МИНИСТЕРСТВО НАУКИ И ВЫСШЕГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ РФ
федеральное государственное бюджетное образовательное учреждение
высшего образования

«ДАГЕСТАНСКИЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ»
Кафедра иностранных языков ЭФ

Международная научно-практическая конференция
«Современные проблемы лингвистики и теории преподавания
иностранного языка»

Махачкала, 2022 г.

**Comparative analysis of the model of polyculturality in
the sphere of education in the eu and the rk**

Mukusheva Guksum Ramazanovna
Candidate of pedagogical sciences,
Associate Professor;
Foreign and Russian languages chair.

Aitzhanov S.M.
st.IR-19-2

Pak M.I.
st.IR-19-2
Karaganda University
of Kazpotrebsoyuz,
Karaganda, Kazakhstan

Annotation. The active role of globalization in the Republic of Kazakhstan became a signal for the development of new foundations for multicultural education, but almost immediately Kazakhstan ran into problems. According to the authors, this work is primarily an applied work in the field of sociology and cultural studies based on institutional theory. The authors consider the main result of the study: the development of the main characteristics of models for the development of multicultural relations, the identification of the interests of the Kazakh model, the determination of the development of bilateral relations between the EU and the Republic of Kazakhstan within this area.

Key words: European Union, Republic of Kazakhstan, multiculturalism model, multicultural education, polyculturalism.

With the development of globalization, completely new challenges and problems have appeared. One of them is the problem of the formation of a multicultural personality in the 21st century. The erasing of borders caused a change n the mono-ethnic environments of nation-states. Absolutely monoethnic countries are a minority (Japan, South Korea, and Portugal). The result of these processes was the growth of social conflicts. Modern solutions to these problems are two methods: nationalism and polyculturalism. The decision by the method of nationalism has never led to good results [1]. Smith and

Hutchinson concluded that after the Second World War, countries abandoned the idea of nationalism, and a policy of multiculturalism was taken. Since the 20th century,there have been two ideas of multicultural development in Europe. The first is Western European, which later evolves to multiculturalism. The second is Eastern European (Soviet), which was based on the Soviet national policy and the Marxist understanding of the brotherhood of peoples [2]. In Western European notion at the end of the 20th century, emphasis is placed on soft power [3]. The bulk of soft power is concentrated in education. Using the modeling method, the authors wish to compare the multiculturalism models of the EU and the RK.The European model of multiculturalism is largely different from the American one. It is based on such concepts as tolerance and multiculturalism. The European model has set the formation of a European personality as part of its educational process, that is, every resident of Europe / the European Union must, in addition to his ethnicity, associate himself with European civilization. The documents of the European Union and the Community became a reflection of Western European thought. The concepts of cultural heritage and identity of nomads (migrants) were fixed. The Council of Europe has secured the position of teaching children in their own language and culture as the protection of minority languages. An essential part of this study is the analysis of contemporary problems of the European model. As paradoxical as it may seem, the policy of polyculturalism has led to the growth of right-wing ideas in Europe [8]. The main problem was the fragmentation of society into two poles, the first represents people who agree with the standard European policy and consider it useful to develop a multicultural society, and the second pole considers this an attack on the culture of the majority and infringement of their rights. A feature of Western European thought was the emergence of such a concept as positive discrimination [9]. These problems have become very aggravated after the crises, but this proves the resilience to crises. The European model is hard to implement in other parts of the world, this is due to the fact that European institutions are not compatible with the culture and characteristics of the locals. This is the key issue of expanding the European model and European thought. In the countries of the post-Soviet space, there is an active political and ideological struggle between supporters of the European model and their own exotic model. However, this does not prevent us from finding the positive aspects of the European model. Firstly, the European model allows you to maintain a high level of politicization of the youth. Young people are actively going into politics, they are actors, not passive observers. Sharp issues are discussed before they are resolved, but without violence, it does not come to that, which proves the effectiveness of the policy of polyculturalism.

The Republic of Kazakhstan, since gaining independence, has positioned itself as a multinational state and has been pursuing an active policy of multiculturalism, which includes strengthening mutual understanding and respect for all nations and nationalities. The Soviet beginning played an important role in the formation of a multicultural policy in Kazakhstan. Due to the diversity of cultures in the USSR, the ideas of international education were introduced into the pedagogy of that time. The strategic goals of education were the achievement of unanimity and the erasure of national specifics [10]. Thus, in Soviet times, "internationalist" education and "folk pedagogy" were practiced in the educational methodology [11]. This effectively influenced the thinking of the Soviet people, instilling in them respect and mutual understanding between nationalities, as well as strengthening universal unity. However, this policy had a negative impact, primarily on the younger generation. Thus, young people faced the problem of determining ethnic identity and ignorance of their culture. Later, after the collapse of the USSR, this problem began to decrease, and the newly independent states began to form their own policy of multiculturalism. In the work "Comparative Analysis of the Implementation of Multilingualism in the Netherlands and Kazakhstan" by F. Duisebayeva and M. Thomas, the authors compared multicultural education in the framework of the educational program in the Netherlands and Kazakhstan [12]. As a result of the analysis, the authors of the work identified the following three features of the curriculum of the Republic of Kazakhstan:

• The introduction of trilingualism into the curriculum of secondary schools and universities emphasized the importance of learning Kazakh, Russian and English. Knowledge of three languages will increase competitiveness in the world market and at the same time help to strengthen the traditions associated with the development of the Kazakh language.
• Multiculturalism in Kazakhstan has been formed due to historical, political, economic, and cultural factors. Thus, the program of multicultural education has its own specifics, which is different from the European concept.
• An important role is given to the study of English in the curriculum. Now Kazakhstan is participating in world integration, and English is the language known and spoken in many countries and is widely used in society because it is the language of business, science, and technology, thereby opening up new perspectives for Kazakhstanis. In the work "Kazakhstan model of organization of a multicultural educational environment" A.M. Sivinsky singled out the expected results of Kazakhstani multicultural education:

1.Preventing the emergence of extremist organizations;

2.Adaptation to life in a multicultural and multi-confessional society;

3.Successive, but adapted to the new conditions of life, internationalism;

4.Raising a new generation ready for social and professional activities in a multicultural society [13]. Despite the different approaches and methods for implementing the program of multicultural education, the models of the Republic of Kazakhstan and the EU are connected by one goal: to educate society in respect and mutual understanding for each other, as well as to strengthen intercultural cooperation. In addition, both in the EU and in the Republic of Kazakhstan, much attention is paid to the study of the language, which, according to many researchers, is considered one of the components in the formation of a multicultural personality.

Bibliography:

1. Smith A. D. et al. (ed.). Nationalism. – Oxford Readers, 1994.

2. Новикова Л. Г. Советская национальная политика в оценках трех западных историков //Отечественная история. – 2006. – №. 4. – С. 140-145.

3. Лебедева М. М. «Мягкая сила»: понятие и подходы //Вестник МГИМО университета. – 2017. – №. 3 (54).

4. Резолюция 13-го Комитета министров

5. Рекомендация Совета министров СЕ

6. Директива СЕ

7. Проект СЕ "Среднее образование для Европы"

8. Мартинец Ю. А. Рост правого популизма в современной Европе (по оценкам европейских экспертов) //Вестник РГГУ. Серия: Политология. История. Международные отношения. – 2019. – №. 1.

9. Шубина М. М. Культурная дискриминация как составляющая часть современного общества //Основные проблемы общественных наук. – 2015. – С.72-74.

10. Джуринский А.Н. Поликультурное образование в многонациональном социуме: учебник и практикум для бакалавриата и магистратуры // Москва, 2019. – С. 73.

11. Мубинова З.Ф. Поликультурное воспитание в современной педагогике: сравнительный анализ зарубежных и отечественных подходов // С. 236-238.

12. Duisebayeva F., Thomas M. Comparative Analysis of Theory and Practice behind
Implementation of Multiligualism and Multilingual Education in the Netherlands and Kazakhstan // Comparative analysis of theory and practice behind. – 2016.

13. Сивинский А.М. Казахстанская модель организации поликультурной образовательной среды (на примере школы для детей с нарушением слуха) // Отечественная и зарубежная педагогика. – 2020. - №. 5 (71). – С.38-49.