



THE HERITAGE OF ETHNIC COMMUNITIES IN KAZAKHSTAN: BETWEEN DISCOURSES OF UNITY AND INVENTORY PRACTICES

Farida MUSSATAYEVA 

Center for Analysis and Forecasting of Demographic Processes under RSE on REM "Information and Computing Center of the Bureau of National Statistics of the Agency for Strategic Planning and Reforms of the Republic of Kazakhstan", Astana, Kazakhstan

 mussatayeva@mail.ru

Abstract. This article examines the institutional conditions for representing the intangible cultural heritage (ICH) of ethnic communities in Kazakhstan within the framework of national cultural policy and the system for protecting cultural heritage. The aim of the study is to identify the factors that contribute to the underrepresentation of the heritage of certain ethnic groups in national and international registers, as well as to assess the potential impact of the 2026 institutional transformation associated with the transition from the Assembly of the People of Kazakhstan to Qazaqstan Halyk Kenesi on existing mechanisms of cultural representation. The methodological basis comprises a comparative institutional analysis of legislation, the National List of Elements of the ICH, UNESCO registers, and cultural heritage practices in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Mongolia. The Dungan community of Kazakhstan serves as a case that illustrates the gap between the declared principle of cultural diversity and the actual representation of the cultural heritage of ethnic communities. The analysis finds that the formal recognition of cultural diversity does not by itself ensure the identification, documentation, and nomination of ICH elements of various ethnic groups. Comparative evidence indicates that community-based inventory practices, accessible nomination procedures, and the institutional involvement of heritage bearers can contribute to more inclusive representation. The institutional transformation creates an opportunity to strengthen these mechanisms; however, by itself, it does not automatically eliminate the existing representational gap. The study provides a basis for a more systematic and community-oriented inventory of the ICH of Kazakhstan's ethnic communities.

Keywords: cultural policy; cultural diversity; intangible cultural heritage; UNESCO Convention; inventory system; heritage bearers; ethnic communities; Dungan community; Qazaqstan Halyk Kenesi; National List.

For citation:

Mussatayeva, F. (2026). The Heritage of Ethnic Communities in Kazakhstan: Between discourses of Unity and Inventory Practices. *Jete – Journal of Philosophy, Religious and Cultural Studies*, 156 (3), 167-179 <https://doi.org/10.32523/3080-1281-2026-156-3-167-179>

ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ ЭТНИКАЛЫҚ ҚАУЫМДАСТЫҚТАРДЫҢ МҰРАСЫ: БІРЛІК ДИСКУРСТАРЫ МЕН ТҮГЕНДЕУ ТӘЖІРИБЕСІ

Фарида МУСАТАЕВА

«Қазақстан Республикасы Стратегиялық жоспарлау және реформалар агенттігі Ұлттық статистика бюросының Ақпараттық-есептеу орталығы» РМК жанындағы Демографиялық үдерістерді талдау және болжау орталығы, Астана, Қазақстан

НАСЛЕДИЕ ЭТНИЧЕСКИХ СООБЩЕСТВ КАЗАХСТАНА: МЕЖДУ ДИСКУРСАМИ ЕДИНСТВА И ПРАКТИКОЙ ИНВЕНТАРИЗАЦИИ

Фарида МУСАТАЕВА

*Центр анализа и прогнозирования демографических процессов при РГП на ПХВ «Информационно-вычислительный центр Бюро национальной статистики Агентства по стратегическому планированию и реформам Республики Казахстан»,
Астана, Казахстан*

Аңдатпа. Мақалада Қазақстандағы этникалық қауымдастықтардың материалдық емес мәдени мұрасын (МеММ) мемлекеттік мәдени саясат пен мәдени мұраны қорғау жүйесі аясында репрезентациялаудың институционалдық ахуалы қарастырылады. Зерттеудің мақсаты – жекелеген этникалық топтардың мұрасы ұлттық және халықаралық тізімдерде не себепті жеткіліксіз танылғанын анықтау, сондай-ақ 2026 жылы Қазақстан халқы Ассамблеясынан Қазақстан Халық Кеңесіне өтуге байланысты институционалдық өзгерістердің мәдени репрезентация тетіктеріне ықтимал ықпалын бағалау. Зерттеудің әдіснамалық негізін Қазақстан, Қырғызстан және Моңғолия заңнамасын, МеММ элементтерінің ұлттық тізімдерін, ЮНЕСКО тізімдерін және мәдени мұраны басқару тәжірибесін салыстырмалы институционалдық талдау құрайды. Қазақстандағы дүнген қауымдастығы мәдени әртүрліліктің ресми мойындалуы мен этникалық қауымдастықтардың мәдени мұрасын нақты репрезентациялау арасындағы алшақтықты көрсететін кейс ретінде қарастырылады. Талдау мәдени әртүрлілікті ресми мойындау этностардың МеММ-ын жүйелі анықтауға, құжаттандыруға және номинациялауға өздігінен кепілдік бермейтінін көрсетеді. Салыстырмалы тәжірибе қауымдастықтардың қатысуымен жүргізілетін түгендеудің, номинациялау рәсімдерінің қолжетімділігінің және мұра тасымалдаушыларының институционалдық қатысуының маңызын айқындайды. Институционалдық трансформация аталған тетіктерді жетілдіруге мүмкіндік бергенімен, репрезентациядағы алшақтықты өздігінен шеше алмайды. Зерттеу Қазақстандағы этникалық топтардың МеММ-ын жүйелі әрі қауымдастыққа бағдарланған түгендеуді дамытуға негіз қалыптастырады.

Аннотация. В статье рассматриваются институциональные условия репрезентации нематериального культурного наследия (НКН) этнических сообществ Казахстана в рамках государственной культурной политики и системы охраны культурного наследия. Цель исследования – выявить факторы, обуславливающие недостаточную представленность наследия отдельных этнических групп в национальных и международных реестрах, а также оценить возможное влияние институциональной трансформации 2026 года, связанной с переходом от Ассамблеи народа Казахстана к Қазақстан Халық Кеңесі, на существующие механизмы культурного представительства. Методологическую основу составили сравнительный институциональный анализ законодательства, Национального перечня элементов НКН, списков ЮНЕСКО и практик управления культурным наследием в Казахстане, Кыргызстане и Монголии. Дунганская община Казахстана рассматривается в качестве кейса, демонстрирующего разрыв между декларируемым принципом культурного многообразия и фактическим представлением культурного наследия этнических сообществ. Установлено, что официальное признание культурного многообразия не обеспечивает систематического выявления, документирования и номинирования НКН различных этносов. Сравнительный анализ показывает значимость инвентаризации, основанной на участии самих сообществ, доступности процедур номинирования и институционального вовлечения носителей наследия. Институциональная трансформация создает возможность для совершенствования данных механизмов, однако сама по себе не устраняет существующий разрыв в репрезентации. Исследование предлагает основу для более системной

Түйін сөздер: мәдени саясат; мәдени әртүрлілік; материалдық емес мәдени мұра; ЮНЕСКО конвенциясы; түгендеу; мұра тасымалдаушылары; этникалық қауымдастықтар; дүнген қауымдастығы; Қазақстан Халық Кеңесі; Ұлттық тізім.

и ориентированной на сообщества инвентаризации НКН этнических групп Казахстана.

Ключевые слова: культурная политика; культурное многообразие; нематериальное культурное наследие; Конвенция ЮНЕСКО; инвентаризация; носители наследия; этнические сообщества; дунганское сообщество; Қазақстан Халық Кеңесі; национальный перечень.

Дәйексөз үшін:

Мусатаева, Ф. (2026). Қазақстандағы этникалық қауымдастықтардың мұрасы: бірлік дискурстары мен түгендеу тәжірибесі. *Jete – Journal of Philosophy, Religious and Cultural Studies*, 156(3), 167-179 <https://doi.org/10.32523/3080-1281-2026-156-3-167-179>

Для цитирования:

Мусатаева, Ф. (2026). Наследие этнических сообществ Казахстана: между дискурсами единства и практикой инвентаризации. *Jete – Journal of Philosophy, Religious and Cultural Studies*, 156(3), 167-179 <https://doi.org/10.32523/3080-1281-2026-156-3-167-179>

Introduction

The preservation of cultural diversity and intangible cultural heritage (ICH) plays an important role in contemporary cultural policy. The 2003 UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage defines ICH in terms of practices, knowledge, and skills that communities recognize as part of their own heritage, and explicitly provides for the participation of heritage bearers in its identification, safeguarding, and transmission (UNESCO, 2003). For multi-ethnic states, this means the need for mechanisms that are capable of cultural practices identification and documentation of all communities that contribute to the country's cultural diversity, not just the numerically dominant community.

Kazakhstan ratified the Convention in 2011, and its provisions were subsequently reflected in national cultural policy, including the Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan "On Culture", the Cultural Policy Concept, documents regarding the protection of ICH, and the activities of the Assembly of the People of Kazakhstan (APK). The continuity of this principle is evident at the constitutional level as well: the right to use one's native language and culture was enshrined in the original 1995 Constitution and has been preserved in the 2026 version, which, in addition, classifies the preservation of historical and cultural heritage as one of the fundamental principles of the state (Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 1995; 2026).

However, there remains a gap between the normative recognition of cultural diversity and its institutional representation in the ICH inventory system. As of 2024, the National List of ICH of Kazakhstan includes 79 elements, of which 14 are represented on the UNESCO lists (Abulova et al., 2025: 32). The majority of the registered elements are associated with the cultural practices of the Kazakh people, while the heritage of other ethnic communities is underrepresented on the List. At the same time, the Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan "On Culture" and the bylaws regulating the establishment and maintenance of the List do not establish any restrictions based on the ethnic origin of ICH holders. This makes it possible to view the issue of the heritage of the Uyghur, Kurdish, Dungan, and other ethnic communities not as a consequence of normative exclusion, but as a matter of how effectively the mechanisms for identifying, documenting, selecting, and representing ICH elements function.

The Dungan community serves as an illustrative case study. Despite the presence of stable ritual, craft, and gastronomic traditions, elements of Dungan ICH are not included in the National List of Kazakhstan, whereas in Kyrgyzstan, certain elements of Dungan cultural heritage have become the subject of digital documentation ("Aigine" Cultural Research Center, 2023). A comparison of the two countries inhabited by the same transboundary community makes it possible to view ICH representation not merely as a reflection of the presence and preservation of cultural practices, but also as the result of the institutional and procedural mechanisms for their identification, documentation, and official recognition.

An additional dimension of the problem emerges in the context of the institutional transformation of 2026, under which the functions previously associated with the APK and the National Kurultai are consolidated within a new constitutional body – Qazaqstan Halyk Kenesi (QHK) (Tokayev K.-Zh., 2026). This transformation in itself does not determine changes in the system for safeguarding and representation of the ICH, but it creates a new institutional context for analyzing the interaction between the state and ethnic communities. In this regard, it is of interest to examine the extent to which a change in the architecture of public representation may affect the mechanisms for identifying, documenting, and recognizing the cultural heritage of various communities.

The aim of the study is to determine the institutional and procedural conditions for the representation of the ICH of Kazakhstan's ethnic communities, to determine approaches to assessing their representation in national and international inventory instruments. To achieve this aim, the following objectives are addressed: to define the theoretical foundations for analyzing the institutional representation of the ICH; to analyze the regulatory and institutional mechanisms for compiling the National List; to examine the Dungan community as an illustrative case study; to compare the experiences of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Mongolia; and to identify areas to improve the mechanisms for the ICN inventory in the context of the transition from the APK to QHK.

Accordingly, the article examines which institutional and procedural mechanisms shape the representation of the ICH of Kazakhstan's ethnic communities in national and international inventory systems, and identifies areas for improvement based on comparative practices in Kyrgyzstan and Mongolia.

Materials and methods

The study adopts a theoretical, methodological, and comparative analytical nature. The theoretical foundation rests on the provisions of the 2003 UNESCO Convention, including the principle of community participation in the identification, safeguarding, and transmission of ICH (UNESCO, 2003), as well as an institutional approach that views ICH representation as the result of the operation of normative rules, procedures, and institutions, rather than as an automatic consequence of the existence of cultural practices. The key analytical category is the institutional representation of ICH, understood as the reflection of the cultural practices of ethnic communities in official systems for their identification, documentation, registration, and nomination.

The material base consisted of international and national regulatory and legal documents, national lists of ICH, UNESCO lists, materials from government bodies in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Mongolia, as well as scientific publications on issues related to ICH and ethnocultural interaction. The main method used was the analysis of regulatory documents. Comparative analysis focused on the following parameters: the structure and content of national lists, the representation of cultural practices of ethnic communities, the criteria and procedures for including elements, the participation of communities, the connection between national inventory mechanisms and the UNESCO system, and institutional responsibility for the safeguarding and representation of ICH.

The choice of countries reflects differences in institutional practices, despite the presence of comparable tasks related to preserving cultural diversity. The research includes Kyrgyzstan due to the historical and cultural ties between the Dungan communities of the two countries and the existence of practices for documenting Dungan heritage (Khishanlo, 2018: 50; Imyarova, Ali, 2021: 112; KIC "Aigine", 2023). Mongolia is included in the comparative analysis as an example of the international representation of the cultural practices of ethnic groups – the traditional dance "bielgeye," which UNESCO inscribed on the List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Need of Urgent Safeguarding (UNESCO ICH, 2009). The Dungan community of Kazakhstan is used as a representative example of the broader problem of the institutional representation of ICH, rather than as the sole subject of the study. To analyze this case, we used statistical data from the Bureau of National Statistics of the Republic of Kazakhstan, materials on the cultural heritage of the Dungans in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan, as well as studies of the events in the Korday district in 2020 (Sadvokassova et al., 2020: 4; Kumar, Baktybayev, 2021; Kaliyev et al., 2024).

The analysis proceeds in three stages. The first, normative-institutional stage, identifies the principles and mechanisms governing ICH regulation. The second, analytical stage, establishes the relationship between inventory procedures and the degree of official representation of the ICH. The third, comparative stage, compares the national lists and inventory practices of the three countries.

The study considers three complementary assumptions as analytical hypotheses. The institutional hypothesis (H1) explains the underrepresentation of certain communities' ICH by the lack of mechanisms for the targeted identification and documentation of their cultural practices. The procedural hypothesis (H2) links the representation of ICH to the availability and adaptability of the procedures for compiling the national list and submitting nominations, primarily in the case of associations with limited expert and organizational resources. The community participation hypothesis (H3) suggests that the level of representativeness of ICH in national registers depends on the degree of involvement, activity, and initiative of the local communities themselves and the direct bearers of cultural traditions. The hypotheses are considered to be complementary and do not presuppose the a priori identification of a single determining factor.

The study relies exclusively on desk research and does not include fieldwork with communities or interviews with traditional speakers. Therefore, the absence of an element from the official list is interpreted solely as the absence of its institutional representation, as evidence of the absence of the corresponding cultural practice. The documentary analysis makes it possible to identify the normative, institutional, and procedural conditions for the representation of ICH, but it cannot directly establish the motivation of government agencies or communities themselves or the factors underlying their decisions. Verification of these aspects requires a separate empirical study and is beyond the scope of this article.

Literature Review

Research on ICH is developing at the intersection of cultural policy, institutional analysis, and the study of cultural diversity. The key point for most of the studies remains the 2003 UNESCO Convention, which defines ICH in terms of practices, knowledge, and skills recognized as part of their cultural heritage and emphasizes the involvement of heritage bearers in its identification and safeguarding (UNESCO, 2003). An important direction considers national lists not merely as documentation tools, but also as mechanisms for institutional selection and public recognition of cultural practices: the community-based approach emphasizes the participation of the communities themselves in documenting and representing their own heritage. In this article, this approach serves as a theoretical framework for assessing the accessibility of inventory procedures, rather than as a method of field research.

In the context of Central Asia, the experience of Kyrgyzstan is indicative, where certain elements of the Dungan cultural heritage are included in the digital accounting system (ICH KR, 2023), and Mongolia, where the “bijelgey” dance associated with the ethnic groups of the Western Aimags is included in the UNESCO ICH List (UNESCO ICH, 2009). For the context of Kazakhstan, research into interethnic relations and the 2020 Kordai events holds particular significance (Sadvokassova et al., 2020; Kumar & Baktybayev, 2021; Tutumlu & Imyarova, 2023; Kaliyev et al., 2024).

At the same time, the relationship between the inventory mechanisms of ICH, the ethnic communities' participation, and the degree of their official representation remains insufficiently studied specifically in the Kazakh context. This article addresses this issue through an institutional analysis, the Dungan case, and a comparison of the experiences of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Mongolia.

Institutional Transformation: From the Assembly of the People of Kazakhstan to Qazaqstan Halyk Kenesi

The Assembly of the People of Kazakhstan (APK) was established in 1995 as a consultative and advisory body under the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, tasked with ensuring the representation of ethnic and cultural interests and promoting public cohesion. Researchers who have examined the history of the institutionalization of ethnopolitics in Kazakhstan characterize the pre-conflict period of the APK in a single term – *folklorization*. This concept means that ethnocultural diversity was reduced mainly to symbolic and event-based forms of representation, such as festivals and concert programs dedicated to public holidays, and did not have a deep integrative content (Tutumlu, Imyarova, 2023: 71). The tragic events of February 2020 in the Kordai district of Zhambyl region led to casualties, destruction and mass displacement of people. According to a number of authors, the confrontation between the Dungan and Kazakh populations forced a rethink of the model of ethnopolitical governance, which led in the post-conflict period to a transition to more systematic and empirical risk control (Sadvokassova et al., 2020: 5; Kumar, Baktybayev, 2021: 99; Tutumlu, Imyarova, 2023: 73).

This trajectory continued as part of a larger transformation of the country's political architecture. Speaking at the Fifth Session of the National Kurultai in Kyzylorda on January 20, 2026, the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, K.-Zh. Tokayev stated that the historically important missions of the APK and the National Kurultai can be considered fulfilled, and proposed the creation of Qazaqstan Halyk Kenesi (QHK), while maintaining the institutional continuity of their functions in the field of public dialogue and national unity (Tokayev, 2026). Subsequently, this initiative received constitutional and legal formalization: the ICH is constitutionally established as the highest consultative body in a separate section of the Constitution, consolidating the functions previously associated with the Assembly of the People of Kazakhstan and the National Kurultai.

For the present study, it is fundamentally important that the President characterized the reform precisely as a change in the structural format while maintaining meaningful continuity. From this perspective, the transition from

the APK to QHK should be considered not as an automatic change of approaches to ethnocultural policy, but as a change in the institutional framework in which these approaches can be reconsidered.

The previous model primarily provided the representation of ethnocultural associations and event-based forms of cultural interaction. The new architecture creates an opportunity for wider inclusion of cultural heritage issues in the system of public dialogue. However, the institutional reform itself does not mean the emergence of a mechanism for a systematic inventory of ICH, as this function is not explicitly assigned to the People's Council of Kazakhstan under the current legal provisions (Constitutional Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan "On the People's Council of Kazakhstan", 2026). This creates a zone of institutional uncertainty: a change in institutional structure does not mean a change in practice, and there is a risk that the event format of the representation of ethnic and cultural diversity will be reproduced in a new institutional framework. At the same time, the reform opens up the possibility to move towards a different model, implying a movement from a predominantly presentational representation of ethnocultural communities to their more systematic representation in cultural policy, including the identification and documentation of ICH.

The problem, therefore, lies not in the absence of cultural practices as such, but in the lack of a guaranteed institutional route through which existing practices become an officially identified, documented and recognized element of ICH. The transition from APK to QHK is further considered not as a proven solution to this problem, but as a new institutional condition, the effectiveness of which is to be assessed by the content of subsequent practice. A comparison of Kazakhstan with Kyrgyzstan and Mongolia, presented in the "Discussion" section, demonstrates that the degree of representation of ICH is determined not only by the presence of cultural practices themselves, but also by whether there are procedures for their identification, documentation and promotion. In this regard, the key question for Kazakhstan is in this sense is whether the new institutional architecture will be able to facilitate the transition from the representation of ethnic communities to the representation of their cultural heritage.

The gap between declared support and institutional representation: the case of the Dungan community

The normative model of Kazakhstan formally provides for the possibility of representing the cultural heritage of various ethnic communities. This provision is reflected not only in the general principles of cultural policy but also directly in the procedure for compiling the National List. The current rules identify local and ethnic communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals involved in the creation, preservation and restoration of heritage as the bearers of ICH; the form of the National List provides for a mandatory description of "belonging to an ethnic group", as well as details about the bearers, the element's origins, and its geographical distribution. In reviewing an application, the relevant commission must also take into account the use of the element by ethnic communities, groups, or individuals who recognize it as part of their cultural heritage (Order No. 368, 2015; Order No. 231-NQ, 2025).

The gap arises at another level – between the formal possibility of ethnic attribution of an element and the actual composition of the National List. The list, updated in 2024, includes 79 elements, but its content is mainly represented by practices of Kazakh culture. UNESCO's lists likewise contain no elements of a transnational character. It is precisely this institutional path from the transmission of cultural practices within the community to their official documentation that is further considered using the example of the Dungan mechanism.

The Dungan community is significant for the analysis of this mechanism. According to the 2021 census, the number of Dungans in Kazakhstan was 78,817; a significant part of the community lives in the Zhambyl region, primarily in the Kordai district (BNS, 2022: 15). Dungan culture includes sustainable ceremonial, family, gastronomic, and craft practices that can potentially be classified as ICH, but the relevant elements are not represented in the National List of Kazakhstan. In itself, this does not indicate the absence of government or public efforts concerning Dungan cultural heritage, but it shows that the results of such work are not reflected in the official representation of the heritage through the accounting tool in question.

A review of the historiography makes this problem more visible. Early works of the late 19th and early 20th centuries mainly recorded the peculiarities of the way of life, economy, and worldview of migrants (Poyarkov, 1901: 3; Selitsky, 1905: 21; Fedorov, 1903: 88; Tsibuzgin and Shmakov, 1909: 4). During the Soviet period, researchers focused on certain aspects of ritual, traditions, and religious identity (Stratanovich, 1950; Tolstov, 1963: 305; Sushanlo, 1971: 140). During the independence period, studies of the history, culture, and religious beliefs of the Dungan community appeared (Khishanlo, 2018: 50; Imyarova, Ali, 2021: 112; Mudrov, Logorova, 2016: 34), and after 2020, the number

of works examining the Dungan community in the context of interethnic relations, conflict, and social integration has increased markedly (Sadvakassova et al., 2020: 8; Kumar, Baktybayev, 2021: 100; Tutumlu, Imyarova, 2023: 74).

This distribution of research attention is important for understanding the identified gap, since the availability of scientific literature on the community does not in itself mean the availability of documentation suitable for the official inventory of ICH. Historical and ethnographic descriptions, conflict studies, and the study of modern social processes solve other research tasks. At the same time, for an element to be included in the National List, a different configuration of information is required, including information about its affiliation, bearers, origin, geographical distribution, degree of preservation and other characteristics provided for in the accounting form. Thus, the problem may consist not so much in the lack of knowledge about Dungan culture, as in the lack of systematic translation of such knowledge into a format consistent with the institutional accounting procedure for ICH.

The comparison with Kyrgyzstan is particularly significant in this regard. In 2023, as part of the “Aigine” Cultural Research Center project, an inventory of the Dungan people’s ICH was conducted with the participation of traditional speakers and bearers. The collected materials were organized into nine ICH domains and incorporated into a digital inventory system. Within the same project, documentation was also extended for the first time to the intangible cultural heritage of the Uyghur community in Kyrgyzstan (CRC “Aigine”, 2023).

Comparing the two cases helps to clarify the possible reasons for the differences in the representation of ICH. Kazakhstan’s regulatory system allows for ethnic attribution of elements, so the absence of Dungan heritage in the National List cannot be explained by the lack of an appropriate regulatory opportunity. At the same time, the application-based approach to compiling the National Inventory may create barriers for communities with limited access to expert resources, which provides partial support for the procedural hypothesis (H2).

A significant change occurred in 2025 by Order of the Minister of Culture and Information of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated May 13, 2025, No. 231-NQ, when the Rules for the formation and maintenance of the National List were set out in a new edition. The new rules regulate in more detail the procedure for submitting and reviewing applications, as well as the timing of the relevant procedure. This creates an opportunity for subsequent empirical verification of the procedural hypothesis (H2). If accessibility and organization of the procedure significantly affect the representation of ethnocultural communities, subsequent updates to the National List will make it possible to determine whether the number of applications and included elements related to the previously underrepresented communities increases.

These three hypotheses describe the institutional and procedural aspects of the problem under consideration, but do not exhaust its broader context. An additional dimension of the problem is provided by data on the social distance between ethnic groups in Kazakhstan. An analysis of more than twenty interethnic conflicts of the post-Soviet period reveals pronounced differences in social distance between individual groups, ranging from closeness and solidarity to alienation and intolerance (Kaliev et al., 2024: 57). These data do not allow us to establish a causal relationship between the degree of cultural heritage representation and social distance; however, they show that the cultural representation of ethnic communities is formed in the broader context of interethnic relations and social reproduction. In this regard, the systematic identification and documentation of cultural practices can be considered one of the possible mechanisms for increasing the public visibility of cultural diversity, operating alongside the institutional and procedural factors discussed above.

The “Invisibility” of an element in the National List should not be automatically interpreted as the absence of the heritage itself: it may reflect the specifics of institutional attention, the procedure for identification and documentation, as well as the degree of involvement of heritage bearers and the research community. The Dungan case is neither an exceptional nor an isolated problem, but rather an illustrative example of a more general mechanism: the existence of cultural heritage and the legally provided possibility of its ethnic attribution do not guarantee its inclusion in the state inventory system. There is a sequence of procedures between the community and the official list, including identification, documentation, application processing, peer review, and decision-making. It is at this level that the reasons for the differences in the representation of ICH should be sought. This determines the rationale for the transition to the next section, which shifts attention from the very fact of the presence of elements in the Kazakhstani list to various ways of institutionally transforming cultural practice into a recognized element of ICH based on the cases of Kyrgyzstan and Mongolia.

Discussion: Kyrgyzstan and Mongolia in Comparative Perspective

A comparison of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Mongolia shows that the existence of a National List and the number of elements included in the UNESCO lists are not sufficient indicators of the inclusivity of ICH policy in themselves. For this study, something else is important: how national systems identify heritage elements, who initiates their inclusion, and how inventory procedures make it possible to represent cultural practices of different ethnic communities.

Of the three countries under consideration, **Kazakhstan** has both the largest population and significant ethnic diversity. According to the 2021 census, the country's population was 19.2 million people. Kazakhs made up 70.4% of its ethnic composition, Russians – 15.5%, Uzbeks – about 3.2%, Ukrainians – about 2.0%, Uighurs – about 1.5%. A total of 124 ethnic groups were represented in the country according to the results of the census (BNS, 2023: 6). At the same time, the National List of ICH includes 79 elements, 14 of which are listed by UNESCO (UNESCO ICH, 2025a).

Quantitatively, these indicators could be interpreted as evidence of a well-developed inventory system and active international promotion of cultural heritage. However, when the structure of the inventory is related to the ethnic composition of the population, a different picture appears: the elements presented are mainly related to the Kazakh cultural tradition, while the cultural practices of other ethnic communities have not received comparable institutional representation. The Kazakh case is important as an example of the discrepancy between the scale of the inventory system and the degree of its ethnocultural representation: the National List is relatively extensive, but the existing mechanism does not ensure equal visibility for the cultural practices of different communities. The Dungan case discussed above provides a concrete illustration of this gap. The existence of sustainable cultural practices does not in itself lead to their automatic inclusion in the national inventory system.

Kyrgyzstan demonstrates a different institutional approach. With a population of about 6.6 million people in 2021, Kyrgyz made up about 74% of the population, Uzbeks about 15%, and Russians about 5%. In official documents of the National Statistical Committee of the Kyrgyz Republic, the number of ethnic groups is indicated as “more than 100” (National Statistical Committee of the Kyrgyz Republic, 2022). Kyrgyzstan is represented in UNESCO lists by 16 elements (UNESCO ICH, 2025b). According to the relevant government decree, in 2021 the national list of ICH included about 54 elements (Government of the Kyrgyz Republic, 2015).

However, for this research, it is not the number of items that is more important, but the organization of the inventory process itself. The National List of ICH of Kyrgyzstan is maintained on the basis of Resolution No. 557 of the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic of 2015 and provides for the participation of state institutions, specialized organizations, non-governmental associations and traditional speakers in its updating (Government of the Kyrgyz Republic, 2015). The experience of the “Aigine” Cultural Research Center is particularly significant in this regard: in 2023-2025, as part of the ICH digitalization project, work was carried out to identify and document the cultural heritage of the Dungan and Uighur communities (CRC “Aigine”, 2023).

It is significant that the Dungan heritage has a cross-border character and is represented in both Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan, yet the institutional trajectory of its recognition differs between the two countries. In Kyrgyzstan, it has become the subject of a targeted inventory, whereas in Kazakhstan, at present, Dungan ICH elements are not included in the National List. The difference between the Kyrgyzstani model lies, obviously, primarily in reducing the distance between heritage bearers and the official inventory system. Here, the community acts not only as an object of ethnographic description, but also as a source of information and a participant in the inventory formation process, which is directly linked to the H3 hypothesis, which assumes community participation.

Mongolia presents a third option for the institutional organization of the ICH system. In 2021, the population of the country was about 3.4 million people; according to the census, Khalkhs accounted for 83.8%, Kazakhs – 3.8%, Derbets – 2.6%, Bayats – 2.0%, and Buryats – 1.4% of the population (National Statistical Office of Mongolia, 2021). Despite its significantly smaller population, Mongolia has 17 elements included in the UNESCO lists (UNESCO ICH, 2025c), which exceeds the corresponding figures for Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan.

However, the structure of the national inventory is more significant than the number of international nominations itself. It provides for the classification of heritage elements by ethnic, sub-ethnic, and regional groups, while national materials separately record the traditions of various groups in western and northern Mongolia, including linguistic, performing, handicraft, and ritual practices (National Center for Cultural Heritage of Mongolia, 2025). The element “Mongol Biyelgee”, included by UNESCO in 2009 in the List of ICH in need of urgent safeguarding, is

indicative in this regard. UNESCO links this tradition with several ethnic groups in western Mongolia, including the Bayads, Derbets, Zahchins, and other groups (UNESCO ICH, 2009). Thus, the international nomination in this case can be considered as a continuation of a more detailed national inventory, rather than as an isolated initiative.

The Mongolian experience cannot be directly transferred to Kazakhstan without reservations. A significant part of the ethnic categories represented in the Mongolian national inventory system belong to sub-ethnic groups within the broader Mongolian cultural space, whereas in Kazakhstan, Dungans, Uighurs, Kurds, Meskhetian Turks and other communities are recognized as separate ethnic groups, rather than as sub-ethnic groups of the Kazakh people. Therefore, the Mongolian model is significant primarily as an example of a more detailed approach to national inventorying, whereas the Kyrgyz model provides an example of the direct involvement of communities themselves in the identification and documentation of heritage. For the Dungan case in Kazakhstan, the second guideline seems more relevant.

Comparing the indicators of the three countries in a single table (Table 1) makes it possible to clarify this picture.

Table 1 – Comparative Characteristics of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Mongolia

Indicator	Kazakhstan	Kyrgyzstan	Mongolia
Population, 2021	19.2 million	6.6 million	3.3 million
The largest ethnic group	Kazakhs – 70.4%	Kyrgyz – 74%	Khalkhi – 83.8%
The number of ethnic groups	124	More than 100	About 20 main groups
National inventory of ICH	79 elements	54 elements	88 elements
UNESCO elements	14	16	17
Community participation in inventory	Formally provided for by the regulations	Institutionally used (“Aigine” project)	Used within the framework of ethnic and regional classification
An element assigned to a particular ethnic group of a country	–	Yes (digital) – Dungans and Uighurs, inventory since 2023	Yes, “bijelgey”. These are sub-ethnic groups of the same Mongolian people, and not a separate ethnic group

Source: Compiled by the author based on data from the Bureau of National Statistics of the Republic of Kazakhstan (2021), the National Statistical Committee of the Kyrgyz Republic (2021), the National Statistical Office of Mongolia (2021), and UNESCO country profiles.

Possible Directions for Strengthening the Institutional Representation of Kazakhstan’s Intangible Cultural Heritage

A comparison of the considered practices makes it possible to identify three possible areas for improving the ICH representation system in Kazakhstan, which differ in terms of the nature of the necessary institutional changes and the amount of resources needed.

The first direction is legislative. It implies a clearer consolidation in the regulatory framework of the plurality of subjects of ICH bearers and the creation of conditions for the systematic consideration of the heritage of various ethnic communities. One possible mechanism would be to use the legislative initiative of Qazaqstan Halyk Kenesi to promote the relevant changes. In this case, the representation of ethnic heritage would be regarded not as the outcome of individual initiatives, but as one of the expected outcomes of state cultural policy.

The second direction is project-based and digital. It involves conducting a targeted inventory of the ICH of individual ethnic communities using digital tools. Such work can begin with a community whose heritage is currently underrepresented in official inventory systems, and be carried out with the participation of traditional speakers themselves, researchers, and specialized organizations. This approach corresponds to the experience of the “Aigine” Cultural Research Center in Kyrgyzstan.

The third direction is nomination-based. Drawing on Mongolia’s experience, it is advisable at the initial stage to focus not only on the Representative List of the ICH of Humanity, but also on the mechanism for including elements in the List of ICH in Need of Urgent Safeguarding. For a community with limited expert resources, this approach may be more realistic, as the focus shifts from demonstrating the viability of a tradition to documenting the existing risks of its loss.

The proposed directions are not mutually exclusive and can be implemented in parallel. Their combination makes it possible to simultaneously improve the regulatory framework, expand documentation practices, and create more accessible mechanisms for the representation of ethnic communities’ ICH in the national inventory system.

Conclusion

The analysis shows that the representation of the ICH of Kazakhstan’s ethnic communities cannot be assessed solely on the basis of programmatic and regulatory declarations. Despite the fact that the legislation formally allows for the ethnic attribution of ICH elements, this possibility has not been systematically reflected in the official inventory system: none of the 79 elements included in the National List and none of the 14 Kazakhstani elements included in the UNESCO lists represent the heritage of a particular ethnic community of Kazakhstan. Thus, an institutional gap remains between the normatively fixed principle of cultural diversity and its practical implementation.

To assess this gap, a specific indicator could be used – the proportion of elements of the National List that represent the heritage of individual ethnic communities, considered in relation to their demographic representation. The inclusion of such an indicator in the system of regular monitoring of the relevant ministry would make it possible to assess not only the availability of relevant regulations, but also the outcomes of their practical implementation.

The three hypotheses put forward in the study receive different degrees of confirmation. The institutional hypothesis (H1) is partially supported: the regulatory framework allows for ethnic attribution of ICH elements. However, there is no systematic mechanism for the purposeful identification of the heritage of individual communities in the documents under consideration. The procedural hypothesis (H2) receives preliminary confirmation as well: the changes to the rules for the formation of the National List introduced in 2025 create the basis for assessing whether the totality of procedures affects the number of applications from previously underrepresented communities. The hypothesis of community participation (H3) is indirectly confirmed. Direct evidence from Kazakhstan is insufficient; however, the experience of Kyrgyzstan indicates that the participation of traditional speakers in the inventory can facilitate the identification and documentation of the heritage of Dungan and Uighur communities.

The comparison with Kyrgyzstan and Mongolia makes it possible to identify three complementary areas for Kazakhstan – improving the regulatory framework for the ethnic representation of ICH; conducting a targeted digital inventory with the participation of specialized research centers and the communities themselves; and using the category of urgent safeguarding as a possible first stage of the nomination process. None of these solutions has yet been implemented in relation to Kazakhstan’s Dungan heritage. At the same time, the cross-border nature of the Dungan cultural heritage makes the accumulated experience in Kyrgyzstan in documenting this heritage a potentially valuable resource for Kazakhstan.

The transition from APK to QHK in 2026 creates new institutional opportunities, but by itself does not guarantee a change in established practice. The realization of these opportunities will depend on whether the ethnocultural representation is complemented by systematic efforts to identify and document cultural heritage. In this context, the transition from a predominantly event-based format to preventive and scientifically based work is important for cultural policy and for strengthening social cohesion.

The study has a limitation related to its document-centric nature. The conclusions are based on an analysis of regulations, registers and scientific literature and require further verification through field research, primarily in places where the Dungan population of the Kordai district of the Zhambyl region lives compactly. The next stage of the study should determine which of the factors – institutional, procedural or related to the participation of the

communities themselves, determines the representation of the ICH in Kazakhstan to the greatest extent, or confirm whether these factors have a complementary effect.

References

- Abulova, M., Zhauhanova, Zh., & Kulmanova, A. (2025). Metodicheskij material dlja ekspertov, rabotajushchih v sfere realizacii Konvencii JuNESKO po ohrane nematerial'nogo kul'turnogo nasledija [Methodological Guide for Experts Working on the Implementation of the UNESCO Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage]. Astana, 51 p. [In Russian]
- Akorda (2026). O Qazaqstan Halyq Kengesi [On the People's Council of Kazakhstan]. <https://www.akorda.kz/ru/o-kazakhstan-halyk-kenesi-95056> [In Russian]
- Bjuro nacional'noj statistiki Agentstva po strategicheskemu planirovaniju i reformam Respubliki Kazahstan (2022). Itogi Nacional'noj perepisi naselenija 2021 goda [Results of the 2021 National Population Census]. Astana. <https://stat.gov.kz/ru/national/2021/> [In Russian]
- Cibuzgin, V., & Shmakov, A. (1909). Zametka o zhizni dungan selenija Karakunuz Pishpekskogo uezda Semirechenskoj oblasti [A Note on the Life of the Dungans of Karakunuz Village, Pishpek Uyezd, Semirechye Region]. Zapiski Semipalatinskogo podotdela Zapadno-Sibirskogo otdela Imperatorskogo Russkogo geograficheskogo obshchestva, (4). [In Russian]
- Cifrovoe puteshestvie v mir NKN Kyrgyzskoj Respubliki [Digital Journey into the ICH World of the Kyrgyz Republic]. (n.d.). <https://ich.kg/главная/> [In Russian]
- Fedorov, D. (1903). Opyt voenno-statisticheskogo opisanija Ilijskogo kraja [An Attempt at a Military-Statistical Description of the Ili Region] (Vol. 1). Izdanie Shtaba Turkestanskogo voennogo okruga. [In Russian]
- Hishanlo, S. (2018). Religioznye vozzrenija, obychai i tradicii dungan v Kazahstane [Religious Views, Customs and Traditions of the Dungans in Kazakhstan]. Eurasian Journal of Religious Studies, 13(1), 48–54. <https://doi.org/10.26577/ejrs-2018-1-145> [In Russian]
- Imjarova, Z. S., & Ali, Dzhon (2021). Vlijanie etnicheskoj sredy na tradicionnuju kul'turu kitajskih musul'man (dungan) v Central'noj Azii [The Influence of the Ethnic Environment on the Traditional Culture of Chinese Muslims (Dungans) in Central Asia]. Otan tarihy, (4/96). <https://otan.history.iie.kz/main/article/view/113> [In Russian]
- Kaliyev, T., Ashimkhanova, D., & Mussatayeva, F. (2024). Social Distance of Ethnic Groups: From Proximity to Remoteness (in the Example of Kazakhstan). Journal of Central Asian Studies, 93(1), 57–68. <https://doi.org/10.52536/3006-807X.2024-1.05>
- Kamalov, A. K., & Logorova, Z. O. (Comp.) (2016). Dugane Kazahstana [The Dungans of Kazakhstan]. Assambleja naroda Kazahstana, Komitet nauki MON RK, Akademija gosudarstvennogo upravljenja pri Prezidente RK, 156 p. [In Russian]
- KIC «Ajgine» [Aigine Cultural Research Center] (2023). Ezhenedel'nyj obzor dejatel'nosti KIC Ajgine [Weekly Review of Aigine CRC Activities]. <https://aigine.kg/?p=15801> [In Russian]
- Konstitucija Respubliki Kazahstan 1995 goda [Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 1995]. https://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/K950001000_ [In Russian]
- Konstitucija Respubliki Kazahstan 2026 goda [Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2026]. <https://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/K2600000000> [In Russian]
- Konstitucionnyj zakon Respubliki Kazahstan ot 5 ijunya 2026 goda No. 298-VIII ZRK «O Qazaqstan Halyq Kengesi» [Constitutional Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 298-VIII, “On the People's Council of Kazakhstan”]. <https://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/Z2600000298> [In Russian]
- Kumar, Y., & Baktybayev, B. (2021). Analysis of Inter-Ethnic Conflicts and Application of National Identity Theories in Kazakhstan Context. Bulletin of Socio-Political Studies of Abai KazNPU, 1(73), 95–102. <https://doi.org/10.51889/2021-1.1728-8940.13>
- Nacional'noe statisticheskoe upravlenie Mongolii (2021). Perepis' naselenija i zhilishchnogo fonda 2020 goda: nacional'nyj sostav [2020 Population and Housing Census: Ethnic Composition]. <https://nada.nso.mn/mn/index.php/catalog/60> [In Mongolian]
- Nacional'nyj centr kul'turnogo nasledija Mongolii (2025). Materialy po nematerial'nomu kul'turnomu naslediju [Materials on Intangible Cultural Heritage]. <https://ncch.gov.mn/> [In Mongolian]

- Nacional'nyj statisticheskij komitet Kyrgyzskoj Respubliki (2022). Perepis' naselenija i zhilishchnogo fonda Kyrgyzskoj Respubliki 2022 goda: Kniga II. Naselenie Kyrgyzstana [2022 Population and Housing Census of the Kyrgyz Republic: Book II. Population of Kyrgyzstan]. <https://www.stat.gov.kg/media/publicationarchive/0f717d2d-5078-4e18-8b56-fb2a530462a2.pdf> [In Russian]
- O vnesenii izmenenij v prikaz Ministra kul'tury i sporta Respubliki Kazahstan ot 30 nojabrja 2015 goda No. 368 «Ob utverzhdenii Pravil vedenija Nacional'nogo perechnja elementov nematerial'nogo kul'turnogo nasledija»: prikaz Ministra kul'tury i informacii Respubliki Kazahstan ot 13 maja 2025 goda No. 231-NQ [On Amendments to Order No. 368 of 30 November 2015 "On Approval of the Rules for Maintaining the National List of Intangible Cultural Heritage Elements": Order No. 231-NQ of 13 May 2025]. <https://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/V2500036103> [In Russian]
- Pojarkov, F. (1901). Poslednij epizod dunganskogo vosstaniya (Malen'kaja stranica iz proshloj zhizni Semirech'ja) [The Final Episode of the Dungan Revolt (A Small Page from the Past Life of Semirechye)]. In Pamjatnaja knizhka i adres-kalendar' Semirechenskoj oblasti na 1901 god [Memorial Book and Address Calendar of the Semirechye Region for 1901]. Vernyj. [In Russian]
- Postanovlenie Pravitel'stva Kyrgyzskoj Respubliki ot 5 avgusta 2015 goda No. 557 «Ob utverzhdenii Polozhenija o klassifikacii elementov nematerial'nogo kul'turnogo nasledija Kyrgyzskoj Respubliki i Nacional'nogo perechnja elementov nematerial'nogo kul'turnogo nasledija Kyrgyzskoj Respubliki» [Resolution of the Government of the Kyrgyz Republic No. 557 of 5 August 2015 "On Approval of the Regulation on the Classification of Intangible Cultural Heritage Elements of the Kyrgyz Republic and the National List of Intangible Cultural Heritage Elements of the Kyrgyz Republic"]. <https://cbd.minjust.gov.kg/97848/edition/1072702/ru> [In Russian]
- Prikaz Ministra kul'tury i sporta Respubliki Kazahstan ot 30 nojabrja 2015 goda No. 368 «Ob utverzhdenii Pravil vedenija Nacional'nogo perechnja elementov nematerial'nogo kul'turnogo nasledija» [Order No. 368 of the Minister of Culture and Sport of 30 November 2015 "On Approval of the Rules for Maintaining the National List of Intangible Cultural Heritage Elements"]. <https://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/V1500012594> [In Russian]
- Sadvokassova, A., Rakischewa, B., Yesimowa, K., & Maschitowa, A. (2020). Der interethnische Konflikt im Distrikt Kordai 2020: zu den Hintergründen und der sozialen Lage von Dunganen in Kasachstan. Zentralasien-Analysen, (140), 2–8. [In German]
- Selickij, I. (1905). Kul'dzhinskije pereselency pogranichnoj s Kitaem polosy (ekonomicheskoe-etnograficheskie ocherki i bytovaja zhizn' dzharkentskih taranchej i dungan) [The Kulja Resettlers of the Border Zone with China: Economic and Ethnographic Sketches and Everyday Life of the Zharkent Taranchi and Dungans]. 82 p. [In Russian]
- Stratanovich, G. (1950). Dunganskij narod Kirgizskoj SSR [The Dungan People of the Kirghiz SSR]. Rukopisnyj fond otdela social'nyh nauk Nacional'noj akademii nauk Kazahstana, manuscript, inv. No. 152. [In Russian]
- Sushanlo, M. (1971). Dugane (istoriko-etnograficheskij ocherk) [The Dungans: A Historical and Ethnographic Sketch]. Ilim, 363 p. [In Russian]
- Tokaev, K.-Zh. (2026). Vystuplenie Glavy gosudarstva Kasym-Zhomarta Tokaeva na V zasedanii Nacional'nogo kurultaja [Speech by Head of State Kassym-Jomart Tokayev at the 5th Session of the National Kurultai], 20 January 2026. <https://www.akorda.kz/ru/vystuplenie-glavy-gosudarstva-kasym-zhomarta-tokaeva-na-v-zasedanii-nacionalnogo-kurultaya-200332> [In Russian]
- Tolstov, S. P. (Ed.) (1963). Narody Srednej Azii i Kazahstana [The Peoples of Central Asia and Kazakhstan] (Vol. 2). Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 768 p. [In Russian]
- Tutumlu, A., & Imyarova, Z. (2023). Economies of Conflict: Context and Root Causes of Intercommunal Conflicts in Kazakhstan. Central Asian Economic Review, (4), 66–79. <https://doi.org/10.52821/2789-4401-2023-4-66-79>
- UNESCO (2003). Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. UNESCO. <https://ich.unesco.org/en/convention>
- UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage (2009). Mongol Biyelgee, Mongolian Traditional Folk Dance. <https://ich.unesco.org/en/USL/mongol-biyelgee-mongolian-traditional-folk-dance-00311>
- UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage (2025a). Kazakhstan: Elements on the Lists. <https://ich.unesco.org/en/state/kazakhstan-KZ?info=elements-on-the-lists>
- UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage (2025b). Kyrgyzstan: Elements on the Lists. <https://ich.unesco.org/en/state/kyrgyzstan-KG?info=elements-on-the-lists>

- UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage (2025c). Mongolia: Elements on the Lists. <https://ich.unesco.org/en/state/mongolia-MN?info=elements-on-the-lists>
- Zakon Kyrgyzskoj Respubliki ot 9 avgusta 2012 goda No. 163 «O nematerial'nom kul'turnom nasledii Kyrgyzskoj Respubliki» [Law of the Kyrgyz Republic No. 163 of 9 August 2012, "On the Intangible Cultural Heritage of the Kyrgyz Republic"]. <http://cbd.minjust.gov.kg/act/view/ru-ru/203763> [In Russian]
- Zakon Respubliki Kazahstan ot 21 dekabrya 2011 goda No. 514-IV «O ratifikacii Konvencii ob ohrane nematerial'nogo kul'turnogo nasledija» [Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 514-IV of 21 December 2011, "On the Ratification of the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage"]. <https://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/Z1100000514> [In Russian]

Конфликт интересов. Автор заявляет об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

Сведения об авторе / Автор туралы мәлімет / Information about the author

Фарида Мусатаева – PhD, Қазақстан Республикасы Стратегиялық жоспарлау және реформалар агенттігі жанындағы Демографиялық үдерістерді талдау және болжау орталығының деректер талдаушысы, Иманова көшесі, 13, Астана, Қазақстан. ORCID: 0000-0003-1326-2141. E-mail: f.mussatayeva@mail.ru.

Farida Mussatayeva – PhD, a data-analyst of the Center for Analysis and Forecasting of Demographic Processes under the Agency for Strategic Planning and Reforms of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 13 Imanov Street, Astana, Kazakhstan. ORCID: 0000-0003-1326-2141. E-mail: f.mussatayeva@mail.ru.

Фарида Мусатаева - PhD, дата-аналитик Центра анализа и прогнозирования демографических процессов при Агентстве по стратегическому планированию и реформам Республики Казахстан, ул. Иманова, 13, Астана, Казахстан. ORCID: 0000-0003-1326-2141. E-mail: f.mussatayeva@mail.ru.

Мақала туралы ақпарат / Информация о статье / Information about the article.

Редакцияға түсті / Поступила в редакцию / Entered the editorial office: 25.08.2026

Рецензенттер мақұлдаған / Одобрено рецензентами / Approved by reviewers: 26.09.2026

Жариялауға қабылданды / Принята к публикации / Accepted for publication: 30.09.2026