

**“Kazakhstani history narratives
from the state perspective and its
societal perception”**

by

Atenova Moldir

Sanbayeva Akmaral

Sharipova Nazgul

POLICY ANALYSIS EXERCISE

Submitted to

Nazarbayev University School of Public Policy

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER IN PUBLIC POLICY

Astana,

Kazakhstan

April 14, 2023

**“Қазақстан тарихының мемлекет
тарапынан баяндалуы мен
қоғамның оны қабылдауы”**

авторлары:

Атенова Мөлдір

Санбаева Ақмарал

Шәріпова Назгүл

САЯСАТТЫ ТАЛДАУ БОЙЫНША ЖАТТЫҒУ

МЕМЛЕКЕТТІК САЯСАТ МАГИСТРІ

дәрежесін алу үшін

Назарбаев Университеті

Жоғары мемлекеттік саясат мектебіне

тапсырылған

Астана қаласы, Қазақстан

2023 жылғы 14 сәуір

**“Казахстанские исторические повествования
с точки зрения государства
и их общественное восприятие”**

выполнено

Атеновой Молдир

Санбаевой Акмарал

Шариповой Назгуль

ПРАКТИЧЕСКОЕ ЗАДАНИЕ ПО АНАЛИЗУ ПОЛИТИКИ

представлено в

в Высшую школу государственной политики

Назарбаев Университета

в рамках

частичного выполнения требований для получения степени

МАГИСТРА ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОЙ ПОЛИТИКИ

Астана, Казахстан

14 апреля 2023 года

Abstract

Understanding the role of history in shaping a nation's identity is paramount. The narrative surrounding historical events holds immense power, capable of fueling ethnic tensions and a host of other complications. Thus, our study asks the research question, "How does society in Kazakhstan perceive the state narrative of history?". While previous research has explored the use of history to construct national identity, it has not delved into the perceptions and levels of trust people have toward the state's narrative, particularly in Kazakhstan. This study examines how society, especially the younger generation, trusts the historical narrative presented in textbooks. Moreover, this research aims to analyze alternative sources of narratives considered credible by the population. We employed a mixed-methods approach that included interviews and surveys to investigate this matter. We formulated three hypotheses and explored the correlation between education level, school type, occupation type, and trust in the state's narrative. Data was gathered through surveys and analyzed using the STATA software. Our findings revealed that higher education level does not have a significant relationship with trust in the textbook narrative. However, our study results related to school type and occupation type were partially validated. Thus, our study suggests developing objective narration and critical thinking. Additionally, this study provides a basis for further exploration of the level of trust in historical narratives among the population.

1 INTRODUCTION	6
Background and problem statement/ importance.....	6
Research objectives/questions.....	6
Structure/organization of the PAE paper.....	7
2 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	8
2.1 Theoretical framework.....	13
3 RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS.....	15
3.1 Data.....	15
3.2 Methods.....	17
3.3 Analysis.....	18
3.4 The ethic of the study.....	18
4 FINDINGS.....	19
4.1 STATE NARRATIVE OF KAZAKHSTANI HISTORY.....	19
4.1.1 Kazakhstani/Kazakh history education during the Soviet Union.....	21
4.1.2 Kazakhstani/Kazakh history after the independence.....	20
4.2 The societal perception of history narrative by State.....	27
4.2.1 STATA analysis on social perspective: dependent and independent variables.....	27
4.2.2. Control variables.....	33
5 DISCUSSION.....	34
6 CONCLUSION.....	38
6.1 Research summary.....	38
6.2 Practical implications.....	38
6.3 Limitations of the study.....	39
6.4 Suggestions for further research/ and or policy recommendation.....	40

Chapter 1. Introduction

History of the country is an important part of its culture that can affect the national identity of citizens. Sometimes national identity constructed on wrong, subjective sources might bring inter-ethnic conflicts (Alesina, Reich & Riboni, 2020). Thus, it is important to promote a healthy national identity which, along with instilling pride in their history and ethnic background, could create a respectful atmosphere among nations that live in the country. The state can shape the national identity of its society through history education (Gellner, 1983). However, the state needs trustworthy relationships with its society to implement a policy shaping the needed identity type. In Kazakhstan, society has gone through different waves of ideological changes. It has been part of the Soviet Union and gained its independence, but in recent years, society has become more vocal about its democratic rights. If the Soviet people were taught history from the Soviet narrative, modern Kazakhstani citizens would learn from the new perspective of an independent government (Kissane, 2006). For the government, it is important to present more information about the history of the Kazakh people, as in the past, they were highly suppressed under the Soviet regime. Younger generations are exposed to more information about their ancestors and their roots.

However, they are also exposed to social media posts and discussions, which could possibly affect their perception of history (Anderson, 1983). Independent sources might be reliable and biased. Therefore, many myths and conflictual beliefs might appear. Thus, state intervention is significant in this field and can be implemented under society's trust in the state. In this research, we want to analyze how the government of Kazakhstan narrates its history in the school curriculum and the trust that Kazakhstani society has towards the state's narrative of history education in public schools. We are specifically interested in the younger generation as they are the product of independent Kazakhstan with its narration. Although, it is interesting to see if the younger generations' narrative perception leans more towards the state narrative, Soviet narrative, or a completely different independent media one since their parents, grandparents, and people who taught them were raised in the Soviet era. For that reason, our research question is:

“How does society in Kazakhstan perceive the state narrative of history?”

Societal perception can be defined by the trust the society has towards the historical narratives of the state, compared to its trust in independent sources. In other words, if the history translated by the government is the same, people believe in. Thus, to analyze the findings of this research, we will first introduce the literature review, talk in more detail about our methods and data collection tools, demonstrate results and findings, discuss them, and finally show the summary of the work with the limitations and further recommendations for the state to implement in the history education.

Chapter 2. Literature review

Our research focuses on these important aspects: history narration, its use to promote national identity by the government, and public perception of those narratives. Thus, we divide our literature into four parts: types of national identity, history narrative and national identity in international practice, education and trust, and finally, historical narrative in Kazakhstan. So far, we have found a gap in the literature regarding public perception of history narratives, which we can fill in in the future through our research.

National identity

It is worth drawing on Gellner's work on national identity to understand its origins. In his work called *Nations and Nationalism*, Gellner states that all forms of social organizations are reorganized due to industrialization and labor division (1983). It brings new social relations, specifically the universal standardized education system or, as he calls it, "generic training," which creates a large culturally homogenous group of people. So, Gellner views that people are largely linked to their culture, and identity is a social product. While Gellner's theory on national identity considers national identity as a by-product of the formation of nations due to industrialization, Benedict Anderson's (1983) definition of nations is as "imagined political community" which is limited and sovereign. Anderson's position is distinguished from Gellner's since the concept of "imagined" differs from the concept of "invented". This is the big debate in the literature of nationalism and national identity on how they are constructed.

One of the big names among multicultural theorists, Will Kymlicka, proposed a theory of "liberal multiculturalism" that states that individuals are free to choose what cultural practices they are eager to follow, but they should be given this opportunity from other parties like the state/government (Kymlicka, 2017). The theorist especially concentrates on minority rights and shows that there are debates in this field. For instance, among "liberals" and "communitarians". "Liberals" put the individual first in society and state that the traditions continue to exist only if the people practice them, and the community cannot dictate people's choices. Meanwhile, "communitarians" put society first and claim that societal/cultural practices form individuals (Kymlicka, 2017).

Sharipova (2020) states that Kazakhstan has no universally accepted concept of national identity. She points out that there is no clear line between Kazakhstani identity and Kazakhness. The government wants to promote civic and ethnic identity (Burkhanov and Sharipova, 2014). Due to the Soviet past and multiethnic groups living in Kazakhstan, this approach is the best nation-building tool for Kazakhstan. Other scholars also analyze nation formation and identity in terms of cinema, literature, cityscapes, and monuments (Isaacs, 2015; Kudaibergenova, 2017; Fauve, 2015). Rico Isaacs states that various groups' competing views in Kazakhstani cinema affect identity formation. He highlights that cinema promotes an “ambiguous, re-invented and negotiated by various actors” type of national identity (2015). Finally, the most debatable topic in the national identity context is the status of the Kazakh language in society. Fierman claims that the Russian language still plays an important role in Central Asian states compared to Caucasus and Baltic states (2012). But the recent update is that Kazakhstan is gradually moving from Cyrillic towards the Latin alphabet.

History Education and national identity in international practice

India and Pakistan

Academics have stated that education is used to promote national identity. The government participates in this activity by controlling the school system and imposing necessary curricula. Marie Lall wrote about education's role in creating antagonistic national identities by the Pakistan's and India's governments (2008). The government wanted to create an artificial definition of who is Indian and Pakistani in history through educational reforms. The definition of Indian is made anti-Pakistani, and the definition of Pakistani is made anti-Indian, which creates an antagonistic view of others and a nationalistic view of self. Thus, the author argues that radicalizing the education system might have some consequences regarding regional security. The Indian government aimed to promote the Hindu Nationalist ideology, which is intolerant of other ethnic groups, specifically Pakistanis and the Muslim community. It is viewed as a separate and second-class citizen. The Pakistani government Islamized the education system and the curriculum of schools which is mainly built upon Sunni Islamic views. Overall, the

author states the importance of school education in building national identity, potentially bringing the nation into peace or dangerous conflicts among states.

Canada and the USA

While Jordan, Palestina, and India cases might be examples of the government promoting a nationalistic narrative through school curriculum, some states promote liberal and democratic ideas to shape national identities, such as Canada and the USA. The governments of both countries have worked well to construct Canadian and American identities (Hardwick, Marcus and Isaak, 2010). Canadian school textbooks provide us with the ideas of multiculturalism, global citizenship, and global peacekeepers and focus mainly on the rights of individuals. American textbooks also reflect these values often taught in social science classes. These two countries are distinct in that the US textbooks mostly talk about individual rights, and the Canadian textbooks spread the idea of multiculturalism.

Hong Kong

Vickers and Kan (2015) discuss how the school curriculum is formed to shape the identity of citizens in Hong Kong, considering its history with Britain and mainland China. Up to 1997, the history subject was designed in a colonial context. The British government influenced how history was narrated, and the pre-colonial history of the citizens was presented pro-British. When Communist China arose, the textbooks were controlled to prevent the ideology effect and excluded this information. Instead of recent historical changes, the textbooks started focusing on ancient times. In the 70s, the history textbooks shifted to more recent events and covered European and modern Asian histories, China specifically. The books had a liberal-internationalist view. There were suggestions in 1974 to include Chinese history in the global context, which created protests among people who wanted to preserve ancient history. In the middle of the 80s and 90s, the focus of history shifted to the history of Hong Kong.

Regarding the textbooks published since independence, Vickers and Kan (2005) state that in 1997, they were still not independent of the colonial narratives as they were revised in 1995. At the time, promoting “HongKongness” was prioritized over the Chinese identity. However, after 1997 history started promoting patriotism to raise the national identity. In 2004, the published textbooks did not include information about people killed during the 1989 protests and portrayed

Chinese history with Taiwan, Tibet, and Mongolia as a means to keep its sovereignty from Japan, Russia, and Britain. These narratives were also not approved by the history community. This example illustrates how history textbooks reflect the government's interest.

Ukraine

The article "Shaping unpredictable past: National Identity and history education in Ukraine" by Korostelina (2011) examines the government's role in shaping the national identity through history textbooks. As long as Ukraine is also a post-Soviet country, the source applies to our research regarding the textbooks choosing a methodology and possible hypotheses of the study. The author hypothesized that school textbooks in Ukraine, being the government-controlled tool of education, aim to not only create a national and ethnic identity but also try to develop a border between "Us" and "Others": Ukrainian and other nations. Korostelina (2011) claims that the first history textbooks after independence were concentrated on centralized Soviet history. However, in 2006 the Ukrainian government started to promote patriotic education by positioning Russia as an aggressor and Ukraine as a victim, which is a historically European state. The history textbooks in Ukraine did not blame Stalinism, Communism, and totalitarianism for past events. Instead, they blamed the entire Russian ethnicity, which has led to a negative relationship between Russia and Ukraine in modern times. The author believes that these methods of promoting patriotism could create identity-based conflicts.

Education and trust

For our research, looking at the relationship between trust and education is important. This is because the students perceive the narratives through education. Boyadjieva and Ilieva-Trichkova conducted a study on the correlation between higher education and social trust in 19 European nations. The authors consider trust as a significant factor that influences well-being and differentiate it into two categories: impersonal and institutional trust. (Boyadjieva & Ilieva-Trichkova, 2015). The discussion of an institutional part is closely related to our study. The level of trust that people have in their country's parliament and legal system is used to measure institutional trust. As a result of this research, there is an interesting trend in the varying levels of institutional trust among the countries depending on the level of democracy and higher

education at the same time. Citizens of countries that adhere to full democracy show a positive trend in institutional trust in relation to the level of education, whereas, in countries with flawed democracies, the trend is negative. This can be explained by the transparency and objectivity of the government in full democracies, which build trustful relationships between the government and society. However, in flawed democracies like Kazakhstan, the trust in the government and education level are negatively correlated.

In addition to the objectivity and reliability of the government's narration in flawed democracies, critical thinking might be another factor that affects institutional trust. Critical analysis skills allow people to fact-check every source they face. There is a gap in the literature review on critical thinking skills and trust in government, which we might partially fill in if we consider advanced schools (NIS, KTL, gymnasiums) that teach critical thinking to have more trust in the state history narrative. It is often found in the newly founded schools in Kazakhstan, such as Nazarbayev Intellectual Schools (NIS). According to Natalia Yakavets (2013), students in NIS schools have more education tools than in public schools. The author states that the schools have a competitive selection process; thus, the students must be smart to enroll. Unlike ordinary schools, its curriculum and assessment criteria were developed with Cambridge University. This curriculum is designed to enrich critical thinking and analytical skills. Plus, it can be seen that the teachers that teach in NIS are more qualified. This means it can be more effective in developing the above-mentioned skills.

History Narrative and Kazakhstan

According to Kissane (2006), Kazakhstan's historical narrative is trying to show its departure from the Soviet times and tries to raise a new "Kazakhified" national identity. The author demonstrates that during the Soviet period, the Soviet ideology was highly propagated on a side with the Russification process while the Kazakh historical/cultural figures were eliminated from the history books. Histories of different republics were included to foster the Soviet background. However, many Kazakh historians view the repressive processes as negatively affecting the maintenance of Kazakh culture. With independence, the government initiated "Kazakh-oriented" programs where previous history narratives were revised. It was used for nation-building by focusing on "Kazakhization" and its independence from Soviet identity and "de-Russification".

It can be seen that the government implemented policies regarding changing the history teaching methodology and making it student-oriented, in line with the need to increase patriotism. The author shows that the events of joining Tsarist Russia and the Soviet Union alongside building the Semipalatinsk nuclear reactor were illustrated from the positive and “progressive” side in Soviet textbooks, whereas in independent Kazakhstan, they are portrayed negatively. Plus, the Almaty 1986 protests were excluded from the Soviet books. The author also addresses Kazakhstan’s ethnic diversity and that inclusivity could be used in history narration to create a sense of belonging for Kazakhstani people with different ethnic backgrounds.

Seitkazyiev and Myrzakhmet et al. (2020) also claim that historical education in schools is the main tool for forming the ethnic identity of the Kazakhstani population. Regarding the narration of the historical events, the authors suggest that it is important to consider the “civilizational approach” in modern education and portray Kazakhstan as a country that has assimilated both Turkic and Slavic cultures. Moreover, the content analysis conducted in this research points out that after gaining independence, the first school textbooks needed more true information about the time and places of historical events. While the authors of the study focus on the significance of justifying historical events in textbooks and modern teaching methods, they also suggest that the various ways history is narrated in educational reform should be addressed. Therefore, it is necessary to gather additional information on historical events, how they are narrated in school textbooks, and how they impact the development of national identity in students.

2.1. Theoretical/conceptual framework

For our theoretical framework, we considered the two concepts within the modernist approach to national identity formation: Gellner’s “constructed identity” (1983) and Anderson’s “imagined communities” (1983), both saying that emergence of nationalism is based on a language, but explaining this influence from different angles. Gellner was one of the most influential theoreticians on nationalism. He argued that nationalism creates a nation, and the national identity is successful only when constructed based on the ethnic majority in the country - "primarily a political principle which holds that the political and the national unit should be congruent" (Gellner, 1983:1). His theory is based on industrialism and the popularization of

education, meaning literacy and language education. According to him, nationalism can be raised only in industrial societies, which have an opportunity to transmit one culture to everyone through the education system (Yeskarauy, 2014). Whereas Anderson's point of view on the influence of language on nationalism emergence relies on print capitalism letting people share their culture through printed media and creating "imagined communities" which do not depend on the initial ethnicity of people. Anderson refers to the imagined communities as a "system of production and productive relations, a technology of communication, and the fatality of human linguistic diversity" (Anderson, 1983:16-38).

Gellner's opinion that states can intervene and organize homogeneous communities versus Anderson's view that independent media can influence people's national identity despite their ethnicity describes the debate we want to discuss and resolve through this research. State intervention is effective only when people do not trust the independent media enough to change their national identity based on that. Similarly, the state's narrative of history is trustworthy only when society finds the government sources objective enough to retain from the reading and believing the independent sources on the history of Kazakhstan.

Chapter 3. Research Design and Methods

3.1. Data

We are conducting a cross-sectional study with mixed methods. We intend to test whether social perception matches the state narrative. Thus our research has the following dependent and independent variables:

The dependent variable: trust in the state narrative of history

The independent variables: education level, school type, and occupation type

Control variables: a place of residence (urban/ rural), the language of instruction

We look at trust because we assume the more people trust the narrative, the more likely they are to translate it.

Since the research focuses on societal perception our data consists of two types of participants: society and experts. We collected data from experts as historians that conduct independent research and are part of reputable institutions like the State History Institute to understand USSR times and post-independence era history of Kazakhstan narratives. Due to their knowledge, we could extract information regarding the problems history of Kazakhstan faced in the past and what it is facing today. We were also able to analyze the narrative changes between these two eras. To take a deeper look into the teaching methods of history and the difficulties students have, we talked to the local school teachers. They were able to show how students react to the current methods and the content of the textbooks. For the analysis of the students from the other perspective and to get a grasp of Western sources' narratives, we interviewed foreign university professors. They could explain to us the differences in narration they see when students come to the university fresh from school and what narrations of Kazakhstan's history they were exposed to. To analyze the societal perception and get open answers on it, the blogger was also involved in this study. Their experience at school and how they perceive the school history content gave an understanding of what methods of teaching are ineffective.

Regarding the data for the regression analysis, we were interested in society only. Thus, the respondents of the survey were the general public from different backgrounds. We mainly

focused on the young generation as they are the offspring of independent Kazakhstan's legacy. Our aim was to collect data from people with different backgrounds in education, residence, and other personal aspects. This could give a more enlarged picture of the relation between trust in narrations and our independent variables.

To test their relationship and answer our research question, "How does society in Kazakhstan perceive the state narrative of history?" We came up with three hypotheses from our literature review.

Hypothesis:

1. *The higher the education level, the less trust in the state narrative in Kazakhstan because the government suits the "flawed democracy" type and might be subjective on its sources, whilst people with high education seek objectivity due to critical thinking skills.*
2. *Advanced schools (NIS, KTL, gymnasium, PΦMIII) have less trust in the state narrative of history than ordinary schools because these schools are oriented towards critical thinking and are more likely to question the narrative*

The sources lack empirical research on the relationship between critical thinking and trust. However, some sources justified the lack of trust with the presence of critical thinking abilities. Thus, we assume critical thinking can lead to lesser trust in the state textbook narrative, as students with critical thinking are more likely to question the content.

3. *Public servants have more trust in the state history narrative than private workers*

Despite the lack of literature on occupation type and history narration trust, we believe it can be an important finding. The literature does not provide information on the trust in the government and people's occupation type, which include public or private service. However, we are sure that people with public occupation type are more likely to trust government narration because they might be obliged not to go against government narratives since they genuinely believe in it and support the government, which could be the reason why they are in public service, or because of fear to be fired, etc. Thus, if our research findings are significant, they could enrich the literature

on this topic. Overall, this research does not refute the interrelation between hypotheses and does not render either hypothesis invalid.

3.2. Methods

The research is aimed to be mixed. To collect the data from both state and social perspectives on the historical events of Kazakhstan, we used two types of methods:

1. Interviews. This method was used to find out the opinions of historians, school, university teachers, and blogger on the historical events translated by the state. The interviews were anonymous and contained questions on interviewees' experience as a student and as an expert in independent Kazakhstan. The structure was semi-structural and each interview lasted around 30 minutes. They helped us understand the current and past history education system, how historians participate in textbook writing, how the content is organized in terms of events, and the perception of the state content by the interviewees. To examine the state's perspective more accurately, we interviewed a member of the State History Institute (see Appendix A).
2. Survey. Surveys were conducted anonymously to collect data on societal perceptions of the state narrative on the history of Kazakhstan. The survey's target audience was the younger generation of Kazakhstan aged 18-35 to test the opinions of the society educated in independent Kazakhstan. The survey consisted of 17 primarily multiple choice questions on participants' remembrance of history taught at school and their impression of school education of history. Moreover, we asked general questions like "Are you proud of Kazakhstan's history after reading school textbooks?", "Which events in Kazakhstan history do you like to discuss more?".

Our independent variables are education level, school type, and occupation type, which we extracted from the survey. We controlled the other variables like the area of residence (urban/rural) and language of instruction. This helped us answer the first three hypotheses (see Appendix C).

3.3. Analysis

The findings of the interviews are analyzed by content analysis, while the STATA program is used for the survey results.

Starting with the interviewees, we looked at the content and derived common themes. We transcribed the interviewees manually and, through looking at the content, identified findings that answered and expanded our research question.

Regarding the survey, a regression analysis was conducted. To run the regression, we first created dummy variables for our dependent, independent, and control variables. In this way, we could look at the relationship between each variable in more detail. For instance, rather than looking at the relationship between trust and occupation type, we separately analyzed both private and public sectors' trust in different narratives. This was also needed as our survey answers were categorical. We then ran logit regression and applied a 95% confidence interval to assess the p-value. In this way, we could tell whether our results were significant.

3.4. The ethic of the study

The study has obtained Nazarbayev University Institutional Research Ethics Committee (IREC) clearance from NU GSPP IREC, which is the responsible committee for checking on the ethics of human research. Our research was conducted through consideration of all ethical norms of the investigation. We obtained consent from our participants of an interview with the message that addresses our study's nature, aim and potential risks. The approval was obtained from our interviewees since everyone was welcoming and ready to participate in our research, including all historians, professors, authors and bloggers.

Moreover, we tried to keep confidentiality and anonymity, and it was notified in advance. We also took consent to record on a voice recorder beforehand. We used records for our research purposes only and treated their personal information responsibly, and put measures to protect them. No harm, risks or physical or emotional harm was made during the interview.

Chapter 4. Results and Findings

4.1. State Narrative of Kazakhstani History

The interviews gave us a view of history education from two perspectives: USSR history education and independent Kazakhstan history education. In this chapter, we will discuss these eras and examine their differences and similarities.

To present the findings, we divided the USSR era and post-independence Kazakhstan era into two sections: **the content of the history books** and the **methodologies used to teach the history of Kazakhstan**. We aim to understand how the textbooks are narrated before analyzing the societal perception of narrative. The main finding of this chapter is that Kazakhstan is paying more attention to its history education than in the USSR.

4.1.1. Kazakhstani/Kazakh history education during the Soviet Union.

1. Content of the history books

For a start, the history of the education of Kazakhstan was not detailed during the Soviet times. Kazakhstani history teachers who have been students during the Soviet period highlighted that the history education was not detailed and the history of Kazakh people was at times lessened and discriminated against. The lessons usually were one hour per week. School teacher (Interviewee 5) states that even though part of her education was in independent Kazakhstan as a historian they know that people used to have books that looked like brochures where the history of Kazakh people started from the 1916 uprising of Amangeldi Imanov. The content did not open to the topics of Sakas and Huns and mainly paid attention to the important dates without explaining their contribution. A couple of interviewees stated that people who wrote Kazakh history were discriminated against. The school teacher remembers the book of Olzhas Suleimenov, "AZiYa" where he highlights the connection between Turkic and Slavic nations' history. This was seen as a threat to the USSR. As a result, the book was disqualified everywhere, which made it clear that "there is no Turkic history for our nation". Interviewee 1 also mentioned Yermukhan Bekmukhanov, who authored the history textbook for the Kazakh SSR. However, Bekmukhanov's fate was tragic - he was persecuted, imprisoned, and fell into amnesia. Despite this, he wrote textbooks with his daughter, Nelya. This highlights the

challenges and risks many intellectuals faced in navigating the complex and often oppressive political environment of the Soviet era.

Thus, it can be understood that the detailed parts of the history books in the USSR focused on the USSR itself. As the interviewees state, the content concentrated on the 1917 bourgeoisie revolution and the creation of the Soviet Union, which demonstrates that it wanted to show its history's importance rather than emphasizing the histories of nations within it. The books also focused on the achievements of the Soviet Union in freeing Kazakhstan from feudalism, bolstering its economy, and promoting social growth, which was significantly influenced by Soviet ideology. During this time, the Soviet Union's role in combating fascism and the sacrifices of Kazakh soldiers to the war effort were both stressed in the history curriculum. One of the interviewees further explained that the history of the world was given priority over the history of Kazakhstan, reflecting the Soviet government's emphasis on the global struggle between communism and capitalism.

Despite the discrimination, Interviewee 4 added a positive point regarding Soviet history education. Unlike today the content was easier for the students to understand as it suited their age category. For instance, the student in 5th grade would learn the program designed for the 5th grader. Whereas today, a student in the 5th grade studies the program that is designed for 6th-grade students, which makes the language of the content harder to understand.

2. Teaching Methods during the Soviet Union

Our interviews revealed several Kazakhstani history teaching methods during Soviet times. One of the most important highlights is that the teaching was focused on the rote memorization of facts and figures, with little emphasis on critical thinking or independent inquiry. Thus, the emphasis was mostly on transmitting knowledge and information rather than its analysis. In addition to textbooks, Kazakh history was taught through lectures and classroom discussions. These sessions were often led by Soviet-approved teachers trained in Soviet pedagogical methods. It can be seen that teaching methods like today were dependent on the teacher's approach. Interviewee 5 states that they used maps and schemes, which made the lessons interesting. Another interviewee says the lessons had an opinion exchange, round table, and open lessons. In the summer, they would go on excursions, expeditions, and museums.

Our study discovered the challenges of teaching and learning history in the Soviet-era education system in Kazakhstan. According to Interviewee 1, history was not a priority subject, and teachers often refused to teach it. There was a subjective factor in the form of the teacher who taught history, who was also the school's director and did not have enough time to dedicate to teaching the subject. This lack of emphasis on history education, combined with the subjective factors that affected teaching, meant that Interviewee 1 did not have a strong grasp of history. Overall, the analysis of this interview highlights the difficulties of providing a comprehensive history education under the Soviet education system and the limitations of relying solely on state-issued textbooks.

4.1.2. Kazakhstani/Kazakh history after the independence

1. Content of the history books

It can be seen that since independence, the trajectory of Kazakhstani history teaching has changed. The promotion of Kazakh history and culture was given fresh vigor with the fall of the Soviet Union. Since then, the distinctive history and cultural traditions of the Kazakh people have received more attention in Kazakhstani history books. The history curriculum now covers topics including the history of the Kazakh Khanate, the Kazakh people's nomadic lifestyle, and the contribution of Kazakh cultural icons to the development of Kazakh identity. Thus, the content has more significant historical events and is more detailed than in the past yet still concise, which is highlighted by several interviewees. However, the school teacher, Interviewee 5, and the university teacher, Interviewee 6, state that because of the time limit, this might be the right decision as it gives a fundamental idea of the history of Kazakhstan. Regarding modern Kazakhstani history, students are usually taught about the president's messages and the goals achieved, not the detailed story of events.

On a negative note, despite the diversity in narration, the sources used nowadays still contain Soviet viewpoints. Continuing on this argument, one of the interviewees, a foreign professor, claims that the majority of historiography on Kazakhstan up until relatively recently was from the Soviet times. According to Interviewee 8, Soviet Kazakh history was highly influenced by ideological agendas like "friendship of Peoples" or denying that Kazakhs were Muslims. These are ideas that serve the ideological agenda of the Soviets and are often misleading. The interview

also highlighted the international authors trying to eliminate the Soviet influence on Kazakh historiographies, like Niccolo Pianchola, who has written one of the important works on the Kazakh famine, which is never fully discussed in the Governmental sources and textbooks. Interviewee 8 expects a rising interest in Kazakhstani history since, due to the political situation, people who want to do research in the Russian language will be looking at the archives outside of Russia, and many people will come to Kazakhstan. They think that will generate more attention in Central Asia and improve the international exposure of Kazakhstan's Kazakh language and history.

The quality of history textbooks in Kazakhstan is another problem. According to Interviewee 1, there is a monopoly on textbook production, with Atamura and Mektep being the only two companies that can produce them. This has led to a lack of diversity among textbook authors and a standard program. They were invited to write a book in May that had to be completed by August 15th, which included a textbook, chrestomathy, and a workbook. The interviewee suggests that the process of writing textbooks is not well-defined, and textbooks must be checked for plagiarism. Moreover, they believe that history textbooks aim to describe events rather than analyze them. There are still significant challenges in producing quality history textbooks in Kazakhstan, including time constraints and lack of critical analysis.

Moreover, there is the issue of dry and unengaging textbooks. The authors, such as academics, focus on avoiding mistakes rather than creating exciting and engaging content, highlighting Interviewee 10. Lack of emotion and values make the content uninspiring for students. The second issue is the changing nature of communication, where gadgets and technology have become a primary means of consuming information. This raises the question of how exciting and engaging textbooks will be for students in this digital age. They also note that not all teachers are keeping up with the latest trends and concepts, such as infographics, which can be used to make information more visually appealing and accessible to students.

Plus, the content is rather complicated for students' comprehension. A school teacher, Interviewee 4, states that modern students learn a program that is rather complicated to understand as it is intended for another age category. It means that a 5th grader learns a program for 6th graders, which includes more facts and information that is hard to memorize for the 5th grader rather than the 6th one. This means language and the content need to be simplified for

better understanding. This, as a result, causes the students to be less enthusiastic. They often don't do homework as they say the content is hard to memorize, especially things like dates and centuries.

Another important issue is that there are some historical mistakes in academic textbooks for school children. Interviewee 10 discusses two historical topics commonly taught in Kazakhstani schools: the Battle of Orbulak and the concept of the Akorda as the predecessor of the Kazakh Khanate. According to the interviewee, it has been proven that the Battle of Orbulak did not occur in the Almaty region as commonly believed, but rather in the Dzhambul or Turkestan region. Interviewee 10 also states that the character of Karasai Batyr is a complete myth and only included in the historical canon due to his connections with the former president. However, he did not refer to any evidence. As for the concept of the Akorda as the predecessor of the Kazakh Khanate, the interviewee claims that historians have long refuted it. The Akorda, according to the Kazakh epic tradition, is where the khan resides and does not refer to the state as a Horde, a common mistake still found in textbooks.

2. Teaching Methods after Independence

Based on the analysis of interviews, it is evident that there have been alterations in the way history is taught in Kazakhstan following the disintegration of the Soviet Union. According to the interviewee, the significance of the history of Kazakhstan has increased, and it is now being taught as a distinct discipline. Now there is also a chrestomathy, or a collection of literary passages or texts, that serves as a methodology for teaching the subject. This methodology includes a plan, student workbook, and educational and methodological complex. Interviewee 1 suggests that there has been a greater effort to develop a comprehensive and structured approach to teaching the history of Kazakhstan in the post-Soviet era. The shift in teaching approach in Kazakhstan may be an indication of the increasing significance of national identity and the necessity to enhance comprehension of the country's history and culture following the Soviet era.

The findings show that new and old methods are currently in use. The school teacher says teachers can use whiteboards and the Internet due to technologies, but unfortunately, not all schools are supplied with those. Interviewee 5 claims comprehension is the key element in

today's education system. It is thought that understanding the material is more important than memorizing it. Students are divided according to their abilities and given tasks of different difficulty levels, but the goal is the same. However, old methods such as fact memorization are also used by the instructors, as Interviewee 4 states. They add that the content is complicated for students as children have to memorize the dates; thus, there are extra lessons outside of school hours. These are called “variatives”, where our interviewee stops at each topic separately and breaks it down for separate lessons if needed. This shows that comprehension is important, but fact-memorization is used in line with the new requirement by some teachers.

The critical thinking element has been considered insufficient by the society representative. The interviews contained questions about the interviewee's experiences at school, and one of the youngest interviewees — a famous Kazakhstani blogger and influencer, the society representative in our research, described it negatively. He needed more discussion and the method that Interviewee 8 uses in his classes — forgetting about narratives and helping the students formulate their own opinions about historical events. Insufficiency in critical thinking can also be seen in the teaching experience of Interviewee 8. They say that some students who come to the university history lectures do not understand history because most of them have been exposed to “patriotic and nationalist narratives”. Interviewee 8, the history professor, tries to explain in his courses that every history work is written with the cultural background influences and emotions. Some students genuinely believe in the glorious Kazakh khanate, which could be questioned. However, despite the demand for discussion sessions and critically assessing the past to build a decent future, Interviewee 9, a local school teacher, thinks that the Soviet method of teaching is the most effective and short enumeration of facts is enough for the non-advanced school students. Plus, they think that children who will not study history after school do not need to develop their own opinion about historical events, and they prefer to pay attention to those students who put an effort to find and critically evaluate the historical facts, while other students are better off with a constation of facts on the lecture type lessons.

How is the state involved in writing history textbooks? Is there any censorship or standard?

The state approves a special program and assigns authors to create textbooks based on the standard program. While authors have some freedom, they must follow a predetermined chronological order fixed by the state, as Interviewee 1 states. For instance, this includes sections

on territory, location, ethnic composition, political history, social structure, economy, and culture of the Turkic Khaganate. The program cannot be changed, but authors can alter individual paragraphs. This structure is designed to ensure consistency in the content and organization of the textbooks. While this approach may limit the creativity of the authors, it also helps to ensure that the textbooks are comprehensive and cover all necessary topics.

The state standard and framework for history textbooks are heavily influenced by the post-Soviet canon established in the 1990s. The academic history of Kazakhstan has been written and rewritten over the years, with several attempts at producing extensive volumes. The latest effort to write a new academic history was announced by President Tokayev in 2021 (President, 2021) and is expected to be completed by the middle of 2023 (Vaal, 2022). One of the central changes is the presentation of the history of medieval Kazakhstan, which will now be presented in multiple volumes instead of one (President, 2021). Despite the changes, there are still limitations on the content that can be included in history textbooks, and Interviewee 10 suggests that more freedom is needed to write more diverse and nuanced history.

There was an argument touched by Interviewee 8 every government uses history as a tool to control students' perception of the state, to justify or support the ideological agenda they have at that moment. Even democratic countries like the United States do this consistently. This is a professional issue not only for the people that learn history, but also for historians who try to get to the bottom of the truth and share their knowledge. Interviewee 8 says, "Politicians are not historians. They abuse history. They use it like a grab bag, taking what is suitable. They do not look at it as a whole." Interviewee 6 gave an example of the political structure of the Khanate. Interviewee states they noticed that students often come to their university classes with the idea that the political system was centralized at the time, meaning that one khan succeeded the other. However, they claim that in actuality, it was the opposite, and there could be several khans at one period as the system was quite decentralized. However, they also mentioned that these narratives mainly come from Western sources. The interviewee believes this does not give full credit to the diversity of the political system. However, there are understandable reasons why it is narrated accordingly since people like Putin question certain countries' statehood. Interviewee 8 also gave an example of state involvement in the historical education of Kazakhstani people other than school programs. The national museum in Astana has outstanding discoveries about the Saka

people. The guides try to portray these people as Kazakhs, saying that their DNAs demonstrate their relation to the Kazakh nation, and they reconstruct their faces and their signs of being Kazakh. However, Saka people are Iranian stockholders who have migrated to Central Asia as the interviewee, the history professor, states.

State and national identity

Many of the interviewees stated that history is used to raise national identity. Many interviewees highlighted that Kazakh people were discriminated against and that in the USSR, it was supposed to show that Kazakhs were brought civilization. The findings like Altyn Adam, which can make people proud, are added to the books to raise patriotic feelings, as Interviewee 4 says. Moreover, Interviewee 5 highlights that the figures that fought for the freedom of the Kazakh people, the historical events, the Khans, and the Saka civilization make them proud of their culture. Interviewee 8 underlined that this era is the age of the nation-state, and people usually encounter it studying Kazakhstan's history. They gave an example of Kenesary Khan, who is believed to be a hero fighting for the freedom of the Kazakh people, when in fact, his idea was that the state was a heritage from his grandfather, Ablay. The non-local professor (Interviewee 6) also claims that it is not about Kazakhstan but other countries too, especially with compulsory schooling, which makes it a common practice to use narration as a tool of national identity.

However, these narratives are not always successful in raising national identity and pride. If this is the goal of the narratives, Interviewees 7 (influencer) and 8 (professor) think that the goal has yet to be achieved since the independence of Kazakhstan. Interviewee 7 claims that he is not proud of his country after learning history at school that Kazakhs killed a number of people during the wars. However, Interviewee 10 shows their frustration and says there is nothing about national identity or raising patriotism in history textbooks. In their opinion, rather than instilling pride in students, the education system supports myths and does not always fulfill the demand in learning of students. Instead, it provides a state standard inherited from the Soviet era. Interviewee 10 argues that this approach leads to ignorance for history and skepticism among students. Furthermore, the interviewee notes many textbook mistakes, including Soviet errors, and that important details are often omitted.

4.2. The societal perception of history narrative by State

4.2.1. STATA analysis on social perspective: *dependent and independent variables*

We conducted a survey on the perception of history education among almost 200 individuals in Kazakhstan. It mainly comprises individuals aged 18-25, whom we consider the young generation of Kazakhstan. The survey was conducted by using the Qualtrics website, and then, to analyze the social perception of the state narrative of history, we used the STATA program and ran regression models to test our hypotheses. Each part of this chapter includes hypotheses, and the regression analysis ran for each independent variable like the type of school, occupation type, and education level.

The hypothesis:

1. The higher the education level, the less trust in the state narrative because the government suits the “flawed democracy” type and might be subjective on its sources, whilst people with high education seek objectivity due to critical thinking skills.

Logistic regression 1

Table 1

school_narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
bachelors	.679	.44	1.54	.122	-.183	1.541	
masters	-.071	.654	-0.11	.913	-1.354	1.211	
phd	1.91	1.069	1.79	.074	-.186	4.005	*
other_educ	-.393	.833	-0.47	.637	-2.025	1.239	

Constant	-1.91	.379	-5.04	0	-2.652	-1.167	***
----------	-------	------	-------	---	--------	--------	-----

The survey has been done to analyze our hypothesis or predicted answers to our research question. Specifically, this hypothesis is tested by the question “Whose history narration do you trust more?” in the survey with the four multiple choice answers of “school textbook”, “independent media”, “other” and “hard to answer”. Then, these answers were analyzed by the STATA program and given here as a table above.

To analyze the given hypothesis, four logit regressions have been done to test it. Firstly, education types were categorized into bachelor’s, master’s, PhD and other education types (college, course etc.) and dummy variables were created for each category to analyze them individually. The school narrative of history represents a narrative of the state, and it was regressed using these four categories of education. As can be seen from Table 1, four categories of education do not have a relationship with state history narrative at school.

Logistic regression 2 Table

2

indep_m e dia_narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
bachelor s	2.007	.553	3.63	0	.923	3.091	***
masters	1.841	.641	2.87	.004	.585	3.097	***
phd	0	
other_ed u c	1.17	.757	1.55	.122	-.313	2.653	

Constant	-2.674	.517	-5.17	0	-3.687	-1.661	***
----------	--------	------	-------	---	--------	--------	-----

Next, we tested the relationship between trust in independent media and education level (bachelor's, master's, PhD and "others"). As can be seen from Table 2, bachelor's and master's have a positive relationship with trust in independent media. The p-value for a bachelor's is 0, which shows its statistical significance, and for one unit increase in a bachelor's, the log odds of independent media increase by 2.007. The p-value for masters is 0.004, and for one unit increase in masters, the log odds of independent media increase by 1.841. Here, PhD is omitted. This might be because bachelor's and master's are progressing variables, showing a positive correlation with independent media.

We also tested whether other narratives than independent media and school narratives can be affected by education level. As a result, people who do not have bachelor's, master's and PhD but have other education levels think that other narratives can be trusted. The p-value for this is 0.025, and for one unit increase in other education levels, the log odds of independent media increase by 1.755, which is about two times (see Appendix B). Moreover, we regressed the "hard to answer" choice for the question, "Whose history narration do you trust more?". It can be concluded that bachelor's degrees and masters trust independent media, but our hypothesis is rejected since no significant relationship with state narrative was found.

2. *Advanced schools (NIS, KTL, gymnasium, RFMS) have less trust in the state narrative of history than ordinary schools because these schools are oriented towards critical thinking and have more qualified teachers to develop those skills*

The regression results have shown that there is a significant relationship in aspects of these variables. The regression results are insignificant regarding the relationship between NIS and other school categories, mostly including advanced school students like KTL. However, with a p-value of 0.005, public school graduates and a p-value of 0.016, gymnasium students have shown a positive significant relationship to trust in textbook narration (Table 1).

Table 1

school_narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
nis	.159	.942	0.17	.866	-1.687	2.005	
public_school	1.787	.636	2.81	.005	.54	3.034	***
o	0	
gymnasium	1.735	.721	2.41	.016	.322	3.147	**
other_school	1.293	.87	1.49	.138	-.413	2.999	
Constant	-2.833	.594	-4.77	0	-3.998	-1.669	***

Regarding trust in independent media sources, NIS and public schools have a positive relationship. Interestingly enough, public school representatives have a positive significant relationship regarding trust in both types of resources, whereas, for NIS students, this relationship is significant only with the independent media variable ($p=0.001$, Table 2). It can mean that public school students consume both of the sources and have an equal amount of trust in both narrations.

Table 2

indep_media_narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
nis	1.885	.564	3.34	.001	.78	2.99	***
public_school	1.033	.489	2.11	.035	.074	1.993	**
private_school	2.079	1.479	1.41	.16	-.819	4.978	
gymnasium	.613	.627	0.98	.328	-.615	1.841	
other_school	.901	.717	1.26	.209	-.505	2.307	

Constant	-2.079	.433	-4.80	0	-2.928	-1.231	***
-----------------	--------	------	-------	---	--------	--------	-----

NIS, other school students (almost all from advanced schools), and gymnasium students also have a significant positive relationship with the “other narration” variable. In the box, they included old textbooks, independent historians and research, etc. The responses mainly included independent or fact-checked sources. This means that these students rely more on independent sources.

Regarding who finds it hard to answer, all students except “other school” are positively significant. This can mean that both narrations are more or less equally trustworthy or untrustworthy for these students. This might be because both resources are more or less the same regarding the content or other personal reasons.

The hypothesis is partially accepted. The public school students were found to have a significant relation to textbook narration, while only part of the people who studied in advanced school have shown to any significance in the regression. Plus, gymnasium findings came the opposite of our expectations as their graduates trust textbooks.

3. *Public servants have more trust in the state history narrative than private workers*

Table 1

school_narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
public	.543	.409	1.33	.184	-.258	1.345	
private	.555	.425	1.31	.192	-.278	1.387	
Constant	-1.861	.287	-6.48	0	-2.424	-1.298	***

Table 2

indep_media _narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
public	.263	.381	0.69	.489	-.483	1.01	
private	.926	.368	2.51	.012	.204	1.647	**
Constant	-1.498	.254	-5.90	0	-1.996	-1.001	***

The regression has shown that private sector workers have a positive relationship with trust in independent media narration. It can be seen that with a p-value of 0.012, the relationship is significant compared with the public sector workers who do not have a significant relationship. In this part, private sector workers' answers are insignificant. However, the public sector workers answered that it is hard to answer. The p-value shows that public sector workers might have some hesitations in answering this question. To the choice of "other", the answers of public and private sector workers showed insignificant results (see Appendix B).

The hypothesis is partially accepted. The hesitation of public workers' answers could mean that they could not decide what narrative to trust. It is possible that they can trust both state and independent sources more and the lack of significance in the private sector workers' responses led us to this conclusion.

4.2.2. Control variables

Urban-rural residence

The STATA results have shown that adding the residence variable into regression makes all the independent variables insignificant. It can be seen above that certain independent variables have a significant relationship with the dependent variables in the regression. However, when urban and rural residences are added along with the independent variables, all previously significant explanatory variables become insignificant. However, the urban and rural variables are significantly positively related to textbook narrative trust and "hard to answer" when put in the

regression with the highest education levels. When put in the regression with school and occupation types, they are significantly positively connected with independent media trust and “hard to answer”. In occupation regression, only urban citizenship significantly positively relates to the school narrative (see Appendix B, Table 7-18). It shows that urban-rural residence can also relate to the research's dependent variables in certain contexts and is more important than the previous independent variables.

Language of Instruction

Including the language of instruction (Kazakh, Russian, English and Uyghur) as a control variable in the regression analysis revealed interesting findings. The Kazakh language appeared to have a greater impact on the relationship between the state narrative and other independent variables compared to the influence of public schools as an independent variable. Additionally, the Kazakh language was found to play an important role in the relationship between school narrative and the hard-to-answer choice, especially when analyzed in the context of different education levels. When occupation levels were analyzed with the language of instruction as a control variable, the Kazakh and Russian languages were statistically significant (see Appendix B, Table 19-30). This finding suggests that instructors who teach the history of Kazakhstan in Kazakh and Russian may be more effective in cultivating a sense of trust, cultural identity, and historical connection among their students.

Chapter 5. Discussion

The research has shown that the state is putting more emphasis on the history of Kazakhstan compared to the Soviet era. Through the interviews, it could be understood that Kazakh people were oppressed during the USSR, and to oppress their national identities, history was also used by the Soviet government. This can also be explained by Kattabekova and Nurmanova's (2021) argument. They say that during the Soviet era, history education in schools of the Kazakh SSR underwent significant changes. Kazakhstan's history program was extensively politicized and aimed toward supporting Soviet ideology and the Soviet government. Kazakhstan's education system was centered on Russian-language schools during the late 1930s of Soviet control, with little attention paid to Kazakh history and culture (Kattabekova and Nurmanova, 2021). In other words, the ideology prevailed in the system, and people who disobeyed it were often discriminated against, for example, Olzhas Suleimenov and Yermukhan Bekmukhanov. However, today the opposite is taking place. It can be seen that history is raising more events, figures, and historical facts that have left footprints in Kazakhstani history.

The research suggests that history narration and national identity are interrelated and that history can be the tool to construct the national identity. Thus, Gellner's theory on "constructed identity" is seen in education in Kazakhstan. Because the national identity of the Kazakhstani people was oppressed in the past, the state is using history education to construct a new national identity where people are proud of their history. As mentioned by our experts, there are certain events' narration patterns that can make people proud of their background and promote a sense of belonging to our culture. Thus, there is the construction of "nation-building" and at times, even "ethnic" identity. It can be seen that the topics raised in the content of the books cover the events that happened on Kazakhstani territory where Kazakh people are described as heroes. The survey results complement the textbook goals and show that, indeed, history textbooks make a majority of our respondents proud of their history.

However, the research has found several problems in history education. First, critical thinking is insufficient in history education. This could, as a result, lead to issues where students see history one-sidedly, as described by one of the interviewees. The history was presented to the students

from the patriotic point of view previously, and comprehension of the new history content was harder for them to grasp, but it is possible that with the introduction of critical thinking, they would be able to analyze previous information more analytically and understand that events can be narrated in different ways. For instance, it is widely known that Kenesary was the last Khan who saved Kazakh lands from the Russian Empire's invasion and became a hero for us. However, it is also worth mentioning that he was robbing Kazakh people and villages. By this, we do not necessarily want to say that he was a bad or good person but rather acknowledge him as someone who can and has the right to make mistakes. If history were taught in a multifaceted manner, showing and discussing all possible things that might happen at that time, students would have a greater understanding of their past. Thus, we encourage teachers to teach history objectively and impose some critical questions at the end of each lesson.

Moreover, the findings suggest that it is unnecessary for all students, and for those who are not advanced, listing facts can be more useful. However, there is the possibility that allowing students to assess the events critically can increase the involvement and interest of students. Plus, it can also trigger independent research by students not encouraged at school. Through independent research, students can expand their knowledge.

Methods like fact memorization can be discouraging for students. The content of the books has shown to be complex and dry. Memorizing the material that is written in a hard language makes it difficult for the students to understand and memorize the content. Thus they lack the motivation to study. Centering the focus on comprehension can be more helpful as the students study according to their abilities and are encouraged to understand what they learned.

The content has also shown to be not of the highest quality. The authors are given little time to write quality content. This, as a result, leads to minor changes in editions. The authors need more time to research information and think of the content that can be put on the pages. Some of the facts are also false, such as the place where the Orbulak battle took place. Thus, fact-checking is also necessary for the content to be more trustworthy.

The teaching methodologies, the content, and its quality could be the reason behind the lower levels of trust in the school textbooks. It can be seen from the survey that only around 22% surely answer to believe school textbooks, which is quite low as it is less than a quarter of the total responses. It can also be seen that people whose education includes a higher level of critical thinking as NIS and masters students, trust independent media. This could be because independent resources show more alternative narrations and information. Especially in modern history, it can be seen that certain events are censored by the government but can be found in independent media and sources. This could also give the ground for the trust of independent media sources. The research has not examined the relationship between national identity and independent media. However, looking at the content of some bloggers and influencers, it can be seen that they are also centered on posting content that makes people proud of Kazakstani history, such as @unknownkazak (Instagram), which is a popular page with 159 thousand followers. The amount of followers means that people are interested in the content (Kamerdanov and Kamerdanova, n.d.). This can be related to Anderson's theory of "imagined communities", where each blogger and influencer audience is their "imagined community", and the knowledge they share is what constructs the identity of their followers. These communities can intersect as people might be part of different audiences, plus it does not mean that people blindly believe what they read. However, the following can also mean that these people share the values and the narration of the independent media representatives.

It can also be seen that in some of the regressions, control variables were more important than the independent variables of the study. Through different regressions, we found that rural and urban residence is positively correlated with almost all dependent variables in regression except for "other narratives" (see Appendix B). However, the reason behind having a significant relationship with textbooks, independent media narratives and "hard to answer" can be various. Urban citizens are exposed to wider information exchange as there are more sources of information and channels that translate it: forums, people around, media. This can be the reason why people hesitate to answer what narrative they trust more. On the other hand, with the Internet development, even if not all, a lot of rural people have access to different sources of information. Thus, it can also affect the hesitation in the answer. However, it can also lead to the point that independent media sources provide information alternative to the textbooks in the rural

areas that can seem trustworthy, which is what rural and urban citizens believe in. Because in rural places the internet access did not come as rapidly as to the cities and due to the limited amount of population and information sources, the rural citizens still likely consider the textbooks as trustworthy information sources. Whereas, the different information sources urban citizens are exposed may support the textbook narrative and thus they can also appear trustworthy. The findings on control variables also suggest that instructors who teach the history of Kazakhstan in the Kazakh and Russian language may be more effective in cultivating a sense of trust, cultural identity, and historical connection among their students. This can be since these two languages are primarily the first and main communication languages in the country. Thus, the information can be perceived in a more accessible way.

Chapter 6. Conclusion

6.1 Research summary

Education is the main tool in instilling ideology into the next generation's minds, and it is important to encourage objectivity and critical thinking tools and skills in the school program and teaching methods. This research shows that the government always has some intervention in education, such as state standards, that are focused on promoting national identity, and a sense of belonging through history classes. Kazakhstani government, as our research states, sometimes handpicks the historical events that should be included in the school curriculum to upbringing the nation that is proud of its history. However, our study also concludes that not every Kazakhstan citizen is proud due to history classes, and they do not feel attached to the state. However, this does not say they are not proud of their country; rather, school history textbooks did not make them feel this way.

One states that knowing how many wars and deaths were in history cannot make him proud, and the others read and believe the independent media and prefer not mixing the national pride emotions with accurate facts. Nevertheless, many people still believe that the school program gives enough information about the history of Kazakhstan and have mistaken views of Kazakhstan's history, which may cause the rise of national conflicts in the multinational country.

6.2 Practical implications

Our research results can have a broader impact on the education system of Kazakhstan, specifically on history education:

1. **Encourage Critical Thinking:** Critical thinking and objective analysis of historical events should be prioritized in the school program and teaching. Teachers can use various tools and methods to help students develop these skills, such as group discussions, debates, and research projects.
2. **Government Intervention:** It is essential to acknowledge that the government has a role in shaping education, and the national identity and sense of belonging are often promoted through history classes. However, it is important to ensure that historical events are not

cherry-picked to suit a particular agenda or narrative. Education should aim to provide a balanced view of history and encourage students to think critically about the information they are being presented with.

3. **Foster Sense of Belonging:** It is important to foster a sense of belonging among students, but this should not be done at the expense of accuracy or objectivity. Teachers can use various methods to help students feel proud of their country, such as making history classes more engaging and attractive.
4. **Address the Creation of Myths and Usage of Unverifiable Sources:** Addressing these misconceptions about Kazakhstan's history in the school program is crucial. The education system should ensure that accurate information is presented and that students comprehensively understand the country's history. This can help to prevent the rise of national conflicts in the multinational country.
5. **Use Independent Media or other sources:** Using independent media or other sources in education can be an effective way to help students develop a more nuanced understanding of history. Teachers can encourage students to engage with independent media and to think critically about the information they are being presented with.

6.3 Limitations of study

1. Expand the scope of the research and research should be expanded to analyze **the degree of trust:** The current study has focused on analyzing whether state narrative and independent media have a significant relationship with societal trust but does not include the level of trust. For instance, the person can trust both the media and the state or trust the state more than the media.
2. **Increase the sample of the survey (scope):** It would be beneficial to increase the diversity of the sample to ensure that the findings are more representative of the population as a whole. More cities/ more males/ selection bias
3. The current study has included **limited interviews** with independent media representatives. By increasing the number of interviews, obtain a more diverse range of

perspectives on the topic. This can help to provide a more balanced view of the media's role in shaping Kazakhstan's national identity.

6.4 Suggestions for further research/or policy recommendation

Due to the research findings and their analysis, the following further recommendations can be made:

1. *Creating a dialogue between the state and the academic community is essential for this to occur.* The two parties must work towards the same direction and establish standards on content and teaching methods. Academics must focus on sources that objectively look at Kazakhstan's history and culture and for the state to recognise and support the importance of such narrative and ensure the idea of belonging is present.
2. *Use an objective narrative and work on people's trust.* As it can be seen through our findings, the narration of certain events is not objective. This can, as a result, cause less trust among the people. Thus, providing objective or different perspectives on the events and letting people make their own decisions can increase trust in line with the critical thinking mentioned above.
3. *As a result, this can help modify a publishing system for books.* The publishing system is problematic since the content is written in short periods and is not properly fact-checked. Thus, due to the dialogue, the authors should be given more time to compose the textbook content with significant changes in editions, where the events and information are accurate.
4. *Thus, the selection of accurate sources is crucial.* It is essential to emphasize important inscriptions such as Tonykok, Bilte Kagan, the era of the Karakhans and Kultegin, and use the primary sources in the learning processes. This can also help to increase the trust and appreciation of history as people will learn not from the adaptations of the sources but interact with them directly.

Regarding further research, the reason behind the control variables' relation to the dependent variables should be explored more. It can be seen that our research has found the relationship between these variables, but is not able to explain their relationship through our findings. Thus,

adding more questions in interviews and survey could give more perspective on the significance of their relationship.

References

- Alesina, A., Reich, B. & Riboni, A. (2020) Nation-building, nationalism, and wars. *J Econ Growth* 25, 381–430 . <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10887-020-09182-7>
- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso Editions and NLB.
- Boyadjieva P., Ilieva-Trichkova, P. (2015) Higher Education and Social Trust: A European Comparative Perspective. 153-187. *International Perspectives on Education and Society*
- Burkhanov, A., & Sharipova, D. (2014). Kazakhstan’s Civic-National Identity. *Nationalism and identity construction in Central Asia: dimensions, dynamics, and directions*, 21-39.
- Ersayin, N. <https://www.tiktok.com/@nurqojadua>
- Fauve, A. (2015). A tale of two statues in Astana: the fuzzy process of nationalistic city making. *Nationalities papers*, 43(3), 383-398.
- Fierman, W. (2012). Russian in post-Soviet Central Asia: A comparison with the states of the Baltic and South Caucasus. *Europe-Asia Studies*, 64(6), 1077-1100.
- Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hardwick, S. W., Marcus, R., & Isaak, M. (2010). Education and national identity in a comparative context. *National Identities*, 12(3), 253-268.
- Isaacs, R. (2015). Nomads, warriors and bureaucrats: nation-building and film in post-Soviet Kazakhstan. *Nationalities Papers*, 43(3), 399-416.
- Kamerdanov, D., & Kamerdanova, A. [@unknownkazak]. (n.d.). *Posts* [Instagram profile]. Instagram. Retrieved April 14, 2023, from <https://www.instagram.com/unknownkazak/>
- Kattabekova N. and Nurmanova Sh. (2021). FORMATION OF THE ALPHABETIC SYSTEM IN THE HISTORY OF KAZAKH WRITING. *Iasaýı ýnıversitetiniń habarshısy*, 4(122), 184-196.
- Kissane , C. (2006). History education in transit: Where to for Kazakhstan? *Comparative Education*, 41(1), 45–69. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050060500073249>
- Korostelina, K. (2008). History education and Social Identity. *Identity*, 8(1), 25–45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15283480701787327>
- Korostelina, K. (2011). Shaping unpredictable past: National identity and history education in Ukraine. *National Identities*, 13(1), 1-16. doi: 10.1080/14608944.2010.508817
- Kymlicka, W. (2017). Liberal Multiculturalism as a Political Theory of State–Minority Relations. *Political Theory*, 46(1), 81–91. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0090591717696021>
- Kudaibergenova, D. T. (2017). *Rewriting the nation in modern Kazakh literature: Elites and narratives*. Lexington Books.
- Lall, M. (2008). Educate to hate: The use of education in the creation of antagonistic national identities in India and Pakistan. *Compare*, 38(1), 103-119.
- Omarbekov et. al. “Қазақстан тарихы (Орта ғасырлар). Әдістемелік нұсқау. Жалпы білім беретін мектептің 6-сынып мұғалімдеріне арналған құрал”, 127 p. Retrieved from: <https://mektep.kz/userfiles/8de59cab48f6759b5a8c45e5ad1001e5.pdf>
- President. (2021, January 5). *Тәуелсіздік бәрінен қымбат*. Егемен Қазақстан – Egemen Qazaqstan. Retrieved April 13, 2023, from <https://egemen.kz/article/260146-tauelsizdik-barinen-qymbat>
- Sabitov, Z. 2023, “Исторические мифы. Откуда они берутся и что с ними делать | Жаксылық Сабитов | TEDxAstana” <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MnvrZk7dxQk>

- Seitkazyev Ruslan, Zhuzey Myrzakhmet, Smankulova Zhanat, Abdugulova Baglan, Kassymov Madiyar, Bissenbayeva Zhanat. (2020) Modern Trends Of School Historical Education Development In The Republic Of Kazakhstan--Palarch's Journal Of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology 17(3), 781-789. ISSN 1567-214x
- Sharipova, D. (2020). Perceptions of national identity in Kazakhstan: Pride, language, and religion. *The Muslim World*, 110(1), 89-106.
- Yakavets, N. (2014). Reforming society through education for gifted children: The case of Kazakhstan. *Research Papers in Education*, 29(5), 513-533.
- Yeskarauly, B. (2014) Implications of inclusive nation-building policies in Kazakhstan: Young Kazakh adults' national identity. *University of Leicester*. (pp. 14–16)
- Vickers, E., & Kan, F. (2005). The Re-education of Hong Kong: Identity, Politics, and History Education in Colonial and Postcolonial Hong Kong. In *History education and National Identity in East Asia* (pp. 171–202). Routledge.
- Vaal, T. (2022, June 16). Tokayev will participate in writing a new academic history of Kazakhstan. *Vlast*. Retrieved April 13, 2023, from <https://ainews.kz/culture/tokaev-budet-uchastvovat-v-napisanii-novoj-akademicheskoy-istorii-kazahstana--3846883>

Appendix A

Interview questions English version

1. Hello! Thank you for participating in our interview. Don't you mind if we record the interview?
2. We are students from Nazarbayev University working on a master's thesis on "*Kazakhstani history narratives from the state perspective and its societal perception*". We are researching how history textbooks shape your perception of Kazakhstan's history.
3. Can you briefly talk about yourself? What do you do?
4. Where do you collect information from your sources?
5. How do you feel about history education in schools?
6. What is your own experience of learning the history of Kazakhstan? How did teachers deliver the material? What was the narrative of the books you were taught?
7. As an independent source, Do you see any disparities in the independent sources and Kazakhstani state books?
8. If yes, what is your attitude towards these differences in the narration? What is your attitude towards government policy regarding history education in schools? Is there anything you would like to change?
9. Whose narrative do you trust more?
10. Do you notice any disagreements with the state narrative in society? For example, your family, your followers, etc.
11. If yes, can you state what they disagree with?
12. How do you think, does the perception of history differ among young and older people? If yes, how exactly and why?
13. What factors can influence the differences in perception?
14. To what extent is young people's power to bring policy changes to learning history?
15. Thank you very much for the interview!

In Russian

1. Здравствуйте! Спасибо что согласились участвовать в нашем интервью. Мы студентки Назарбаев Университета и пишем проект на тему *«Казахстанские исторические повествования с точки зрения государства и их общественного восприятия»*. То есть как государство транслирует историю казахстана и совпадает ли оно с тем как люди ее понимают. Есть официальный нарратив истории государства, и момент как сами люди воспринимают. Мы хотим узнать переключаются ли они? Например, люди могут верить в мифы.
2. Можете пожалуйста кратко рассказать о себе и о том чем вы занимаетесь?
3. Для начала мы бы хотели спросить ваше мнение о школьном образовании, можете рассказать о своем опыте? Какие методы использовали ваши преподаватели и ваше мнение о содержании учебников?
4. Как вы считаете правильно ли преподается история в школах в плане методологии?
5. А как насчет контента?
6. Какие главные события в истории кз со школьной программы вы бы подчеркнули?
7. На сегодняшний день какие вы видите различия между государственной программой обучения истории и независимым СМИ? Какие темы дискуссии по поводу истории кз по вашему актуальны? (Алаш, Абай, Касым хан)
8. Как вы думаете почему такие различия существуют?
9. Связано ли это с политикой прививания национальной идентичности?
10. Во время обучения истории чувствовали ли вы гордость за свою страну и историю?
11. У вас есть контент с историческим контекстом, на какие источники вы больше полагаетесь? Почему? Офиц. публикации, художественная лит.,
12. Большое спасибо за интервью, благодарим за уделенное вами время. Если хотите прочитать нашу работу, мы с удовольствием поделимся с вами после окончания исследования.

In Kazakh

Сәлеметсіз бе! Біздің сұхбатқа қатысуға келіскеніңіз үшін рахмет. Біз Назарбаев университетінің студенттеріміз және *Қазақстан тарихының мемлекет тарапынан баяндалуы мен қоғамның оны қабылдауы*" тақырыбында магистратуралық диссертацияны жазып жатырмыз. Яғни, Мемлекет Қазақстан тарихын қалай баяндайды және ол адамдардың оны қалай түсінетініне сәйкес келе ме. Мемлекет тарихының ресми баяндамасы бар және адамдардың өздері қабылдайтыны бар. Біз олардың қайталанатынын білгіміз келеді ме? Мысалы, адамдар мифтерге сене алады.

1. Өзіңіз туралы және немен айналыстаныңыз жайлы айтып кетсеңіз?
2. Әрмен қарай, сізден мектептегі білім туралы пікіріңізді сұрағымыз келеді, өз тәжірибеңіз туралы айта аласыз ба? Сіздің кезіңізде оқытушыларыңыз қандай әдістерді қолданды және оқулықтардың мазмұны туралы не айта аласыз?
3. Сіздің ойыңызша мектептерде тарих әдіснамасы бойынша дұрыс оқытыла ма?
4. Ал сабақтың мазмұны туралы не айта аласыз?
5. Мектеп бағдарламасынан балалардың есінде қалатын Қазақстан тарихындағы қандай басты оқиғаларды атап өтер едіңіз?
6. *Сіз өзіңіз тарихты баяндағанда қандай әдіснаманы қолданасыз және жөн санайсыз?*
7. Бүгінгі таңда мемлекеттік Тарихты оқыту бағдарламасы мен тәуелсіз БАҚ- тың тарихты баяндауында қандай айырмашылықтарды байқайсыз ба? Сіздің пікіріңізше Қазақстан тарихы туралы бүгінгі пікірталаста қандай өзекті тақырыптар қозғалуда? (Алаш, Абай, Қасым хан жайлы)
8. Неліктен мұндай айырмашылықтар бар деп ойлайсыз?
9. Қазіргі таңдағы Алаш бейнесіне келсек, сіздің ойыңызша, тарих кітаптарындағы Алаш бейнесі мен ел аузындағы Алаш бейнесінде айырмашылық бар ма?
10. Сонымен қатар, Алаш өкілдері зиялы қауым, ұлтшыл болып көрсетілгеніменен, олардың арасында екіге бөлінушілік; кейбіру қазақ қазақ деп, тілімізді

тарихымызды сақтауға ұмтылса, екіншісі орысша білім алуға тырысып, орыстілділікті білімпаздыққа теңеген болатын. Осындай шындық қаншалықты тарих кітаптарында көрсетілген? Неге кейбірі жасырылынып, кейбір ақпарат күшейтіліп көрсетіледі?

11. Мемлекеттің тарихты осылай баяндауы ұлттық бірегейлік саясатымен немесе басқаша айтқанда *national identity politics*-пен байланысты ма?

12. Тарихты оқыту және оқу барысында сіз өз еліңіз бен тарихыңыз үшін мақтаныш сезімін сезіндіңіз бе?

Сұхбат үшін көп рахмет, уақыт бөлгеніңіз үшін рахмет. Егер сіз біздің жұмысымызды оқығыңыз келсе, зерттеу аяқталғаннан кейін біз сізбен бөлісуге қуаныштымыз.

Appendix B

STATA results

Table 1

other_narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
bachelors	.919	.661	1.39	.165	-.377	2.215	
masters	1.256	.766	1.64	.101	-.244	2.757	
phd	1.88	1.298	1.45	.147	-.663	4.423	
other_educ	1.755	.78	2.25	.025	.225	3.285	**
Constant	-2.979	.592	-5.03	0	-4.139	-1.819	***

Table 2

hard_narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
bachelor	.987	.413	2.39	.017	.178	1.796	**

hard_narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
s							
masters	1.342	.507	2.65	.008	.349	2.336	***
phd	.674	1.21	0.56	.577	-1.696	3.045	
other_educ	1.405	.564	2.49	.013	.3	2.511	**
Constant	-1.773	.361	-4.92	0	-2.48	-1.066	***

Table 3

other_narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
nis	2.322	1.121	2.07	.038	.124	4.519	**
public_school	1.88	1.059	1.78	.076	-.196	3.955	*
o	0	
gymnasium	2.284	1.121	2.04	.042	.087	4.48	**
other_school	3.095	1.141	2.71	.007	.858	5.331	***
Constant	-3.97	1.009	-3.93	0	-5.949	-1.992	***

Table 4

hard_narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
nis	1.784	.646	2.76	.006	.517	3.05	***
public_school	1.95	.56	3.48	0	.853	3.048	***
private_school	2.526	1.507	1.68	.094	-.427	5.479	*
gymnasium	2.146	.632	3.40	.001	.907	3.385	***
other_school	1.347	.773	1.74	.081	-.167	2.861	*
Constant	-2.526	.52	-4.86	0	-3.544	-1.507	***

Table 5

other_narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
public	.548	.488	1.12	.261	-.408	1.505	
private	.466	.515	0.90	.366	-.544	1.476	
Constant	-2.357	.349	-6.76	0	-3.04	-1.673	***

Table 6

hard_narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
public	.945	.341	2.78	.005	.278	1.613	***
private	.365	.373	0.98	.328	-.367	1.096	
Constant	-1.316	.24	-5.48	0	-1.786	-.845	***

*Control variables***Table 7****Logistic regression**

school_narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
bachelors	-.396	.506	-0.78	.433	-1.388	.595	
masters	-1.111	.707	-1.57	.116	-2.496	.273	
phd	.792	1.104	0.72	.473	-1.371	2.955	
other_educ	-1.396	.875	-1.60	.111	-3.11	.319	
rural	2.471	1.199	2.06	.039	.122	4.821	**
urban	2.85	1.109	2.57	.01	.675	5.024	**
Constant	-3.642	1.013	-3.60	0	-5.627	-1.657	***

Mean dependent var	0.178	SD dependent var	0.383
Pseudo r-squared	0.081	Number of obs	236
Chi-square	17.844	Prob > chi2	0.007
Akaike crit. (AIC)	217.191	Bayesian crit. (BIC)	241.438

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Table 8**Logistic regression**

indep_media_narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
bachelors	1.176	.622	1.89	.059	-.043	2.395	*
masters	1.057	.701	1.51	.131	-.316	2.431	
o	0	

other_educ	.415	.808	0.51	.607	-1.168	1.998	
rural	1.705	1.214	1.40	.16	-.674	4.084	
urban	2.011	1.129	1.78	.075	-.201	4.223	*
Constant	-3.818	1.021	-3.74	0	-5.819	-1.818	***
Mean dependent var		0.246	SD dependent var			0.431	
Pseudo r-squared		0.096	Number of obs			232	
Chi-square		24.928	Prob > chi2			0.000	
Akaike crit. (AIC)		245.775	Bayesian crit. (BIC)			266.455	

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Table 9

Logistic regression

hard_narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
bachelors	-.007	.483	-0.01	.989	-.953	.939	
masters	.53	.575	0.92	.356	-.596	1.657	
phd	-.205	1.24	-0.17	.869	-2.636	2.226	
other_educ	.634	.629	1.01	.313	-.598	1.867	
rural	3.738	1.135	3.29	.001	1.513	5.963	***
urban	2.892	1.084	2.67	.008	.767	5.017	***
Constant	-3.785	1.016	-3.73	0	-5.776	-1.794	***
Mean dependent var		0.288	SD dependent var			0.454	
Pseudo r-squared		0.104	Number of obs			236	
Chi-square		29.381	Prob > chi2			0.000	
Akaike crit. (AIC)		268.043	Bayesian crit. (BIC)			292.290	

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Table 10

Logistic regression

other_narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
bachelors	-.229	.692	-0.33	.741	-1.586	1.128	
masters	.11	.798	0.14	.89	-1.454	1.675	
phd	.634	1.317	0.48	.63	-1.948	3.216	
other_educ	.678	.815	0.83	.406	-.92	2.276	
rural	15.214	4447.296	0.00	.997	-8701.327	8731.755	
urban	16.438	4447.296	0.00	.997	-8700.103	8732.978	
Constant	-18.171	4447.296	-0.00	.997	-8734.712	8698.37	
Mean dependent var		0.114	SD dependent var			0.319	
Pseudo r-squared		0.096	Number of obs			236	
Chi-square		16.084	Prob > chi2			0.013	
Akaike crit. (AIC)		165.773	Bayesian crit. (BIC)			190.020	

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Table 11

Logistic regression

school_narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
nis	-.912	1.038	-0.88	.38	-2.946	1.122	
public_school	.729	.77	0.95	.344	-.781	2.238	
gymnasium	.688	.837	0.82	.411	-.953	2.329	

o	0
other_school	.22	.973	0.23	.821	-1.688	2.128	
rural	1.837	1.351	1.36	.174	-.811	4.484	
urban	2.02	1.214	1.66	.096	-.359	4.4	*
Constant	-3.76	1.015	-3.71	0	-5.75	-1.771	***
Mean dependent var	0.179	SD dependent var	0.385				
Pseudo r-squared	0.087	Number of obs	234				
Chi-square	19.229	Prob > chi2	0.004				
Akaike crit. (AIC)	215.019	Bayesian crit. (BIC)	239.206				

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Table 12
Logistic regression

	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
indep_media narr							
nis	.441	.666	0.66	.507	-.864	1.746	
public_school	-.401	.603	-0.66	.506	-1.582	.781	
gymnasium	-.825	.717	-1.15	.25	-2.23	.581	
private_school	.804	1.553	0.52	.605	-2.239	3.847	
other_school	-.552	.799	-0.69	.49	-2.118	1.014	
rural	2.664	1.274	2.09	.037	.166	5.162	**
urban	3.113	1.147	2.71	.007	.864	5.361	***
Constant	-3.692	1.012	-3.65	0	-5.676	-1.708	***
Mean dependent var	0.242	SD dependent var	0.429				
Pseudo r-squared	0.098	Number of obs	236				
Chi-square	25.494	Prob > chi2	0.001				
Akaike crit. (AIC)	251.443	Bayesian crit. (BIC)	279.153				

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Table 13
Logistic regression

	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
hard narr							
nis	.419	.746	0.56	.575	-1.043	1.88	
public_school	.6	.67	0.90	.37	-.713	1.913	
gymnasium	.881	.728	1.21	.226	-.546	2.308	
private_school	.906	1.587	0.57	.568	-2.205	4.016	
other_school	-.015	.859	-0.02	.986	-1.698	1.668	
rural	3.213	1.253	2.56	.01	.757	5.669	**
urban	2.504	1.165	2.15	.032	.22	4.788	**
Constant	-3.764	1.015	-3.71	0	-5.753	-1.776	***
Mean dependent var	0.288	SD dependent var	0.454				
Pseudo r-squared	0.103	Number of obs	236				
Chi-square	29.328	Prob > chi2	0.000				
Akaike crit. (AIC)	270.096	Bayesian crit. (BIC)	297.807				

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Table 14

Logistic regression

other narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
nis	1.03	1.149	0.90	.37	-1.223	3.282	
public_school	.596	1.087	0.55	.583	-1.535	2.728	
gymnasium	.972	1.148	0.85	.397	-1.278	3.221	
o	0
other_school	1.805	1.171	1.54	.123	-.49	4.099	
rural	14.273	4176.314	0.00	.997	-8171.152	8199.698	
urban	15.604	4176.314	0.00	.997	-8169.821	8201.028	
Constant	-18.169	4176.314	-0.00	.997	-8203.594	8167.256	
Mean dependent var		0.115	SD dependent var			0.320	
Pseudo r-squared		0.107	Number of obs			234	
Chi-square		17.987	Prob > chi2			0.006	
Akaike crit. (AIC)		163.382	Bayesian crit. (BIC)			187.569	

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Table 15

Logistic regression

school narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
public	.101	.424	0.24	.811	-.73	.933	
private	.096	.439	0.22	.827	-.765	.957	
rural	2.144	1.18	1.82	.069	-.168	4.456	*
urban	2.361	1.053	2.24	.025	.298	4.424	**
Constant	-3.721	1.013	-3.67	0	-5.706	-1.736	***
Mean dependent var		0.178	SD dependent var			0.383	
Pseudo r-squared		0.053	Number of obs			236	
Chi-square		11.686	Prob > chi2			0.020	
Akaike crit. (AIC)		219.349	Bayesian crit. (BIC)			236.668	

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Table 16

Logistic regression

indep media narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
public	-.234	.397	-0.59	.555	-1.013	.544	
private	.414	.385	1.08	.282	-.34	1.168	
rural	2.435	1.156	2.11	.035	.169	4.701	**
urban	2.792	1.045	2.67	.008	.743	4.84	***
Constant	-3.716	1.013	-3.67	0	-5.7	-1.731	***
Mean dependent var		0.242	SD dependent var			0.429	
Pseudo r-squared		0.083	Number of obs			236	
Chi-square		21.645	Prob > chi2			0.000	
Akaike crit. (AIC)		249.292	Bayesian crit. (BIC)			266.611	

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Table 17**Logistic regression**

hard narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
public	.384	.361	1.06	.287	-.323	1.092	
private	-.218	.392	-0.55	.579	-.986	.551	
rural	3.643	1.119	3.26	.001	1.45	5.836	***
urban	2.925	1.042	2.81	.005	.882	4.968	***
Constant	-3.731	1.013	-3.68	0	-5.716	-1.746	***
Mean dependent var		0.288	SD dependent var			0.454	
Pseudo r-squared		0.103	Number of obs			236	
Chi-square		29.118	Prob > chi2			0.000	
Akaike crit. (AIC)		264.305	Bayesian crit. (BIC)			281.625	

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Table 18

Logistic regression

other narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
public	.088	.499	0.18	.86	-.889	1.065	
private	-.022	.525	-0.04	.966	-1.052	1.007	
rural	14.455	986.306	0.01	.988	-1918.669	1947.579	
urban	15.779	986.305	0.02	.987	-1917.344	1948.902	
Constant	-17.529	986.305	-0.02	.986	-1950.652	1915.593	
Mean dependent var		0.114	SD dependent var			0.319	
Pseudo r-squared		0.081	Number of obs			236	
Chi-square		13.671	Prob > chi2			0.008	
Akaike crit. (AIC)		164.187	Bayesian crit. (BIC)			181.506	

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Table 19

Logistic regression

school narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
bachelors	-.14	.494	-0.28	.778	-1.108	.828	
masters	-.655	.695	-0.94	.346	-2.018	.708	
phd	.793	1.105	0.72	.473	-1.373	2.96	
other_educ	-1.233	.867	-1.42	.155	-2.933	.466	
kazakh	2.242	.671	3.34	.001	.926	3.557	***
russian	2.013	.718	2.80	.005	.606	3.421	***
o	0	
o	0	
Constant	-3.035	.619	-4.90	0	-4.249	-1.821	***
Mean dependent var		0.180	SD dependent var			0.385	
Pseudo r-squared		0.107	Number of obs			233	
Chi-square		23.551	Prob > chi2			0.001	
Akaike crit. (AIC)		210.300	Bayesian crit. (BIC)			234.457	

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Table 20

Logistic regression

	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
indep media narr							
bachelors	2.181	.588	3.71	0	1.029	3.333	***
masters	1.959	.657	2.98	.003	.672	3.246	***
o	0
other_educ	1.278	.782	1.63	.102	-.255	2.811	.
kazakh	-.45	.406	-1.11	.267	-1.246	.345	.
russian	.006	.458	0.01	.989	-.892	.905	.
o	0
o	0
Constant	-2.576	.53	-4.86	0	-3.614	-1.537	***
Mean dependent var		0.249	SD dependent var			0.433	
Pseudo r-squared		0.087	Number of obs			229	
Chi-square		22.275	Prob > chi2			0.000	
Akaike crit. (AIC)		246.724	Bayesian crit. (BIC)			267.326	

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Table 21
Logistic regression

	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
hard narr							
bachelors	.579	.447	1.30	.195	-.296	1.454	.
masters	1.18	.529	2.23	.026	.142	2.217	**
phd	.071	1.234	0.06	.954	-2.349	2.49	.
other_educ	1.039	.592	1.75	.079	-.122	2.199	*
kazakh	1.066	.413	2.58	.01	.256	1.876	***
russian	.868	.469	1.85	.064	-.051	1.788	*
english	1.946	1.471	1.32	.186	-.937	4.829	.
o	0
Constant	-2.235	.424	-5.28	0	-3.065	-1.405	***
Mean dependent var		0.289	SD dependent var			0.454	
Pseudo r-squared		0.067	Number of obs			235	
Chi-square		18.987	Prob > chi2			0.008	
Akaike crit. (AIC)		279.755	Bayesian crit. (BIC)			307.432	

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Table 22
Logistic regression

	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
other narr							
bachelors	.968	.72	1.34	.179	-.444	2.379	.
masters	1.133	.831	1.36	.173	-.496	2.761	.
phd	1.982	1.364	1.45	.146	-.692	4.655	.
other_educ	1.841	.834	2.21	.027	.206	3.476	**
kazakh	.054	.564	0.10	.924	-1.051	1.159	.
russian	.13	.641	0.20	.839	-1.126	1.386	.
english	2.65	1.53	1.73	.083	-.349	5.649	*
o	0
Constant	-3.134	.65	-4.82	0	-4.408	-1.859	***
Mean dependent var		0.111	SD dependent var			0.314	
Pseudo r-squared		0.053	Number of obs			235	
Chi-square		8.726	Prob > chi2			0.273	

Akaike crit. (AIC)	170.762	Bayesian crit. (BIC)	198.439
--------------------	---------	----------------------	---------

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Table 23
Logistic regression

school narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf Interval]	Sig	
nis	-.273	.991	-0.28	.783	-2.215	1.669	
public_school	.712	.787	0.90	.366	-.831	2.254	
gymnasium	.664	.853	0.78	.436	-1.008	2.336	
o	0	
other_school	.386	.98	0.39	.694	-1.534	2.306	
kazakh	1.631	.78	2.09	.036	.103	3.159	**
russian	1.374	.808	1.70	.089	-.21	2.958	*
o	0	
o	0	
Constant	-3.24	.68	-4.77	0	-4.572	-1.908	***
Mean dependent var		0.182	SD dependent var			0.387	
Pseudo r-squared		0.097	Number of obs			231	
Chi-square		21.190	Prob > chi2			0.002	
Akaike crit. (AIC)		211.863	Bayesian crit. (BIC)			235.959	

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Table 24
Logistic regression

indep media narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf Interval]	Sig	
nis	1.943	.577	3.37	.001	.813	3.073	***
public_school	.986	.606	1.63	.104	-.202	2.175	
gymnasium	.497	.719	0.69	.489	-.911	1.906	
private_school	1.91	1.498	1.28	.202	-1.026	4.845	
other_school	.957	.768	1.25	.213	-.549	2.462	
kazakh	.005	.495	0.01	.991	-.965	.975	
russian	.459	.532	0.86	.388	-.583	1.501	
o	0	
o	0	
Constant	-2.139	.445	-4.81	0	-3.011	-1.267	***
Mean dependent var		0.245	SD dependent var			0.431	
Pseudo r-squared		0.061	Number of obs			233	
Chi-square		15.921	Prob > chi2			0.026	
Akaike crit. (AIC)		259.345	Bayesian crit. (BIC)			286.953	

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Table 25
Logistic regression

hard narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf Interval]	Sig	
nis	1.625	.661	2.46	.014	.329	2.921	**

public_school	1.537	.665	2.31	.021	.234	2.839	**
gymnasium	1.739	.723	2.41	.016	.323	3.156	**
private_school	2.397	1.524	1.57	.116	-.591	5.385	
other_school	1.015	.828	1.23	.22	-.608	2.639	
kazakh	.584	.504	1.16	.247	-.404	1.572	
russian	.456	.546	0.83	.404	-.615	1.527	
english	1.044	1.473	0.71	.478	-1.842	3.931	
o	0	
Constant	-2.625	.533	-4.92	0	-3.67	-1.58	***
Mean dependent var	0.289	SD dependent var	0.454				
Pseudo r-squared	0.080	Number of obs	235				
Chi-square	22.486	Prob > chi2	0.004				
Akaike crit. (AIC)	278.256	Bayesian crit. (BIC)	309.393				

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Table 26
Logistic regression

other narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
nis	2.255	1.139	1.98	.048	.023	4.487	**
public_school	1.828	1.168	1.57	.118	-.461	4.118	
gymnasium	2.339	1.219	1.92	.055	-.051	4.728	*
o	0	
other_school	3.235	1.196	2.70	.007	.89	5.579	***
kazakh	-.186	.649	-0.29	.775	-1.457	1.086	
russian	.164	.743	0.22	.825	-1.291	1.62	
english	1.939	1.516	1.28	.201	-1.032	4.909	
o	0	
Constant	-3.981	1.016	-3.92	0	-5.973	-1.989	***
Mean dependent var	0.112	SD dependent var	0.316				
Pseudo r-squared	0.089	Number of obs	233				
Chi-square	14.583	Prob > chi2	0.042				
Akaike crit. (AIC)	164.434	Bayesian crit. (BIC)	192.043				

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Table 27
Logistic regression

school narr	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
public	-.146	.442	-0.33	.741	-1.012	.72	
private	.086	.46	0.19	.852	-.816	.988	
kazakh	2.219	.655	3.39	.001	.935	3.503	***
russian	1.836	.717	2.56	.01	.431	3.242	**
o	0	
o	0	
Constant	-3.186	.596	-5.34	0	-4.355	-2.018	***
Mean dependent var	0.180	SD dependent var	0.385				
Pseudo r-squared	0.088	Number of obs	233				
Chi-square	19.436	Prob > chi2	0.001				
Akaike crit. (AIC)	210.415	Bayesian crit. (BIC)	227.670				

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Table 28
Logistic regression

	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
indep_media_narr							
public	.286	.418	0.68	.494	-.534	1.105	
private	.978	.405	2.41	.016	.183	1.772	**
kazakh	-.054	.403	-0.13	.893	-.844	.735	
russian	.125	.463	0.27	.787	-.783	1.034	
o	0	
o	0	
Constant	-1.499	.304	-4.93	0	-2.095	-.903	***
Mean dependent var		0.245	SD dependent var			0.431	
Pseudo r-squared		0.030	Number of obs			233	
Chi-square		7.803	Prob > chi2			0.099	
Akaike crit. (AIC)		261.463	Bayesian crit. (BIC)			278.718	

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Table 29
Logistic regression

	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
hard_narr							
public	.559	.372	1.50	.133	-.17	1.289	
private	-.026	.411	-0.06	.949	-.831	.779	
kazakh	1.035	.414	2.50	.012	.224	1.846	**
russian	1.047	.479	2.19	.029	.108	1.987	**
english	1.878	1.491	1.26	.208	-1.044	4.8	
o	0	
Constant	-1.852	.339	-5.46	0	-2.517	-1.187	***
Mean dependent var		0.289	SD dependent var			0.454	
Pseudo r-squared		0.056	Number of obs			235	
Chi-square		15.755	Prob > chi2			0.008	
Akaike crit. (AIC)		278.987	Bayesian crit. (BIC)			299.744	

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Table 30
Logistic regression

	Coef.	St.Err.	t-value	p-value	[95% Conf	Interval]	Sig
other_narr							
public	.43	.536	0.80	.423	-.621	1.481	
private	.038	.597	0.06	.949	-1.133	1.209	
kazakh	.291	.572	0.51	.61	-.829	1.411	
russian	.456	.657	0.69	.488	-.832	1.743	
english	2.483	1.557	1.59	.111	-.568	5.534	
o	0	
Constant	-2.521	.446	-5.65	0	-3.396	-1.646	***
Mean dependent var		0.111	SD dependent var			0.314	
Pseudo r-squared		0.022	Number of obs			235	
Chi-square		3.666	Prob > chi2			0.598	
Akaike crit. (AIC)		171.823	Bayesian crit. (BIC)			192.580	

*** $p < .01$, ** $p < .05$, * $p < .1$

Appendix C

Survey questions and results

Q1 - What is your gender?

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	What is your gender?	1.00	3.00	1.26	0.46	0.21	198

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Female	75.25%	149
2	Male	23.74%	47
3	Non-binary/third gender	1.01%	2
4	Prefer not to say	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	198

Q2 - What is your age group?

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	What is your age group?	1.00	3.00	2.02	0.86	0.74	197

#	Answer	%	Count
1	18-24	36.04%	71
2	25-34	26.40%	52
3	>35	37.56%	74

	Total	100%	197
--	-------	------	-----

Q3 - Occupation type

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	Occupation type	1.00	3.00	2.02	0.80	0.64	197

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Private sector	30.96%	61
2	Public sector	36.04%	71
3	I do not work	32.99%	65
	Total	100%	197

Q4 - Which oblast do you live in?

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	Which oblast do you live in?	1.00	19.00	5.14	4.43	19.60	196

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Astana (city)	40.31%	79
2	Almaty (city)	9.69%	19
3	Shymkent (city)	2.04%	4
4	Abay	1.02%	2
5	Akmola	1.53%	3
6	Aktobe	0.51%	1
7	Almaty oblast	0.51%	1
8	Atyrau	0.00%	0
9	East Kazakhstan	40.82%	80

10	Zhambyl	0.00%	0
11	Zhetisy	0.00%	0
12	West Kazakhstan	0.00%	0
13	Karagandy	0.51%	1
14	Kostanay	0.00%	0
15	Kyzylorda	0.00%	0
16	Mangystau	0.00%	0
17	Pavlodar	0.51%	1
18	North Kazakhstan	1.53%	3
19	Turkestan	1.02%	2
20	Ulytau	0.00%	0
	Total	100%	196

Q5 - What area do you live in?

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	What area do you live in?	1.00	2.00	1.11	0.32	0.10	194

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Urban	88.66%	172
2	Rural	11.34%	22
	Total	100%	194

Q6 - What was your language of instruction at school?

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Kazakh	55.78%	140
2	Russian	30.28%	76
3	English	13.55%	34
4	Other	0.40%	1
	Total	100%	251

Q6_4_TEXT - Другой:

Other - Text
Уйгурский

Q7 - What was your high school type?

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Nazarbayev Intellectual School (NIS)	18.31%	39
2	Public secondary school	51.17%	109
3	Gymnasium	19.72%	42
4	Private school	1.88%	4
5	Other	8.92%	19
	Total	100%	213

Q7_5_TEXT - Другое:

Other - Text
КТЛ
Средняя школа
РФМШ
Специализированная школа-интернат для одаренных детей
Ктл
NSPM (Fizmat)
РФМШ
КТЛ
специализированный лицей
Лицей
КТЛ
КТЛ

Q8 - What is your ethnicity?

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	What is your ethnicity? - Selected Choice	1.00	6.00	1.12	0.64	0.41	197

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Kazakh	94.42%	186
2	Russian	4.06%	8
3	Ukrainian	0.00%	0
4	Tatar	0.00%	0
5	Uzbek	0.00%	0
6	Other	1.52%	3
	Total	100%	197

Q8_6_TEXT - Другое:

Other - Text
Уйгур
Белорус
Турчанка

Q9 - Do historical events in history textbooks make you feel proud of being Kazakhstani?

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	Do historical events in history textbooks make you feel proud of being Kazakhstani?	1.00	3.00	1.60	0.87	0.76	196

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	66.33%	130
2	No	7.65%	15
3	Hard to answer	26.02%	51
	Total	100%	196

Q10 - Please rate your knowledge of high school history:

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	Please rate your knowledge of high	1.00	11.00	6.71	2.44	5.97	198

	school history:						
--	--------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

#	Answer	%	Count
1	I do not remember anything 0	3.03%	6
2	1	4.04%	8
3	2	2.02%	4
4	3	9.60%	19
5	4	10.61%	21
6	5	17.68%	35
7	6	11.62%	23
8	7	15.15%	30
9	8	14.65%	29
10	9	6.06%	12
11	I remember everything 10	5.56%	11
	Total	100%	198

**Q11 - What do you think are the most important periods or significant events in the history of Kazakhstan?
You can choose maximum 3 options**

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Late 15th century – The formation of Kazakh Khanate	21.77%	113
2	Early 17th century – Kazakhs split into three tribal unions	4.24%	22
3	1731-42 – The Khans of the three Zhuzes formally join Russia	7.51%	39
4	Soviet rule – Kazakhstan becomes an autonomous republic of the USSR	9.83%	51
5	Late 1920s-1930s – intensive industrialization and collectivization of agriculture	3.66%	19

6	1931-1933 – Famine	10.02%	52
7	Alash Orda	15.61%	81
8	The Virgin Lands campaign	2.89%	15
9	1991 – Declaration of Independence	24.47%	127
	Total	100%	519

Q12 - Do you think that the state narrative of history is biased?

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	Do you think that the state narrative of history is biased?	1.00	4.00	2.84	0.80	0.65	195

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Definitely not	9.74%	19
2	Probably not	12.31%	24
3	Probably yes	62.05%	121
4	Definitely yes	15.90%	31
	Total	100%	195

Q13 - If yes, to what extent do you think the history narration is biased?

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	If yes, to what extent do you think the history narration is biased?	1.00	3.00	2.20	0.64	0.41	181

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Highly biased	12.71%	23
2	Moderately biased	54.70%	99
3	Mildly biased	32.60%	59
	Total	100%	181

Q14 - Do you read independent media sources like Masa.Media, ProTenge, etc.?

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	Do you read independent media sources like Masa.Media, ProTenge, etc.?	1.00	2.00	1.53	0.50	0.25	196

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes	47.45%	93
2	No	52.55%	103
	Total	100%	196

Q15 - If yes, does their narration of historical events differ from the school curriculum?

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	If yes, does their narration of historical events differ from the school curriculum?	1.00	3.00	1.92	0.64	0.42	142

#	Answer	%	Count
1	Yes, I see a lot of differences	25.35%	36
2	They are slightly different	57.75%	82
3	No, I do not see any differences	16.90%	24
	Total	100%	142

Q16 - Whose history narration do you trust more?

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	Whose history narration do you trust more? - Selected Choice	1.00	4.00	2.62	1.17	1.37	194

#	Answer	%	Count
1	School textbook	21.65%	42
2	Independent media	29.38%	57
3	Other	13.92%	27
4	Hard to answer	35.05%	68
	Total	100%	194

Q16_3_TEXT - Другое:

Other - Text
Mix of both where facts are confirmed multiple times
Научным учебникам, профессорам
Дәлелденген ғылыми жұмыстарға
Academic research and data based on concrete evidence like artifacts or documents

Независимым историкам, зарубежным архивам
Старым школьным учебникам
Никому
Researches of scientists from abroad
Тәуелсіз зерттеушілерге
Трудам различных исследователей истории Казахстана и всего региона
Real historians, scholars in academia
I very much like modern “scholars” such as bloggers or influencers. E. G. Stepeart or unknownkazakh in Instagram. Surprisingly they are able to communicate the historical facts in easy way. Also they post vey interesting not “typical” information that we used to get at schools.
Доверенные источники от ученых/специалистов
Историческим данным, первоисточникам

Q17 - What is your highest education level?

#	Field	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Deviation	Variance	Count
1	What is your highest education level? - Selected Choice	1.00	5.00	2.42	1.09	1.19	198

#	Answer	%	Count
1	School	12.12%	24
2	Bachelor's degree	58.08%	115
3	Masters degree	16.67%	33
4	PhD	2.02%	4
5	Other	11.11%	22
	Total	100%	198

Q17_5_TEXT - Other

Other - Text
Колледж. Средне-специальное
2 высших образования
Средне-специальное
Высшее
Среднее специальное
Колледж
Высшее техническое образование
Finishing masters this year
В процессе бакалавра