

Zh.O. Abikenov*

*Korkyt Ata Kyzylorda University, Kyzylorda, Kazakhstan
(E-mail: Abikenovkz@gmail.com)*

Methodological analysis of theories of the concept of nation

This article provides a comprehensive overview of the main theoretical frameworks, taking a deeper look at theories related to the understanding of the issue of nationhood. Concepts and works of scientists who founded this concept were distinguished. Various perspectives on the formation of ethnic identity in modern society were explored. Because the nation is a complex and multifaceted structure that includes various disciplines and has attracted the attention of researchers. Any kind of understanding of the problem of the nation creates certain methodological difficulties during its research. It is important to compare the ways of understanding it and to identify the relevant points of view. The article analyzes the approaches of primordialism, constructivism and instrumentalism. And in the course of the discussion, theories that offer opposing views on ethnic identities will be discussed. Through this multidimensional analysis, the article attempts to provide a comprehensive account of the study of ethnic identity. Combining insights from various theoretical perspectives, it offers insights into the dynamic nature of ethnic identities and their relationship to social cohesion and cultural diversity in contemporary societies. The importance of combining different theories for a comprehensive understanding of the nation is emphasized and recommendations are made for developing an appreciation of cultural diversity.

Keywords: culture, tradition, innovation, society, science, research, method, refinement, education, value.

Introduction

Problems of analysis and research of theories of nation are currently one of the most relevant areas of scientific research. The research methodology has a number of known challenges.

There are many scientific opinions that explain this phenomenon. However, its complexity, comprehensiveness, variety of forms, as well as radically conflicting trends in the development of ethnic identity cover a wide range for further research [1; 112].

Therefore, the theory of the nation consists of personal experiences and cultural connections that shape the way individuals perceive themselves and interact with the surrounding world.

There is much research on the intricacies of nation theory and its implications for social cohesion. All of them first compare and study different theories about the formation of ethnic identity in different cultural contexts.

This article provides a broad understanding of the theory of nation, comprehensively analyzes the methods of primordialism, constructivism and instrumentalism, modern theories in research, necessary for its study. Each of these theories offers unique insights into the development and negotiation of ethnic identity in different social contexts.

* Corresponding author's e-mail: Abikenovkz@gmail.com

Considering these theoretical foundations, we aim to analyze the complex interplay of factors that shape ethnic identity in modern societies.

Methods

The methods of defining the concept of “nation” were based on the theoretical conclusions of scientists, and a comprehensive review of the literature was made. Various theoretical frameworks proposed in the study were analyzed.

The comparative socio-historical method was used as the methodological basis of the work. This methodology made it possible to juxtapose the trajectory of the transformation processes in a certain period of time and the hierarchy of the basic values of the nation.

The study was guided by scientific findings and research. At the same time, systematic and comparative analysis, logical, multifaceted, subjective and objective methods from the point of view of development were used.

Theory

The root of the word “nation” is “nation”, which has two meanings: nation and state. The content of the scientific analysis of the concept of “nation” is subject to a long and heated discussion. Despite the opinions of many prominent scientists of the past and present, there is still no generally accepted definition of the concept of “nation” in world science on this issue.

S. Huntington points out: “Researchers usually distinguish two types of nationalism and national identity and give them different names: civil and ethnic, political and cultural, revolutionary and tribalistic, ethnic-genealogical, patriotism and nationalism” [2; 62].

The concept of “nation” is mainly explained based on a rigorous scientific analysis of this category. Researchers question the possibility of objectively studying the meaning of this phenomenon. For example, Nikolay Berdyaev: “Truly, no rational definition can fill the concept of nation. No amount of rational definitions can eliminate it. Every time some psychological and sociological definitions are used for the concept of nation, the concept of nation becomes more complex” [3; 75-76].

However, due to the absence of a universal theory of nation, the theory of nation is interpreted as a historical phenomenon that analyzes national processes relatively.

From a theoretical point of view, it is still difficult to give a clear definition of the concept of “nation”. Some scholars consider the nation to be simply an “imaginary community” [4]. Other scholars argue that it can be defined in terms of culture or voluntarism, but there are many uncertainties in such an approach. However, “belonging to a certain nationality is not an innate quality of human being” [4], because in the era when the national state became the subject of international relations, only the requirements of time made it “an innate quality, it is a feature of human nature” [5]. In other words, we still have reason to question the legitimacy of the concept of “nation”.

Ernest Gellner is a scholar known for his work “Nations and Nationalism”. In this work, Gellner said, “Specifically, the nation is just as accidental as the state, it is not a universal need. It is believed that neither the nation nor the state can exist at all times and in all circumstances” [6]. According to political scientist B. Shakeeva: “often there is a misunderstanding between the terms “nation” and “citizenship”. We can see it in the translation of these terms in each country. If we take the United Nations Charter as an example, even in its official language translations, there is a similarity between “nation” and “citizenship”. In French, “nationalite” just means “citizenship”. And in German, different words are used for these terms: “Nationalist” means ethnic identity, and “Staatsbürgerschaft” is translated as civic identity. It is clear that questions related to these terms cannot but arise in the countries of the former USSR. In personal passports of the citizens of the USSR, we can see that “nationality” is necessarily marked and it has an ethnic character” [7].

The most basic methodological approaches

At present, primordialism, instrumentalism and constructivism are important in the study of the nation problem.

The primordialist trend maintained its dominance in the theory of the nation. According to the concept of the nation, he introduced changes that are opposite to the primordialist direction. These two positions often compete and oppose each other. The approach of primordialism is widely popular among nationalists in countries developing a nation-state [8].

The approach of primordialism explains the concept of nation as a community of people with immutable biological kinship. This theoretical approach considers the issue of national identification as an inescapable law of nature.

The primordialist approach is based on the natural connection of a person with the culture of his national identity. Proponents of the primordialist approach show the nation as a real phenomenon with an objective basis in nature and society, and consider ethnic groups as biologically formed groups of people living together [9].

Anthony Smith, a primordialist scientist, thinks that nations are formed on the basis of ethnic groups [10].

Because ethnic groups have legends about their common origin, common historical consciousness and historical memory to differentiate them. Common myths and symbols play a particularly important role in the formation of collective consciousness, they begin to identify ethnic groups.

The approach to the study of ethnos problems, which is called constructivist, studies national identity as a social structure that has different meanings for each person [8].

According to the constructivist approach, a person can change the national identity of his own free will. At the same time, the symbols of the nation and the state are considered the main tool for it. State symbols and ideals are an integral part of changing national identity.

In the constructivist approach, ethnicity is understood as a socially created phenomenon.

This approach emphasizes the role of social, cultural and historical processes in the formation and meaning of ethnic identities.

A key concept in constructivism is ethnic division, where individuals and groups define the boundaries of their ethnic identities. Constructivist scholars often analyze how ethnic identities are constructed and changed in relation to power dynamics, social inequalities, and cultural representations.

Constructivist approaches are applied to a variety of ethnographic studies, including multiculturalism, identity politics, diaspora studies, and cultural hybrid studies. By focusing on the socially constructed nature of ethnicity, constructivist approaches contribute to our understanding of the diversity, complexity, and dynamism of ethnic identities and their importance in contemporary societies.

According to the researcher Kaliyev, “proponents of constructivism derive from its purposeful influence of all ethnic communities, cultures and power elites that appeared at different stages of human development. Processes such as the modern state, administrative centralization, statistical data collection, language standardization, and the creation of centralized education systems can create or change a nation” [11; 112].

These contemporary theories offer different perspectives on the complexity of ethnic identity, reflecting the multidimensional nature of identity formation and negotiation in today's globalized world. Researchers advance our understanding of how ethnic identities are formed, maintained, and transformed in different social contexts and historical periods.

Methodological approach — instrumentalism, the problems of ethnicity and nation are considered as a means of struggle for power and career. Ethno issues are considered a means of realizing group interests or an ideology of national intellectuals aimed at grouping people. The emergence of this ethnos is a product of interaction of social conditions.

From an instrumentalist point of view, ethnicity is a strategic resource needed by individuals and groups for specific interests. Instrumentalism focuses on the pragmatic aspects of ethnicity.

Instrumentalist approaches are used in studies related to ethnic politics, ethnic entrepreneurship, identity politics. Instrumentalist perspectives contribute to our understanding of the dynamics of ethnic identity.

Constructivism and instrumentalist trends differ from primordialism in that they pay insufficient attention to the cultural factor, which is considered an important element of ethnic identity. Failure to pay adequate attention to culture, which is considered the “unifier” of an ethnic group or nation, is a process that leads to the destruction of the nation. It is a fact that the historical cultural values of the nation are the way to preserve the ethnic identity from the configurations of “counter-identities” in the context of globalization.

According to scientist Baigabatova, “The technology of collecting empirical material is a question related to the competence of the researcher, in particular, the ability to build relationships”. That is, each researcher chooses the classical methodology as the main method during the accumulation of experience. It expands its own reserve of methods of obtaining other information [1; 119].

French anthropologist J. Devereux introduced the concept of hyperbolization into the scientific circulation of ethnic identity. Hyperindividuation of ethnic identity occurs when it is active from other social identities [12].

Discussion

In this section, the scientific concepts and theoretical methods of the concept of “nation” are analyzed. By analyzing theories, we appreciate the multifaceted nature of human existence and its interaction with social contexts.

E. Renan “What is a nation?” In his report on the topic, the nation comes to the conclusion that it is “a somewhat new phenomenon in history”. According to him, due to the small number of ancient states, due to the diversity of the population and the absence of concepts of “citizenship” and “fatherland”, there was no such thing as a nation. E. Renan noted that nation cannot be tied to family, race, religion, language.

According to E. Renan, “the nation is a manifestation of the spiritual desire of people to live together, to preserve the heritage left by the previous generation, to strive for a common goal” [13].

As for the concept of nation, primordialists say it is the highest form of development of an ethnic group that has emerged on the basis of economic relations, territorial unity, language, cultural features and psyche.

In the primordialist concept, ethnos is considered as a property of human existence that has its objective basis in nature or society. The existence of the ethnos rests on these two objective bases. All theories formulated within the framework of the primordialist approach are divided into two directions: social-biological and evolutionary-historical.

Proponents of the first direction say that the biogenetic nature of the nation is correct.

Representatives of the primordialist view consider ethnic groups as social communities closely related to the socio-historical context rather than biological ones. These groups have their own characteristics. It's language, culture, identity.

According to O. Bauer, “A nation is a whole set of people connected by a common character” [14]. Therefore, he did not consider the common origin, language, territory. Of course, O. Bauer's concept could not reveal the whole nature of the nation phenomenon.

In the 70s and 80s of the 20th century, researchers E. Gellner, B. Anderson, A. Smith, E. Hobsbaum and others. His works played a decisive role in the formation of the modernist and postmodernist movement as a whole concept. Thanks to their work, the undivided supremacy of the first theory about the nation was put to an end. Representatives of the modernist movement said that nations are the creation of a new era.

Adherents of the constructivist theory argue that the formation of nations is a result of the development of industrialization and the growth of urbanization. It is said that it was important in the creation of a single internal market, as well as in the development of the national economy.

According to the constructivist theory, nations differ from pre-national formations in that their members, first of all, perceive themselves as representatives of a particular nation. Only then, the class, family group, professional group, etc.

With the transition from a traditional agrarian society dominated by natural economy to an industrial society, the situation changed dramatically.

As noted by E. Gellner, the most important difference between agrarian and industrial societies is that the first is stable, and the second is mobile. A direct manifestation of this mobility is the significant territorial movement of the population and the growth of urbanization, the creation of a single national market. All these revolutionary changes in the life of society create enormous opportunities for the integration of people and goods. This contributes to the elimination of previous social barriers and the territorial isolation of certain regions.

On the other hand, unlike an agrarian society, an industrial society is not only mobile, but also able to work competently and culturally. These requirements were determined by the literacy of society members and the features of the industrial society's production system.

The difference between the constructivist theory and the primordialist approach is that “nations are not given to us by nature. The nation is not a political version of the theory of biological species” [15].

In contrast to the view that the transformation of an ethnic group into a nation is a natural and predetermined process, modernists consider nations to be an intellectual construct of writers, scientists, and politicians. That is, representatives of the intelligentsia who create the national ideology, which is the theoretical basis of the formation of the nation. At this point we come to the concept of “personality”.

According to constructivists, the process of formation of a nation begins with the emergence of a corresponding national ideology. Representatives of the intelligentsia usually discuss the images of the nation and the concepts of national interest and bring them to the masses.

According to the constructivist statement, the formation of nations is not a universal stage of development of all ethnic groups in the world. Thus, many small ethnic groups are often merged with larger nations. According to them, nations have a purely political origin, etc. Ethnic groups acquire national symbols not as a result of ethnic self-development, but as a result of political action. In essence, it is the result of the activity of individual intellectuals. And the basis of this process is the national ideology formulated by the intellectual elite, according to which “political and national unity must coincide” [15; 8]. In this regard, as E. Gellner pointed out, “nationalism creates nations” [15; 43].

Of course, the modern nation is the ethnic community of the past era. From this point of view, cultural homogeneity is formed on the basis of a specific ethnic community. The ethnic and cultural characteristics of the population targeted by intellectuals significantly influence their conceptions.

According to V.M. Mezhuev, “Nation is the state, social, cultural affiliation of an individual, its anthropological and ethnic definition” [16].

V.A. According to Tishkov, “The idea of a nation is born among peoples, it is not necessarily culturally homogeneous, it is created as a political program for the creation of sovereign civil communities” [17].

In this regard, “nation-states” do not necessarily have kinship and cultural affinity with each other, they include representatives of different ethnic groups.

The national idea appeared along with the development of industrialization, urbanization and individualism, contributing to the formation of the nation.

Understanding the complexity of human personality requires a multidimensional and interdisciplinary approach that considers the interplay of individual, group, cultural, and environmental factors. By studying these theories, it contributes to a comprehensive understanding of the human personality and its social dynamic interactions. By analyzing these different theoretical insights, researchers can develop a more holistic framework to help to address ethnic identity.

Thus, due to the complexity of studying the concept of “nation”, and its importance in modern society, many theoretical studies have appeared. Future directions of research in theories of the concept of “nation” should include interdisciplinary cooperation, various methodological innovations. Scholars can contribute to a comprehensive understanding of ethnic identity by integrating insights from multiple disciplines, engaging with diverse cultural perspectives, and adopting innovative methodologies. By fostering dialogue and collaboration in research practice, we can advance our understanding of ethnic identity and contribute to the promotion of social justice, equality and cultural diversity.

Conclusion

The process of an ethnic group becoming a nation is usually called the nationalization of an ethnic group. Actions of the state, its political institutions or ethno-political elite aimed at turning an ethnic group into a nation are called state building. The process of formation of a nation takes different forms depending on specific historical and socio-economic conditions.

If the national policy of the state is not clear, if we continue to present the idea of a different civil nation, which the society is not used to, it will affect social stability. In this case, how should we consider the issue of cultural integrity of the state? In order to answer this, we must study the phenomena of the national state and national unity from all angles.

Because such a complex and multifaceted phenomenon cannot be fully explained by a single theory. That is, the integration of interdisciplinary methods of scientific directions is necessary in the study of the nation problem. Among them, we should use the methodological practices of ethnology, sociology, psychology, cultural studies. By integrating various theoretical advances, researchers can gain a deeper understanding of the complexities of ethnic identity and its implications for individual well-being and social cohesion.

Continued research and dialogue are essential to developing an appreciation of equity and cultural diversity in ethnic identity studies. By engaging in interdisciplinary collaboration, researchers can explore new lines of inquiry and develop innovative methodologies that include a diversity of ethnic identities. In addition, the development of public dialogue can promote mutual understanding in ethnically diverse societies.

Continued exploration of diverse theoretical perspectives is important to understanding ethnic identity and its impact on societal well-being.

The benefits of studying nation theory are the development of intergroup understanding and shaping practices.

Moving forward, continued interdisciplinary research, empirical research, and critical engagement with theoretical frameworks are essential to advancing understanding of nation theory. By adopting the necessary elements of the theory of nation and promoting dialogue between cultures, we can identify the factors related to the ethnic identity of each individual.

Acknowledgements

This research has been funded by the Science Committee of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Grant AP19677146. Cross-cultural and axiological analysis of ethnic identification processes of ethnic minorities in the southern region of Kazakhstan.

References

- 1 Baigabatova N. Fieldwork of ethnic identity: theory, practice, reflection / N. Baigabatova // Bulletin of history. — 2021. — 1 (100). — P. 112–119.
- 2 Хантингтон С. Столкновение цивилизаций / С. Хантингтон. — М.: ООО «Издательство "АСТ"», 2003. — 603 с.
- 3 Бердяев Н. Философия неравенств / Н. Бердяев. — Париж, 1970. — 231 с.
- 4 Андерсон Б. Воображаемые общности. Размышления о происхождении и распространении национализма. / Б. Андерсон // Этнос и политика: хрестом. — М.: Изд-во «УРАО», 2000. — С. 78-79.
- 5 Гулыга А.В. Гердер / А.В. Гулыга. — 2-е изд.; пер. Хоу Хунсюнь. — Шанхай: Шанхай. нар. изд-во «Октябрь», 1985. — С. 67.
- 6 Геллнер Э. Нации и национализм / Э. Геллнер; ред. и послесл. И.И. Крупника; пер. с англ. Т.В. Бредниковой, М.К. Тюнькиной. — М.: Прогресс, 1991. — 794 с.
- 7 Шакеева Б.Р. Қазақстандағы ұлттық бірегейліктің қалыптасу аясындағы қазақ этникалығы. Филос. д-ры (PhD) ... дисс. 6D050200 — Саясаттану мамандығы / Б.Р. Шакеева. — Алматы, 2022. — 175 б.
- 8 Айтымбетов Н. Қазақстандағы ұлттық бірегейліктің қалыптасу ерекшеліктері. Жеке монография / Н. Айтымбетов. — Алматы: ҚР БҒМ ҒК Философия, саясаттану және дінтану институты, 2018. — 200 б.
- 9 Ахмедьянова Д.Х. Национальная идентичность как условие сохранения и позиционирования казахстанского общества в глобализирующемся мире: дис. канд. ... полит. наук / Д.Х. Ахмедьянова. — Астана, 2010. — С. 21.
- 10 Smith A.D. National identity Penguin / A.D. Smith // Harmondsworth Smith National identity. — 1991.
- 11 Kaliyev D.S. Theories of Ethnicity, Nationality and Ethnic Identity / D.S. Kaliyev, Aimar Ventsel // Adam alemi. — 2021. — No 4 (90). — P. 106–113.
- 12 Деверо Дж. О работах Джорджа Деверо / Дж. Деверо // Личность, культура, этнос: современная психологическая антропология; под общ. ред. А.А. Белика; пер. Л.В. Трубицыной. — М.: Смысл, 2001. — 555 с.
- 13 Малинова О.Ю. Либерализм и концепт нации / О.Ю. Малинова // Полис. Политические исследования. — 2003. — № 2. — С. 96–111.
- 14 Бауэр О. Национальный вопрос и социал-демократия / О. Бауэр. — СПб., 1909. — С. 1-2.
- 15 Геллнер Эрнест. Нации и национализм / Эрнест Геллнер; пер. Хань Хуньи. — Центр. изд-во по подбору и переводу, 2002. — С. 5.
- 16 Межуев В.М. Идея национального государства в исторической перспективе / В.М. Межуев // Полис. — 1992. — № 5-6. — С. 10–16.
- 17 Тишков В. Дилеммы развития России / В. Тишков // Этнополис. — 1992. — № 1. — С. 76–85.

Ж.О. Әбікенов

Ұлт ұғымы теорияларын әдіснамалық талдау

Мақала ұлт мәселесін түсінуге қатысты теорияларды тереңірек қарастырып, негізгі теориялық негіздерге жан-жақты шолуды ұсынады. Автор осы ұғымның негізін қалаған ғалымдардың тұжырымдамаларына, еңбектеріне сараптама жасаған. Қазіргі қоғамдағы этникалық сәйкестікті қалыптастыруға қатысты түрлі перспективаларды зерттейді. Себебі ұлт дегеніміз бұл түрлі пәндерді қамтитын, зерттеушілердің назарын аударған күрделі және көп қырлы құрылым. Ұлт мәселесін түсінудің кез келген түрі өзінің зерттеу барысында белгілі бір әдіснамалық қиындықтарды тудырады. Оны түсінудің тәсілдерін салыстыру және тиісті көзқарастарды анықтау маңызды. Мақалада примордиализм, конструктивизм және инструментализм тәсілдері талданған. Ал талқылау барысында этникалық сәйкестіктер туралы қарама-қарсы көзқарастарды ұсынатын теориялар зерделенген. Осы көп өлшемді талдау арқылы мақала этникалық сәйкестікті зерттеуге қатысты жан-жақты мәлімет

беруге тырысады. Әр түрлі теориялық көзқарастардағы түсініктерді біріктіре отырып, ол этникалық сәйкестіктің динамикалық табиғатын және оның қазіргі қоғамдардағы әлеуметтік келісім мен мәдени әртүрлілікпен байланысын түсінуді ұсынады. Ұлтты жан-жақты түсіну үшін әртүрлі теорияларды біріктірудің маңыздылығы атап өтілген және мәдени әртүрлілікті түсінуді дамыту бойынша ұсыныстар берілген.

Кілт сөздер: мәдениет, дәстүр, ұлт, қоғам, идентификация, зерттеу, әдіс, нақтылау, білім, құндылық.

Ж.О. Абикенов

Методологический анализ теорий понятия нации

В статье представлен всесторонний обзор основных теоретических основ, более глубоко рассматриваются теории, связанные с пониманием проблемы государственности. Выделены концепции и работы ученых, основавших эту концепцию. Исследованы различные точки зрения на формирование этнической идентичности в современном обществе. Потому что нация представляет собой сложную и многогранную структуру, включающую в себя различные дисциплины и привлекающую внимание исследователей. Любое понимание проблемы нации создает определенные методологические трудности при ее исследовании. Важно сравнить способы его понимания и выявить соответствующие точки зрения. Кроме того, автором проанализированы подходы примордиализма, конструктивизма и инструментализма. А в ходе дискуссии будут обсуждаться теории, предлагающие противоположные взгляды на этническую идентичность. Посредством этого многомерного анализа в статье предпринята попытка дать всесторонний отчет об изучении этнической идентичности. Сочетая идеи различных теоретических точек зрения, автор предлагает понимание динамической природы этнической идентичности и ее связи с социальной сплоченностью и культурным разнообразием в современных обществах. Подчеркнута важность объединения различных теорий для комплексного понимания нации и даны рекомендации по развитию понимания культурного разнообразия.

Ключевые слова: культура, традиция, нация, общество, идентификация, исследование, метод, уточнение, знание, ценность.

References

- 1 Baigabatova, N. (2021). Fieldwork of ethnic identity: theory, practice, reflection. *Bulletin of history*, 1 (100), 112–119.
- 2 Huntington, S. (2003). *Stolknovenie tsivilizatsii* [Clash of Civilizations]. Moscow: OOO «Izdatelstvo “AST”» [in Russian].
- 3 Berdyayev, N. (1970). *Filosofia neravenstv* [Philosophy of inequalities]. Paris [in Russian].
- 4 Anderson, B. (2000). *Voobrazhaemye obshchnosti. Razmyshleniia o proiskhozhdenii i rasprostraneni natsionalizma* [Imaginary communities. Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism]. *Etnos i politika: Khrestomatiia — Ethnicity and politics. Chrestomathy*. Moscow: Izdatelstvo «URAO» [in Russian].
- 5 Gulyga, A.V. (1985). *Gerder* [Herder]. (2nd edition). (Hou Hongxun, Trans). Shanghai: Shangkhaikoe narodnoe izdatelstvo. «Oktiabr» [in Russian].
- 6 Gellner, E. (1991). *Natsii i natsionalizm* [Nations and nationalism]. I.I. Krupnik (Ed.). (T.V. Brednikova, M.K. Tiunkina, Trans). Moscow: Progress [in Russian].
- 7 Shakeeva, B.R. (2022). *Qzaqstandagy ul'tyq biregeiliktin qalyptasu aiasyndagy qazaq etnikalygy* [Kazakh ethnicity in the framework of formation of national identity in Kazakhstan]. *PhD's thesis*. Almaty [in Kazakh].
- 8 Aitymbetov, N. (2018). *Qazaqstandagy ul'tyq biregeiliktin qalyptasu erekshelikteri. Zheke monografiia* [Features of formation of national identity in Kazakhstan. Personal monograph]. Almaty: Qazaqstan Respublikasy Bilim zhane Gylym ministriligi Gylym Komitetinin Filosofii, saiasattanu zhane dintanu instituty [in Kazakh].
- 9 Akhmedianova, D.Kh. (2010). *Natsionalnaia identichnost kak uslovie sokhraneniia i pozitsionirovaniia kazakhstanskogo obshchestva v globaliziruiushchemsia mire* [National identity as a condition of preservation and positioning of the Kazakh society in the globalizing world]. *Candidate's thesis*. Astana [in Russian].
- 10 Smith, A. (1991). *National Identity* Penguin. *Harmondsworth Smith National identity*.
- 11 Kaliyev, D.S. & Ventsel, A. (2021). Theories of Ethnicity, Nationality and Ethnic Identity. *Adam alemi — The human world*, 4 (90), 106–113.
- 12 Devereux, J. (2001). *O rabotakh Dzhordzha Devero* [George Devereux works]. *Lichnost, kultura, etnos: sovremennaia psikhologicheskaiia antropologiia — Personality, culture, ethnos: contemporary psychological anthropology*. A.A. Belik (Ed.). (L.V. Trubitsyna, Trans). Moscow [in Russian].
- 13 Malinova, O.Yu. (2003). *Liberalizm i kontsept natsii* [Liberalism and the concept of nation]. *Polis. Politicheskii issledovaniia — Polis. Political studies*, 2, 96–111 [in Russian].

- 14 Bauer, O. (1909). *Natsionalnyi vopros i sotsial-demokratiia* [National question and social democracy]. Saint Petersburg [in Russian].
- 15 Gellner, Ernest (2002). *Natsii i natsionalizm* [Nation and nationalism]. (Han Hunyi, Trans). Tsentralnoe izdatelstvo po podboru i perevodu [in Russian].
- 16 Mezhev, V.M. (1992). *Ideia natsionalnogo gosudarstva v istoricheskoi perspektive* [The idea of a national state in a historical perspective]. *Polis — Polis*, 5-6, 10–16 [in Russian].
- 17 Tishkov, V. (1992). *Dilemmy razvitiia Rossii* [Dilemma of development of Russia]. *Etnopolis — Ethnopolis*, 1, 76–85 [in Russian].

Information about the author

Abikenov Zharkynbek — PhD, Senior Lecturer of the Department of Philosophy and Social Sciences and Humanities, Korkyt Ata Kyzylorda University, Kyzylorda, Kazakhstan. <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7950-330X>

Buketov University