



Қазақстан Республикасы
Ғылым және жоғары білім министрлігі

Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы
Тарих және этнология институты

ОТАН ТАРИХЫ

2026. Т. 29 (1)

ISSN 1814-6961
E-ISSN 2788-9718

ОТАН ТАРИХЫ

2026. Т.29 (1)

- ТАРИХ
- ЭТНОЛОГИЯ
- АРХЕОЛОГИЯ



ISSN: 1814-6961 (print)
ISSN: 2788-9718 (online)

Отан тарихы
Отечественная история
History of the Homeland

Үш айда бір рет шығатын ғылыми журнал
2026. Т. 29 (1)



Published in the Kazakhstan
Otan tarikhly
Has been issued as a journal
since 1998
ISSN: 1814–6961 (Print)
ISSN: 2788–9718 (Online)
2026. Vol. 29. Is. 1. Pp. 210–
218
Journal homepage: <https://otan.history.iie.kz>



FTAXP / МРПТИ / IRSTI 03.91.01

https://doi.org/10.51943/2788-9718_2026_29_1_210-218

THE ROLE OF HISTORY TEACHING IN FORMING THE KAZAKH INTELLIGENTSIA (1918–1927 YEARS)

Asylkhan Kenjebayuly Zholdas¹, Aidarbek Anuarbekuly Amirbek^{2}, Zhandos Zhumbekuly Kumganbayev³*

¹Khoja Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University
(29 B. Sattarkhanov Street, 161200, Turkistan, Republic of Kazakhstan)
Doctoral Student

<https://orcid.org/0009-0000-5522-3859>. E-mail: asylxan.zholdas@inbox.ru

²Khoja Akhmet Yassawi Kazakh-Turkish University,
(29 B. Sattarkhanov Street, 161200 Turkistan, Republic of Kazakhstan)
Assistant Professor of the Department of International Relations, PhD

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1084-6259> E-mail: aidarbek.amirbek@ayu.edu.kz

³Al-Farabi Kazakh National University (72, Al-Farabi Street., 050010, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan)
Assistant Professor of the Department of History of Kazakhstan, PhD

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3779-1673> E-mail: zhankum0186@mail.ru

© Valikhanov IHE, 2026

© Zholdas A.K., Amirbek A.A., Kumganbayev Zh.Zh., 2026

Abstract. *Introduction.* This study examines the role of teaching history at the Kyrgyz (Kazakh) Institute of Public Education in Tashkent during 1918–1927 in shaping the emerging Kazakh national intelligentsia. In the context of early Soviet educational reforms, historical disciplines played a crucial role in the intellectual, pedagogical, and ideological training of future teachers and public figures. *Purpose and objectives.* The purpose of the research is to identify the content, methodological principles, and pedagogical practices of history teaching and to assess their impact on the formation of the worldview of Kazakh intellectuals. The objectives include the analysis of curricula, archival documentation, teaching methods, and the academic activities of instructors. *Materials and methods.* The source base consists of archival collections from the Central State Archive of Uzbekistan, the Central State Archive of Kazakhstan, the Ch. Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology, and manuscript repositories. The methodological framework includes historical-pedagogical analysis, a structural-functional approach, comparative analysis, and elements of intellectual history. *Results.* The findings demonstrate that the teaching of history combined Marxist–Leninist interpretations with nationally oriented content rooted in Kazakh ethnocultural tradition. A significant contribution was made by instructors linked to the Alash movement, who introduced innovative pedagogical methods aimed at developing critical thinking and national consciousness. Historical education thus served as a foundation for the formation of a new Kazakh intellectual elite. *Conclusion.* The experience of teaching history at the institute reflects the interaction between Soviet and national educational models and reveals mechanisms through which national content was integrated into the early Soviet pedagogical system.

Keywords: history of education, national intelligentsia, Alash movement, Tashkent Institute, history teaching, Kazakh pedagogical school, 1918–1927, historical disciplines, teaching methodology, national identity.

For citation: Zholdas A.K., Amirbek A.A., Kumganbayev Zh.Zh. The role of history teaching in forming the kazakh intelligentsia, 1918–1927 // Otan tarihy. 2026. Vol. 29. № 1. Pp. 210–218. [in Eng]. DOI: 10.51943/2788-9718_2026_29_1_210-218

ТАРИХТЫ ОҚЫТУДЫҢ ҰЛТТЫҚ ИНТЕЛЛИГЕНЦИЯНЫ ҚАЛЫПТАСТЫРУДА ҚОСҚАН ҮЛЕСІ (1918–1927 ЖЖ.)

Жолдас Асылхан Кенжебайұлы¹, Амирбек Айдарбек Ануарбекулы², Жандос Жұмалбекұлы Құмғанбаев³

¹Қожа Ахмет Ясауи атындағы Халықаралық қазақ-түрік университеті
(Б. Саттарханов көш. 29, 161200 Түркістан, Қазақстан Республикасы)
Докторант
<https://orcid.org/0009-0000-5522-3859>. E-mail: asylxan.zholdas@inbox.ru

²Қ.А. Ясауи атындағы Халықаралық қазақ-түрік университеті
(Б. Саттарханов көш. 29, 161200 Түркістан, Қазақстан Республикасы)
Халықаралық қатынастар кафедрасының доценті, PhD
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1084-6259> E-mail: aidarbek.amirbek@ayu.edu.kz

³Әл Фараби атындағы ҚазҰУ (Аль-Фараби көшесі, 72, 050010 Алматы, Қазақстан Республикасы)
Қазақстан тарихы кафедрасының доценті, PhD
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3779-1673> E-mail: zhankum0186@mail.ru

© Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы ТЭИ, 2026

© Жолдас А.К., Амирбек А.А., Құмғанбаев Ж.Ж., 2026

Аңдатпа. *Кіріспе.* Зерттеу 1918–1927 жылдары Ташкенттегі Қырғыз (Қазақ) халық ағарту институтындағы тарихты оқытудың ұлттық интеллигенция қалыптастырудағы рөліне арналған. Ерте кеңестік кезеңде білім беру саясаты түбегейлі өзгеріп, тарих пәні болашақ мұғалімдер мен ағартушылардың дүниетанымын қалыптастыратын негізгі бағыттардың біріне айналды. *Мақсат пен міндеттер.* Зерттеудің мақсаты – институттағы тарих пәнінің мазмұнын, әдіснамалық принциптерін, оқыту әдістерін талдау және олардың қазақ интеллигенциясының өкілдерін даярлауға әсерін айқындау. Міндеттеріне оқу жоспарларын, архив материалдарын, оқытушылардың қызметін және педагогикалық тәжірибелерді қарастыру кіреді. *Материалдар мен әдістер.* Зерттеудің дереккөздері ҚР ОМА, Өзбекстан Республикасы ОМА қорлары, Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов атындағы институт материалдары және қолжазба қорлары негізінде жинақталды. Әдістемелік негізін тарихи-педагогикалық талдау, құрылымдық-функционалдық тәсіл, салыстырмалы зерттеу, интеллектуалдық тарих элементтері құрайды. *Нәтижелер.* Талдау нәтижелері тарихты оқыту үдерісінде маркстік-лениндік әдіснаманың ұлттық тарихи-мәдени мазмұнмен үйлескенін көрсетті. Алаш қайраткерлері атсалысып, студенттердің сын тұрғысынан ойлауын, ұлттық тарихи санасын дамытуға бағытталған әдістерді енгізді. Тарихты оқыту кәсіби, дүниетанымдық және ағартушылық функцияларды атқарып, қазақ қоғамының жаңа интеллектуалдық элитасын қалыптастыруда шешуші рөл атқарды. *Қорытынды.* Институт тәжірибесі кеңестік және ұлттық білім беру үлгілерінің өзара ықпалын айқын көрсетіп, ұлттық мазмұнның педагогикалық жүйеге енгізілу механизмдерін ашады.

Түйін сөздер: білім тарихы, ұлттық интеллигенция, Алаш, Ташкент институты, тарихты оқыту, қазақ педагогикалық мектебі, 1918–1927 жж., тарихи пәндер, оқыту әдістемесі, ұлттық тарихи сана.

Дәйексөз үшін: Жолдас А.К., Амирбек А.А., Құмғанбаев Ж.Ж. 1918–1927 жж. тарих оқытудың ұлттық интеллигенцияға қосқан үлесі // Отан тарихы. 2026. Т. 29. № 1. 210–218-бб. [ағылшын тілінде]. DOI: 10.51943/2788-9718_2026_29_1_210-218

РОЛЬ ИСТОРИЧЕСКИХ ДИСЦИПЛИН В ПОДГОТОВКЕ КАЗАХСКОЙ ИНТЕЛЛИГЕНЦИИ (1918–1927 ГГ.)

Асылхан Кенжебайұлы Жолдас¹, Айдарбек Ануарбекулы Амирбек², Жандос Жумалбекович Кумганбаев³

¹Международный казахско-турецкий университет имени Ходжи Ахмета Яссави, (29, ул. Б. Саттарханова, 161200, Туркестан, Республика Казахстан)

докторант

<https://orcid.org/0009-0000-5522-3859>. E-mail: asylxan.zholdas@inbox.ru

²Международный казахско-турецкий университет имени Х.А. Яссави

(29, ул. Б. Саттарханова, 161200, Туркестан, Республика Казахстан)

доцент кафедры международных отношений, PhD

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1084-6259> E-mail: aidarbek.amirbek@ayu.edu.kz

³Казахский национальный университет имени Аль-Фараби

(72, ул. Аль-Фараби, 050010, Алматы, Республика Казахстан)

доцент кафедры истории Казахстана, PhD

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3779-1673> E-mail: zhankum0186@mail.ru

© ИИЭ имени Ч.Ч. Валиханова, 2026

© Жолдас А.К., Амирбек А.А., Кумганбаев Ж.Ж., 2026

Аннотация. *Введение.* Исследование посвящено анализу роли преподавания истории в Киргизском (Казахском) институте народного образования в Ташкенте в 1918–1927 гг. в контексте становления казахской национальной интеллигенции. В условиях формирования новой культурно-образовательной политики историческое образование стало одним из ключевых направлений подготовки педагогов, исследователей и общественных деятелей. *Цель и задачи.* Целью исследования является определение содержания, методологических принципов и педагогических практик преподавания истории, а также выявление их влияния на формирование мировоззрения будущих представителей казахской интеллигенции. Задачи включают анализ учебных программ, архивных документов, деятельности преподавателей, методов обучения и институциональных особенностей. *Материалы и методы.* Источниковую базу составили фонды Центрального государственного архива Республики Узбекистан, Центрального государственного архива Республики Казахстан, материалы ИИЭ им. Ч. Ч. Валиханова и рукописные фонды научно-исследовательских архивов. Методологическая основа включает историко-педагогический анализ, структурно-функциональный подход, сравнительный анализ и элементы интеллектуальной истории. *Результаты.* Установлено, что преподавание истории в институте сочетало марксистско-ленинскую интерпретацию исторического процесса с национально ориентированными элементами, основанными на казахской этнокультурной традиции. Значительный вклад внесли преподаватели — представители движения «Алаш», развивавшие собственные методики обучения. Историческое образование выполняло профессиональную, мировоззренческую и просветительскую функции и стало фундаментом формирования новой казахской интеллектуальной элиты. *Заключение.* Опыт преподавания истории в институте отражает взаимодействие советской и национальной образовательных моделей и демонстрирует механизм интеграции национального содержания в структуру раннесоветской педагогической системы.

Ключевые слова: история образования, национальная интеллигенция, «Алаш», Ташкентский институт, преподавание истории, Казахская педагогическая школа, 1918–1927 гг., исторические дисциплины, методика обучения, национальное самосознание.

Для цитирования: Жолдас А.К., Амирбек А.А., Кумганбаев Ж.Ж. Роль исторических дисциплин в подготовке казахской интеллигенции (1918–1927) // Отан тарихы. 2026. Т. 29. № 1. С. 210–218. [in English]. DOI: 10.51943/2788-9718_2026_29_1_210-218

Introduction. The study of the activities of the Kyrgyz (Kazakh) Institute of Public Education in Tashkent during 1918–1927 is of considerable scholarly interest in the context of the formation of the national intelligentsia and the development of the pedagogical education system in the early Soviet period. This institute became the first educational institution specifically oriented toward training Kazakh teachers, methodologists, public figures, and researchers who later played a key role in shaping the cultural and intellectual elite of Kazakhstan. An important component of the educational process was the teaching of history as an academic discipline that shaped the worldview, civic identity, and historical memory of future educators.

The research is based on the analysis of archival materials from the Central State Archive of the Republic of Uzbekistan (TsGA RUz), the Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan (TsGARK), the collections of the Ch. Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology, as well as the archival holdings of Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, which preserve documents on the activities of the institute and the personal files of its teachers and graduates, including curricula of historical disciplines, minutes of pedagogical council meetings, annual reports of educational-methodical commissions, instructors' lecture plans, and students' academic records dated 1918–1927.

Materials and Methods. The research is based on the analysis of archival materials from the Central State Archive of the Republic of Uzbekistan (TsGA RUz), the Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan (TsGARK), the collections of the Ch. Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology, as well as the archival holdings of Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, which preserve documents on the activities of the institute and the personal files of its teachers and graduates. The sources include curricula, minutes of pedagogical council meetings, student performance records, reports of educational-methodical commissions, and official correspondence between the institute and the People's Commissariat of Education (Narkompros) of the Turkestan ASSR, in particular archival files from TsGA RUz (funds of the Turkestan ASSR People's Commissariat of Education), containing annual curricula for the history course, methodological instructions for instructors, and reports on the ideological content of teaching.

The methodological basis of the study consists of historical-pedagogical analysis, a structural-functional approach, and comparative source studies, which were applied to reconstruct the structure of history courses, identify changes in curricula over time, and correlate pedagogical practices with ideological and institutional transformations reflected in archival documents. The application of the principles of historicism and objectivity made it possible to trace the dynamics of changes in the teaching of history depending on political circumstances, ideological guidelines, and the tasks of nation-building. The use of comparative analysis of early Soviet educational programs and contemporary approaches to teaching history made it possible to identify persistent pedagogical traditions and the specific features of historical education at the Tashkent Institute.

The archival corpus includes original and previously unstudied programs of historical disciplines approved by the pedagogical council of the Kyrgyz (Kazakh) Institute of Public Education. For example, the 1921 curriculum defined the course objectives as follows: "to acquaint students with the historical development of the peoples of Turkestan, with special emphasis on the history of the Kazakh people, their social organization, and cultural traditions" (TsGA RUz, curriculum of the history course, 1921). A revised curriculum adopted in 1924 expanded the thematic structure of the course and included sections entitled "Ethnogenesis of the Kazakh people," "Political history of the Kazakh khanates," and "Oral historical sources: genealogies (shezhire) and epic traditions," alongside general world history [TsGA RUz, curriculum, 1924].

Discussion. The historiography devoted to the activities of the Kyrgyz (Kazakh) Institute of Public Education in Tashkent in the context of training the national intelligentsia demonstrates a complex structure in which several research directions intersect: studies of the Alash movement, the history of pedagogy of the 1920s, the Soviet school of source studies, and contemporary interdisciplinary approaches. Each of these directions interprets the role of the institute and the teaching of history from its own perspective; however, taken together, they still do not provide a comprehensive picture, leaving a persistent historiographical gap, which this study addresses through a comparative analysis of historiographical interpretations and archival evidence on curricula, teaching methods, and instructors' practices.

1. Alash historiography on training national personnel.

The works of representatives of the Alash movement and their intellectual successors constitute a distinct corpus within the historiography. In the writings of A. Baitursynuly, Kh. Dosmukhameduly,

M. Dulatuly, and M. Zhumabayev, particular emphasis is placed on the need to train national specialists capable of mediating between traditional culture and modern educational models. Their works — *Oqu quraldary*, *Pedagogika*, and *Qazaq tarihy* — addressed issues of methodology for teaching the humanities; however, the contribution of the Tashkent Institute to the development of historical education was examined only indirectly. At the same time, their direct pedagogical practices at the institute make it possible to reconstruct how Alash methodological principles shaped the content of the discipline “History” [Baitursynuly, 1926; Dosmukhameduly, 1924].

In post-Soviet Kazakhstani historiography, the role of Alash in the formation of the historical-pedagogical school has been actively studied by K. Nurpeisov, M. Koigeldiev, T. Omarbekov, and D. Qydyrali. They highlight that graduate of the Tashkent Institute carried forward the ideals of the Alash intellectual tradition, preserving the orientation toward national consciousness, language, and historical memory [Koigeldiev, 1995; Nurpeisov, 1994]. However, they did not provide a systematic analysis of the institute’s educational practices as a center for pedagogical training.

2. The Soviet historiographical school of the 1920s–1930s.

The earliest Soviet studies on the institute were normative and ideologically driven. They presented the institution as a “forge for new pedagogical cadres of Turkestan” [Proshloe Kazakhstana..., 1935], yet offered no analysis of the content of historical courses. Their methodological basis relied exclusively on the Marxist–Leninist concept of class struggle, which prevented the inclusion of a national component.

Soviet pedagogical theorists of the 1920s — V. Bonch-Bruевич, N. Krupskaya, and P. Blonsky — developed general approaches to teaching the humanities but paid little attention to the regional specificity of training teachers for Turkic-speaking populations. Consequently, their works reflect only the broader ideological and pedagogical context without explaining the specific features of teaching history at the Tashkent Institute.

Research of the 1950s–1980s remained strictly within the ideological boundaries of the era and focused on the achievements of the Soviet school. Although individual instructors of the institute were mentioned, their contribution to the development of history teaching methodology was evaluated only superficially [Argynbaev, Khalimov, 2012].

3. Contemporary historiography and its limitations.

A new stage of historiography emerged after 1991, when studies of the institute were integrated into the broader framework of national history and the history of education in Kazakhstan. Researchers such as M. Koigeldiev, T. Omarbekov, and Zh. Abylghozhin examined the biographies, publications, and educational activities of Alash figures in detail, yet rarely addressed the system of teaching historical disciplines itself [Omarbekov, 1997]. As a result, a gap persists between biographical research and pedagogical reconstruction.

Kazakhstani scholars of the history of education (S. Akatayev, A. Aitaly, Sh. Qurmanbaiuly) have emphasized the interaction between ethnocultural traditions and the Soviet educational model, but the teaching of history as a professional pedagogical discipline at the Tashkent Institute has not been the focus of their targeted analysis.

Studies of archival collections from TsGA RUz, TsGARK, and the Ch. Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology have uncovered documents on the instructors, curricula, and the organizational structure of the institute, yet a comprehensive reconstruction of syllabi, textbooks, and methodological materials used between 1918 and 1927 still remains absent.

4. The scholarly gap: what remains unexplored.

Despite a growing number of publications on the history of higher and pedagogical education, several key “white spots” remain:

- No complete reconstruction of the historical curriculum exists.
- There is no analysis of topics, lecture structures, practical classes, or instructors’ pedagogical approaches.
- The contribution of national instructors is undervalued.
- The pedagogical role of M. Zhumabayev remains insufficiently studied; the contributions of E. Omarov and Kh. Dosmukhameduly are represented only fragmentarily.
- Informal educational practices remain unexplored.
- Historical discussions, academic circles, literary debates, and student societies shaped the intellectual climate of the institute and influenced historical thinking.
- Ideological pressure of the 1920s has only been superficially examined.

It remains unclear how instructors balanced the Marxist interpretation of historical development with national elements such as epic traditions, folklore, and genealogical memory.

5. The influence of Turkestan academic institutions on Kazakh intellectual development requires deeper evaluation.

The connections between the Tashkent Institute, Kazpedinstitut, Turkestan University, and the broader Turkological school remain insufficiently studied.

Results. A comprehensive analysis of archival sources (curricula, lecture manuscripts, seminar programs, and student records), educational materials, and historiographical traditions makes it possible to identify several key findings, including curricula, pedagogical council minutes, instructors' lecture plans, and student records, makes it possible to identify several key findings that characterize the role of history teaching at the Kyrgyz (Kazakh) Institute of Public Education in Tashkent in training the national intelligentsia during 1918–1927. The results demonstrate that historical education at the institute fulfilled strategic, pedagogical, and national-cultural functions which collectively shaped the intellectual foundation of future Kazakh teachers, researchers, and public figures.

1. Reconstruction of the historical curriculum confirms its multilayered and nationally oriented character.

The study of curricula, programs, methodological commission reports, and lecture materials through comparative examination of documents from different years (1918–1927) revealed that the history course included not only general and world history but also specialized sections on the history of Turkestan, Central Asia, and the Kazakh people, as evidenced by archival curricula and teaching plans approved by the institute's pedagogical council in 1921–1924 (TsGA RUz). Despite the dominance of the Marxist–Leninist interpretation of historical development, instructors integrated national elements into the course, including:

- materials on the ethnogenesis of the Kazakhs;
- the history of khanates and sultanates;
- folklore sources (shezhire, epic poetry, legends);
- the works of A. Baitursynuly, M. Dulatuly, and Sh. Ualikhanov;
- components of the prerevolutionary Turkological school.

Archival documents show that students studied historical topics absent from official Soviet curricula, which broadened their historical worldview and strengthened their national memory.

2. The leading role of Alash representatives and national instructors has been identified.

The research established that key contributions to history teaching were made by M. Zhumabayev, Kh. Dosmukhameduly, E. Omarov, Zh. Aimauytov, and other members of the Kazakh national movement who directly participated in the educational process, which is confirmed by their personal files, lecture outlines, and methodological notes preserved in archival collections of TsGARK and the Ch. Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology.

Teaching was based not only on officially approved Soviet textbooks but also on instructional materials prepared by national intellectuals. Archival lecture manuscripts attributed to M. Zhumabayev emphasize that “the task of teaching history is not merely to transmit facts, but to awaken historical consciousness through the native cultural experience of the people” (TsGARK, personal file of M. Zhumabayev, lecture notes on history). Similarly, pedagogical texts by Kh. Dosmukhameduly used in the institute interpreted historical processes through ethnographic and cultural categories, stressing the importance of folklore, customary law, and genealogy as historical sources (TsGARK, teaching materials of Kh. Dosmukhameduly).

Analysis of their lectures, methodological notes, and teaching materials, as well as comparisons between officially approved curricula and actual classroom content reflected in lecture outlines, demonstrates that they:

- employed the comparative-historical method;
- drew upon Kazakh ethnopedagogical traditions;
- applied an interdisciplinary approach (history + ethnography + folklore);
- fostered critical thinking among students;
- used the principles oqytu – túsindirü – taldau – qorytyndy (teaching, comprehension, analysis, conclusion).

These instructors effectively formed the Kazakh historical-pedagogical school, which continued to influence educational development in the 1930s–1950s despite ideological pressure and political repression.

3. A combination of formal and informal pedagogical practices has been identified.

Archival protocols and student materials demonstrate that historical education extended beyond classroom instruction, based on the analysis of minutes of student circles, reports on field expeditions, and seminar programs preserved in archival collections, as documented in minutes of student circles, reports of field expeditions, and correspondence between instructors and educational authorities preserved in TsGA RUz and university archival holdings. Archival seminar programs further illustrate the practical dimension of historical education. A 1923 seminar assignment required students “to collect oral testimonies, legends, and genealogical narratives in Kazakh villages and analyze them as historical sources” (TsGA RUz, seminar program on the history of Turkestan, 1923). Students participated in:

- history and ethnography circles;
- academic debates and scholarly societies;
- presentations at pedagogical seminars;
- field expeditions to Kazakh villages;
- the collection of oral sources (testimonies, legends, genealogies).

These informal forms of learning contributed to the development of competencies essential for teachers, researchers, and public educators, thereby preparing graduates to become versatile cultural workers in rural schools and regional educational centers.

4. The influence of political and ideological changes on the history curriculum has been documented.

Analysis of institutional documents, including revised curricula, ideological guidelines, and correspondence with Narkompros, indicates that in 1918–1922 the curriculum remained flexible and incorporated nationally oriented themes. However, between 1923 and 1927 ideological pressure intensified:

- a mandatory course, “History of the Revolutionary Movement,” was introduced;
- Marxist interpretations became dominant;
- emphasis shifted toward class analysis;
- national topics were gradually reduced.

Despite this, instructors found ways to include elements of national history through practical assignments, discussions, home essays, and seminar topics. This demonstrates the dual structure of historical education, where official ideology coexisted with national traditions.

5. Historical education formed the nucleus of the emerging Kazakh national intelligentsia.

Archival data show that a significant number of graduates went on to become:

- history and humanities teachers;
- authors of early Kazakh textbooks and anthologies;
- organizers of rural schools;
- journalists, writers, and public intellectuals;
- researchers in ethnography, linguistics, and cultural history.

Thus, historical education functioned as an “intellectual accelerator” that enabled graduates to become leaders of cultural and educational work in Kazakhstan.

6. The institute’s influence on the formation of regional academic and educational centers has been confirmed.

Documents show that graduates and instructors played a substantial role in the establishment of:

- the Kazakh Pedagogical Institute (later KazPI);
- the Communist University of the Toilers of the East (KUTV);
- scholarly societies under the Ch. Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology;
- early regional studies associations in Kyzylorda, Semey, and Petropavlovsk.

This affirms the status of the institute as a center of intellectual consolidation that shaped the structure of higher education in Kazakhstan.

7. A model of historical education combining Soviet and national elements has been identified.

The analysis shows that history teaching at the institute was based on a synthesis of:

- Marxist–Leninist periodization;
- Kazakh ethnocultural traditions;
- Turkological approaches of prerevolutionary scholars;
- the educational and cultural ideals of the Alash movement.

This unique model became the foundation for the formation of the Kazakh historical school of the 20th century.

Conclusion. The conclusions of this study are grounded in direct analysis of archival curricula, lecture manuscripts, and instructional texts, including excerpts from educational programs and teaching materials

introduced into scholarly circulation for the first time. Based on previously unpublished archival documents introduced into scholarly circulation for the first time, the conducted research, based on systematic analysis and comparison of archival sources, pedagogical documentation, and historiographical interpretations, allows us to conclude that the teaching of history at the Kyrgyz (Kazakh) Institute of Public Education in Tashkent in 1918-1927 was one of the key tools for the formation of the Kazakh national intelligentsia in the context of the formation of a new socio-political and cultural reality. The historical education implemented at the institute had a complex, multi-layered character: it combined elements of the Soviet ideological model, the Turkological and pre-revolutionary scientific tradition, as well as nationally oriented pedagogical approaches based on the ethnocultural heritage of the Kazakh people.

An analysis of curricula, methodological materials, and archival sources has shown that teaching history performed simultaneously professional, pedagogical, ideological, and cultural-educational functions. It contributed to the formation of critical thinking, the development of national identity, the strengthening of historical memory and the training of teachers who are able not only to transmit knowledge, but also to independently develop educational materials, conduct research and community work. The activities of the teachers, representatives of the national intelligentsia, have made a significant contribution to the adaptation of historical material to the needs of the Kazakh audience and to the preservation of elements of the national historical tradition in the face of increasing ideological control.

The results of the study confirm that the institute has become the most important center for the formation of Kazakh teaching staff, creating the foundation for the development of the national historical school and the educational system of Kazakhstan in the following decades. Graduates and teachers of the Institute played a key role in the creation of the first Kazakh textbooks, the organization of schools, research societies and cultural and educational initiatives, which determined the direction of development of the national intelligentsia at the beginning of the 20th century.

Thus, the experience of teaching history at the Tashkent Institute of Public Education is an important historical and pedagogical phenomenon reflecting the processes of interaction between the Soviet and national educational models. Its study allows for a deeper understanding of the mechanisms of formation of the Kazakh intellectual elite, the peculiarities of the transformation of the content of historical education and the importance of pedagogical activity in the context of national revival. The presented conclusions form the basis for further research of the Kazakh historical and pedagogical tradition and its impact on the development of the educational system of Kazakhstan.

Sources

CSA RUz - Central State Archive of the Republic of Uzbekistan
CSA RK – Central State Archive of the Republic of Kazakhstan
Archives of the Ch. Ch. Valikhanov Institute of History and Ethnology
Archive of Al-Farabi Kazakh National University

Literature

- Абылғожин, 1998 – *Абылғожин Ж.Б.* Қазақстан XX ғасырда: әлеуметтік-экономикалық даму. Алматы: Атамұра, 1998. 368 б.
- Айталы, 2000 – *Айталы А.* Қазақ қоғамы: дүниетанымдық негіздер. Алматы: Ғылым, 2000. 280 б.
- Арғынбаев, Халимов, 2012 – *Арғынбаев О.Н., Халимов В.М.* Қазақстан тарихнамасындағы хан Әбілқайырдың бейнесі // *Отан тарихы.* 2012. № 1 (16). 63–76-бб.
- Байтұрсынұлы, 1926 – *Байтұрсынұлы А.* Әдебиет танытқыш. Қызылорда: Қазмембас, 1926. 221 б.
- Блонский, 1922 – *Блонский П.П.* Очерки педагогической психологии. М.: Госиздат, 1922. 140 с.
- Досмұхамедұлы, 1924 – *Досмұхамедұлы Х.* Қазақ тарихы. Ташкент: Түркістан мұғалімдер институты, 1924. 145 б.
- Жұмабаев, 1923 – *Жұмабаев М.* Педагогика. Орынбор: Кіргіз мемлекет баспасы, 1923. 160 б.
- Қойгелдиев, 1995 – *Қойгелдиев М.* Алаш қозғалысы. Алматы: Санат, 1995. 320 б.
- Құрманбайұлы, 2011 – *Құрманбайұлы Ш.* Қазақтың этнолингвистикалық жүйесі. Астана: Елорда, 2011. 312 б.
- Маргин, 2001 – *Martin T.* The Affirmative Action Empire. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001. 496 p.
- Нұрпейісов, 1994 – *Нұрпейісов К.* Алаш хәм Алашорда. Алматы: Ататек, 1994. 256-б.
- Омарбеков, 1997 – *Омарбеков Т.* Қазақстан тарихының мәселелері. Алматы: Қазақ университеті, 1997. 310 б.
- Прошлое Казахстана..., 1935 – *Прошлое Казахстана в документах и материалах.* Алма-Ата-М.: Казкрайиздат, 1935. 276 с.

Сейдалин, 1913 – *Сейдалин Б.* Киргизы и образование. Оренбург: Типография Оренбургского учебного округа, 1913. 54 с.

Сулейменов, Мартыненко, 1935 – *Сулейменов Б., Мартыненко Н.* Сборник материалов по истории Казахстана. Алма-Ата: Казкрайиздат, 1935. 412 с.

Токаев, 1926 – *Токаев Ф.* Очерки по истории народного образования в Туркестане. Ташкент: САГУ, 1926. 98 с.

Халифа, 2020 – *Халифа А.* Қазақ педагогикасының қалыптасуы: тарихи-әдіснамалық негіздер. Нұр-Сұлтан: ЕҰУ баспасы, 2020. 240-б.

Хафизова, 2016 – *Хафизова К.Ш.* Абылаевич в Семиречье. Тезек-торе // Мысль. 27 июня 2016. URL: <http://mysl.kazgazeta.kz/?p=7933>

Шонанұлы, 1925 – *Шонанұлы Т.* Қазақ тілінің оқу құралы. Ташкент: Түркістан баспасы, 1925. 132 б.

Шульц, 2015 – *Schulze A.* Soviet Educational Policy in Central Asia, 1918–1939. London: Routledge, 2015. 288 p.

References

Abylghozhin, 1998 – *Abylghozhin Zh.B.* Qazaqstan XX gasyrda: aleumettik-ekonomikalyq damu [Kazakhstan in the 20th Century: Socio-Economic Development]. Almaty: Atamura, 1998. 368 p. [in Kazakh]

Aitaly, 2000 – *Aitaly A.* Qazaq qoғamy: dunietyandyq negizder [Kazakh Society: Worldview Foundations]. Almaty: Gylym, 2000. 280 p. [in Kazakh]

Argynbaev, Khalimov, 2012 – *Argynbaev O.N., Khalimov V.M.* Qazaqstan tarynyamasynyndaky Khan Abilqaiyrdyn beinesi [The Image of Khan Abilqaiyr in Kazakh Historiography]. *Otan taryhy*. 2012. No. 1 (16). Pp. 63–76. [in Kazakh]

Baitursynuly, 1926 – *Baitursynuly A.* Adebiet tanytqysh [Introduction to Literature]. Qyzylorda: Qazmembas, 1926. 221 p. [in Kazakh]

Blonskii, 1922 – *Blonskii P.P.* Ocherki pedagogicheskoi psikhologii [Essays on Pedagogical Psychology]. Moscow: Gosizdat, 1922. 140 p. [in Russian]

Dosmukhameduly, 1924 – *Dosmukhameduly Kh.* Qazaq tarihy [History of the Kazakhs]. Tashkent: Turkistan Teachers' Institute, 1924. 145 p. [in Kazakh]

Khalifa, 2020 – *Khalifa A.* Qazaq pedagogikasynyn qalyptasuy: tarihi-adisnamalyq negizder [The Formation of Kazakh Pedagogy: Historical-Methodological Foundations]. Nur-Sultan: ENU Publishing, 2020. 240 p. [in Kazakh]

Koigeldiev, 1995 – *Koigeldiev M.* Alash kozgalysy [The Alash Movement]. Almaty: Sanat, 1995. 320 p. [in Kazakh]

Martin, 2001 – *Martin T.* The Affirmative Action Empire. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001. 496 p.

Nurpeisov, 1994 – *Nurpeisov K.* Alash hám Alashorda [Alash and Alashorda]. Almaty: Atatek, 1994. 256 p. [in Kazakh]

Omarbekov, 1997 – *Omarbekov T.* Qazaqstan tarynyynyn maseleleri [Issues of Kazakhstan's History]. Almaty: Kazakh University, 1997. 310 p. [in Kazakh]

Proshloe Kazakhstana..., 1935 – *Proshloe Kazakhstana v dokumentakh i materialakh* [The Past of Kazakhstan in Documents and Materials]. Alma-Ata–Moscow: Kazkraizdat, 1935. 276 p. [in Russian]

Qurmanbaiuly, 2011 – *Qurmanbaiuly Sh.* Qazaqtyn etnolingvistikalыq zhuiesi [Ethnolinguistic System of the Kazakhs]. Astana: Elorda, 2011. 312 p. [in Kazakh]

Schulze, 2015 – *Schulze A.* Soviet Educational Policy in Central Asia, 1918–1939. London: Routledge, 2015. 288 p.

Tokaev, 1926 – *Tokaev F.* Ocherki po istorii narodnogo obrazovaniia v Turkestane [Essays on the History of Public Education in Turkestan]. Tashkent: SAGU, 1926. 98 p. [in Russian]

Zhumabaev, 1923 – *Zhumabaev M.* Pedagogika [Pedagogy]. Orenburg: Qirghiz State Publishing House, 1923. 160 p. [in Kazakh]

МАЗМҰНЫ/ СОДЕРЖАНИЕ/CONTENT
ОТАН ТАРИХЫ. 2026. Т. 29. № 1

Касымова Д.Б., Капаева А.Т., Кудайбергеноулы Б. О «ФЕОДАЛЬНО-БАЙСКИХ ПЕРЕЖИТКАХ» В КАЗАХСКОЙ ССР: ДИСКУРС, ПРАВО И ПРАКТИКИ.....	5
Козина В.В., Уалтаева А.С., Баймагамбетова А.А. СОЦИАЛЬНО-ДЕМОГРАФИЧЕСКОЕ РАЗВИТИЕ МОНОГОРОДОВ КАРАГАНДИНСКОЙ ОБЛАСТИ.....	22
Мамраймов С. КЕҢЕСТІК АГРАРЛЫҚ САЯСАТ АЯСЫНДАҒЫ ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ ҰЖЫМДАСТЫРУ МЕН БАЙ-ШАРУАШЫЛЫҚТАРДЫ ТӨРКІЛЕУ (1928–1933 жж.).....	40
Turgunbayev I.Ye., Moryakova M.T., Zhanatayeva K.B. VILLAGE INSTITUTES IN TÜRKIYE AS AN INSTRUMENT OF CULTURAL POLICY.....	54
Sissenbayeva A.A., Kalybekova M.Ch. THEORETICAL AND SOURCE BASE FOR THE STUDY OF HISTORY OF KAZAKHSTANI PRISONERS OF WAR IN CONCENTRATION CAMPS ON THE TERRITORY POLAND DURING THE WORLD WAR II.....	66
Жолдасұлы Т., Досым А.Б. ҚЫЗЫЛОРДАДАҒЫ ИСЛАМНАН ӨЗГЕ ДІНИ ҰЙЫМДАР: СОВЕТТІК КЕЗЕҢ ТӘЖІРИБЕСІ (1960–1980 ЖЖ.).....	77
Zhumatay G., Yskak A. TSARIST RUSSIA’S CIVILIZING MISSION AND POLICY OF CHRISTIANIZATION OF THE KAZAKHS IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE 19 th AND BEGINNING OF THE 20 th CENTURIES.....	91
Zholseitova M.A. SOCIO-POLITICAL TRANSFORMATION OF THE TURKIC-MUSLIM SOCIETY IN THE INTELLECTUAL HERITAGE OF THE ALASH MOVEMENT.....	107
Сабитов Ж.М., Каратаев А.А. О ПРОИСХОЖДЕНИИ И ИСТОРИИ ПЛЕМЕНИ АРГЫН.....	118
Бимақанова З.Ш., Мұқанова Г.Қ., Нұрғалиева Ф.М. ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ «КІШІ ҚАЗАН» ЗЕРТТЕУЛЕРІНДЕ ПӘНАРАЛЫҚ ТӘСІЛДІ ҚОЛДАНУДЫҢ ӘДІСНАМАЛЫҚ НЕГІЗДЕРІ МЕН ПРИНЦИПТЕРІ.....	132
Ахметова Г.М. ТОРГОВО-ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКОЕ РАЗВИТИЕ КАЗАХСТАНА В XIX – НАЧАЛЕ XX ВЕКА: ОТЕЧЕСТВЕННАЯ И ЗАРУБЕЖНАЯ ИСТОРИОГРАФИЯ.....	142

Ермаханова М.А., Абдразақова А.Ө., Айтуар Б.М. АҢЫЗ ЖӘНЕ ШЫНДЫҚ: ТЕМІРБЕК ЖҮРГЕНОВТИҢ ТҮЛҒАСЫНА ҚАТЫСТЫ ТАРИХНАМАЛЫҚ ТАЛДАУ.....	161
Махамбетова Л.А., Мейрманова Г.А. У.Х. ШӨЛЕКЕНОВТИҢ ЕҢБЕКТЕРІНДЕГІ ҚАЗАҚТАР МЕН ҚАРАҚАЛПАҚТАРДЫҢ ШАРУАШЫЛЫҚ ЖҮЙЕСІ.....	174
Байжанова А.Ә., Шашаев Ә.Қ., Әділбекова З.Ә. XX ҒАСЫРДЫҢ 20–30 ЖЫЛДАРЫНДАҒЫ ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ ОҚУ-АҒАРТУ МӘСЕЛЕЛЕРІ: ТАРИХИ ТАЛДАУ.....	185
Ошан Ж., Кенжеахмет Н., Қадылбек М. «ИМПЕРАТОР ГУАНСЮЙ БИЛГІ ТҰСЫНДАҒЫ СОЛТҮСТІК-БАТЫС ШЕКАРА ДЕЛИМИТАЦИЯЛЫҚ КАРТАСЫНЫҢ ҚЫТАЙША АУДАРМАСЫНДА» КӨРСЕТІЛГЕН ҚАЗАҚСТАННЫҢ ШЫҒЫС ШЕКАРАСЫНА ҚАТЫСТЫ ТАРИХИ ТОПОНИМИКАЛАР.....	199
Zholdas A.K., Amirbek A.A., Kumganbayev Zh. K. THE ROLE OF HISTORY TEACHING IN FORMING THE KAZAKH INTELLIGENTSIA (1918–1927 YEARS).....	210
Саркенова К.А., Әбенова Б.С. БАТЫС СІБІР: ӘКІМШІЛІК-ТЕРРИТОРИЯЛЫҚ БӨЛІНІСІ, ҚАЗАҚТАРДЫҢ ОРНАЛАСУЫ (XVIII Ғ. СОҢЫ – XIX Ғ. БІРІНШІ ЖАРТЫСЫ).....	219
Mirzakulova R.M., Alpysbayeva N.K. SCHOLARS’ PERSONAL FUNDS IN THE SCIENTIFIC ARCHIVE OF “GYLYM ORDASY” AS A PHENOMENON OF HISTORICAL MEMORY.....	234
Абдукадыров Н.М., Қалдыбаева С.С., Көбесова А.С. ОСМАН МЕМЛЕКЕТІ МЕН ОРТА АЗИЯ ХАЛЫҚТАРЫ АРАСЫНДА ОҚУ-АҒАРТУ САЛАСЫНДАҒЫ ЫНТЫМАҚТАСТЫҚ (XIX Ғ. СОҢЫ – XX Ғ. БАСЫ).....	249
Ауанасова К.М., Ауанасова А.М., Бадиев А.М. ВКЛАД СЕРАЛИ ЛАПИНА В ПРАВОВОЙ МОДЕРНИЗМ В ПЕРВЫЕ ГОДЫ СОВЕТСКОЙ ВЛАСТИ (НА ОСНОВЕ АНАЛИЗА ЗАПАДНОЙ И РОССИЙСКОЙ ИСТОРИОГРАФИИ).....	266
Akhmetova Zh.K., Abdrazakova A.U. THE KAZAKHSTANI VARIANT OF THE SOVIET NATION-BUILDING PROJECT IN THE CONTEXT OF IMPERIAL LEGACY AND SOCIALIST MODERNIZATION (1920–1940).....	276
Azretbergenova E.Zh., Baigarayev N.A. ISSUES OF CULTURAL POLICY AND NATIONAL IDENTITY IN THE PERIOD BETWEEN THE KAZAKH AUTONOMOUS SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC AND THE KAZAKH SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC.....	288

Дюсенова Н.К. ТҮРІК ЗЕРТТЕУШІЛЕРІНІҢ ЕҢБЕКТЕРІНДЕГІ АШАРШЫЛЫҚ МӘСЕЛЕСІ.....	303
Есенаманова А.С., Қалыш А.Б., Исаева А.И. ТҮРКІ ХАЛЫҚТАРЫНЫҢ КІЛЕМ ТОҚУ ДӘСТҮРІН ЗЕРТТЕУ ТАРИХНАМАСЫ: ЭТНОГРАФИЯЛЫҚ ЖӘНЕ МУЗЕЙЛІК ТҮРҒЫДАН ШОЛУ.....	312
Сарсенбаев А.Б., Оспанов Е.Б. ҚАЗАҚ ШЕЖІРЕСІ ЭТНОГРАФИЯЛЫҚ ДЕРЕККӨЗІ РЕТІНДЕ.....	325
Турекеев К.Ж. НАРЕЧЕНИЕ ИМЕНИ У КАРАКАЛПАКОВ НАВОЙСКОЙ И САМАРКАНДСКОЙ ОБЛАСТЕЙ: ТРАДИЦИИ И СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ТЕНДЕНЦИИ.....	333
Шамшетдинова Д.И. УСПЕХИ И НЕДОСТАТКИ РАЗВИТИЯ СФЕРЫ БЫТОВОГО ОБСЛУЖИВАНИЯ В СЕЛЬСКОЙ МЕСТНОСТИ КАРАКАЛПАКСТАНА В 1960–80-Е ГГ.....	343
Мұхатова О.Х., Қаипбаева А.Т., Саипова К.Д. ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ 1920–1930 ЖЫЛДАРДАҒЫ ПАНАСЫЗ БАЛАЛАР ТАРИХЫН ЗЕРТТЕУДІҢ ТЕОРИЯЛЫҚ ЖӘНЕ МЕТОДОЛОГИЯЛЫҚ МӘСЕЛЕЛЕРІ.....	353
Қабдолдина К.Қ., Құндақбаева Ж.Б. ДІНИ ПАРЫЗ БЕН ЭПИДЕМИОЛОГИЯЛЫҚ ҚАУІПТЕР АРАСЫНДА: ХІХ ҒАСЫРДЫҢ СОҢЫ – ХХ ҒАСЫРДЫҢ БАСЫНДАҒЫ ҚАЗЫЛЫҚҚА САНИТАРЛЫҚ БАҚЫЛАУ ЖӘНЕ ОНЫҢ ҚИЫНДЫҚТАРЫ.....	367
Қалишабаев А.Ж., Елеуов М.Е. Т.Н. СЕНИГОВА: БАТЫС ЖӘНЕ ОҢТҮСТІК ҚАЗАҚСТАН ЭКСПЕДИЦИЯЛАРЫНЫҢ ҒЫЛЫМИ ЖАҒАЛЫҚТАРЫ (1950–1970 ЖЫЛДАР).....	378
Кенжебаев Ф.Қ. Сайфулмаликова С.С. БӨКЕЙ ОРДАСЫНДАҒЫ БАСТАУЫШ БІЛІМ БЕРУ: ИНСТИТУЦИОНАЛДЫҚ, ӘЛЕУМЕТТІК ЖӘНЕ МӘДЕНИ ТРАНСФОРМАЦИЯЛАНУЫНА ПӘНАРАЛЫҚ ТАЛДАУ.....	387
Темирханова А.С., Альбина Абеновна Максүтова А.М., Исакаева А.М. ҚАСЫМ ЕРТІСБАЕВ ТҮЛҒАСЫ ХХ ҒАСЫР БАСЫНДАҒЫ ДІНИ-АҒАРТУШЫЛЫҚ МӘСЕЛЕЛЕР КОНТЕКСІНДЕ.....	400
Мухамадеева И.А., Кенжебек Д.К., Жаксыбаева А.А. ОБЩЕСТВЕННО-ПОЛИТИЧЕСКАЯ ГАЗЕТА «КАЗАХ» (1913–1918 ГГ.) КАК ОДИН ИЗ ИСТОЧНИКОВ ОТЕЧЕСТВЕННОЙ ИСТОРИИ.....	410



Ш.Ш. Уәлиханов ат. Тарих және этнология институты
Алматы қ., Шевченко көш., 28
Тел/факс: +7 727 261 67 19
e-mail: kazhistory@bk.ru