

Zh.A. AGABEKOVA¹, A.S. SALIMZHANOVA², N. BAIRBEK³¹Nazarbayev University²Kazakh National Women's Teacher Training University³Southern Utah University e-mail: zhazira.agabekova@gmail.com

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF GENDER STUDIES COURSES IN KAZAKHSTAN AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Abstract. This study presents a comparative analysis of gender studies courses in Kazakhstan and the United States, examining how the field is institutionalized, structured, and pedagogically implemented across distinct higher education systems. Drawing on feminist theory, intersectionality, and postcolonial approaches, the research analyzes 97 gender-related courses across 29 Kazakhstani universities and compares them with 204 courses offered at American University and University of Wisconsin-Madison. Using qualitative document analysis and semi-structured faculty interviews, the study evaluates three analytical dimensions: institutionalization, curriculum breadth, and pedagogical practice. The findings reveal that in Kazakhstan, gender studies remains predominantly elective-based and embedded within traditional departments, with limited interdisciplinary expansion and minimal integration of experiential learning components. In contrast, the U.S. institutions examined demonstrate fully institutionalized, degree-granting programs characterized by interdisciplinary curricula, explicit incorporation of intersectionality, and structured experiential learning opportunities such as internships and capstone projects. The study argues that these differences reflect divergent trajectories of disciplinary consolidation shaped by governance structures, policy environments, and institutional capacity. It concludes by proposing a multidimensional framework for strengthening gender studies education in Kazakhstan through enhanced institutional support, interdisciplinary integration, and practice-oriented curriculum development.

Keywords: gender education, higher education, Kazakhstan, United States, comparative analysis, interdisciplinarity.

Introduction

International organizations have declared gender equality a fundamental requirement for achieving quality education and sustainable development [1]. University-level gender studies programs serve as vital educational tools, enabling students to understand social inequalities and develop the capacity to foster positive social transformation [2, 3, 4]. However, research in comparative education shows that gender studies is not taught uniformly across national contexts [5; 6]. The structure, content, and institutionalization of these programs are shaped by political priorities, higher education policies, cultural norms, available resources, and the level of institutional support

* Бізге дұрыс сілтеме жасаңыз:

Agabekova Zh.A., Salimzhanova A.S., Bairbek N. Comparative Analysis of Gender Studies Courses in Kazakhstan and The United States of America // Yassawi Journal of Education Studies. – 2026. – №2 (140). – Б. 96-107. <https://doi.org/10.47526/3107-3123.336>

*Cite us correctly:

Agabekova Zh.A., Salimzhanova A.S., Bairbek N. Comparative Analysis of Gender Studies Courses in Kazakhstan and The United States of America // Yassawi Journal of Education Studies. – 2026. – №2 (140). – Б. 96-107. <https://doi.org/10.47526/3107-3123.336>

Date of receipt of the article 15.09.2025 / Date of acceptance 30.06.2026

within universities [5; 6; 7]. Consequently, gender studies may be conceptualized and delivered differently across countries, reflecting distinct historical, social, and institutional conditions [8; 9; 10].

Building on scholarship in comparative education, curriculum development, and the institutionalization of academic fields [5; 6; 11], this study examines gender studies education through three analytical dimensions: institutionalization, curriculum structure, and pedagogical practice. These dimensions provide a framework for understanding how gender studies develops within diverse higher education systems. The study conducts a comparative analysis of gender studies programs in Kazakhstan and the United States, examining how courses are organized and delivered, with particular attention to theoretical frameworks, curricular content, interdisciplinarity, experiential learning, and institutional support. By comparing these dimensions, the study identifies challenges and opportunities within different program structures and assesses how gender studies education fosters critical thinking, promotes social justice, and advances equality [12; 13; 14; 6].

To frame this analysis, the study draws on feminist theory, intersectionality, and postcolonial theory [2; 3; 4], reviewing their relevance to gender studies programs in both contexts. The investigation begins with an assessment of gender studies programs at Kazakhstani universities [8; 15], followed by an examination of programs at American University and the University of Wisconsin–Madison [16–19]. The analysis considers curriculum breadth, interdisciplinary integration, practical implementation, and institutional backing. Based on these insights, the study explores potential strategies for strengthening gender studies education in Kazakhstan, including the adoption of U.S. models such as intersectional studies, field-based learning, and integration with STEM disciplines.

To guide this comparative investigation, the study addresses the following research questions:

RQ1: How are gender studies courses structured and institutionalized in universities in Kazakhstan and the United States?

RQ2: How do curricula differ in terms of interdisciplinarity, theoretical frameworks, and thematic scope?

RQ3: How do pedagogical practices and experiential learning opportunities compare between the two contexts?

RQ4: What implications do these differences have for the future development of gender studies education in Kazakhstan?

Research methods and materials

The development of gender studies within higher education has followed diverse theoretical and pedagogical trajectories. Comparative education research emphasizes, however, that the mere presence of gender-related courses does not signify the consolidation of gender studies as a recognized academic field; rather, meaningful institutionalization, curriculum structure, and pedagogical practice reflect broader higher education policies, governance models, and cultural contexts [8]. In line with the research aims articulated in previous section, this study draws systematically on scholarship in comparative education, gender studies curriculum development, institutionalization of academic fields, and Central Asian higher education policy to construct an analytical framework that is both theoretically grounded and empirically operationalizable.

Feminist theory constitutes the conceptual foundation for defining and evaluating gender studies curricula. Judith Butler's theorization of gender as performative and socially constructed [2], Kimberlé Crenshaw's articulation of intersectionality [3], and Robin Lakoff's linguistic analyses of gendered discourse [20] provide criteria for examining course content and syllabi, enabling assessment of the extent to which curricula engage with social constructionism, intersectional analysis, and structural inequalities. These frameworks directly inform the study's evaluation of theoretical underpinnings and thematic breadth across the national contexts, ensuring that analysis remains aligned with the research problem of understanding how gender studies is conceptualized and operationalized in diverse higher education systems.

The methodological design is further shaped by scholarship on feminist pedagogy and curriculum development. Sandra Harding's standpoint epistemology [21] and Martha Nussbaum's perspectives linking equality-oriented education to democratic citizenship and global responsibility [12], together with Audre Lorde and Patti Lather's advocacy for dialogical, critically reflective pedagogies [13; 14], provide indicators for assessing classroom practices and experiential learning. These works guide the examination of teaching methods, integration of lived experiences, internships, community-based learning, and other applied components, ensuring that pedagogical practices are analyzed as active mechanisms for fostering critical thinking and social justice rather than as neutral knowledge transmission. Comparative education and institutionalization scholarship provide the structural lens for analysis. Madeleine Arnot and Gaby Weiner [5] emphasize the value of integrating gender perspectives across disciplines to enhance academic quality, while Christine Skelton and Becky Francis [22] highlight how curriculum design shapes cultural understandings of equality. Elaine Unterhalter and North [6], Louise Morley [7], and Leathwood and Read [17] underscore the influence of sustained policy support, interdisciplinary collaboration, and institutional culture on the legitimacy and effectiveness of gender studies programs. These insights inform the operationalization of structural variables - including degree status, administrative positioning, interdisciplinary integration, and institutional sponsorship - thereby linking institutional characteristics directly to the research questions on curriculum organization and program consolidation.

The scholarly works also situate the comparative analysis within post-Soviet and Central Asian contexts. Russian and post-Soviet scholarship - including Khasbulatova and Smirnova [9], Zdravomyslova and Temkina [23], Kirilina [24], and Shnyrova [10] - illustrates how global gender frameworks are selectively adapted to local political and cultural conditions, emphasizing the mediating role of governance structures, terminology, and institutional norms. In Kazakhstan, higher education policy analyses by Khairullayeva et al. [15] and Mun and Kudaibergen [25] document the evolution of gender policy from Soviet-era emancipation initiatives to post-independence reforms, highlighting the integration of gender equality within nation-building agendas and the influence of layered imperial and neoliberal legacies. Empirical research by Agabekova et al. [8] indicates that gender studies in Kazakhstan has undergone partial institutionalization, with programs remaining fragmented and unevenly supported, underscoring the need for systematic mapping of course distribution, thematic integration, and experiential components.

Overall, this body of literature informs the study's analytical design along three interrelated dimensions, each aligned with the research questions. First, feminist and intersectional theory delineate the criteria for evaluating theoretical frameworks and thematic scope in curricula [20; 2; 3]. Second, feminist pedagogy scholarship establishes indicators for assessing pedagogical practices and experiential learning [12; 21; 13; 14]. Third, comparative education and institutionalization studies provide the structural variables - degree status, governance, interdisciplinarity, and policy alignment - used to compare Kazakhstan and the United States [5; 22; 6; 7; 11; 15; 25]. By anchoring the methodological framework in these complementary strands of scholarship, the study advances a rigorous, theory-informed comparative analysis of institutionalization, curriculum structure, and pedagogical practice, moving beyond descriptive accounts to interrogate how intersecting educational, cultural, and policy environments shape gender studies.

The current research establishes a base for understanding how Kazakhstan and the United States approach gender studies education at their universities. The international and Russian academic literature demonstrates two essential points: (1) gender studies require interdisciplinary approaches which unite sociology with linguistics, law, and economics, and (2) long-term program development needs institutional backing for success [5; 6; 9]. The research bases its analysis on these academic discussions by examining gender studies programs in Kazakhstan and the United States.

This study employs a comparative qualitative research design combining systematic document analysis and primary data collection to examine how universities institutionalize and deliver gender studies education. This design was selected because it allows for systematic cross-national

comparison while accounting for contextual differences in program structure, governance, and cultural norms. The research integrates three components: national-level mapping of gender-related programs in Kazakhstan, purposive case selection of two U.S. institutions, and cross-case comparative analysis. The unit of analysis is the institutionalized gender studies program and gender-focused coursework within higher education institutions. The study does not aim to produce statistically generalizable findings about the entire U.S. higher education system; rather, it offers an analytically structured comparison between Kazakhstan's national higher education landscape and two illustrative U.S. research universities.

Data collection for Kazakhstan was conducted during the 2023–2024 academic year through a systematic review of all accredited higher education institutions listed on the Unified Higher Education Platform of Kazakhstan. All institutions were screened for standalone gender studies programs, gender-focused degree tracks, and courses explicitly referencing gender-related themes, including “Gender and Education,” “Gender and Language,” “Gender Policy,” and “Women’s Rights.” Courses embedding gender modules within broader disciplinary frameworks (e.g., sociology, law, linguistics, education) were also included. This comprehensive search identified 29 institutions offering a total of 97 relevant courses. Document analysis was selected to systematically capture officially reported program structures, curricula, and institutional data, providing a consistent basis for cross-national comparison. To ensure data accuracy, official requests were sent to universities to obtain verified information on course descriptions, ECTS credit values, degree levels (Bachelor’s, Master’s, PhD), and administrative positioning. Only courses confirmed through official documentation were included in the final dataset; institutions with incomplete or unverifiable data were excluded from the comparative analysis. A structured database was developed coding for institutional status (public/private), degree type (major, minor, elective), administrative location, interdisciplinary integration, theoretical frameworks referenced, and presence of experiential components such as internships or capstone projects.

For the United States, a purposive comparative case study approach was employed. Two institutions were selected to represent distinct institutional models within research-intensive U.S. higher education: American University, a private policy-oriented institution located in Washington, D.C., and the University of Wisconsin–Madison, a large public R1 flagship university with a historically established Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies (WGSS) department. These institutions were chosen based on the visibility, longevity, and institutional support of their gender studies programs, as well as their contrasting governance structures (private versus public). While the United States has approximately 6,000 higher education institutions, this study does not claim national representativeness; rather, these cases function as analytically illustrative models of institutionalized gender studies within well-resourced research environments. Data collection involved systematic analysis of official academic catalogs, departmental websites, publicly available syllabi, degree requirements, and program mission statements.

In addition to document analysis, semi-structured interviews were conducted with faculty members in both Kazakhstan and the United States to contextualize curriculum development and pedagogical practices. Faculty participants were selected purposively based on their leadership roles within gender-related programs, their responsibility for core courses, or their involvement in curriculum design. A total of 15 interviews were conducted: 10 with faculty across five Kazakhstani universities and 5 across the two U.S. institutions. Interviews lasted between 45 and 75 minutes and followed a structured protocol focusing on curriculum development processes, theoretical frameworks guiding course design, pedagogical strategies for teaching gender theory, interdisciplinary collaboration, and institutional support mechanisms. Semi-structured interviews were used to supplement document analysis and capture practical insights not always reflected in official materials. Interview data were anonymized and analyzed as contextual material rather than as the sole evidentiary base.

This study employs a structured, hybrid qualitative content analysis to systematically map the institutionalization and delivery of gender studies. The analytical procedure integrates deductive coding derived from established theoretical and comparative frameworks with limited inductive coding to surface context-specific findings. Hybrid qualitative content analysis was selected to ensure that the evaluation is both theory-informed and sensitive to emergent, locally-specific patterns. The deductive framework utilizes four primary categories derived from the literature: institutionalization (examining degree status, administrative positioning, and governance structures), curriculum scope (analyzing thematic breadth, theoretical grounding, and alignment with equality frameworks), interdisciplinarity (assessing faculty cross-listing, departmental affiliations, and thematic integration across fields), and pedagogical practice (evaluating teaching methodologies, experiential learning, and capstone requirements). Within these categories, line-by-line inductive coding of course descriptions, syllabi, and interview transcripts identified emergent themes, including institutional barriers, policy constraints, and pedagogical innovation. Data were systematically coded using comparative matrices to assess convergence and divergence between the Kazakhstani national dataset and the U.S. case institutions. This hybrid approach moves beyond descriptive review to interrogate how structural variables and local experiences shape the operationalization of gender studies.

Although all publicly listed Kazakhstani institutions were screened, reliance on publicly available documentation may not fully capture classroom-level pedagogical nuance. The U.S. component is limited to two research-intensive universities and is illustrative rather than generalizable. Interview data were exploratory and may not reflect the full diversity of institutional experiences. Despite these limitations, the study provides a structured comparative framework for examining institutionalization, curriculum design, and pedagogical practice across distinct higher education environments.

Research and discussion

This section presents a summary of the Kazakhstani dataset (97 courses identified for the 2023–2024 academic year) and a comparative analysis of gender studies programs in Kazakhstan and two U.S. institutions, structured around institutionalization, curriculum scope, interdisciplinarity, and pedagogical practice (Table 1).

Table 1 – Distribution of 97 Gender-Related Courses in Kazakhstan (2023–2024)

Primary Discipline	Number of Courses	Level	Status (Elective/Required)
Sociology	28	Bachelor's	25 Elective, 3 Required
Pedagogy/Education	22	Bachelor's, Master's	22 Elective
Psychology	18	Bachelor's, Master's	18 Elective
Linguistics/Philology	15	Bachelor's	15 Elective
Law & Policy	9	Master's	7 Elective, 2 Required
Other	5	Bachelor's	5 Elective

Source: Compiled by the authors from official university catalogs and syllabi (2023–2024).

Of the 97 gender-related courses identified in Kazakhstan, 89 function as electives, with only five required Bachelor's-level courses and two required Master's-level courses. Most offerings are concentrated in sociology and pedagogy, indicating that gender studies largely remains embedded within traditional disciplinary structures rather than organized as independent programs. Even at universities with relatively strong engagement - such as al-Farabi Kazakh National University and L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University - courses are integrated into broader faculties, and doctoral-level specialization is rare. These patterns suggest that program development relies heavily on faculty initiative rather than consolidated institutional frameworks with dedicated resources.

In contrast, the two U.S. case institutions - American University and the University of Wisconsin-Madison - demonstrate fully institutionalized programs with degree-granting authority. Across these institutions, 204 courses were identified (70 at AU and 134 at UW–Madison), encompassing structured undergraduate and graduate pathways, formal program requirements, and dedicated administrative units. Departmental leadership, cross-school integration, and affiliated research centers indicate robust institutional support. This structural divergence highlights the contrast between Kazakhstan’s dispersed elective model and the U.S. programs’ departmental consolidation and administrative permanence.

Curricular scope further differentiates the contexts. Kazakhstani courses emphasize foundational feminist and sociological theory, focusing on topics such as gender roles, family and society, and socialization. Intersectional and postcolonial frameworks are largely absent, reflecting a narrower epistemological range. Newer courses, such as *Gender and Digital Society*, suggest emerging diversification, but economic, STEM, and policy-focused courses remain limited. By contrast, U.S. curricula integrate gender analysis across multiple disciplines, with courses such as *Gender Economics*, *Gender and Development*, *Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Media*, and *Gender, Sexuality, and Global Health*. Intersectionality is explicitly incorporated, and program content extends to law, public policy, media, and global governance, achieving broader thematic breadth and applied relevance.

Pedagogical approaches reveal a third axis of differentiation. Kazakhstani syllabi rely primarily on lectures, seminars, and examinations, with limited evidence of structured internships, fieldwork, or community-based research. Engagement is mostly classroom-based and theory-driven. In contrast, both U.S. institutions systematically embed experiential learning, including internships, research labs, community partnerships, and capstone projects. This pedagogical integration complements structural and curricular consolidation, linking theory with practice and fostering professional preparedness.

Taken together, these findings indicate that differences between Kazakhstan and the two U.S. institutions are not only quantitative but structural and epistemic. Kazakhstan’s gender studies programs are largely elective-based, disciplinary, and theory-centered, reflecting an earlier stage of field consolidation. U.S. programs, by contrast, demonstrate departmental autonomy, interdisciplinary integration, and embedded experiential learning, reflecting a more advanced stage of institutional development. The comparison underscores the interplay between institutional support, curriculum design, and pedagogical practice in shaping the operationalization and impact of gender studies education (Table 2).

Table 2 – Comparative Analysis of Gender Studies Programs

Criterion	Kazakhstan (Analysis of 97 Courses)	U.S. Case Studies (AU & UW–Madison; 204 Courses)
Institutional Status	89/97 courses elective; embedded within traditional departments; limited doctoral pathways	Fully institutionalized programs with degree-granting authority at BA/MA/PhD levels
Curriculum Breadth	Concentrated in sociology, pedagogy, psychology; limited policy/STEM integration	Interdisciplinary integration across economics, policy, media, global health, and law
Pedagogical Approach	Predominantly lecture-based; limited evidence of structured internships or fieldwork	Embedded experiential learning: internships, research labs, capstones
Institutional Support	No evidence of dedicated departmental budgets or autonomous centers in documentation	Dedicated administrative structures, affiliated research centers, cross-school integration
Interdisciplinary Integration	Moderate; primarily humanities and social sciences	Extensive; social sciences, policy, digital humanities, health, and economics

Source: Authors’ comparative analysis of institutional documentation (2023–2024).

The comparative analysis demonstrates that differences between Kazakhstan and the U.S. institutions are structural, epistemic, and pedagogical, not merely quantitative. Kazakhstan's gender studies programs remain largely peripheral, with courses dispersed as electives and limited institutional recognition, while American University and the University of Wisconsin–Madison feature consolidated programs with dedicated administrative support, interdisciplinary curricula, and applied pedagogical components. These contrasts reflect divergent stages of disciplinary consolidation shaped by governance arrangements, intellectual traditions, and institutional capacity.

Institutionalization emerges as the most consequential distinction. In Kazakhstan, gender-related courses are predominantly embedded within traditional departments, relying on faculty initiative rather than consolidated structures. Doctoral-level pathways are rare, consistent with post-Soviet patterns in which emerging interdisciplinary fields are often absorbed into established departments [8; 9]. By contrast, the U.S. cases illustrate how departmental consolidation, dedicated research centers, and sustained administrative support enhance program durability and epistemic legitimacy [5; 6; 7].

Curricular scope reinforces these structural differences. Kazakhstani courses foreground sociological and psychological theory, centering on gender roles, family, and socialization, with limited integration of intersectional or postcolonial frameworks. U.S. programs, however, demonstrate thematic diversification across economics, law, policy, STEM, and applied interdisciplinary perspectives, systematically incorporating intersectionality and other contemporary frameworks. This broader epistemological range reflects a more advanced stage of field development.

Pedagogical integration further differentiates the two contexts. Kazakhstan's programs rely mainly on lectures, seminars, and examinations, with limited experiential learning. In contrast, U.S. institutions embed internships, research labs, community engagement, and capstone projects, linking theory with practice and fostering professional preparedness [13; 14; 26].

Taken together, institutionalization, curriculum breadth, interdisciplinarity, and pedagogical practice function as mutually reinforcing dimensions of gender studies consolidation. Where structural autonomy enables interdisciplinary expansion and applied pedagogy, programs achieve greater visibility, academic influence, and social impact. Fragmentation in these dimensions constrains institutional and epistemic development. These findings situate gender studies within broader processes of academic field formation, providing a comparative framework to understand program evolution across diverse higher education contexts.

Conclusion

This study compared the institutionalization, curricular structure, and pedagogical design of gender studies education in Kazakhstan and the United States. By combining national-level mapping of 97 courses across 29 Kazakhstani universities with case analyses of two U.S. institutions, the research examined how gender studies is structurally embedded, theoretically framed, and pedagogically enacted within distinct higher education systems. Rather than treating course presence as evidence of disciplinary consolidation, the analysis approached gender studies as an evolving academic field shaped by governance structures, intellectual traditions, and institutional capacity.

The findings indicate that institutionalization constitutes the primary axis of divergence. In Kazakhstan, gender studies remains predominantly elective-based and embedded within traditional departments, reflecting partial consolidation. Comparative education scholarship emphasizes that durable academic fields require formal governance structures, degree-granting authority, and sustained institutional commitment. Post-Soviet higher education research similarly documents that interdisciplinary domains often remain administratively peripheral. The Kazakhstani case exemplifies integration without full structural autonomy.

By contrast, the U.S. institutions maintain autonomous programs with formalized degree pathways, cross-disciplinary integration, and dedicated research centers. Institutional embedding of gender perspectives enhances both epistemic legitimacy and academic quality, while sustained

commitment supports the durable implementation of gender equity frameworks. This structural configuration illustrates a more advanced stage of disciplinary stabilization.

Curricular comparisons reveal further divergence. Kazakhstani courses foreground foundational sociological and psychological frameworks, whereas U.S. programs demonstrate broader interdisciplinary application and explicit incorporation of intersectionality. The institutionalization of intersectional frameworks reflects theoretical diversification and a shift toward applied, policy-relevant gender scholarship.

Pedagogically, the contrast between lecture-centered instruction in Kazakhstan and experiential, community-engaged formats in the U.S. underscores the role of educational design in shaping disciplinary impact. Integrating internships, research labs, and applied projects aligns with feminist pedagogical principles that emphasize dialogical engagement, critical reflexivity, and transformative learning. Kazakhstan's more conventional instructional formats reflect broader governance and accreditation constraints.

Practical significance of this research lies in its ability to inform policy, program development, and capacity building. The findings highlight the importance of structural autonomy, interdisciplinary breadth, and applied pedagogy in consolidating gender studies as a robust academic field. For Kazakhstani institutions, this study suggests potential pathways to strengthen gender studies programs through dedicated administrative support, interdisciplinary collaboration, and integration of experiential learning components.

Future research directions include expanding the U.S. comparative sample to capture a wider spectrum of institutional models, conducting classroom-level studies to assess teaching practices and student engagement, and exploring longitudinal outcomes of gender studies graduates in professional and policy contexts. Further cross-national comparisons could examine how regional governance, cultural norms, and funding structures influence the evolution of gender studies in diverse higher education systems.

Taken together, this study contributes a multidimensional framework for understanding the development of gender studies, emphasizing the interplay of institutionalization, curriculum, interdisciplinarity, and pedagogy. It provides a basis for both scholarly inquiry and practical action aimed at advancing gender-focused education globally.

Funding information

This study was conducted as a part of the project AP19680587, entitled "The scientific concept of gender education in the universities of Kazakhstan: theoretical and methodological foundations." The authors thank the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan for providing support through grant funding (Scientific and Theoretical Projects for 2023-2025).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Experts discussed issues of gender equality in education in Kazakhstan. UNESCO News. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/experts-discussed-issues-gender-equality-education-kazakhstan> (date of access 20.06.2025)
2. Butler J. Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity. New York and London: Routledge, 2002. [Electronic resource]. URL: https://selforganizedseminar.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/butler-gender_trouble.pdf (date of access 20.06.2025)
3. Crenshaw K. Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique // University of Chicago Legal Forum. – 1989. – №1. – P. 139–167.
4. Connell R.W. Gender in world perspective. – Cambridge: Polity Press, 2009. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://xyonline.net/sites/xyonline.net/files/2019-08/Connell%2C%20Gender%20in%20World%20Perspective%2C%202nd%20Edition%20%282009%29.pdf> (date of access 20.06.2025)
5. Arnot M., Weiner G. Gender and the politics of schooling. – London: Routledge, 2017. – 408 p.

6. Unterhalter E., North A. Education, poverty and global goals for gender equality. – London: Routledge, 2017. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.routledge.com/Education-Poverty-and-Global-Goals-for-Gender-Equality-How-People-Make-Policy-Happen/Unterhalter-North/p/book/9780367203795?srsId=AfmBOoroqEeK-8HfbI9q6Vp9y6bfp3ZKL5ktnH-Fsnw8-7JYr5MhjMJq> (date of access 21.06.2025)
7. Morley L. Sister-matic: Gender mainstreaming in higher education // *Teaching in Higher Education*. – 2007. – №12(5). – P. 607–620. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510701595267>
8. Agabekova Zh., Salimzhanova A., Suleimenova Zh., Yestekova G. Gender perspectives in higher education: Enhancing gender studies in Kazakhstan // *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*. – 2025. – №16(1). – P. 88–137.
9. Хасбулатова О.А., Смирнова И.Н. Женское движение в России: моделирование баланса взаимодействия государства и женской инициативы // *Женщина в Российском обществе*. – 2021. – №1. – С. 3-19. <https://doi.org/10.21064/WinRS.2021.1.1>
10. Шнырова О. Проблемы восприятия гендерных исследований в академической среде // *Пол. Гендер. Культура*. – 2000. – Т.2. – С. 231-238.
11. Leathwood C., Read B. Gender and the changing face of higher education: A feminized future? – Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2009. – 217 p.
12. Nussbaum M. Women and human development: The capabilities approach. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511841286>
13. Lorde A. Sister outsider: Essays and speeches. – Trumansburg, NY: Crossing Press, 1984.
14. Lather P. Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy within the postmodern. – New York: Routledge, 1991. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9780203451311/getting-smart-patti-lather> (date of access 21.06.2025)
15. Khairullayeva V., Sarybayev M., Kuzembayeva A., Yermekbayev A., Baikushikova G. Gender Policy in Kazakhstan // *Journal of International Women's Studies*. – 2022. – №24(1). [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://vc.bridgew.edu/jiws/vol24/iss1/25/> (date of access 20.06.2025)
16. American University Catalog 2026-2027. [Electronic resource]. URL: https://catalog.american.edu/content.php?filter%5B27%5D=-1&filter%5B29%5D=&filter%5Bkeyword%5D=gender&filter%5B32%5D=1&filter%5Bpage%5D=1&cur_cat_oid=18&expand=&navoid=3072&search_database=Filter#acalog_template_course_filter (date of access 20.06.2025)
17. Gender and Women's Studies. [Electronic resource]. URL: https://guide.wisc.edu/courses/gen_ws/ (date of access 20.06.2025)
18. Women's, Gender, & Sexuality Studies. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.american.edu/cas/wgss/> (date of access 20.06.2025)
19. Gender and Women's Studies, BS. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://guide.wisc.edu/undergraduate/letters-science/gender-womens-studies/gender-womens-studies-bs/> (date of access 20.06.2025)
20. Lakoff R. Language and woman's place. – New York: Harper & Row, 1975. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.scribd.com/document/272131684/Lakoff-Robin-Language-and-Womans-Place> (date of access 20.06.2025)
21. Harding S. The feminist standpoint theory reader: Intellectual and political controversies. – New York: Routledge, 2004. – 394 p.
22. Skelton C., Francis B. Feminism and 'the schooling scandal'. – London: Routledge, 2009. – 192 p.
23. Здравомыслова Е.А., Темкина А.А. 12 лекций по гендерной социологии: учебное пособие. – Санкт-Петербург: Издательство Европейского университета в Санкт-Петербурге, 2015. – 768 с.
24. Кирилина А. О применении понятия гендер в русскоязычном лингвистическом описании // *Филологические науки*. – 2000. – №3. – С. 18-27.
25. Mun O., Kudaibergen D.T. Jeong and asar: Theorising reparative concepts in gendered artistic, activist, and academic spaces // *European Journal of Women's Studies*. – 2025. – №32(2). – P. 159–176. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13505068251330986>
26. Braidotti R. Metamorphoses: Towards a materialist theory of becoming. – Cambridge: Polity Press, 2002. – 328 p.

REFERENCES

1. Experts discussed issues of gender equality in education in Kazakhstan. UNESCO News. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/experts-discussed-issues-gender-equality-education-kazakhstan> (date of access 20.06.2025)
2. Butler J. Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity. New York and London: Routledge, 2002. [Electronic resource]. URL: https://selforganizedseminar.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/butler-gender_trouble.pdf (date of access 20.06.2025)
3. Crenshaw K. Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique // University of Chicago Legal Forum. – 1989. – №1. – P. 139–167.
4. Connell R.W. Gender in world perspective. – Cambridge: Polity Press, 2009. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://xyonline.net/sites/xyonline.net/files/2019-08/Connell%2C%20Gender%20in%20World%20Perspective%2C%202nd%20Edition%20%282009%29.pdf> (date of access 20.06.2025)
5. Arnot M., Weiner G. Gender and the politics of schooling. – London: Routledge, 2017. – 408 p.
6. Unterhalter E., North A. Education, poverty and global goals for gender equality. – London: Routledge, 2017. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.routledge.com/Education-Poverty-and-Global-Goals-for-Gender-Equality-How-People-Make-Policy-Happen/Unterhalter-North/p/book/9780367203795?srsId=AfmBOoroqEeK-8HfbI9q6Vp9y6bfp3ZKL5ktnH-Fsnw8-7JYr5MhjMJq> (date of access 21.06.2025)
7. Morley L. Sister-matic: Gender mainstreaming in higher education // Teaching in Higher Education. – 2007. – №12(5). – P. 607–620. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510701595267>
8. Agabekova Zh., Salimzhanova A., Suleimenova Zh., Yestekova G. Gender perspectives in higher education: Enhancing gender studies in Kazakhstan // Journal of Social Studies Education Research. – 2025. – №16(1). – P. 88–137.
9. Hasbulatova O.A., Smirnova I.N. Zhenskoe dvizhenie v Rossii: modelirovanie balansa vzaimodeistvia gosudarstva i zhenskoi iniciativy [The Women's Movement in Russia: modeling the balance of interaction between the State and women's Initiative] // Zhenshina v Rossiskom obshestve. – 2021. – №1. – S. 3-19. <https://doi.org/10.21064/WinRS.2021.1.1> [in Russian]
10. Shnyrova O. Problemy vospriatia gendernyh issledovani v akademicheskoi srede [Problems of perception of gender studies in the academic environment] // Pol. Gender. Kultura. – 2000. – T.2. – S. 231-238. [in Russian]
11. Leathwood C., Read B. Gender and the changing face of higher education: A feminized future? – Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2009. – 217 p.
12. Nussbaum M. Women and human development: The capabilities approach. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511841286>
13. Lorde A. Sister outsider: Essays and speeches. – Trumansburg, NY: Crossing Press, 1984.
14. Lather P. Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy within the postmodern. – New York: Routledge, 1991. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9780203451311/getting-smart-patti-lather> (date of access 21.06.2025)
15. Khairullayeva V., Sarybayev M., Kuzembayeva A., Yermekbayev A., Baikushikova G. Gender Policy in Kazakhstan // Journal of International Women's Studies. – 2022. – №24(1). [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://vc.bridgew.edu/jiws/vol24/iss1/25/> (date of access 20.06.2025)
16. American University Catalog 2026-2027. [Electronic resource]. URL: https://catalog.american.edu/content.php?filter%5B27%5D=-1&filter%5B29%5D=&filter%5Bkeyword%5D=gender&filter%5B32%5D=1&filter%5Bcpage%5D=1&cur_cat_oid=18&expand=&navoid=3072&search_database=Filter#acalog_template_course_filter (date of access 20.06.2025)
17. Gender and Women's Studies. [Electronic resource]. URL: https://guide.wisc.edu/courses/gen_ws/ (date of access 20.06.2025)
18. Women's, Gender, & Sexuality Studies. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.american.edu/cas/wgss/> (date of access 20.06.2025)

19. Gender and Women's Studies, BS. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://guide.wisc.edu/undergraduate/letters-science/gender-womens-studies/gender-womens-studies-bs/> (date of access 20.06.2025)
20. Lakoff R. Language and woman's place. – New York: Harper & Row, 1975. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.scribd.com/document/272131684/Lakoff-Robin-Language-and-Womans-Place> (date of access 20.06.2025)
21. Harding S. The feminist standpoint theory reader: Intellectual and political controversies. – New York: Routledge, 2004. – 394 p.
22. Skelton C., Francis B. Feminism and 'the schooling scandal'. – London: Routledge, 2009. – 192 p.
23. Zdravomyslova E.A., Temkina A.A. 12 lekci po gendernoi sociologii: uchebnoe posobie [12 lectures on gender sociology: a textbook]. – Sankt-Peterburg: Izdatelstvo Evropeiskogo universiteta v Sankt-Peterburge, 2015. – 768 s. [in Russian]
24. Kirilina A. O primenenii poniatia gender v russkoiazыchnom lingvisticheskom opisanii [On the application of the concept of gender in the Russian linguistic description] // Filologicheskie nauki. – 2000. – №3. – S. 18-27.
25. Mun O., Kudaibergen D.T. Jeong and asar: Theorising reparative concepts in gendered artistic, activist, and academic spaces // European Journal of Women's Studies. – 2025. – №32(2). – P. 159–176. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13505068251330986>
26. Braidotti R. Metamorphoses: Towards a materialist theory of becoming. – Cambridge: Polity Press, 2002. – 328 p.

Қазақстан мен Америка Құрама Штаттарындағы гендерлік зерттеу пәндерінің салыстырмалы талдауы

Андатпа. Бұл зерттеу Қазақстан мен Америка Құрама Штаттарындағы гендерлік зерттеулер пәндеріне салыстырмалы талдау жасайды және әртүрлі жоғары білім беру жүйелерінде осы саланың институционалдануы, құрылымы мен педагогикалық жүзеге асырылуын қарастырады. Феминистік теорияға, интерсекционалдылыққа және постколониялық тәсілдерге сүйене отырып, зерттеу Қазақстанның 29 университетіндегі 97 гендерлік пәнді және Америка университеті (American University) мен Висконсин-Мэдисон (University of Wisconsin–Madison) университетіндегі 204 пәнді салыстырады. Сапалық құжаттық талдау және жартылай құрылымданған сұхбаттар негізінде зерттеу үш өлшем бойынша жүргізілді: институционалдану, оқу бағдарламасының ауқымы және педагогикалық практика. Нәтижелер Қазақстанда гендерлік зерттеулер көбіне элективті пәндер ретінде дәстүрлі кафедралар аясында ұсынылатынын, пәнаралық кеңею мен тәжірибелік оқыту компоненттері шектеулі екенін көрсетті. Ал АҚШ-тағы зерттелген университеттерде интерсекционалдылықты айқын қамтитын, пәнаралық мазмұнға және тағылымдамалар мен қорытынды жобалар сияқты тәжірибелік оқытуға негізделген толық институционалданған бағдарламалар қалыптасқан. Зерттеу бұл айырмашылықтар басқару құрылымдарына, саясаттық ортаға және институционалдық мүмкіндіктерге байланысты пәннің дамуының әртүрлі траекторияларын көрсететінін дәлелдейді. Қорытындысында Қазақстанда гендерлік білім беруді күшейту үшін институционалдық қолдауды арттыру, пәнаралық ықпалдастықты кеңейту және тәжірибеге бағытталған оқу бағдарламаларын дамыту ұсынылады.

Кілт сөздер: гендерлік білім, жоғары оқу орындары, Қазақстан, АҚШ, салыстырмалы талдау, интердисциплинарлық тәсіл.

Сравнительный анализ курсов гендерных исследований в Казахстане и Соединенных Штатах Америки

Аннотация. Исследование представляет собой сравнительный анализ курсов по гендерным исследованиям в Казахстане и Соединённых Штатах Америки, рассматривающий институционализацию, структуру и педагогическую реализацию данной области в различных системах высшего образования. Опираясь на феминистскую теорию, концепцию интерсекциональности и постколониальные подходы, исследование анализирует 97 гендерных курсов в 29 университетах Казахстана и сопоставляет их с 204 курсами в American University и University of Wisconsin–Madison.

На основе качественного анализа документов и полуструктурированных интервью с преподавателями в работе рассматриваются три аналитических измерения: институционализацию, широту учебной программы и педагогические практики. Результаты показывают, что в Казахстане гендерные исследования преимущественно представлены в форме элективных курсов, встроенных в структуру традиционных кафедр, при ограниченной междисциплинарности и минимальной интеграции практико-ориентированного обучения. В рассматриваемых американских университетах, напротив, действуют полностью институционализированные программы с правом присуждения академических степеней, характеризующиеся междисциплинарной направленностью, явной интеграцией интерсекционального подхода и системным включением стажировок и итоговых проектов. Различия отражают разные траектории формирования академической дисциплины, обусловленные особенностями управления, политической среды и институциональных ресурсов. В заключение предлагается многомерная рамка развития гендерного образования в Казахстане посредством усиления институциональной поддержки, расширения междисциплинарной интеграции и развития практико-ориентированных компонентов обучения.

Ключевые слова: гендерное образование, высшие учебные заведения, Казахстан, США, сравнительный анализ, междисциплинарный подход.

Information about the authors

Agabekova Zh.A. – The Corresponding Author, Candidate of Philological Sciences, Assistant Professor, Nazarbayev University, e-mail: zhazira.agabekova@gmail.com, Kazakhstan, Astana.

Salimzhanova A.S. – PhD, Kazakh National Women's Teacher Training University, e-mail: aizhan.salimzhan@gmail.com, Kazakhstan, Almaty.

Bairbek N. – University of North Dakota, e-mail: nazira.bairbek@ndusc.edu, USA, Grand Forks.

Авторлар туралы мәлімет

Агабекова Ж.А. – корреспондент-автор, филология ғылымдарының кандидаты, ассистент-профессор, Назарбаев университеті, e-mail: zhazira.agabekova@gmail.com, Қазақстан, Астана қ.

Салимжанова А.С. – PhD, Қазақ Ұлттық қыздар педагогикалық университеті, e-mail: aizhan.salimzhan@gmail.com, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.

Байырбек Н. – Солтүстік Дакота университеті, e-mail: nazira.bairbek@ndusc.edu, АҚШ, Гранд-Форкс қ.

Сведения об авторах

Агабекова Ж.А. – автор-корреспондент, кандидат филологических наук, ассистент-профессор, Назарбаев университет, e-mail: zhazira.agabekova@gmail.com, Казахстан, г. Астана.

Салимжанова А.С. – PhD, Казахский Национальный женский педагогический университет, e-mail: aizhan.salimzhan@gmail.com, Казахстан, г. Алматы.

Байырбек Н. – Университет Северной Дакоты, e-mail: nazira.bairbek@ndusc.edu, США, г. Гранд-Форкс.