

UDC 378(091); IRSTI 14.09.35

<https://doi.org/10.47526/3107-3123.39>A. MUKHTAROVA¹, Y. OSPANOV^{2✉}, G. TUSSUPOVA³¹The National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan²Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University³National Scientific and Practical Center "Til-Qazyna" named after Sh.Shayakhmetov

✉e-mail: yedilbay.ospan@gmail.com

THE DEVELOPMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN KAZAKHSTAN: HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES ON LEADERSHIP

Abstract. The paper explores the historical development of higher education governance in Kazakhstan, with particular attention to the late imperial, early twentieth-century and Soviet periods. It examines how educational priorities, institutional control and leadership models changed under the influence of different political regimes. A historical-comparative approach makes it possible to trace these shifts, while qualitative interpretation helps reveal the social and ideological conditions that shaped the educational system of that time.

The analysis begins with the pre-Soviet stage, when Kazakh reformist intellectuals started to promote a modern, secular and nationally oriented model of education. Representatives of the Alash movement, including Alikhan Bokeikhan, Akhmet Baitursynuly and Mirzhakyp Dulatuly, regarded education not only as a tool for literacy, but also as a means of cultural preservation, civic development and national modernization. In their view, an educated generation could strengthen Kazakh identity and prepare society for broader intellectual and social progress.

However, these initiatives did not develop into a stable institutional tradition. Political changes, Soviet consolidation and later repression against the national intelligentsia interrupted the continuity of early academic and educational ideas. As a result, the emerging model of nationally grounded higher education was gradually replaced by a different system based on ideological discipline and administrative control.

During the Soviet period, higher education governance in Kazakhstan became part of a centralized state structure. Universities and institutes were managed through vertical authority, unified curricula, strict planning and strong ideological supervision. The study shows that the governance of higher education in Kazakhstan was closely connected with state-building, ideology and cultural policy. Its historical path reflects the tension between early reformist aspirations and the long-lasting Soviet legacy of centralization. Understanding this background is important for evaluating current reforms, especially those related to university autonomy, academic freedom, national identity and integration into international educational standards.

Keywords: higher education institutions, pre-Soviet period, Kazakh intelligentsia, Alash movement, higher education governance, academic leadership.

* Бізге дұрыс сілтеме жасаңыз:

Mukhtarova A., Ospanov Y., Tussupova G. The Development of Higher Education in Kazakhstan: Historical Perspectives on Leadership // Yassawi Journal of Education Studies. – 2026. – №2 (140). – Б. 5-16. <https://doi.org/10.47526/3107-3123.39>

*Cite us correctly:

Mukhtarova A., Ospanov Y., Tussupova G. The Development of Higher Education in Kazakhstan: Historical Perspectives on Leadership // Yassawi Journal of Education Studies. – 2026. – №2 (140). – Б. 5-16. <https://doi.org/10.47526/3107-3123.39>

Date of receipt of the article 06.02.2026 / Date of acceptance 30.06.2026

Introduction

The formation of higher education governance and academic leadership in Kazakhstan cannot be separated from the country's wider historical experience. Political upheavals, colonial administration, Soviet institutional planning and cultural transformations all shaped the way universities were managed and how leadership was understood. Moorosi, Fuller and Reilly [1, p. 156] rightly stress that present-day leadership practices should be read through the lens of earlier historical struggles, since these struggles influence not only formal structures, but also professional attitudes, expectations and patterns of authority. For Kazakhstan, this background includes the weakening of indigenous forms of social and educational organisation, the dominance of imperial and Soviet bureaucratic models, and the forced interruption of national intellectual projects. Their combined effect is still visible in the way leadership in higher education is defined, justified and reproduced.

Particular importance belongs to the pre-Soviet reformist tradition associated with the Kazakh intelligentsia and the Alash-Orda movement. Although Alash-Orda existed for a limited period, its intellectual programme had long-term significance. Its representatives promoted the idea of an autonomous, secular and culturally grounded education system capable of serving national development rather than merely administrative needs. The value of this legacy lies not only in the model it proposed, but also in the fact that this model was cut short before it could become a stable institutional practice.

The Soviet stage is commonly linked with the period beginning in 1936, when the Constitution of the USSR was adopted on 5 December and the Kazakh ASSR was reorganised into the Kazakh SSR. This change formally granted Kazakhstan the status of a union republic with its own constitutional framework, yet real decision-making remained highly centralised. Between 1936 and 1991, higher education expanded institutionally and supported industrial and technological modernisation, but its governance was built on strict vertical control, ideological supervision and unified administrative standards. Academic autonomy was narrowed, local leadership traditions were pushed aside, and many nationally oriented intellectuals and reformers were persecuted or removed from public life. As a result, Kazakhstan lost an important layer of institutional memory and leadership continuity.

For this reason, the historical development of higher education governance should be viewed not as a closed chapter, but as a key to understanding current reforms. By tracing how leadership practices emerged, changed and were disrupted, it becomes possible to explain why contemporary universities still face tensions between centralised control, institutional independence and national educational priorities. Such a perspective also creates a basis for rethinking leadership in a way that is more autonomous, culturally grounded and responsive to the future needs of Kazakhstan's higher education system.

Research Methods and Materials

This article uses a historical and comparative method to identify the distinctive features and institutional transformations in Kazakhstan's higher education system during key historical periods. This method allows us to compare management models, educational structures, and political changes in the pre-Soviet, Soviet, and post-Soviet periods. Qualitative descriptive analysis is also used to reconstruct the evolution of governance mechanisms in higher education, with a particular focus on the role of the Kazakh intelligentsia, government authorities, and institutional change. Thus, higher education is considered a dynamic reflection of political, ideological, and socio-cultural changes in the region. The historical framework covers the following stages: pre-Sovietisation, the Kazakh intelligentsia, and higher education in Soviet Kazakhstan.

The first section explores the rise of educational thought and academic initiatives led by members of the Alash-Orda movement, a national liberation organisation and provisional Kazakh government formed in 1917, which sought to establish an autonomous state. Many Alash-Orda leaders were notable educators, scientists, and intellectuals who laid the ideological and institutional foundations of higher education in Kazakhstan. Their vision emphasised secular, modern, and

culturally rooted education. The second stage, Higher Education in Soviet Kazakhstan, covers the era following the integration of Kazakhstan into the Soviet Union as the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic (1936–1991). At this stage, higher education in Kazakhstan was drawn into a rigid Soviet administrative order and subordinated to Marxist-Leninist ideology. The sector expanded rapidly: new institutions appeared, training programmes became more systematic, and the state invested in preparing specialists for industry, science and public administration. Yet this growth came at a high cost. The Stalinist purges destroyed a large part of the Kazakh intellectual elite, including educators and public figures connected with Alash-Orda. Their removal broke the continuity of national academic thought and replaced earlier reformist ideas with a uniform Soviet model based on control, standardisation and political loyalty.

A comparison of the pre-Soviet and Soviet stages makes it possible to see how the logic of leadership, institutional management and educational priorities changed over time. The historical-comparative perspective helps trace these shifts across different political conditions, while descriptive analysis clarifies how external ideological pressure influenced universities, academic decision-making and leadership culture. Such an approach reveals why many current challenges in Kazakhstan's higher education system are rooted not only in recent reforms, but also in deeper historical ruptures. Understanding this legacy is necessary for building future governance models that combine institutional autonomy, national continuity and modern educational standards.

Discussion

The entire natural structure of Kazakh nomadic life and culture, genuine mentality, and national identity changed dramatically with the colonial policy that began in the mid-eighteenth century. Within a century, the whole territory of Kazakhstan was controlled by the Russian Empire. There were continuous uprisings against Tsarist Russia's policies, including the occupation of lands, confiscation of wealth and cattle, and leaving people in hunger. The modern Kazakh historian, Mankeev [2], distinguishes several periods of political repression and persecution in the Soviet Union directed towards the Kazakh nation and its leaders.

The first period (1929–1930) of repression was between 1916 and 1920. It is associated with a severe famine that killed 1.144 million Central Asian people [3, p. 45, cited in 4, p. 499]. The second period (1930–1932) of repression has attracted more attention from researchers from different parts of the world. The Goloshchekin genocide, or the Kazakh famine, a catastrophe between 1930 and 1933, took away 1.5 million lives (a quarter of the population), and 'mass violence and comparative famines, the crisis is little known in the West' [5, p. 117]. The numbers vary in different sources, with the likelihood that more than 2 million people died [6]. However, the Kazakh population was the ethnic group with the highest losses in the Soviet period.

Of all repressions, the third period of political prosecution in 1937–1938 had the greatest impact on education, in particular higher education and leadership. This was the period of the Great Purge, or the Great Terror, which killed around 1.2 million people in the Soviet Union [7]; more than 100,000 people were illegally convicted in Kazakhstan, and 25,000 of them were sentenced to death by shooting [6]. Mankeev [2] mentions a number of political and educational elites who were severe victims of repression.

Notable educationalists were members of Alash-Orda, a national liberation movement and provisional Kazakh government initiated in 1917, which aimed at establishing an autonomous state [4]. In their draft political programme published in 1917 in the Qazaq newspaper, they stated that 'Democracy is the people's power and federation is a unity of equal states (each state is based on self-government and has its own territory; each state is united and in collaboration with other states)' [4, p. 495].

The newspaper Qazaq, as well as others (e.g., Qazaqstan, Eshim dalasy, Alash, Sary-Arka, Uly Turkestan, Zhas Azamat, Aiqap, Abai), were very popular among Kazakh youth, as they were influential sources regarding education strategy in the Kazakh steppe. Mukhtar Auezov, a well-known Kazakh writer, wrote about the Qazaq newspaper, which was published between 1913 and 1918, with

a circulation of 8,000, as follows: ‘Popular stories published from time to time in the newspaper Qazaq played a significant role in the education of Kazakh schoolchildren. They disclosed possible dangers and pointed out the right way. The newspaper was a guide for the young and immature generation. Young people who did not want to go to school (e.g., religious medrese) read the Qazaq newspaper with great interest wherever they could get it [...] It was the Qazaq newspaper that awakened old and young Kazakhs from their death-like sleep. This paper activated the minds and souls of its readers, just as the circulation of blood animates an otherwise lifeless body’ [4, p. 495].

Awakening and activating young Kazakhs’ minds was not desirable to the Soviet Communist Party leadership, which pursued a policy of Russification among colonised nations. Alash-Orda was perceived as a real threat to the central government and a potential driving force for other colonised countries. Thus, SovNarkom issued a ‘Decree on Publishing’ on 27 October (November) 1917, which imposed censorship on any text with a national orientation. Consequently, many newspapers were forced to close under this regulation.

Alash-Ordists’ political programme was drafted by several political and educational activists, such as A. Bokeikhanov, A. Baitursynov, M. Dulatov, E. Gumarov, E. Turmukhamedov, G. Zhandibaev, and G. Birimzhanov, who were all eventually repressed for their national and democratic ideas. According to their programme, higher education should be free and accessible to all people, and programmes should be taught in the native Kazakh language. Importantly, they argued that all educational institutions should be autonomous, and that political authorities should not interfere with education [8].

The central policy in education was envisioned by members of the Educational Committee in the Alash movement, such as Ahmet Baitursynuly, Magzhan Zhumabayev, Eldes Omarov, Biahmet Sarsenov, and Telzhan Shonanov. To exemplify, in his autobiographical writing (12 May 1920), Baitursynuly states that his role in Alash-Orda was mainly writing books in the Kazakh language. He started as a primary school teacher and became an educational reformer who introduced scientific terminology and a new alphabet, converting Arabic script to Latin (later converted to Cyrillic in the Soviet Union). Apart from his teaching experience, he held leadership positions such as People’s Commissar for Education and Chair of the Academic Centre. Furthermore, he was a lecturer at the Kazakh Institute of People’s Education and an associate professor in the Department of Kazakh Language at the Kazakh Pedagogical Institute in Tashkent (now the capital of Uzbekistan, transferred to its territory in 1925 by the USSR). He was repressed twice, in 1909–1910 when he was head of a pedagogical training academy (‘uchilishche’), and later, on 25 November 1937, he was sentenced to death [8].

Another prominent higher education leader is Sanzhar Asphendiayrov. He was a founder of a Kazakh teacher training college (later the Kazakh National Pedagogical Institute) and also the first rector of Almaty Medical Institute (1931–1933; now S.F. Asfendiarov Kazakh National Medical University). Later, he was a professor at Moscow State University and also a practising doctor. Despite his proximity to Moscow, he was labelled an ‘enemy of the people’ and was shot on the same day as his imprisonment. Similarly, Professor and Vice-Rector of the Kazakh Pedagogical Institute, Khalel Dosmukhameduly, was executed [9]. The majority of repressed educated people were sentenced or imprisoned under Article 58 of the Criminal Code of the RSFSR, published in 1934, which broadly covered activities deemed counter-revolutionary or against the interests of the Soviet state [10].

The list of repressed educationalists and leaders may be extensive; however, two critical issues should be highlighted in discussing the tragic fate of the Kazakh intelligentsia. Mankeev [2] offers a revealing distinction within the Kazakh intelligentsia, separating it into two symbolic groups: *ziyaly*, meaning intellectually and morally responsible figures, and *ziyandy*, meaning those whose actions became destructive for national development. This classification is important because it shows that repression was not carried out only by external Soviet authorities. In many cases, it also relied on local intermediaries who had been incorporated into the new political system and used their position

to report, accuse or expose others. Mankeev describes such actors as *ziyandy*, since they often participated in denunciations against their own compatriots. As noted in [11], these informers could report to “the centre” in Moscow about alleged local misconduct, administrative weakness or political unreliability.

The repressions of 1937–1938 became one of the most damaging moments in the formation of higher education in Soviet Kazakhstan. The arrest and execution of Kazakh scholars, teachers, writers and public leaders caused not only personal tragedy, but also a serious intellectual rupture. A large part of the educated elite disappeared from academic and public life, which sharply weakened the human, cultural and institutional foundations needed for the development of national higher education. The wave of repression effectively destroyed much of the first generation of the Kazakh national intelligentsia, who had laid the foundations for educational institutions, translated scientific knowledge into the Kazakh language, and promoted national cultural development [12, p. 14].

Extreme persecution in the 1930s had catastrophic consequences for the formation, identity, and further development of the Kazakh nation as part of the Soviet Union. In other words, oppression, terror, fear, and passive resistance became part of everyday life, where ‘normal life’ became ‘a luxury’ [13, p. 2]. According to Kissane [14, p. 49], ‘the systematic extermination of the people’s customs, traditions, and suppression of national character resulted in a decline in national culture and traditions during the Soviet period’.

In line with denomadisation, there was a process of constructing a new Soviet socialist identity and citizenship through the development of a new education system. Totalitarianism, which aimed to create a new type of citizen, *Homo Sovieticus*, ultimately failed and manifested itself in a stigmatised ‘social aliens’ society [14]. Many topics that could potentially question the legitimacy of the totalitarian Soviet regime were taboo. In such a highly controlled environment, freedom of speech and action was suppressed, and any deviations from established norms were quickly punished. The consequences for education were profound. Leadership positions were increasingly occupied by people who did not challenge the system and could be trusted to reproduce the official political line. Professional competence mattered, but loyalty to the Communist Party and acceptance of the Soviet ideological order often became the decisive criteria for promotion.

Higher education in the Kazakh SSR developed as part of the wider administrative structure of the Soviet Union. In contrast to Western university traditions, where institutional self-governance gradually became an important principle, the Soviet system relied on strict hierarchy. Ministries, party committees and central planning bodies controlled key decisions, from curricula and staffing to research priorities and institutional development. Universities were expected not only to train specialists, but also to shape politically reliable citizens who could serve the goals of industrialisation, state-building and ideological consolidation.

For this reason, the governance of higher education in Soviet Kazakhstan should be understood as a mechanism through which knowledge, research and academic management were subordinated to the needs of the regime. Educational institutions functioned within a political economy where intellectual activity was valuable only when it supported the strategic, technical and ideological objectives of the Soviet state.

Results

Nurtazina [15, p. 148 cited in 18] classifies the process of the development of the Kazakh Soviet education system into three periods. The first period, between 1918 and the 1930s, is the formation stage of the country’s education system, which aimed at eradicating illiteracy, developing a new educational policy, establishing authorities and structures, and clarifying functions and processes. It should be noted that the illiteracy rate was measured in relation to knowledge of the Russian language, whereas the majority of educated people in the early twentieth century were proficient in Arabic and Persian.

The second period, between 1931 and 1960, was characterised by the elimination of indigenous pedagogical traditions and the strengthening of policy at national levels through collectivisation

linked to economic objectives. The final period, between 1961 and 1990, was the ‘epoch of technical revolution, of intensification of research and explorations’. According to Smolentseva, Huisman, and Froumin [16, p. 7], the Soviet HE system had the following distinctive features:

(1) mainly state-centred, with central planning and a top-down command method of administration;

(2) the higher education system was embedded in a broader economic planning system and had to respond to directives from higher authorities;

(3) higher education institutions were required to train a specified number of specialists in particular fields, while the broader economic planning system was responsible for graduates’ job assignments;

(4) the control and supervision of higher education institutions were distributed among a large number of sectoral ministries responsible for administering specific industries.

Since the system was based on a collective perspective, neither academic freedom nor individual rights in higher education were prioritised [17]. The political priorities of the USSR were disseminated through communist universities. In 1931, there were 45 such institutions; all of them were modelled on the first ‘Communist University named after Sverdlov’, established in 1919. The primary purpose of these universities was ‘to be the main instrument in the training of new leaders, of a new Soviet elite’ and to train ‘ethnic’ local leaders to serve the interests of the Party [18, p. 50]. Notably, early Russian academia was composed largely of ‘foreigners, representing scholars of Nordic Europe, mostly of German and Dutch descent’ [17, p. 183].

In the 1920s, the first five institutions were opened in Kazakh lands: Bukeev, Semipalatinsk, the Kazakh Orenburg Institute of Public Education, and the Kazakh Institute of Education in Alma-Ata [Almaty]. Despite the various tragedies taking place in the steppe, Soviet education policy continued to expand and consolidate its influence across cities. Thus, between 1927 and 1932, 15 new specialised institutions with postgraduate (aspirantura) programmes were established, including those in medicine, agriculture, and livestock, such as the Veterinary-Zoo Technical Institute (1928), Kazakh State Agricultural Institute (1930), and the Kazakh Medical Institute (1931). Between 1933 and 1937, there was further expansion of pedagogical institutes throughout the Kazakh SSR, including the establishment of Kirov Kazakh State University (1934) [19, pp. 200–201].

A further 16 institutions were established after the Second World War, between 1946 and 1963. Overall, ‘by 1975, there were 47 HEIs, which offered programmes in 175 different areas for 200,000 students’ [20 cited in 19, p. 201]. In 1986, before the collapse of the Soviet Union, there were 55 institutions and 246 vocational training colleges and academies with 550,000 students in more than 200 programmes [21].

Notably, the increase in the number of institutions significantly improved literacy rates among the population. In 1916, the literacy rate among Kazakhs was 4% [22], rising to 6.9% by 1926 (total population 3.713 million) and reaching 54.5% in 1939 (total population 2.327 million) [23].

Due to the contribution of repressed elite educators in the 1930s and the strong centralised directive policy, the population of Kazakhstan had achieved a high literacy rate (97.53% in 1989, Macrotrends.net, 2022) by the time it gained independence in 1991. Subsequently, it reached its current literacy rate of 99.8% for both males and females within a relatively short period [24]. The Soviet education system, by encompassing citizens of different backgrounds and ages, promoted equality and gender balance in access (both rural and urban) and quality of education. Olcott [25] notes that: ‘during the Soviet period Kazakhs and all other Soviet citizens were granted access to education...’.

However, it should be noted that the system did not foster critical thinking, as it aimed to cultivate collective communist consciousness aligned with the needs of a planned economy. In the period after the Second World War, there was a fourth wave of political repression of the intelligentsia (following the three periods mentioned above, Atajurt Kazakhstan, 2019), which lasted until Stalin’s death in 1953.

The governance of higher education in Soviet Kazakhstan reveals a system that prioritised political loyalty and economic utility over academic autonomy. On the one hand, centralisation allowed for rapid expansion of higher education, the establishment of specialised institutions, and the alignment of research with state needs. At the same time, this model seriously narrowed the space for academic freedom and independent innovation. Universities had little opportunity to define their own research agendas, design flexible curricula or respond to local intellectual needs. The strong presence of Party structures guaranteed ideological discipline, yet it also suppressed pluralism and prevented alternative scholarly traditions from developing within the higher education system.

In terms of Kazakhs holding leadership positions in the Soviet period, the numbers were generally low across most fields. For example, only 6.8% of heads in medical organisations, 19.9% in agriculture, 16% in educational institutions, and 6.9% in communications were Kazakh [23, p. 144]. Despite the rapid development of the education system in the 1960s, the professorial and academic staff did not meet required standards. Only 921 individuals (20.3%) held the rank of associate professor or candidate of sciences, and just 99 (2.2%) held the title of Professor or Doctor of Science. These figures remained largely unchanged in the 1990s [21].

In Soviet Kazakhstan, the management of higher education was embedded in a multi-level system dominated by the Communist Party. At every level – union, republican, and institutional – appointments and policies were tightly controlled. Development programmes were based on five-year plans reflecting priorities of industrialisation, modernisation, and integration with production. While the system succeeded in producing a technically skilled workforce, it did so at the expense of institutional autonomy and academic freedom.

At the top stood the Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialised Education of the USSR (Minvuz), which regulated curricula, admissions quotas, and funding. At the republican level, the Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialised Education of the Kazakh SSR implemented all-Union directives. In practice, however, decisive power remained in the hands of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan, which supervised the most important appointments and determined who could occupy leadership positions.

The Soviet state promoted higher education in Kazakhstan for two closely connected reasons: ideological consolidation and economic mobilisation. Universities were expected to bring the Kazakh population into the Soviet cultural and linguistic space, while also preparing engineers, teachers, administrators and technical specialists needed for industrialisation and collectivisation [5]. In this respect, higher education functioned not only as a channel for professional training, but also as a tool for reshaping society according to Soviet political priorities.

Conclusion

The evolution of higher education governance in Kazakhstan reveals how deeply academic institutions were shaped by state formation, political rupture and administrative redesign. Early reformist circles were not merely discussing education as a technical sphere; they were trying to imagine a national intellectual infrastructure built on autonomy, cultural continuity and modern knowledge. The Kazakh intelligentsia, particularly representatives of the Alash Movement, gave this vision its clearest expression. For them, education was connected with the future of the nation: it had to prepare a new educated elite, preserve cultural identity and open access to modern forms of social and scientific development. Yet this trajectory was sharply redirected during the Soviet period. Centralised control, ideological regulation and political repression changed the logic of university governance, weakened institutional independence and interrupted the formation of plural academic traditions.

The personnel structure of Soviet higher education created additional long-term limitations. Ethnic Kazakhs remained insufficiently represented in senior academic and administrative positions, while the share of highly qualified teaching staff also stayed relatively low for a considerable part of the Soviet period. This imbalance affected more than statistics. It slowed the emergence of national leadership schools, strengthened dependence on central administrative models and limited the growth

of strong research communities. A shortage of doctoral-level faculty reduced scientific capacity and made universities more vulnerable to external control. The fact that many of these problems were still visible in the 1990s shows how deeply inherited institutional patterns continued to influence post-Soviet academic development.

These historical breaks help explain why contemporary reform efforts often face resistance not only at the level of policy, but also inside organisational culture. The legacy of Soviet governance did not disappear with political independence. Bureaucratic routines, vertical decision-making and cautious attitudes toward academic autonomy continued to shape institutional behaviour. Modernisation and internationalisation may formally introduce new standards, rankings, quality assurance procedures and partnership models, yet their implementation is often slowed by older habits of control and dependency.

At the same time, the Soviet period cannot be reduced only to repression and restriction. It also expanded access to higher education, created technical institutes, supported professional training and linked universities to large state modernisation projects, including the Virgin Lands campaign and the technological priorities of the 1980s. Centralised monitoring and quality control were ideologically rigid, but they did help produce specialists for industry, agriculture, engineering and public administration. The contradiction is important: the same system that built institutional capacity also limited intellectual freedom and local academic initiative.

Future reform in Kazakhstan's higher education sector should therefore move beyond formal restructuring and policy revision. A more sustainable model requires a serious return to marginalised intellectual traditions, especially the national pedagogical and reformist heritage interrupted in the twentieth century. Academic autonomy, context-sensitive governance and stronger research leadership need to develop alongside international standards, not in opposition to them. Kazakhstan's experience shows that university reform is never only about management. It is also about historical memory, cultural legitimacy and the ability of academic institutions to define their own role in national development.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Moorosi P., Fuller K., Reilly E. Leadership and intersectionality: Constructions of successful leadership among Black women school principals in three different contexts // *Management in Education*. – 2018. – Vol. 32, № 4. – P. 152–159.
2. Нұрдаулет Манкеев тарихшы. Болмыс бағдарламасы // *Atajurt Kazakhstan*. – 2019. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V1xG35ysjts> (date of access: 05.01.2026)
3. Chokay M. *Turkestan under Soviet Power (On the Nature of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat)*. – Paris, 1935. – 127 p.
4. Kendirbay G. The national liberation movement of the Kazakh intelligentsia at the beginning of the 20th century // *Central Asian Survey*. – 1997. – Vol. 16, №4. – P. 487–515. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02634939708401009>.
5. Cameron S. The Kazakh famine of 1930–33: Current research and new directions // *East/West: Journal of Ukrainian Studies*. – 2016. – Vol. 3, №2. – P. 117–132.
6. Zhumabayeva K. May 31 marks Kazakh Day of Remembrance // *The Astana Times*. – 2017. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://astanatimes.com/2017/05/may-31-marks-kazakh-day-of-remembrance/> (date of access: 09.01.2026)
7. Ellman M. Soviet Repression Statistics: Some Comments // *Europe-Asia Studies*. – 2002. – Vol. 54, № 7. – P. 1151–1172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0966813022000017177>.
8. Установление советской власти и первые шаги. – 2017. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://e-history.kz/ru/history-of-kazakhstan/show/9235/> (date of access: 12.01.2026)
9. Члены народного совета правительства Алашорды // *Алаш электрондық кітапханасы*. – 2016. [Electronic resource]. URL: http://alash.semeylib.kz/?page_id=81&lang=ru (date of access: 12.01.2026)
10. Cunningham H.S. Article 58, Criminal Code of the RSFSR, 1934. – 1999. [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://www.cyberusssr.com/rus/uk58-e.html#58-1a> (date of access: 15.01.2026)

11. Fitzpatrick S. The Practice of Denunciation in Stalinist Russia. – Washington: National Council for Soviet and East European Research, 1994. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://ru.scribd.com/document/938058281/1994-808-04-Fitzpatrick-the-Practice-of-Denunciation-in-Stalinist-Russia> (date of access: 12.01.2026)
12. Olcott M. The Kazakhs. – Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1995. – 388 p.
13. Fitzpatrick S. Everyday Stalinism: Ordinary Life in Extraordinary Times: Soviet Russia in the 1930s. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. – 501 p.
14. Kissane C. History education in transit: Where to for Kazakhstan? // *Comparative Education*. – 2005. – Vol. 41, №1. – P. 45–69. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050060500073249>.
15. Нуртазина Р.А. Образовательная политика Республики Казахстан в условиях глобализации: дис. ... докт. полит. наук. – Алматы, 2005. – 277 с.
16. Smolentseva A., Huisman J., Froumin I. Transformation of higher education institutional landscape in post-Soviet countries: From Soviet model to where? // In: *25 Years of Transformations of Higher Education Systems in Post-Soviet Countries*. – Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-52980-6_1.
17. Kuraev A.N. Soviet higher education: An alternative construct to the western university paradigm // *Higher Education*. – 2016. – Vol. 71. – P. 181–193.
18. Froumin I., Kouzminov Y. Common legacy: Evolution of the institutional landscape of Soviet higher education // In: *25 Years of Transformations of Higher Education Systems in Post-Soviet Countries*. – Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018. – P. 45–72.
19. Ahn E.S., Dixon J., Chekmareva L. Looking at Kazakhstan's higher education landscape: From transition to transformation between 1920 and 2015 // In: *25 Years of Transformations of Higher Education Systems in Post-Soviet Countries*. – Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018. – P. 199–228.
20. Джолдасбеков У., Кузнецов Е. Казахский государственный университет и высшее образование в Казахской ССР. – Алма-Ата: Казахский национальный университет имени Кирова, 1975. – 302 с.
21. Преодоление массовой неграмотности населения и развитие народного образования. – 2013. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://e-history.kz/ru/contents/view/330> (date of access: 20.01.2026)
22. Mynbayeva A., Pogosian V. Kazakhstani school education development from the 1930s: History and current trends // *Italian Journal of Sociology of Education*. – 2014. – Vol. 6, №2. – P. 144–172.
23. Баканов С.А., Жумашев Р.М. О темпах ликвидации неграмотности в Казахстане в 1926-1939 годах. – 2002. [Electronic resource]. URL: https://rep.ksu.kz/bitstream/handle/data/103/Bakanov_Zhumashev.pdf (date of access: 20.01.2026)
24. Yerkinbayev A., Benjamin J., Kambarova M. Corporate Acquisitions and Mergers in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan. – 2nd ed. – Alphen aan den Rijn: Kluwer Law International, 2019. – 255 p.
25. Olcott M. Kazakhstan's Soviet Legacy // *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*. – 2011. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://carnegieendowment.org/2011/11/30/kazakhstan-s-soviet-legacy-pub-46096> (date of access: 25.01.2026)

REFERENCES

1. Moorosi P., Fuller K., Reilly E. Leadership and intersectionality: Constructions of successful leadership among Black women school principals in three different contexts // *Management in Education*. – 2018. – Vol. 32, № 4. – P. 152–159.
2. Nurdaulet Mankeev tarihshy. Bolmys bagdarlamasy [Nurdaulet Mankeev is a historian. Existence program] // [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V1xG35ysjts> (date of access: 05.01.2026). [in Kazakh]
3. Chokay M. Turkestan under Soviet Power (On the Nature of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat). – Paris, 1935. – 127 p.
4. Kendirbay G. The national liberation movement of the Kazakh intelligentsia at the beginning of the 20th century // *Central Asian Survey*. – 1997. – Vol. 16, №4. – P. 487–515. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02634939708401009>.
5. Cameron S. The Kazakh famine of 1930–33: Current research and new directions // *East/West: Journal of Ukrainian Studies*. – 2016. – Vol. 3, №2. – P. 117–132.

6. Zhumabayeva K. May 31 marks Kazakh Day of Remembrance // The Astana Times. – 2017. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://astanatimes.com/2017/05/may-31-marks-kazakh-day-of-remembrance/> (date of access: 09.01.2026)
7. Ellman M. Soviet Repression Statistics: Some Comments // Europe-Asia Studies. – 2002. – Vol. 54, № 7. – P. 1151–1172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0966813022000017177>.
8. Ustanovlenie sovetsoi vlasti i pervye shagi [The establishment of Soviet power and the first steps]. – 2017. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://e-history.kz/ru/history-of-kazakhstan/show/9235/> (date of access: 12.01.2026) [in Russian]
9. Chleny narodnogo soveta pravitelstva Alashordy [Members of the People's Council of the Government of Alashorda] // Alash elektrondyq kitapqanasy. – 2016. [Electronic resource]. URL: http://alash.semeylib.kz/?page_id=81&lang=ru (date of access: 12.01.2026) [in Russian]
10. Cunningham H.S. Article 58, Criminal Code of the RSFSR, 1934. – 1999. [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://www.cyberusssr.com/rus/uk58-e.html#58-1a> (date of access: 15.01.2026)
11. Fitzpatrick S. The Practice of Denunciation in Stalinist Russia. – Washington: National Council for Soviet and East European Research, 1994. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://ru.scribd.com/document/938058281/1994-808-04-Fitzpatrick-the-Practice-of-Denunciation-in-Stalinist-Russia> (date of access: 12.01.2026)
12. Olcott M. The Kazakhs. – Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1995. – 388 p.
13. Fitzpatrick S. Everyday Stalinism: Ordinary Life in Extraordinary Times: Soviet Russia in the 1930s. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. – 501 p.
14. Kissane C. History education in transit: Where to for Kazakhstan? // Comparative Education. – 2005. – Vol. 41, №1. – P. 45–69. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050060500073249>.
15. Nurtazina R.A. Obrazovatelnaia politika Respubliki Kazahstan v usloviakh globalizatsii: dis. ... dokt. polit. nauk. [Educational Policy of the Republic of Kazakhstan in the Context of Globalization: dis.]. – Almaty, 2005. – 277 s. [in Russian]
16. Smolentseva A., Huisman J., Froumin I. Transformation of higher education institutional landscape in post-Soviet countries: From Soviet model to where? // In: 25 Years of Transformations of Higher Education Systems in Post-Soviet Countries. – Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-52980-6_1.
17. Kuraev A.N. Soviet higher education: An alternative construct to the western university paradigm // Higher Education. – 2016. – Vol. 71. – P. 181–193.
18. Froumin I., Kouzminov Y. Common legacy: Evolution of the institutional landscape of Soviet higher education // In: 25 Years of Transformations of Higher Education Systems in Post-Soviet Countries. – Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018. – P. 45–72.
19. Ahn E.S., Dixon J., Chekmareva L. Looking at Kazakhstan's higher education landscape: From transition to transformation between 1920 and 2015 // In: 25 Years of Transformations of Higher Education Systems in Post-Soviet Countries. – Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018. – P. 199–228.
20. Dzholdasbekov U., Kuznecov E. Kazahski gosudarstvennyi universitet i vysshee obrazovanie v Kazahskoi SSR [Kazakh State University and Higher Education in the Kazakh SSR]. – Alma-Ata: Kazahski nacionalnyi universitet imeni Kirova, 1975. – 302 s. [in Russian]
21. Preodolenie massovoi negramotnosti naselenia i razvitie narodnogo obrazovania [Overcoming mass illiteracy and developing public education]. – 2013. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://e-history.kz/ru/contents/view/330> (date of access: 20.01.2026) [in Russian]
22. Mynbayeva A., Pogossian V. Kazakhstani school education development from the 1930s: History and current trends // Italian Journal of Sociology of Education. – 2014. – Vol. 6, №2. – P. 144–172.
23. Bakanov S.A., Zhumashev R.M. O tempah likvidatsii negramotnosti v Kazakhstane v 1926-1939 godah [On the rate of illiteracy elimination in Kazakhstan in 1926-1939]. – 2002. [Electronic resource]. URL: https://rep.ksu.kz/bitstream/handle/data/103/Bakanov_Zhumashev.pdf (date of access: 20.01.2026) [in Russian]
24. Yerkinbayev A., Benjamin J., Kambarova M. Corporate Acquisitions and Mergers in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan. – 2nd ed. – Alphen aan den Rijn: Kluwer Law International, 2019. – 255 p.
25. Olcott M. Kazakhstan's Soviet Legacy // Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. – 2011. [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://carnegieendowment.org/2011/11/30/kazakhstan-s-soviet-legacy-pub-46096> (date of access: 25.01.2026)

Қазақстандағы жоғары білімнің дамуы: көшбасшылықтың тарихи қырлары

Андатпа. Зерттеуде Қазақстандағы жоғары білім беруді басқару жүйесінің дамуы тарихи-аналитикалық тұрғыдан қарастырылады. Кеңес кезеңіне дейінгі және кеңес кезеңіндегі жүйедегі өзгерістер талданады. Зерттеуде тарихи-салыстырмалы әдіс пен сапалық сипаттамалық талдау қолданылады, осы арқылы басқару құрылымдарының, білім беру модельдерінің және институциялық басымдықтардың өзгеруін, сондай-ақ жүйеге әсер еткен әлеуметтік-саяси факторларды ашу көзделеді. Зерттеу кеңеске дейінгі кезеңді талдаудан басталады, онда ұлт-азаттық Алаш қозғалысы мүшелерінің, қазақ зиялыларының қосқан үлесіне назар аударылады. Олар ұлттық құндылықтарға негізделген, зайырлы, автономды білім беру жүйесін құруға ұмтылды және жоғары білім беру идеологиясының іргетасын қалады, бірақ ол бастамаларды кеңес билігі тоқтатып тастады. Алаш қайраткерлері мен алғашқы ағартушылар жаппай саяси қуғын-сүргінге ұшырап, ұсталып, атылды немесе айдалды, бұл ұлттық академиялық дамудың сабақтастығын үзіп жіберді. Нәтижесінде жүйе кеңестік бірыңғай модельге сәйкес қайта құрылып, идеологияға бағыну мен орталықтандырылған басқаруға негізделді.

Зерттеудің басты мақсаты – тарихи мұра, саяси идеологиялар мен институциялық күйзелістердің Қазақстандағы жоғары білім беруді басқару траекториясына қалай әсер еткенін талдау. Нәтижелер саланы басқару мемлекеттілік және идеологиялық өзгерістермен тығыз байланысты екенін көрсетеді. Сондай-ақ жоғары білім беруді басқару модельдерінің тарихи эволюциясын түсіну – қазіргі реформаларды бағалау үшін маңызды. Ерте интеллектуалдық қозғалыстардың мұрасы мен кеңестік кезеңдегі институциялық қатаңдық бүгінгі сын-қатерлер мен стратегиялық шешімдерге әсер етуде. Бұл талдау академиялық дербестікті қалпына келтіру, тарихи жадыны сақтау және ұлттық бірегейлікті жаһандық білім стандарттарымен ұштастыра отырып басқару жүйесін қайта пайымдаудың маңызын айқындайды.

Кілт сөздер: жоғары білім, кеңеске дейінгі кезең, қазақ зиялылары, Алаш қозғалысы, жоғары оқу орындары, жоғары білімдегі көшбасшылық.

Развитие высшего образования в Казахстане: исторические аспекты лидерства

Аннотация. Настоящее исследование представляет собой историко-аналитическое осмысление развития системы управления высшим образованием в Казахстане, прослеживая её трансформации на ключевых этапах: до-советском и советском периодах. В работе применяется историко-сравнительный метод для анализа изменений в образовательных моделях, структурах управления и институциональных приоритетах, а также качественный описательный анализ для реконструкции социально-политических факторов, повлиявших на систему. Исследование начинается с анализа до-советского периода с акцентом на вклад казахской интеллигенции, особенно представителей движения «Алаш Орда» – национально-освободительной организации, возникшей в 1917 году. Эти интеллектуалы и педагоги стремились создать светскую автономную систему образования, основанную на национальных ценностях. Они сыграли ключевую роль в формировании идеологических основ высшего образования, хотя их усилия были впоследствии прерваны советской консолидацией. В этот период система высшего образования стала централизованной, подчинённой марксистско-ленинской идеологии и строгому государственному контролю. Политические репрессии, включая аресты, ссылки и расстрелы представителей движения «Алаш» и просветителей, серьёзно нарушили преемственность национального академического развития. В результате система была перестроена в соответствии с унифицированной советской моделью с акцентом на идеологическое подчинение и централизованное управление. Основная цель исследования – проанализировать, как историческое наследие, политические идеологии и институциональные потрясения повлияли на траекторию развития системы управления высшим образованием в Казахстане. Результаты показывают, что управление в данной сфере тесно связано с процессами государственного строительства и идеологических трансформаций. В заключение исследование утверждает, что понимание исторической эволюции моделей управления высшим образованием имеет решающее значение для оценки современных реформ. Наследие ранних интеллектуальных движений и институциональная жёсткость советской эпохи продолжают оказывать влияние на текущие вызовы и стратегические решения. Проведенный анализ подчеркивает важность восстановления академической

автономии, сохранения исторической памяти и переосмысления управления в направлении, сочетающем национальную идентичность с глобальными образовательными стандартами.

Ключевые слова: высшее образование, советский период, казахская интеллигенция, движение Алаш, учреждения высшего образования, управление высшим образованием.

Information about the authors

Mukhtarova A. – PhD, The National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, e-mail: anar.mukhtarova@gmail.com, Kazakhstan, Almaty.

Ospanov Y. – The Corresponding Author, Candidate of Philological Sciences, Senior Lecturer, Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, e-mail: yedilbay.ospan@gmail.com, Kazakhstan, Almaty.

Tussupova G. – Candidate of Philological Sciences, National Scientific and Practical Center “Til-Qazyna” named after Sh.Shayakhmetov, e-mail: gulshat.bakyt24@gmail.com, Kazakhstan, Astana.

Авторлар туралы мәлімет

Мұхтарова А. – PhD, Қазақстан Республикасының Ұлттық ғылым академиясы, e-mail: anar.mukhtarova@gmail.com, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.

Оспанов Е. – корреспондент-автор, филология ғылымдарының кандидаты, аға оқытушы, Абай атындағы Қазақ ұлттық педагогикалық университеті, e-mail: yedilbay.ospan@gmail.com, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.

Тусупова Г. – филология ғылымдарының кандидаты, Ш. Шаяхметов атындағы «Тіл-Қазына» ұлттық ғылыми-практикалық орталығы, e-mail: gulshat.bakyt24@gmail.com, Қазақстан, Астана қ.

Сведения об авторах

Мухтарова А. – PhD, Национальная академия наук Республики Казахстан, e-mail: anar.mukhtarova@gmail.com, Казахстан, г. Алматы.

Оспанов Е. – автор-корреспондент, кандидат филологических наук, старший преподаватель, Казахский национальный педагогический университет имени Абая, e-mail: yedilbay.ospan@gmail.com, Казахстан, г. Алматы.

Тусупова Г. – кандидат филологических наук, Национальный научно-практический центр «Тіл-Қазына» имени Ш. Шаяхметова, e-mail: gulshat.bakyt24@gmail.com, Казахстан, г. Астана.