызовы времени. В обоих случаях наблюдается постепенное освобождение от идеологических догм и развитие многообразного подхода к интерпретации прошлого, что открывает новые горизонты для формирования гражданской культуры, исторического сознания и укрепления национального самосознания.

Ключевые слова: Казахстан, Турция, отечественная история, кемализм, национальная идентичность, сравнительный анализ, историография, постсоветское пространство

Для цитирования: Азретбергенова Э.Ж. Формирование национальной идентичности и актуальные проблемы отечественной истории в контексте опыта Казахстана и Турции // Asian Journal "Steppe Panorama". 2025. Т. 12. № 4. С. 960–973. (На Англ.).

DOI: 10.51943/2710-3994_2025_12_4_960-973

Introduction

The formation of national identity through the lens of domestic history in Kazakhstan and Turkey is a complex and multilayered process that encompasses various stages of political, ideological, and academic development in both countries. The relevance of this topic stems from the fact that, within the post-imperial and post-totalitarian context, both states were compelled to construct their own visions of the past visions that departed significantly from former imperial ideological frameworks. In Turkey, this process began with the republican revolution of 1923 and, from the early years of Kemalist rule, became an integral component of the official ideological agenda. In contrast, Kazakhstan only began to develop the conditions for a sovereign historiographical discourse by the late 1990s. Throughout the entire Soviet period, Kazakhstan's national history operated largely within the paradigm of communist ideology, where the national interpretation of the past was subordinated to the Marxist-Leninist view of historical development, emphasizing class struggle, internationalism, and the unity of the Soviet peoples (Karibayev, 2015: 4–11).

After gaining independence, Kazakh historical scholarship entered a new phase, in which one of its central tasks was to liberate national history from its colonial and ideological legacy. This transformation was reflected in the reassessment of key concepts, terminologies, and narratives that had previously been imposed from the outside. In this context, the objective was not to replace one ideology with another, but rather to develop a scientifically grounded and interpretively open approach to national history one rooted in primary sources, cultural memory, and the internal logic of Kazakhstan's historical development (Koygeldiyev, Omarbekov, 2003). At the same time, throughout the twentieth century, national history in Turkey was actively used as a tool for constructing national identity based on the statist ideology of Kemalism, in which the Ottoman, Islamic, and multiethnic past was often reduced or reinterpreted to fit the needs of the new secular nation state (Turan, 2019: 626–641). Only in the early twenty-first century, particularly with the rise to power of the Justice and Development Party (AKP), did Turkish historiography begin to partially reassess the Ottoman legacy, while also facing criticism for ideologically redefining the past in favor of a neo-Ottoman and Islamized narrative.

The aim of this article is to conduct a comprehensive comparative analysis of the transformation of national history in Kazakhstan and Turkey in the context of national identity formation, with a focus on the transition from an ideologized to a scholarly, polyphonic, and culturally grounded approach. The research objectives include, first, identifying the initial preconditions for the formation of national historical narratives in each of the two countries; second, analyzing institutional and

discursive shifts in academic and educational policy following key historical turning points (1991 in Kazakhstan, 1923 and 2025 in Turkey); third, comparing thematic priorities and methodologies in national historiography, particularly within curricula, university scholarship, and public memory; and fourth, determining the degree to which historical knowledge remains influenced by contemporary state ideology, as well as identifying trends toward academic autonomy.

The central hypothesis of this study is that, since the beginning of the twenty-first century, Kazakhstan has been undergoing a deliberate scholarly reassessment of its national history within a decolonial framework. In this process, historians aim to move beyond clichéd Soviet-era models and construct a national narrative grounded in cultural codes, ethnic continuity, and the integration of Turkic, Islamic, and Eurasian components, while consciously avoiding a shift toward radical nationalism or ideological monologue (Koygeldiyev, 1995). In Turkey, although professional historical scholarship has a longer academic tradition, there is a noticeable trend toward the reinterpretation of history within the framework of official rhetoric, particularly in recent decades, as the Ottoman legacy has become a component of state cultural policy and foreign policy identity (Yıldız, 1999: 333–342). It is important to emphasize that both countries are in the process of rethinking the concept of the “national” as a category that extends beyond ethnic identity, incorporating linguistic and civilizational dimensions. In this process, national history serves both as scholarly knowledge about the past and as a social instrument through which foundational ideas about the boundaries of community, memory canons, heroes, symbols, and cultural codes are either reinforced or contested. For this reason, the analysis of history textbooks, academic research, and public interpretations of the past becomes an integral part of studying national identity.

The methodology of this study is based on comparative analysis, interpretation of historical narratives, and elements of critical historiography, particularly the idea that national history is a product of specific political and cultural conditions rather than an objective reflection of the past. The use of sources in three languages Kazakh, Russian and Turkish allows for a deep and multilayered understanding of the processes unfolding in the historical scholarship of both countries. In the Kazakh academic field there is a growing demand for the revision of the content and methodological foundations of national history relying on approaches from Turkology, Islamic studies and anthropology. In Turkish historiography meanwhile debates continue over the boundaries of acceptable interpretation of the Ottoman and Republican past which is reflected both in academic research and in public speeches by political figures. The academic significance of this research lies in its comparative perspective on two national historiographies and in identifying broader patterns in the formation of postcolonial historical scholarship that is free from former ideological dependency and capable of offering society a layered and balanced understanding of the past. This work is of interest to scholars in the fields of history, political identity, cultural anthropology and education as well as to a broader audience interested in understanding the pathways of decolonization and academic emancipation in post imperial societies.

Materials and Methods of the Study

This study employs a comprehensive interdisciplinary approach based on the synthesis of historical comparative narrative discursive and hermeneutic methods which together allow for a thorough examination of the formation of national identity in Kazakhstan and Turkey as a result of complex sociocultural political and historical transformations. The primary methodological framework is the comparative historical method which makes it possible to identify both parallels and differences in the national ideologies and historical narratives of the two countries. Kazakhstan and Turkey represent two examples of societal modernization each of which has undergone phases of ethnopolitical construction and a struggle for cultural distinctiveness under conditions of external pressure (Aminov, 2019: 195).

The research is based on an extensive body of historical legal journalistic and educational materials including works by Kazakh and Turkish scholars legal and regulatory documents official doctrines as well as memoirs of participants in the political processes of the twentieth and twenty first centuries. Particular attention is given to texts that shape national memory and the cultural canon such

as school history textbooks educational reform programs speeches by political leaders and works of fiction that actively contribute to the construction of identity frameworks (Kara, 2012: 89–103).

Hermeneutic analysis was applied to interpret key concepts such as nation homeland ancestors and spirituality within the context of historical narratives emphasized in state policy and education. In the case of Kazakhstan the central category became the concept of *rukhani zhangyru* or spiritual renewal introduced in a programmatic article by Nursultan Nazarbayev in 2017. This term initiated a process of symbolic reconstruction of the past and offered a new direction for cultural modernization (Nazarbayev, 2017: 2).

Discursive analysis made it possible to identify structural changes in the official narratives of Kazakhstan and Turkey during different stages of nation building. For example, in Turkey the formation of Kemalist ideology was accompanied by strict control over historiography where priority was given to the idea of *Anadolu'nun medeniyet beşiği olması* (Anatolia as the cradle of civilization) and to the denial of the multiethnic legacy of the Ottoman past (Bora, 1998: 35–50). In Kazakhstan, by contrast, the post-Soviet identity policy evolved from Soviet internationalism to an ethnocentric model and later to an attempt to integrate all ethnic groups within the framework of a Kazakhstani nation (Kabyl, Khazretalikyzy, Orazkhan, 2024).

The source base of this research consists of three main groups. The first group includes academic studies among which the works of Kazakh historians (Aitaly, 2003: 226) and Turkish authors (Gökalp, 1992) are particularly significant. The second group consists of official documents and conceptual programs such as *Madeni mura* meaning Cultural Heritage from 2004 *Rukhani zhangyru* meaning Spiritual Renewal from 2017 *Türkiye Yuzyili* meaning The Century of Turkey from 2023 as well as the constitutions of both countries. The third group consists of fieldwork materials, including interviews with history teachers, students, and education experts in Almaty, Nursultan, Ankara, and Istanbul, conducted by the author during the 2024–2025 academic year.

Particular attention is given to the interpretation of the university history curriculum as an instrument of political socialization. University textbooks in both countries are viewed as an institutionalized form of transmitting the national narrative (Turlybay, 2025). In Turkey textbooks reflect an evolution from strict Kemalism to a more pluralistic interpretation of history including Islamic and Ottoman heritage. In Kazakhstan, there is a tendency to reevaluate the prerevolutionary past and to engage in its heroization, particularly in relation to figures such as Abilay Khan, Kenesary, and Altynsarin (Jaqslyqov, 2017: 95–99).

In the course of analysis the method of historical reconstruction was used to identify the mechanisms of symbolic construction of the past. As noted by K. Kara (Kara, 2012: 101) in Turkey the creation of a new nation was accompanied by the creation of a new past in which key historical milestones were interpreted in the spirit of national heroism and civilizational leadership. Similar processes are taking place in Kazakhstan where the Soviet legacy is viewed through the lens of oppression or colonialism and local forms of resistance are interpreted as expressions of early patriotism (Masanov, Abylkhozhin, Erofeyeva, Alekseenko, Baratova, 2000).

In working with the materials the principles of content analysis were applied especially in the study of media discourse. Publications in outlets such as “*Egemen Qazaqstan*”, “*Zaman*”, “*Yeni Safak*”, and “*Qazaq adabiet*” were analyzed which made it possible to trace how symbolic images of the nation are constructed in the modern information environment. Finally, an important component of the methodology was the use of oral sources. As part of the project 16 in depth interviews were conducted with Kazakhstani and Turkish historians, educators and students who had direct experience interacting with the state education system. These data made it possible to understand how the constructed identities are perceived in practice outside official formats. Thus, the methodological foundation of the study is aimed at a comprehensive analysis of the relationship between historical policy the educational system and processes of identity transformation with attention to local and regional contexts.

Discussion

The formation of national identity represents not only a political but also a deeply humanitarian process that involves engaging with historical memory myths, cultural codes and the education system. In the context of Kazakhstan and Turkey this process takes on particularly complex dimensions as both countries have experienced imperial post imperial and post totalitarian stages which has led to a plurality and tension of identity models. Kazakhstan having been part of the Soviet Union developed for a long time within the framework of internationalist ideology whereas Turkey as the successor of the Ottoman Empire shaped its identity in the spirit of secular nationalism. In both cases historical scholarship and memory politics have become essential tools for the cultural construction of the nation (Nurlanova, 2011: 55–58; Ahmad, 1993: 77–81). A distinctive feature of the Turkish and Kazakhstani approach lies in the use of the past not as a neutral experience but as a resource that mobilizes collective consciousness for contemporary political construction.

Kazakhstan historiography of national identity after 1991 has been characterized by an effort to overcome Soviet narratives that diminished or devalued the significance of local elites, resistance, spiritual culture, and indigenous forms of legal consciousness. While in the early years of independence there was a strong drive to restore historical justice, by the 2000s the emphasis had shifted toward building a positive historical memory grounded in heroic narratives. A key part of this process was the movement toward an ethnocentric model of the nation in which primary attention was given to the Kazakh language culture and religious expressions of Islam (Tleubaev, 2016: 76). State programs such as Madenı mura and Rukhani zhangyru contributed to the institutionalization of historical policy within which the significance of khanate authority the figures of the Alash intelligentsia and the Soviet period as a time of identity loss was reinterpreted (Sadikov, 2018: 59–60). However, this approach is often criticized for its limitations and bias, as ethnocentrism can exclude other groups such as the Russian-speaking population, ethnic minority communities, and migrants from the unified national narrative.

One of the key arenas where identity is formed and reproduced is the education system, particularly school history textbooks. As demonstrated in the work of M. Sh. Egamberdiyev and D. Taldybayeva, since 2010, Kazakhstani school curricula have become predominantly oriented toward the formation of patriotic consciousness, within which students are presented with positive interpretations of the past, simplified and heroic representations of national figures, and a tendency to underestimate the contributions of other ethnic and religious communities to the development of the country. The issue lies in the fact that such an approach hinders the development of critical thinking among students and reproduces a one-dimensional historical perspective. Alternative studies, including field interviews with teachers in Almaty, also confirm the existence of censored topics such as political repression, the famine of the 1930s, and the Soviet modernization project, which are covered only superficially or framed in vague terms (Egamberdiyev, Taldybayeva, 2020: 24–32).

The Turkish experience of identity formation, in turn, was based on the principles of republican nationalism codified in the Kemalist ideology. Since the 1920s, Turkey's official historiography has been constructed within the framework of the *Türk Tarih Tezi* (Turkish History Thesis), which asserted that the Turks were the progenitors of the world's most ancient civilizations, including the Hittites and Sumerians (Bora, 2002: 114). This approach pursued a dual purpose. On one hand, it rejected the Ottoman legacy as feudal, religious, and "backward". On the other hand, it sought to construct a secular ethno-national identity aligned with the goals of modernization and Europeanization. By the mid twentieth century, such historiography came under criticism from both academic circles and members of the religious intelligentsia. During the 1980s and 1990s, a process of historical and ideological liberalization began. This shift acknowledged the cultural diversity of the Ottoman Empire, the significance of the Islamic component, and the painful chapters of history, including the Kurdish and Armenian issues (Kadioğlu, 2007: 120).

Contemporary Turkey finds itself in a state of historical and identity-based pluralism. Since the 2000s, the ruling Justice and Development Party (AKP) has been constructing a new model of national memory in which Islam and the Ottoman legacy are viewed as central components of Turkish

cultural identity. Within the framework of the concept of *Yeni Türkiye* (New Turkey), the image of the nation has become intertwined with the idea of restoring historical justice, returning to “spiritual roots”, and positioning Turkey as a civilizational center (Ortaylı, 2020: 62). In this context, there has been a growing interest in Ottoman history, Arabic-language sources, Sufi heritage, and the works of Islamic thinkers. At the same time, however, there has been an increase in state control over the academic environment and the content of school textbooks, raising concerns about a potential return to ideologically driven historiography. Thus, Turkey finds itself balancing between openness to historical debate and the strengthening of a politicized narrative.

A comparative analysis of Kazakh and Turkish historiography reveals both common features and significant differences. In both cases, the state plays an active role in shaping historical memory, using schools, media, and cultural platforms as channels to transmit desired models of identity. However, Turkey has a longer tradition of academic debate and historiographical pluralism, while in Kazakhstan, historical policy tends to remain more centralized and prescriptive. Nevertheless, in both countries, modern history has become a field of ideological contestation, where secular, religious, ethnic, and globalist paradigms intersect and often compete.

In the context of the twenty-first century, Kazakhstan and Turkey face new challenges such as migration processes, the digitalization of memory, and transnational cultural influences, all of which intensify the need to rethink approaches to identity. Post-Soviet Kazakhstan is gradually shifting from an ethnocentric model toward a more inclusive concept of nationhood, with particular emphasis on the idea of “civic identity” (*qazaqstandyq ult*). In Turkey, there is an ongoing tension between a retrospective glorification of the past and the demands of contemporary pluralism. Both countries require the development of critical historiography, dialogical forms of memory, and historical education aimed not at reproducing myths, but at fostering an understanding of historical complexity.

Results

The results of the conducted study reveal significant methodological, substantive, and institutional differences in the organization of university-level teaching of national history in Kazakhstan and Turkey. The analysis is structured along three key dimensions: the theoretical and methodological foundations and structure of academic disciplines, the practical implementation of teaching methods through case studies and educational platforms, and interdisciplinary initiatives along with the civic and spiritual components of education.

The first group of findings pertains to the theoretical and methodological basis of the courses. In Kazakhstan, the university curriculum for the “History of Kazakhstan” course, introduced in 2021, is structured around the chronological progression of major historical periods ancient history, the era of the khanates, the colonial period, the Soviet era, and the establishment of independence. Modules such as “Revival of National Statehood” and “Sovietization and Modernization” reflect a patriotic motivation underpinning the course content (Abdrakhmanov, 2021: 23–26). This structure supports the restoration of national identity, but at the same time, it promotes a limited conception of history as a linear sequence of events, lacking contextual, structural, and cultural connections.

An opposing approach is observed in Turkish universities, where disciplines that include national history are implemented as interdisciplinary projects. Courses such as *Belge Bilgisi* (Document Analysis) and *Tarih ve Kültür* (History and Culture) incorporate not only source studies but also engage with cultural analysis, archaeology, oral history, and digital practices (Yılmaz, 2019: 38–52). Students work with primary sources, conduct field interviews, and participate in museum and research projects. This format of education cultivates the ability to view history as a complex and active social practice rather than a passive repository of facts.

Since 2018, within the framework of higher education reform in Kazakhstan, groups of educational programs have been introduced to differentiate the directions of student preparation depending on the academic profile. In the field of historical education, this has led to a division into two main tracks called academic history and pedagogical history. Pedagogical history focuses on preparing future history teachers for general secondary schools and colleges. It is primarily

implemented in regional teacher training universities such as Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University and the Kazakh National Women Teacher Training University. Special attention is given to teaching methods, didactics, developmental psychology, and curriculum design. At the same time, academic history entails scholarly training for specialists such as historians, researchers, archaeologists, archivists, and museum professionals. It is taught at the country's leading research centers such as Al-Farabi Kazakh National University and L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, where emphasis is placed on historiography, source studies, historical research methodology, and working with primary sources. Graduates of pedagogical history receive qualifications that allow them to teach history in schools and colleges, while graduates of academic history mainly continue their careers in academic settings, in research institutes, or in master's and doctoral programs. Despite a shared disciplinary focus, the training programs differ significantly in terms of content, objectives, and applied methods. Pedagogical history is structured around practice oriented instruction, while academic history requires the development of research skills and command of historical criticism.

In the second area, special attention is given to the practical implementation of methodology. In Kazakhstan, an attempt was made to introduce innovative pedagogy through the course History of Religious Consciousness, offered by the Faculty of Humanities at Kazakh National University since 2021. Students engaged in oral history, documentation of traditions, and the architecture of sacred spaces. More than 60 percent of participants noted a reevaluation of Islamic heritage as a personal line of historical continuity (Tauke, 2022: 77–80). However, the tendency toward restricted access to Soviet archives and the lack of methodological support hinder the understanding of history as a research-based practice.

In contrast, the Turkish project Historical Architectural Heritage conducted in Ankara from 2022 to 2023 demonstrated that an interdisciplinary approach involving historians, architects, and sociologists contributes to the formation of active civic identity. Participation in restoration projects, interviews with local residents, and the creation of exhibitions enables students to identify themselves as custodians of cultural heritage (Kaplan, 2023: 100–110). Archival work in Turkey included expeditions, digitization, and analysis of documents from the National Archives, which contributed to an increased level of methodological autonomy and competence (Gültekin, 2021: 85–94).

The third section of the findings focuses on interdisciplinarity, motivation, and the development of civic skills. The course Tarih ve Kültür (History and Culture) demonstrates how the integration of historical studies with cultural research, sociology, and architecture creates an educational model of historical thinking that prepares students for real social engagement and public dialogue. This contributes not only to the growth of academic competence but also to the formation of civic activism and cultural self-awareness (Altun, 2022: 129–140). In Kazakhstan, similar initiatives emerge irregularly, such as electives on regional memory or the history of sacred heritage, but they have not become part of the core curriculum, and there is a lack of coordination between faculties and institutes (Shaimerdenova, 2024: 20–30).

The fourth research category concerns the professional mobility and academic freedom of faculty members. An analysis of teaching staff shows that around one quarter of history instructors in Kazakhstan have international experience, and an even smaller number make use of English-language sources (Abilgazyev, 2024: 153–156). This hinders the implementation of modern teaching methods and limits the reform of academic curricula. In Turkey, instructors actively participate in training programs across Europe and Asia, applying methods from digital history and archival studies (Yılmaz, 2019: 40–45), however, there remain persistent issues related to the lack of instructors specializing in Central Asia, which reflects a broader gap in regional expertise.

The fifth direction concerns student motivation and the emotional component of learning. Field surveys of students of the history of Kazakhstan show that only about one third of students experience a high level of engagement with the discipline, while the majority perceive the course as a collection of facts rather than as a personal cultural experience (Abdrakhmanov, 2021: 50–55). Similar indicators reveal a lack of motivational conditions and an absence of interactive approaches to creating meaningful learning experiences.

In Turkey, emotional engagement is enhanced through participation in practical projects and reconstruction programs, where 75 percent of participants report a deeper connection with history as part of their personal and cultural identity (Kaplan, 2023: 106–110).

The sixth area of focus is the analysis of national identity formation. In universities of both countries, history is used as a tool for constructing a national narrative, but the methods differ. In Kazakhstan, the curriculum emphasizes a constructed line of national continuity, civic belonging, and symbolic meaning.

In Turkey, despite the presence of an ideological framework, there is a stronger inclination toward pluralism and public discussion. Academic clubs openly debate topics such as the Kurdish and Armenian questions, the role of Islamic identity, and the influence of Atatürk on contemporary thought. This creates space for critical reflection, although questions remain regarding the degree of freedom and state support.

The seventh result concerns the analysis of institutional barriers and opportunities. In Kazakhstan, limited access to archives, weak federal support for humanities disciplines, insufficient funding, and narrow professional differentiation all hinder the development of interactive and project-based learning formats. In Turkey, there is significant institutional support for interdisciplinary projects, summer schools, and student clubs, although control over topics and history teaching persists.

Based on these findings, the following recommendations have been formulated.

First, universities in Kazakhstan are strongly advised to integrate elective and project-based courses into the mandatory part of the history curriculum, including archival work, participation in cultural analysis, and digital storytelling.

Second, it is necessary to expand international internships and dual degree programs with universities, and to support faculty mobility especially in Asian and European countries that facilitate the introduction of innovative methods and the strengthening of regional competencies.

Third, the development of multimedia teaching tools that include digital reconstructions, game-based learning, interactive maps, and analytical case studies is needed as part of the modernization of history teaching.

Fourth, academic freedom for history instructors should be encouraged through grants, publications, methodological support, deideologization of courses, and the removal of taboo topics.

Fifth, an important task should be the decolonization of educational content through multiculturalism, gender perspectives, local history, personal narratives, and studies of diasporas and migration phenomena.

Sixth, universities should engage students as agents of historical communication through project activities, urban initiatives, academic research, multimedia formats, and civic platforms.

Thus, university-level education in national history in Kazakhstan and Turkey is currently undergoing transformation. The Kazakhstani model remains oriented toward consolidation and ideological framing, while the Turkish model shows elements of transition toward critical, civic, and cultural practices. Kazakhstan may benefit from the successful elements of the Turkish model by adapting them to local conditions. In this regard, the reconfiguration of the educational curriculum can become a supportive tool not only for training qualified specialists but also for cultivating active citizens who take responsibility for cultural heritage, historical awareness, and moral memory.

Conclusion

Concluding this study, it should be emphasized that in Kazakhstan over the past decades significant progress has been made in the teaching of national history, especially in the aspect of strengthening national identity and rethinking historical heritage. After gaining independence, a process began of forming a national historical school aimed at restoring those layers of the national past that had previously remained outside the framework of official academic discourse. Foundational works on the history of Kazakh statehood were published, and new academic courses were launched, including “History of Kazakhstan” as a compulsory subject for all university students. Particular

importance was given to the development of new textbooks and the integration of research projects into the educational process. Since 2018, within the framework of higher education modernization, a differentiated approach to specialist training has been introduced with separate educational groups for academic and pedagogical history. This became a step towards the professionalization of historical education, allowing universities to clearly orient graduates toward different segments of professional activity such as research, teaching and applied practice.

In Kazakhstan's pedagogical universities, such as Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University and the National Women's Pedagogical University, modern methods of teaching history at school have been introduced. Here a generation of teachers is being formed, capable of adapting historical knowledge to the needs of the younger generation, taking into account both state values and regional specificities. Meanwhile, in academic centers such as Al-Farabi Kazakh National University and L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, active scientific work is underway, aimed at the development of source studies, historical anthropology, archival studies and theoretical foundations of historiography. These universities have become centers of attraction for young researchers, many of whom carry out international projects and publish in reputable journals. One of Kazakhstan's successes has been the formation of a modern concept of sacred geography, historical memory and the study of the role of traditional Islam in ethnic identity. All of this points to a multi level approach by the state and the academic community to the development of historical knowledge based both on national priorities and universal academic principles.

Comparative analysis with Turkey has made it possible to identify both similar trends and differences in educational approaches. In both countries, history serves as a key element in the formation of cultural and political identity. Over the past two decades, Turkey has developed an effective model for the implementation of interdisciplinary courses, public history and museum pedagogy in the university environment. In Kazakhstan this process is only gaining momentum, but examples of active student involvement in project based learning can already be observed, such as the study of sacred sites, local memory and archival work including the development of digital resources. Kazakhstan demonstrates a clear desire to integrate advanced teaching methods while preserving its own historical and cultural specificity. The opening of regional research centers, the expansion of international academic ties and the formation of domestic schools in archaeology, ethnology and the history of statehood all confirm the existence of a solid foundation for further development.

The prospects for teaching national history in Kazakhstan today are directly related to the tasks of preserving cultural continuity, strengthening interethnic harmony and raising the level of scientific thinking among young people. At the next stage it is important to deepen the integration of pedagogical and academic training and to expand the range of academic disciplines through the inclusion of global history, digital humanities, comparative historiography and applied methods. At the same time special attention should be paid to improving the qualifications of teachers, developing student research initiatives and creating educational platforms and interactive environments. Kazakhstan's educational policy in the field of history has already demonstrated its focus on strengthening cultural sovereignty and developing historical consciousness, which serves as valuable experience and an example for other post Soviet countries. The comparison with Turkey shows that the path of historical education can take many forms, and the Kazakhstani model is confidently moving toward the formation of a modern, stable and intellectually rich concept of teaching national history.

References

- Abdrakhmanov, 2021 — *Abdrakhmanov M.D.* Metodika prepodavaniya istorii v vuzakh Kazakhstana [Methodology of Teaching History in the Universities of Kazakhstan]. Almaty: Gylym, 2021. 176 p. (In Russ.).
- Abilgazyev, 2024 — *Abilgazyev S.T.* Gotovnost' prepodavateley istorii k interaktivnomu obucheniyu [Readiness of History Teachers for Interactive Learning]. Astana: Elorda, 2024. Pp. 143–160. (In Russ.).
- Ahmad, 1993 — *Ahmad F.* The Making of Modern Turkey. London: Routledge, 1993. 260 p.

- Aitaly, 2000 — *Aitaly A.* Ulttanu (Oku quraly) [Nation Studies (Textbook)]. Almaty: Arys, 2000. 226 p. (In Kaz.).
- Altun, 2022 — *Altun F.* Tarih ve Kültür Eğitimi: Türkiye Örneği [History and Culture Education: The Case of Turkey]. Konya: Çizgi Kitabevi, 2022. Pp. 129–140. (In Turk.).
- Aminov, 2019 — *Aminov T.M.* Sovremennaya istoriya Kazakhstana: Uchebnoe posobie [Modern History of Kazakhstan: A Textbook]. Almaty: Bastau, 2019. 456 p. (In Russ.).
- Bora, 1998 — *Bora T.* Milliyetçiliğin Kara Kitabı [The Black Book of Nationalism]. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1998. Pp. 35–50. (In Turk.).
- Bora, 2002 — *Bora T.* Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce, Cilt 4: Milliyetçilik [Political Thought in Modern Turkey, Vol. 4: Nationalism]. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002. 648 p. (In Turk.).
- Egamberdiyev, Tal'dybayeva, 2020 — *Egamberdiyev M., Tal'dybayeva D.* Identity perception in Central Asia and nation-state building: case of Uzbekistan. *Journal of History*, 2020. No. 98(3). Pp. 24–32. // DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26577/JH.2020.v98.i3.03>
- Gökalp, 1992 — *Gökalp Z.* The Principles of Turkism. Leiden: Brill, 1992. 163 p.
- Gültekin, 2021 — *Gültekin A.* Archival Learning Projects in Turkey. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı, 2021. Pp. 85–94. (In Turk.).
- Jaqslyqov, 2017 — *Jaqslyqov A.* Istoriya Kazakhstana: obraz i interpretatsiya [The History of Kazakhstan: Image and Interpretation]. Nur-Sultan: Foliant, 2017. Pp. 95–99. (In Russ.).
- Kabyl, et al., 2024 — *Kabyl A.A., Khazretalikyzy R., Orazkhan N.O.* Problemy prepodavaniya istorii otkochevki i migratsii kazakhskogo naroda v 1920–1930 gg. [Problems of Teaching the History of the Kazakh People's Nomadic Departures and Migrations in the 1920s–1930s]. *Vestnik KazNPU imeni Abaya. Seriya: Istoricheskie i sotsial'no-politicheskie nauki*, 2024. No. 3(82). // DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51889/2959-6017.2024.82.3.021> (In Russ.).
- Kadioğlu, 2007 — *Kadioğlu A.* Nationalism and Its Others in a Post-Imperial Age: Turkish Identity and the Kurdish Question. *Nations and Nationalism*, 2007. Vol. 13. No. 1. Pp. 117–134.
- Kaplan, 2023 — *Kaplan Y.* Historical Architecture Projects in Turkish Universities. Ankara: Nobel Akademi, 2023. Pp. 100–110. (In Turk.).
- Kara, 2012 — *Kara K.* Osmanlı’dan Cumhuriyet’e Tarih Yazımı [Historiography from the Ottoman Empire to the Republic]. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 2012. Pp. 89–103. (In Turk.).
- Karibayev, 2015 — *Karibayev B.B.* Mysli Glavy gosudarstva po srednevekovoy istorii Kazakhstana: analiz i nauchnoe obobshchenie [The Head of State’s Thoughts on the Medieval History of Kazakhstan: Analysis and Scholarly Synthesis]. *Vestnik KazNU: Seriya istoricheskaya*, 2015. Vol. 1. No. 76. Pp. 4–11. // URL: <https://bulletin-history.kaznu.kz/index.php/1-history/article/view/545> (In Russ.).
- Koygeldiyev, 1995 — *Koygeldiyev M.Q.* Alash qozğalysy (Kömekshi oku quraly) [The Alash Movement (Supplementary Textbook)]. Almaty: Sanat, 1995. 368 p. (In Kaz.).
- Koygeldiyev, Omarbekov, 2003 — *Koygeldiyev M.Q., Omarbekov T.* Tarih tağlymy ne deydi? [What Does the Lesson of History Say?]. Almaty: Ana tili, 1993. 205 p. (In Kaz.).
- Masanov, et al., 2000 — *Masanov N.É., Abylkhózhin Zh.B., Erofeeva I.V., Alekseenko A.N., Baratova G.* Istoriya Kazakhstana: narody i kul'tury: Uchebnoe posobie [The History of Kazakhstan: Peoples and Cultures – A Textbook]. Almaty: Daik-Press, 2000. 608 p. (In Russ.).
- Nazarbayev, 2017 — *Nazarbayev N.A.* Bolashaqqa baǵdar: rukhani jańǵyru (stat’i, inter’yu, vystupleniya, ekspertniye kommentarii i spravočno-analiticheskiye materialy) [Course Towards the Future: Spiritual Modernization (Articles, Interviews, Speeches, Expert Commentaries, and Reference-Analytical Materials)]. Astana: Kazakhstanskiy institut strategicheskikh issledovaniy pri Prezidente Respubliki Kazakhstan, 2017. 512 p. (In Russ.).
- Nurlanova, 2011 — *Nurlanova N.Sh.* Natsional’naya identichnost’ v usloviyakh globalizatsii: kazakhstanskiy kontekst [National Identity in the Context of Globalization: The Kazakhstani Perspective]. Almaty: Institut filosofii i politologii, 2011. 214 p. (In Russ.).
- Ortaylı, 2020 — *Ortaylı İ.* Tarihin Sınırlarına Yolculuk [A Journey to the Borders of History]. İstanbul: Kronik Kitap, 2020. 312 p. (In Turk.).
- Sadikov, 2018 — *Sadikov T.M.* Istoricheskaya nauka v Kazakhstane: paradigm i vyzovy epokhi [Historical Science in Kazakhstan: Paradigms and Challenges of the Era]. Astana: Elorda, 2018. Pp. 41–62. (In Russ.).
- Shaimerdenova, 2024 — *Shaimerdenova Zh.* Elektivnaya istoriya v universitetakh RK [Elective History Courses in the Universities of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. Almaty: Daik Press, 2024. Pp. 20–30. (In Russ.).
- Tauke, 2022 — *Tauke Zh.* Istoricheskoe soznanie studentov v usloviyakh elektivnykh program [Historical Consciousness of Students in the Context of Elective Programs]. Nur-Sultan: MON RK, 2022. Pp. 75–84. (In Russ.).
- Tleubaev, 2016 — *Tleubaev A.A.* Problemy istoricheskoy pamyati v Kazakhstane: ot amnezii k politike pamyati [Problems of Historical Memory in Kazakhstan: From Amnesia to a Policy of Remembrance]. Almaty: Qazaq universiteti, 2016. Pp. 73–102. (In Russ.).
- Turan, 2019 — *Turan R.* Türkiye’de Cumhuriyet Dönemi Tarih Öğretim Sisteminin Dönemlendirilmesi Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme [An Evaluation on the Periodization of the History Teaching System in the Republican Era of Turkey]. Uluslararası 24 Kasım Başöğretmen Eğitim ve Yenilikçi Bilimler Sempozyumu, Ankara, 2019. Pp. 626–641. (In Turk.).

Turlybay, 2025 — *Turlybay B.S.* Metodologicheskoye osnovy prepodavaniya istorii s ispol'zovaniem statey o prosveshchenii v gazete “Qazaq” [Methodological Foundations of Teaching History Using Enlightenment Articles from the Newspaper “Qazaq”]. Vestnik KazNPU imeni Abaya. Seriya: Istoricheskie i sotsial'no-politicheskie nauki, 2025. No. 1 (84). // DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51889/2959-6017.2025.84.1.023> (In Russ.).

Yıldız, 1999 — *Yıldız G.* The Well Protected Domains: Ideology and the Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire 1876–1909. OA, 1999. No. 19(19). Pp. 333–342. // URL: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/oa/issue/10959/131030>

Yılmaz, 2019 — *Yılmaz E.* University History Education in Turkey: Approaches and Challenges. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Yayınları, 2019. Pp. 38–52. (In Turk.).

Әдебиеттер тізімі

Ahmad, 1993 — *Ahmad F.* The Making of Modern Turkey. London: Routledge, 1993. 260 p.

Altun, 2022 — *Altun F.* Tarih ve Kültür Eğitimi: Türkiye Örneği. Konya: Çizgi Kitabevi, 2022. Pp. 129–140.

Bora, 1998 — *Bora T.* Milliyetçiliğin Kara Kitabı. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1998. Pp. 35–50.

Bora, 2002 — *Bora T.* Modern Türkiye’de Siyasi Düşünce, Cilt 4: Milliyetçilik. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2002.

648 p.

Egamberdiyev, Taldybayeva, 2020 — *Egamberdiyev M., Taldybayeva D.* Identity perception in Central Asia and nation-state building: case of Uzbekistan. Journal of History, 2020. No. 98(3). Pp. 24–32. // DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26577/JH.2020.v98.i3.03>

Gökalp, 1992 — *Gökalp Z.* The Principles of Turkism. Leiden: Brill, 1992. 163 p.

Gültekin, 2021 — *Gültekin A.* Archival Learning Projects in Turkey. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı, 2021. Pp. 85–94.

Kadioğlu, 2007 — *Kadioğlu A.* Nationalism and Its Others in a Post-Imperial Age: Turkish Identity and the Kurdish Question. Nations and Nationalism, 2007. Vol. 13. No. 1. Pp. 117–134.

Kaplan, 2023 — *Kaplan Y.* Historical Architecture Projects in Turkish Universities. Ankara: Nobel Akademi, 2023. Pp. 100–110.

Kara, 2012 — *Kara K.* Osmanlı’dan Cumhuriyet’e Tarih. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 2012. Pp. 89–103. (In Turk.).

Ortaylı, 2020 — *Ortaylı İ.* Tarihin Sınırlarına Yolculuk. İstanbul: Kronik Kitap, 2020. 312 p.

Turan, 2019 — *Turan R.* Türkiye’de Cumhuriyet Dönemi Tarih Öğretim Sisteminin Dönemlendirilmesi Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme. Uluslararası 24 Kasım Başöğretmen Eğitim ve Yenilikçi Bilimler Sempozyumu, Ankara, 2019. Pp. 626–641.

Yıldız, 1999 — *Yıldız G.* The Well Protected Domains: Ideology and the Legitimation of Power in the Ottoman Empire 1876–1909. OA, 1999. No. 19(19). Pp. 333–342. // URL: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/oa/issue/10959/131030>

Yılmaz, 2019 — *Yılmaz E.* University History Education in Turkey: Approaches and Challenges. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Yayınları, 2019. Pp. 38–52.

Абдрахманов, 2021 — *Абдрахманов М.Д.* Методика преподавания истории в вузах Казахстана. Алматы: Ғылым, 2021. 176 с.

Абилгазиев, 2024 — *Абилгазиев С.Т.* Готовность преподавателей истории к интерактивному обучению. Астана: Елорда, 2024. С. 143–160.

Айталы, 2000 — *Айталы А.* Ұлттану (Оқу құралы). Алматы: «Арыс» баспасы, 2000. 226 б.

Аминов, 2019 — *Аминов Т.М.* Современная история Казахстана: Учебное пособие. Алматы: «Бастау», 2019. 456 с.

Жаксылыков, 2017 — *Жаксылыков А.* История Казахстана: образ и интерпретация. Нур-Султан: Фолиант, 2017. С. 95–99.

Карибаев, 2015 — *Карибаев Б.Б.* Мысли Главы государства по средневековой истории Казахстана: анализ и научное обобщение. Вестник КазНУ: Серия историческая, 2015. Т. 1. № 76. С. 4–11. // URL: <https://bulletin-history.kaznu.kz/index.php/1-history/article/view/545>

Қабыл, т.д., 2024 — *Қабыл А.Ә., Хазретәліқызы Р., Оразхан Н.О.* Проблемы преподавания истории откочевки и миграции казахского народа в 1920–1930 гг. Вестник КазНПУ имени Абая. Серия: Исторические и социально-политические науки. 3, 82 (сен. 2024). // DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51889/2959-6017.2024.82.3.021>

Қойгелдиев, 1995 — *Қойгелдиев М.Қ.* Алаш қозғалысы (Көмекші оқу құралы). Алматы: «Санат», 1995. 368 б.

Қойгелдиев, Омарбеков, 2003 — *Қойгелдиев М.Қ., Омарбеков Т.* Тарих тағылымы не дейді? Алматы: Ана тілі, 1993. 205 б.

Масанов, т.д., 2000 — *Масанов Н.Ә., Абылхожин Ж.Б., Ерофеева И.В., Алексеенко А.Н., Баратова Г.* История Казахстана: народы и культуры: Учебное пособие. Алматы: Дайк-Пресс, 2000. 608 с.

Назарбаев, 2017 — *Назарбаев Н.А.* Болашаққа бағдар: рухани жаңғыру (статьи, интервью, выступления, экспертные комментарии и справочно — аналитические материалы). Астана: Казахстанский институт стратегических исследований при Президенте Республики Казахстан, 2017. 512 с.

Нурланова, 2011 — *Нурланова Н.Ш.* Национальная идентичность в условиях глобализации: казахстанский контекст. Алматы: Институт философии и политологии, 2011. 214 с.

Садыков, 2018 — *Садыков Т.М.* Историческая наука в Казахстане: парадигмы и вызовы эпохи. Астана: Елорда, 2018. С. 41–62.

Тауке, 2022 — *Тауке Ж.* Историческое сознание студентов в условиях элективных программ. Нур-Султан: МОН РК, 2022. С. 75–84.

Тлеубаев, 2016 — *Тлеубаев А.А.* Проблемы исторической памяти в Казахстане: от амнезии к политике памяти. Алматы: Қазақ университеті, 2016. С. 73–102.

Тұрлыбай, 2025 — *Тұрлыбай Б.С.* Методологические основы преподавания истории с использованием статей о просвещении в газете «Қазақ». Вестник КазНПУ имени Абая. Серия: Исторические и социально-политические науки, 2025. // DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51889/2959-6017.2025.84.1.023>

Шаймерденова, 2024 — *Шаймерденова Ж.* Элективная история в университетах РК. Алматы: Дайк Пресс, 2024. С. 20–30.

МАЗМҰНЫ

ТАРИХНАМА ЖӘНЕ ДЕРЕКТАНУ

Мамытова С.Н.

XX ҒАСЫРДЫҢ 30-ШЫ ЖЫЛДАРЫНДАҒЫ ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ АШАРШЫЛЫҚ ТУРАЛЫ ТАРИХИ ЖАДЫН ҚАЛЫПТАСТЫРУДАҒЫ БАТЫС ТАРИХНАМАСЫ.....934

Сабитов Ж., Қаратаев Ә., Төлегенұлы Б.

«МАНАС» ЖЫРЫНДАҒЫ ҚАЗАҚ РУЛАРЫНЫҢ ӨКІЛДЕРІ.....946

ТАРИХ

Азретбергенова Э.Ж.

ҚАЗАҚСТАН МЕН ТҮРКИЯ ТӘЖІРИБЕСІ КОНТЕКСТІНДЕ ҰЛТТЫҚ БІРЕГЕЙЛІКТІ ҚАЛЫПТАСТЫРУ ЖӘНЕ ОТАНДЫҚ ТАРИХТЫҢ ӨЗЕКТІ МӘСЕЛЕЛЕРІ.....960

Айтимбаев А.Т., Сандыбаева А.Д.

1920–1930 ЖЫЛДАРДАҒЫ ОҢТҮСТІК ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ САЯСИ ҚУҒЫН-СҮРГІН ҚҰРБАҢДАРЫНЫҢ ТАҒДЫРЫ.....974

Алпыспаева Г.А., Джумағалиева К.В., Жұман Г.

ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ ДІН ІСТЕРІ ЖӨНІНДЕГІ УӘКІЛЕТТІЛЕР ИНСТИТУТЫНЫҢ ҚЫЗМЕТІ (1945–1990 ЖЖ.)...988

Аубакирова Ж.С., Краснобаева Н.Л., Уалтаева А.С.

ШЫҒЫС ҚАЗАҚСТАННЫҢ ҚАЛА ХАЛҚЫ: ЕРЕКШЕЛІКТЕРІ, ӘЛЕУЕТІ ЖӘНЕ ТӘУЕКЕЛДЕРІ.....1007

Қабылдинов З.Е., Бейсембаева А.Р.

XVIII–XX ҒАСЫРДЫҢ БАСЫНДАҒЫ ҚАЗАҚСТАН ТАРИХЫ ҚАЗІРГІ ЖАПОН ТАРИХНАМАСЫНДА.....1028

Далаева Т.Т., Идрисова А.М.

ВИЗУАЛДЫ ТАРИХИ ДЕРЕККӨЗДЕР ЗЕРТТЕУ БАҒДАРЫНДА: ДӘСТҮРЛІ ИЛЛЮСТРАЦИЯДАН VR/AR РЕПРЕЗЕНТАЦИЯЛАУҒА дейін.....1039

Джампейсова Ж.М., Бижигитова Қ.С., Бекенжанова А.А.

XIX ҒАСЫРДЫҢ 70–90 ЖЫЛДАРЫНДА ҚАЗАҚ ДАЛАСЫНДАҒЫ РЕСЕЙ ӘКІМШІЛІК ШЕКАРАЛАРЫН ОРНАТУ ТӘЖІРИБЕСІ.....1056

Капаева А.Т., Асанова С.А.

XX ҒАСЫРДЫҢ 20–30 ЖЫЛДАРЫНДАҒЫ ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ ӘЛЕУМЕТТІК САЯСАТТЫҢ ЕРЕКШЕЛІКТЕРІ.....1073

Қасымова Д.Б., Тілеубаев Ш.Б., Абдрахманов Б.

1950–1980 ЖЫЛДАРДАҒЫ ҚАЗАҚ КСР-індегі ДІНИ ЖАҒДАЙДЫҢ КЕЙБІР АСПЕКТІЛЕРІ1089

Қозыбаева М.М.

ТЫҢ ИГЕРУ КЕЗЕҢІНДЕГІ (1950–1960 ЖЖ.) СОЛТҮСТІК ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ АРНАЙЫ ҚОНЫС АУДАРУШЫЛАРДЫҢ КҮНДЕЛІКТІ ӨМІРІ МЕН ҚҰҚЫҚТЫҚ АСПЕКТІЛЕРІ.....1109

Махметова Н.А., Аубакирова Ж.С., Марғұлан А.С.

РЕСПУБЛИКАСЫНЫҢ БАСҚА ӨҢІРЛЕРІМЕН САЛЫСТЫРҒАНДА ШЫҒЫС ҚАЗАҚСТАННЫҢ ЭТНОДЕМОГРАФИЯЛЫҚ ДАМУ ЕРЕКШЕЛІКТЕРІ.....1130

Мұқанова Г.Қ., Сәдуақасова З.Т.

ОРТАЛЫҚ АЗИЯ ИШАНДАРЫ ТУРАЛЫ БІЛІМДІ ҚАЛЫПТАСТЫРУДЫҢ НЕГІЗГІ АСПЕКТІЛЕРІ (XIX–XX ҒАСЫРДЫҢ БАСЫ).....1149

Сауырқан Е., Қанпбаева А.Т.

1930 ЖЫЛДАРЫ ШЫҢЖАҢНАН КӨШКЕН ҚАЗАҚ БОСҚЫНДАРЫ ЖӘНЕ ҚАРАУСЫЗ ҚАЛҒАН БАЛАЛАРДЫҢ ӘЛЕУМЕТТІК МӘСЕЛЕСІ.....1163

Сисенбаева А.А., Калыбекова М.Ч.

ЖЕКЕ ІС – ШТУТТГОФ КОНЦЛАГЕРІНДЕГІ ҚАЗАҚСТАНДЫҚ СОҒЫС ТҰТҚЫНДАРЫН ЗЕРТТЕУ МӘСЕЛЕЛЕРІНІҢ ДЕРЕК КӨЗІ РЕТІНДЕ (А. БЕЛОЗАРОВТЫҢ ЖЕКЕ ІСІ МЫСАЛЫНДА).....1177

ЭТНОЛОГИЯ/АНТРОПОЛОГИЯ

Ақымбек Е.Ш., Кембаева А.К.

ОРТА ҒАСЫРЛАРДАҒЫ ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ ШЫНЫ ӨНДІРІСІ ТУРАЛЫ: ОҢТҮСТІК ЖӘНЕ ОҢТҮСТІК-ШЫҒЫС ҚАЗАҚСТАН ШЫНЫЛАРЫНЫҢ РЕНТГЕН-СПЕКТРЛІК МИКРОТАЛДАУЫНЫҢ НӘТИЖЕЛЕРІ.....1190

Бейсегулова А., Ашимова С., Картаева Т.

МАТЕРИАЛДЫҚ ЕМЕС МӨДЕНИЕТ МҰРАНЫҢ «ТАБИҒАТ ПЕН ДҮНИЕГЕ ҚАТЫСТЫ БІЛІМДЕР МЕН ӘДЕТ-ҒҰРЫПТАР» ТИПІН САҚТАУДЫҢ АБАЙ ОБЛЫСЫ БОЙЫНША АЙМАҚТЫҚ ЕРЕКШЕЛІКТЕРІ.....1202

Сапатаев С.Ә., Куралова З.С.

ЕРТЕ ТЕМІР ДӘУІРІ ҚАЗАҚСТАН АУМАҒЫНДАҒЫ ҚОРЫМДАРДА АТПЕН ЖЕРЛЕУ ДӘСТҮРІ.....1221

Сахи Ж., Каржаубаева А.

АЛМАТЫ ҚАЛАСЫНДАҒЫ ТАРИХИ ТҰРҒЫН ҮЙЛЕРДІҢ ҚАЛАЛЫҚ МӨДЕНИ КЕҢІСТІКТІ САҚТАУДАҒЫ РӨЛІ.....1235

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

ИСТОРИОГРАФИЯ И ИСТОЧНИКОВЕДЕНИЕ

Мамытова С.Н.

ЗАПАДНАЯ ИСТОРИОГРАФИЯ В ФОРМИРОВАНИИ ИСТОРИЧЕСКОЙ ПАМЯТИ О МАССОВОМ ГОЛОДЕ В КАЗАХСТАНЕ В 30-Е ГГ. XX ВЕКА.....934

Сабитов Ж., Каратаев А., Толегенулы Б.

ПРЕДСТАВИТЕЛИ КАЗАХСКИХ ПЛЕМЕН В ЭПОСЕ «МАНАС».....946

ИСТОРИЯ

Азретбергенова Э.Ж.

ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ НАЦИОНАЛЬНОЙ ИДЕНТИЧНОСТИ И АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ ОТЕЧЕСТВЕННОЙ ИСТОРИИ В КОНТЕКСТЕ ОПЫТА КАЗАХСТАНА И ТУРЦИИ.....960

Айтимбаев А.Т., Сандыбаева А.Д.

СУДЬБЫ ЖЕРТВ ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИХ РЕПРЕССИЙ В ЮЖНОМ КАЗАХСТАНЕ В 1920–1930-е ГОДЫ: АНАЛИЗ НА ОСНОВЕ АРХИВНЫХ ДАННЫХ.....974

Алпыспаева Г.А., Джумагалиева К.В., Жуман Г.Ж.

ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТЬ ИНСТИТУТА УПОЛНОМОЧЕННЫХ ПО РЕЛИГИИ В КАЗАХСТАНЕ (1945–1990 ГГ.).....988

Аубакирова Ж.С., Краснобаева Н.Л., Уалтаева А.С.

ГОРОДСКОЕ НАСЕЛЕНИЕ ВОСТОЧНОГО КАЗАХСТАНА В РЕГИОНАЛЬНОМ РАЗРЕЗЕ: ОСОБЕННОСТИ, ПОТЕНЦИАЛ И РИСКИ.....1007

Кабульдинов З.Е., Бейсембаева А.Р.

ИСТОРИЯ КАЗАХСТАНА XVIII – НАЧАЛА XX ВЕКА В СОВРЕМЕННОЙ ЯПОНСКОЙ ИСТОРИОГРАФИИ.....1028

Далаева Т.Т., Идрисова А.М.

ВИЗУАЛЬНЫЕ ИСТОРИЧЕСКИЕ ИСТОЧНИКИ В ФОКУСЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЙ: ОТ ТРАДИЦИОННОЙ ИЛЛЮСТРАЦИИ К VR/AR РЕПРЕЗЕНТАЦИИ.....1039

Джампеисова Ж.М., Бижигитова К.С., Бекенжанова А.А.

ПРАКТИКИ УСТАНОВЛЕНИЯ РОССИЙСКИХ АДМИНИСТРАТИВНЫХ ГРАНИЦ В КАЗАХСКОЙ СТЕПИ В 70–90-е ГОДЫ XIX ВЕКА.....1056

Капаева А.Т., Асанова С.А.

ОСОБЕННОСТИ СОЦИАЛЬНОЙ ПОЛИТИКИ В КАЗАХСТАНЕ В 20–30-е ГОДЫ XX В.....1073

Касымова Д.Б., Тлеубаев Ш.Б., Абдрахманов Б.

НЕКОТОРЫЕ АСПЕКТЫ РЕЛИГИОЗНОЙ СИТУАЦИИ В КАЗАХСКОЙ ССР В 1950–1980-е ГОДЫ.....1089

Козыбаева М.М.

ПОВСЕДНЕВНОСТЬ И ПРАВОВЫЕ АСПЕКТЫ ЖИЗНИ СПЕЦПЕРЕСЕЛЕНЦЕВ В СЕВЕРНОМ КАЗАХСТАНЕ В ПЕРИОД ОСВОЕНИЯ ЦЕЛИНЫ (1950–1960-е ГГ.).....1109

Махметова Н.А., Аубакирова Ж.С., Маргулан А.С.

ОСОБЕННОСТИ ЭТНОДЕМОГРАФИЧЕСКОГО РАЗВИТИЯ ВОСТОЧНОГО КАЗАХСТАНА В СРАВНЕНИИ С ДРУГИМИ РЕГИОНАМИ РЕСПУБЛИКИ.....1130

Муканова Г.К., Садвокасова З.Т.

ОСНОВНЫЕ АСПЕКТЫ ФОРМИРОВАНИЯ ЗНАНИЯ ОБ ИШАНАХ ЦЕНТРАЛЬНОЙ АЗИИ (XIX – НАЧАЛО XX ВВ.).....1149

Сауыркан Е., Каипбаева А.Т.

КАЗАХСКИЕ БЕЖЕНЦЫ ИЗ СИНЬЦЗЯНА В 1930-х ГОДАХ И СОЦИАЛЬНАЯ ПРОБЛЕМА БЕСПРИЗОРНЫХ ДЕТЕЙ.....1163

Сисенбаева А.А., Калыбекова М.Ч.

ЛИЧНОЕ ДЕЛО – КАК ИСТОЧНИК ИЗУЧЕНИЯ ПРОБЛЕМЫ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ ВОЕННОПЛЕННЫХ КАЗАХСТАНЦЕВ КОНЦЛАГЕРЯ ШТУТТГОФ (НА ПРИМЕРЕ ЛИЧНОГО ДЕЛА А. БЕЛОЗАРОВА).....1177

ЭТНОЛОГИЯ/АНТРОПОЛОГИЯ

Акымбек Е.Ш., Кембаева А.К.

О СТЕКЛОДЕЛИИ В СРЕДНЕВЕКОВОМ КАЗАХСТАНЕ: РЕЗУЛЬТАТЫ РЕНТГЕНСПЕКТРАЛЬНОГО МИКРОАНАЛИЗА СТЕКЛА ИЗ ЮЖНОГО И ЮГО-ВОСТОЧНОГО КАЗАХСТАНА.....1190

Бейсегулова А., Ашимова С., Картаева Т.

РЕГИОНАЛЬНЫЕ ОСОБЕННОСТИ СОХРАНЕНИЯ ВИДА НЕМАТЕРИАЛЬНОГО КУЛЬТУРНОГО НАСЛЕДИЯ «ЗНАНИЯ И ОБЫЧАИ, СВЯЗАННЫЕ С ПРИРОДОЙ И ВСЕЛЕННОЙ» В АБАЙСКОЙ ОБЛАСТИ.....1202

Сапатаев С.А., Куралова З.С.

ТРАДИЦИЯ ЗАХОРОНЕНИЯ ЛОШАДЕЙ В МОГИЛЬНИКАХ КАЗАХСТАНА РАННЕГО ЖЕЛЕЗНОГО ВЕКА.....1221

Сахи Ж., Каржаубаева А.

РОЛЬ ИСТОРИЧЕСКИХ ЖИЛЫХ ДОМОВ ГОРОДА АЛМАТЫ В СОХРАНЕНИИ ГОРОДСКОЙ КУЛЬТУРНОЙ СРЕДЫ.....1235

CONTENTS

HISTORIOGRAPHY AND SOURCE STUDIES

Mamytova S.N. WESTERN HISTORIOGRAPHY IN THE FORMATION OF HISTORICAL MEMORY OF THE MASS FAMINE IN KAZAKHSTAN IN THE 30S OF THE XXTH CENTURY	934
Sabitov Zh., Karatayev A., Tolegenuly B. REPRESENTATIVES OF KAZAKH TRIBES IN THE EPIC “MANAS”	946

HISTORY

Azretbergenova E.Zh. FORMATION OF NATIONAL IDENTITY AND CURRENT ISSUES OF NATIONAL HISTORY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE EXPERIENCE OF KAZAKHSTAN AND TURKEY	960
Aitimbaev A., Sandybayeva A. THE FATE OF VICTIMS OF POLITICAL REPRESSION IN SOUTHERN KAZAKHSTAN IN THE 1920 AND 1930: AN ANALYSIS BASED ON ARCHIVAL DATA	974
Alpyspaeva G., Dzhumagaliyeva K., Zhuman G. ACTIVITIES OF THE INSTITUTE OF COMMISSIONERS FOR RELIGION IN KAZAKHSTAN (1945–1990)	988
Aubakirova Zh.S., Krasnobaeva N.L. Ualtayeva A.S. URBAN POPULATION OF EAST KAZAKHSTAN: FEATURES, POTENTIAL AND RISKS	1007
Kabuldinov Z.E., Beisembayeva A.R. HISTORY OF KAZAKHSTAN IN THE XVIII – EARLY XX CENTURIES IN CONTEMPORARY JAPANESE HISTORIOGRAPHY	1028
Dalayeva T.T., Idrissova A.M. VISUAL HISTORICAL SOURCES IN FOCUS OF RESEARCH: FROM TRADITIONAL ILLUSTRATION TO VR/AR REPRESENTATION	1039
Jampeissova Zh., Bizhigitova K., Bekenzhanova A. PRACTICE OF ESTABLISHING RUSSIAN ADMINISTRATIVE BORDERS IN THE KAZAKH STEPPE IN THE 70–90S OF THE XIX CENTURY	1056
Kapayeva A.T., Asanova S.A. FEATURES OF SOCIAL POLICY IN KAZAKHSTAN IN THE 1920S–1930S XX CENTURY	1073
Kassymova D.B., Tleubayev Sh.B., Abdrakhmanov B. SOME ASPECTS OF RELIGIOUS SITUATION IN THE KAZAKH SSR IN 1950–1980s	1089
Kozybayeva M.M. EVERYDAY LIFE AND LEGAL ASPECTS OF THE LIVES OF SPECIAL SETTLERS IN NORTHERN KAZAKHSTAN DURING THE PERIOD OF VIRGIN LAND DEVELOPMENT (1950–1960S)	1109
Makhmetova N.A., Aubakirova Zh.S., Margulan A.S. FEATURES OF ETHNO-DEMOGRAPHIC DEVELOPMENT OF EASTERN KAZAKHSTAN IN COMPARISON WITH OTHER REGIONS OF REPUBLIC	1130
Mukanova G.K., Sadvokasova Z.T. THE MAIN ASPECTS OF THE FORMATION OF KNOWLEDGE ABOUT HEALING IN CENTRAL ASIA (XIX – EARLY XX CENTURIES)	1149
Sauyrkan Ye., Kaipbayeva A.T. KAZAKH REFUGEES FROM XINJIANG IN THE 1930S AND THE SOCIAL PROBLEM OF ABANDONED CHILDREN	1163
Sissenbayeva A.A., Kalybekova M.Ch. PERSONAL FILE – AS A SOURCE FOR STUDYING THE PROBLEM OF RESEARCHING KAZAKH PRISONERS OF WAR IN THE STUTTHOF CONCENTRATION CAMP (BASED ON THE EXAMPLE OF A. BELOZAROV'S PERSONAL FILE)	1177

ETHNOLOGY/ANTHROPOLOGY

Akymbek Ye.Sh., Kembyaeva A.K. GLASSMAKING IN MEDIEVAL KAZAKHSTAN: RESULTS OF X-RAY SPECTRAL MICROANALYSIS OF GLASS FROM SOUTH AND SOUTHEAST KAZAKHSTAN	1190
Beysegulova A., Ashimova S., Kartaeva T. REGIONAL SPECIFICS OF SAFEGUARDING THE INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE “KNOWLEDGE AND CUSTOMS RELATED TO NATURE AND THE UNIVERSE” IN THE ABAI REGION	1202
Sapatayev S., Kuralova Z. TRADITION OF BURIAL OF HORSES IN EARLY IRON AGE CEMETERIES OF KAZAKHSTAN	1221
Sakhi Zh., Karzhaubayeva A. THE ROLE OF HISTORIC RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS IN PRESERVING THE URBAN CULTURAL LANDSCAPE OF ALMATY	1235

ASIAN JOURNAL “STEPPE PANORAMA”

2025. 12 (4)

Бас редактор:

Қабылдинов З.Е.

Компьютерде беттеген:

Копеева С.Ж.

Құрылтайшысы және баспагері:

Қазақстан Республикасы Ғылым және жоғары білім министрлігі Ғылым комитеті

Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты ШЖҚ РМК

Редакция мен баспаның мекен-жайы:

050010, Қазақстан Республикасы, Алматы қ., Шевченко көш., 28-үй

ҚР ҒЖБМ ҒК Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы Тарих және этнология институты ШЖҚ РМК

Журнал сайты: <https://ajspiie.com>

Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов ат. ТЖЭИ басылған:

050010 Қазақстан Республикасы, Алматы қ., Шевченко көш., 28-үй