World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology
International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences
Vol:6, No:6, 2012

Formation of Civic Identity in the Process of Globalization: The Example of the U.S.A. and Kazakhstan

Elnura Assyltayeva, Zhanar Aldubasheva, Zhengisbek Tolen

Abstract**—**An attempt has been made several times to identify and discuss the U.S. experience on the formation of political nation in political science. The purpose of this research paper is to identify the main aspects of the formation of civic identity in the United States and Kazakhstan, through the identification of similarities and differences that can get practical application in making decisions of national policy issues in the context of globalization, as well as to answer the questions "What should unite the citizens of Kazakhstan to the nation?" and "What should be the dominant identity: civil or ethnic (national) one?"

Can Kazakhstan being multiethnic country like America, adopt its experience in the formation of a civic nation? Since it is believed that the "multi-ethnic state of the population is a characteristic feature of most modern countries in the world," it states that "inter-ethnic integration is one of the most important aspects of the problem of forming a new social community (metaetnic - Kazakh people, Kazakh nation" [1].

Keywords**—**nation, civic identity, nation building, globalization, interethnic relations, patriotism

I. INTRODUCTION

AT the current stage of the development of socio-political processes in the context of globalization, the problem of the formation of civic identity and strengthening of civil peace continues to be one of the most important questions of political science. According to the Kazakh scholar G.Beysenova, the process of formation of the international community at the beginning of the XXI century comes to a qualitative phase of its thinking, considering all the faults and mistakes of the past century [2]. By most researchers this stage is denoted by the concepts of "globalization" and "identity". All countries of the world in varying degrees and in different capacities are involved in these processes, which are transient, determining the choice**.**

II. NATION - BUILDING PROBLEMS IN KAZAKHSTAN AND THE USA

The challenges of globalization, identity and nation-building are the subject of scientific research and they are under scrutiny of Kazakh scientists. In recent years the idea of forming unified Kazakh nation in our country similar to the American nation has actually been discussed in periodicals and the media.

Elnura Assyltayeva is with Department of Political Science,Faculty of Philosophy and Political Science, Al-Farabi Kazakh State National University, Kazakhstan. E-mail: elnura007@mail.ru

Zhanar Aldubasheva is with Department of Political Science , Faculty of Philosophy and Political Science, Al-Farabi Kazakh State National University, Kazakhstan. E-mail: zhanar-03@mail.ru

Zhengisbek Tolen is with Department of Political Science , Faculty of Philosophy and Political Science, Al-Farabi Kazakh State National University, Kazakhstan. E-mail: zhenisbek-86@mail.ru

This idea was first expressed by President Nursultan Nazarbayev, in his speech at the press conference of the XI extraordinary congress of the National Democratic Party "Nur Otan". "... we are building our self-identity - to be a single nation of Kazakhstan. For example, Americans are made up of hundreds of people and nations, but are called Americans. No one calls each other Chinese or Korean there. And your nationality - is your business. And this is a right thing. Because one country is to live as one nation" [3]. Thus, the people of Kazakhstan have two ways to nation-building: the first is the choice of development for a model of the American "melting pot" and to become a civic nation by building civic identity. The second way is the establishment of the state with ethnic characteristic by the preservation of national, cultural and spiritual values of the Kazakh people.

Under cover of a set of common narratives national identity has always been a subject of debate since the contested histories of colonial settlements, through the Civil War, the rise and fall of cities to modern debates about race, gender and language. Broadcasting in the twentieth century has long provided the apparent homogeneity**,** helping to build and strengthen the national identity of the internal security and economic growth. But now, when the country's history is told and retold many times, more apparent becomes the struggle for redefinition of American national identity and the establishment of how it should be plural. Any formulation of national identity bears the signs of struggle for power, so it isn't a coincidence that the contest for the regulation of images in the American society generates a lively interest [4].

Thus, the term 'civic identity" often used successfully in America, is referred to as "americanization".

So, americanization refers to process of "becoming American," and to organized efforts to encourage the transformation of immigrants into "Americans". The term was in informal use in the United States in the mid-nineteenth century, but it is most prominently associated with the movement of that name during the 1910s and early 1920s. The term is often used interchangeably with assimilation. The "problem" of Americanization arises because American national identity must be constructed in the absence of primordial ethnic mythology, and in the face of exceptional diversity. There is general recognition that the United States is a "civic nation", rather than an "ethnic nation", in which devotion to "founding principles" is the source of national identity and community. The creedal nature of American identity carries the implication that anyone may "become American" by committing himself or herself to the nation's founding principles, and to their expression in distinctively American symbols and ways of living. However, the propositional nature of American identity carries with it the question of who is capable of the necessary understanding, and commitment to American principles, and to the ways of

living that they are taken to imply. That seed of doubt has led Americans to scrutinize cultural differences, ethnic consociation, and race as potential indicators of the lack of qualification for trusted membership in the polity, and to insist on outward demonstrations of Americanization by those considered for membership.

From this point of view the United States of America is of great interest, being one of the major power of the modern world, have a multifaceted impact on key processes and trends of the world development. As Lenin wrote: "America has won the first place among free and educated nations, in the development of the productive forces of human labor, in the use of machines and all the wonders of modern technology". This country played the important role in the development and implementation of the bourgeois ideas of liberty, democracy and national sovereignty. In the absence of any established feudal institutions and traditions in fact, America has become the first country where the bourgeois nation and national identity have developed in a pure form. The U.S. experience in this context demonstrated that an essential feature of the formation of modern nations and national identity was a change in the content and forms of national and ethnic relations.

The inhabitants of the colonies in the middle of the XVIII century were loyal patriots of the British Empire. North American colonists were tied to the mother country by their commitment to British art, literature, architectural forms, English tastes, manners, customs and traditions, as well as to military and political, economic and other ties. However, to the last third of the XVIII century in the course of a long development some of the essential factors have developed in the colonies, necessary for the formation of the American nation with a specific national consciousness. The thing is about the common economic interests of the North American colonies, opposing economic interests of the British Empire, the common territory in which they lived together for over one and a half centuries, a common language, etc. In addition, some important elements of the socio-psychological and spiritual commonality of Americans were developed to that period. As R. Kechem noted correctly, colonial thought was in the "barely noticeable state of kinetic stress", which undermined the institutions and forms of ideology, brought from Europe to America by immigrants and have contributed to the emergence of new forms of thoughts, ideas and opinions in the New World. The war for independence was just intended to give final approval of these "new forms". During the revolution, faced with the problem of separation from the Great Britain, American colonists were engaged in heated debates not only about the nature and methods of a legal break with the mother country, but also debated on broader issues related to freedom, reassessment and re-formulation of national values, ideas of self-regulation, nationalism, etc. [5].

The war for independence filled with the material content the words of one of the founding fathers Patrick Henry, who said at the first Continental Congress that "the differences between Virginians, Pennsylvanians, New Yorkers and residents of New England no longer exists. Now I am not Virginian, I am American.". Since then, the former colonists saw themselves not as nationals of the British Empire, but as representatives of an entirely new American nation. However, it should be noted that the processes of formation and approval of national forms of consciousness, which began long before the shots at Lexington, which ushered in the war for independence and continued after the victory of 13 North American colonies over Great Britain. America, in particular, had to establish itself as an independent nation, to form its own way of life, create its own literature, purely American forms of art, to form national goals etc.

However, Kazakhstan has quite a different situation. An attempt of the young state to reconcile the need for revival of ethnic Kazakh identity with the need to create a new Kazakh identity on the common civil base, led to problem of functioning of ethnic identity. Most of the indigenous people were not satisfied with the position of the native language, the state of the national culture, education and social services.

Kazakhstan as a country which is geographically located in the center of the Eurasian continent has become the leader in the Central Asian region, and the active agent of globalization processes. The maintenance of national sovereignty is the actual problem in the context of globalization. Today the low level of civic identity and patriotism, the lack of a unified national idea may adversely affect the sovereignty of the state.

And from here, on the one hand, arises the problem of identity of a contemporary Kazakh under the conditions of the world globalization, on the other hand, multi-ethnic and ethnically diverse society.

In this case, one must bear in mind the really complex ethnonational composition of the Kazakh society, its linguistic, cultural, religious heterogeneity. It is important to remember that today we seem to overcome the hidden inner boundary of the "collective man" of a traditional society, in order to achieve socio-cultural characteristics of an "individual man" of a civil society, as the new, civil society, with its heterogeneous polyethnicity needs a new historical personality type.

Thus, the actualness of the study is as follows: in recent years not only democratically-oriented ideologists, but the authorities have shown interest in the formation of civil society, its values and norms. Social transformations in the 90s in Kazakhstan promote the study of problems related to social role and function of Kazakh citizens in the transforming society.

The collapse of the Soviet Union, the change of political systems and structures of power, economic reforms, cultural processes associated with the openness of society to other cultures have had an enormous impact on the contemporary society, especially young people.

Only today, we realize that an experiment to create a national identity as a propaedeutics of the Soviet super - identity on the basis of the class struggle (class conflict) was actually conducted in the Soviet Union. The experiment failed, because the neglect of the "national" was the reason for failure of the Soviet model of a man and further reconstruction of series of separate national identities in the CIS [6].

In this context of globalization there is an urgent task not only to preserve national sovereignty and develop traditional culture, but also to form a permanent national "self", to educate and form a sense of patriotism among the young people.

The block of problems is contained in the question of the nature of national identity and its relation to the civil, which is an important topic that is worthy of attention.

Identification processes are aggravated and difficult to estimate in the context of historical faults, turning epochs in the life of nations. Kazakhstan is going through such a transitional period, in which the transition to a new state of society occurs simultaneously with the implementation of radical modernization in the sphere of socio-economic and political relations, which entails a change in value-oriented systems on different levels: social, group, personal. It is a crisis of identity, the essence of which lies in the fact that control was lost not only "on the processes occurring throughout society, but also on the reproduction and construction of a large part of individual and group identities" [7].

We comment on periodization of identification process in Kazakhstan.

The first stage (from 1986 to 1990 year) is characterized by the beginning of the destruction of identity values in the Soviet political system. Publicity became the first form of social action, in which people began to talk openly about what they think. In the era of glasnost the myths professed by private individuals who acquired the status of charismatic leaders in the public mind, became the subject of general social interest, and appeared in the press. In accordance with the rules of mythological thinking, the struggle between Ligachev, Gorbachev and Yeltsin have been considered by significant part of the population as the struggle between good and evil [8].

National and ethnic orientation began to influence more on the formation of identity preferences of Kazakhstani people, under the influence of the events of December 1986 in Almaty. At the same time there was a significant weakening of the ties of citizens with large solidarity groups such as: the party, Komsomol, trade unions, and in general with the state. The first phase of the differentiation of interest began with the emergence of new socio-political movements and organizations (in 16-17 December, 1986 in Alma-Ata, there was an anti-governmental insurgency (protested mostly students), the occasion for which was the appointment of "varyag" Gennady Kolbin, the first secretary of the Ulyanovsk Oblast Party Committee, to the post of the first secretary of the Communist Party of the Kazakh SSR by the Secretary General of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev.

This appointment was a violation of longstanding unspoken tradition of appointing the heads of the republics of the USSR from the local staff of the titular nation. So in the spirit of the age-old traditions the problem of ruling in Kazakhstan was solved. But this time ignoring the national interests of the Republic was met with opened and determined resistance resulting in the protest of Kazakh youth in Alma-Ata. In the morning of 17 December hundreds of people met on the square near the building of the Central Committee of Communist Party to protest against the outright violation of their basic civil rights (then the number of demonstrators reached several thousand people).

The result of emerging contradictions between the proclaimed course of transformation in the country and the current realities were the December events of 1986 year in Kazakhstan, which served as a catalyst for the democratization of political life. One of the first mass movements were "Nevada-Semipalatinsk" (1989), Historical and Educational Society "Adilet" – "Spravedlivost" (1989), international movement "Edinstvo" (1990) and others.

The second stage (from 1991 to 1993) is characterized on the one hand, by the crisis of identity of individuals as citizens of the former great power, on the other hand, by the new identity objectives relating to independence. The society was in a situation of the split of values, the loss of cohesive understanding of the active participation in the construction of a "new world" which, as it turned out, suddenly lost all its attractiveness [9].

The new world when living conditions are changed, the old groups are destroyed and the new ones are created. The process of development a party system in Kazakhstan can be served as a proof of this. The new fact was that people could identify themselves by party characteristics, not only with the Communist Party, but also with the Socialist Party, the Party of the People's Congress of Kazakhstan, the parties "Alash", "Azat" and other parties and social organizations formed during that period.

The third stage (1993 - August 1995) is characterized by increasing differentiation of the citizen's identity preferences, including those based on ethnicity. When life conditions change, new needs appear and collective efforts are made to adapt to the situation. One of such efforts was an attempt to make the civilian identity of the individual dependent on his ethnicity. A powerful impetus to the development of these trends has given approval of the national-ethnic and new civic options for the development of Kazakhstan in the text of the Constitution, adopted in January 1993 year. In particular, the Constitution used such formulas as "Kazakhstan – the state of self-determined Kazakh nation" [10], "state formed nation" and so on, which gave the nation the fundamental nature of the political entity.

At the same time there was an increase of immigration sentiments, resulting in a significant outflow of Russian-speaking population from the country. Thus, more than 400,000 people left Kazakhstan in 1994. On the whole, for the period of 7 years of independence, the number of people of Kazakhstan decreased to 2 million (from 16.9 million in 1992 to 14.9 million in 1999.).

The fourth stage began in August 1995 and continues until present time. This stage is characterized by a heightened attention to the development and improvement of the national policy of the Republic of Kazakhstan. The official policy of the Republic of Kazakhstan in the sphere of national relations in the multinational country consists of the full support, maintenance and development of the national traits of culture, language and other forms of life of all ethnic groups living in Kazakhstan and, of course, the Kazakh nation is in the first place.

Authorities are trying and have already done much to preserve the common culture and the culture of other ethnic groups in the country. Such institutions as the State Committee for National Policy, Big and Small Assemblies of Peoples of Kazakhstan, a division of the Domestic Policy of the President's office, and akimats are established and operate in the Republic [11].

III. Kazakhstan Nation or Kazakh Nation?

In recent years the idea of forming unified Kazakh nation in our country has become vigorously debated in periodicals and the media. This is evidenced by the eruption of the debate recently around the project "The doctrine of national unity". Proponents of this document argued that the united nation of Kazakhstan should be a unified Kazakh nation. At the same time opponents who are especially national-patriots of the country, express their opinion that the concept of "Kazakhstan nation" will mean the gradual elimination and disappearance of state-formed ethnic Kazakhs. The importance of this issue will become especially apparent when one considers the extreme contradiction, complexity of national consciousness and the content of the category 'nation". In the beginning of the XX c one of the experts specializing on the national identity issues Bedzhgot rightly pointed out: "We know what is nation, while we are not asked about it, but we find ourselves face to face with a huge challenge when we have to define exactly what a nation is". Despite the abundance of literature, the theme of the nation remains one of the key subjects of study in social science literature, both of the East and the West, the subject of heated controversy and debate. Abstracting from these debates and discussions, we may note that the nation, the national idea, national consciousness in many ways is difficult to classify and identify.

Nevertheless, since the modern time the national idea has evolved into a powerful social and political force. And this is natural, since man can not renounce from its history, its national identity. Each individual lives, not only their own life, but also the life of his people and society, the member of which he is.

According to E.Mustafaev [12] many ordinary citizens of Kazakhstan did not find the difference between nation and nationality. And that is why, a great importance is paid by them to what is called a nation of Kazakhstan.

There is a stable group in Kazakhstan that supports the national-patriotic rhetoric about the formation of the Kazakh nation which may lead to the disappearance of the Kazakhs. First of all, this idea is a consolidating factor for the small part of population. It should be noted that the national-patriotic idea is perceived wrongly. Our national-patriots can not make a clear distinction between the national-radicalism and national-patriotism yet. Therefore, nationalist rhetoric is often expressed, that is why national-patriotic ideology do not take root and can not act as a consolidating factor.

You should always remember that "nation"– is a political concept and is not dominated by one ethnic group in a community.

The concept of "nation building" quickly gained popularity because the idea was proposed to combine multi-ethnic, multicultural, multiracial, even multicivilized community into one that would share common values, ideas and constitute a common identity, a single nation. The American model of "melting pot" was taken on for a sample of nation-building which was based on the concept of modernization. Subsequently, this concept has been criticized, but still it is workable. In Kazakhstan, in many respects, the concept of nation-building is the foundation of national policy of the state and determines the national processes in our country.

Cultural background, national multi-cultural symbolism should be formed to conduct nation building. The community is consolidated around these ideas, these symbols. For example, in America, English language, English culture to a certain point, then the Protestant religion, values of market, capitalism and liberalism were such an ethno-cultural symbolism.

Our situation is very controversial. There are problems of the nation formation, the new slogans are heard. But when we come to the practical side, the question arises: on what base should the cultural nation of Kazakhstan be formed - on the basis of the Kazakh language and culture, or on the basis of Russian language and culture? Here we may find serious disagreements.

Why do we need such identity? For example: each group of people living and working together in one union or one party who wants to achieve something together, needs a sense of community, knowledge of what is meaningful to the individual and common goals to enter this group. Such a feeling can not be forced, only a voluntary basis is needed for it. The same relates to the States, where the citizens must identify themselves with their state in order to live and work for the state's interest, and if it's necessary, to protect it. Ten years ago, it was felt that the citizens of Kazakhstan did not identify themselves with their state, and this poses a risk to the stability of the country, as the State has still failed to give its citizens a sense of community – "We are citizens of Kazakhstan". Scientists have noted a crisis of national identity in the country, and the population has no longer a common ideological base [8]. One could perhaps speak of the formation of a unified Kazakh nation, if all the ethnic groups of Kazakhstan have undergone a process of assimilation, merged with each other, having lost their original, specific features, characteristics, and possess a common, unified for all features that occurred repeatedly in the history of the world. But it didn't happen with us [9].

All ethnic groups, whatever fate they found in Kazakhstan, have retained their own characteristics, their generic characteristics, their ethnic autonomy. There was no "russification" in the colonial period, and there is no "kazahizatsi" in sovereign Kazakhstan. Kazakhs escaped this process; they were not assimilated by any other people, and did not assimilate any other ethnic group. There is no doubt that if we replace the formal concept of "people of Kazakhstan", by the concept of "Kazakhstani nation", in which the Kazakhs and other ethnic groups that actually exist are dissolved, then mainly Kazakhs themselves will be indignant, and non-Kazakhs can just get embarrassed and ask: but where are Kazakhs, if they really exist, they are near us, are they a special nation?

IV. Civic Identity as a Basis for Stability

The identification process should not be considered individually and in its self-sufficiency in the context of poly-ethnic Kazakhstan. Taking into account international experience, it should be considered as a process of cultural interaction and formation the Kazakh civil nation on this basis, taking into account the geopolitical specifics and realities. And in any way it can not infringe upon the state-nation, for there must be established conditions for the realization of the idea

"We are the people of Kazakhstan", and not merging of one national culture with the other. Without it the process of transformation of the traditional Kazakh society into civil is simply impossible.

In the framework of this paper it is not possible to give an answer to all these questions, because each of them requires a separate consideration, but to focus on them in consideration of personal identity, is necessary, in our opinion.

Civil society and civic nation should unite (collective identity) free, individually responsible, tolerant persons, possessing a strong sense of dignity, duty and honor and respecting the culture, traditions and religious beliefs of others (personal identity).

And thus, an objective change in the historical personality type should occur and resulting in personal and collective identification, which is not an easy process, that will change immediately.

But in our opinion, it is important to draw attention to two points.

Firstly, it is generally accepted to point out three basic levels of political culture, without an analysis of which is impossible to determine more or less objectively the degree of civic identity of a person or a team. Therefore, analyzing the results of our study it was important to remember the main things that are included in the structure of political culture.

According to tradition these are:

political needs and interests;
knowledge about politics;
political and ideological consciousness;
political beliefs, orientation, evaluation of political phenomena;
political norms and traditions recognized in society;
patterns of political behavior;
skills and methods of political activity, skill and experience;
political institutions.

Thus, the civil identity is realized through social positions in the fields of identification, which in complex can be regarded as an integrative achievable status. It is determined by the possession of specific capitals of various characteristics (political, ethnic, cultural, religious, etc.). Accordingly, developing in a specific historical context, civic identity depends on the political, economic and cultural life of society.

We pay attention to only one indicator of the level of civil self-identification of the Republic of Kazakhstan's population resulting from the sociological survey conducted by the Kazakhstan Institute for Development in March 1996.

To the question "Who do you feel to be?" only 11% of respondents reported that they feel themselves to be citizens of Kazakhstan. But 22.1% felt like the citizens of the USSR and 39.4% - the citizens of the CIS [11].

The formation of an idea of civic identity has become a significant social fact in the modern Kazakhstan society. The dominance of ethnic self – consciousness was a consequence of the collapse of the USSR, an explosion of ethnicity, loss or alteration of other identities (social status, the atheistic outlook, the idea of the "Soviet people", etc.), gradually decreased.

According to our research ethnic and religious identities, remaining important, do not go ahead of the state identity (Table I).

TABLE I
RATING OF IDENTITY

ethnicity	22%
citizenship	18%
religion	3,9%
their country	28,2%
family	27,3%
other	0,7%

The individual determines its position in the coordinate system, and identifies himself with one or another community on the base of awareness. There is no doubt that in real life, in addition to ethnicity, he identifies himself with different social spaces and communities – with the people of his generation, with the people of one profession, religion, and common identity of "Soviet people", cities, regions, countries, Europeans, etc. But many people identify themselves primarily by state characteristics, which is quite stable.

As it appears, the growth of family identity is accompanied by its great actualization for a significant part of the population aged from 21 to 60 years, which gives reason to associate this situation with a family crisis. At the same time, of course, at these rates you can expect positive changes in the institution of the family.

Ethnic component takes a strong position in the age groups of 15-20 and older than 60 years old.

In the middle and mature age groups, after the leading family identity follows immediately the state identity.

In the identity rating the civil self-identity is in the third place only in people aged 21 to 30 years.

In general, we may say that such distribution of priorities of self-assessment of the Republic of Kazakhstan's citizens is in the sphere of social stability.

However, under the leading, but at the same time the low index of civil identity indicators of "place of birth" (36.6%) - 92.4% of respondents considered Kazakhstan as their homeland (Table II).

At first glance, this can be seen as a contradiction, a paradox. But there is no paradox, because the respondents feel the difference in what it means to be just Kazakh in the sense of Kazakhstani nationality or feel like a citizen of Kazakhstan. This is confirmed by respondents' answers to the questions "while living in Kazakhstan, which country you consider your home country?" And "while living in Kazakhstan, do you feel yourself the full citizen of this country?"

TABLE II
WHILE LIVING IN KAZAKHSTAN, WHICH COUNTRY DO YOU CONSIDER YOUR HOME COUNTRY?

Kazakhstan	92,5%
Russia	4%
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	1,4%
Do not know	0,9%
My ethnic country	1,2%

Of the 92.5% of respondents who consider their home country the Republic of Kazakhstan, only 84.8% fully perceive themselves as citizens of this country (Table III).

TABLE III
WHILE LIVING IN KAZAKHSTAN, DO YOU FEEL YOURSELF THE FULL CITIZEN OF THIS COUNTRY?

Yes	85,2%
No	1,6%

Maybe	11,8%
Do not know	1,4%

Unequal rates of self-determination of Kazakhstani people on thestate and civil characteristics evidence the differentiation of these two categories.

Thus, the interest is nearly proportional ratio of shares of the civil and national self-identity of Kazakhstani citizens.

Thus, the persons aged of 29-39 years old, whose political socialization occurred in an era of change, has the lowest proportion of feeling that their homeland is Kazakhstan (89.2%) and the highest proportion of recognition of the Soviet Union as their home country (2%). And the lowest indicator of a sense of citizenship is in the same age category (82.1%), and the highest share of the lack of awareness of citizenship - 3.2%. These young men belong to three ethnic groups - Kazakhs, Russians and Uzbeks. The first two groups, in fact, have become direct participants and witnesses of post-Soviet political change.

It is possible that this fact is a historical reason for the uncertainty of the civil and national identity of modern Kazakhstan people in the group of 29-39 years old.

In the choice of the other factors that perform the consolidating function of the citizens, are seen the dependence on residence and ethnicity of respondents. Thus, “the nationality of a person” is on the second position in the classification of the civic identity indicators. The entrance of this indicator in the top three is explained that the ethnic component is fairly stable in the psychology of individuals and less dependent on the socio-political situation.

The 16% of all respondents chose “the nationality of a person”. More responses of these are observed in the Moldovans (50%), Turks (30.8%) (Table 9).The difference of responses were 16.6% in regions (this question were answered by 9% of respondents in Astana, in the Eastern region - 25.6%).

The national component as a unifying factor is less dependent on the gender identity of respondents (this answer was chosen by 17.1% of men and 15.1% of women) and the type of settlement (in the city this table made up 15.8%, while in rural areas - 16.3 %).

The third place in the classification of the of civic identity indicators belongs to the consolidating indicator “the duration of residence” (11.8%).

However, when respondents had to move from abstract representations of the main civic identity indicators to a more concrete understanding of their personal self-awareness of their Kazakhstan citizenship, their answers have changed. The answer to the question “What does it mean for you to be a citizen of Kazakhstan?” The respondents were asked to select no more than 3 answers which in the process of results were as follows: “to live in Kazakhstan” (68.1%), “to execute the laws and Constitution of Kazakhstan “ (46.4%), “ to be born in Kazakhstan” (24.9%). Further, a majority of respondents answered “in the country and abroad to be under the protection of the state”" - 10% “to possess native language and get education in their mother tongue” - 24%.

In general, it is clear that the “place of birth” and “duration of residence” were the most resistant, affective components of civic self-identification of Kazakhstani citizens as in the group level so in the individual one. And such indicator as “person's nationality”, which takes place among the affective component of a group level turned out to be unstable and it was replaced by “the execution of the laws and Constitution of Kazakhstan” at the individual level.

Civil society is being formed in the Republic of Kazakhstan. The desire to create it is observed, not only from above (eg, creation of a public house), but also from below. The survey data show that the majority of our citizens consider that to be a citizen of the RK means not only to “live in Kazakhstan” (68.1%), to benefit the country, but to execute the laws, to follow the Constitution of Kazakhstan (46.4%). Such judgments may be correlated with a sense of responsibility for the fate of the country.

“Knowledge of the state language” was in the fourth place. And it was mostly supported by Ukrainians (20%) and Kazakhs (15.3%).

Language is not given leadership preferences by the respondents. On the one hand, this situation is typical. History shows that linguistic unity is formed in the process of historical development of ethnic communities, serving as the primary means of interpersonal communication, the way of transmission of ethnic traditions, information about the culture of the people, historical heritage, etc. As A.J. Shadzhe pointed out: “the first attribute of the uniqueness of a nation is its language” [13].

Consequently, the language is the most striking determinant of ethnic identity and the factor of its formation [14], but not civic identity. However, in this case we are talking about the ethnic (national) language when the native language serves as the most important indicator of ethno-consolidated and ethno-differentiated indicator of ethnic identification of the population.

On the other hand, the state language still plays a special role under civil identification. And this can not be overlooked. If the respondents in this study attributed language to the 4th place to determine the classification of the civic identity indicators, then 75% of respondents recognized the importance of the state language (Table 4).

The answers “it’s important” made up 75%. That means, there is a need to know the state language. It seems that the state language policy of our state affects these results: the Law “On Languages”, the Law “On the public service”.

TABLE IV
THE IMPORTANCE OF KNOWLEDGE OF THE STATE LANGUAGE

it’s always important	75%
it’s important, but sometimes	16,7%
it is important on special occasions	4,7%
it is not important	2,2%
Don’t know	1,4%

We can not ignore the problem of formation of Kazakhstani patriotism in the search for civic identity. Patriotism – is not only a social and cultural control, but the mechanism (method) of self- identity, which consists of recognizing by the individual the unity of his self-interest with the group interest of social community. Patriotic identification - is the state of group solidarity being formed on the basis of ethnic and political unity, which includes the collective levels (the awareness and experience of individuals to belong to the

nation) [15]. In addition, according to V.J. Selivanova patriotism implies "a higher level of identity, raising each individual over the ethnic roots and bringing to the forefront his belonging to a particular country.

Thus, patriotism does not imply denial of the individual from their ethno-national characteristics, their traditions and customs. It does not deny the existence of ethnic and national pride of ethnic and national identity. Thus, patriotism allows combining the ethnic plurality and political unity, bringing people together with many connections and relationships" [16].

66.2% of Kazakhs are absolutely confident that patriotism is the basis for the formation of citizenship of the population (Table 5).

TABLE V
IS PATRIOTISM THE BASIS FOR THE FORMATION OF CITIZENSHIP OF THE POPULATION?

Yes	66,2%
No	2,8%
Maybe	22,6%
Don't know	8,4%

Equally important is the assertion that "one of the most important questions of formation of Kazakh identity is the determination of common grounds on which people could identify their affiliation to a community as people of Kazakhstan. In other words, for the full formation of Kazakh identity it is required the national, unifying common Kazakh idea" [17].

Civic identity is realized through social positions in the fields of identification, which in complex can be regarded as an integrative achievable status. It is determined by the possession of the specific characteristics (political, ethnic, cultural, religious, etc.). Accordingly, developing in a specific historical context, civic identity depends on the particular peculiarities of political, economic and cultural life of society. In this connection, separation of the civil identity by Kazakhstani people as less important in the allocation of priorities of self-assessment of the Republic of Kazakhstan's citizens (the state identity - on the first place, the family identity - on the second, the national identity - on the third, the civil identity - on the fourth) lies in the sphere of low social stability.

The cognitive component of the "place of birth" by shifting the national and linguistic factors, became the most constant component of civic identity. Transformations in the Kazakh society shook foundations of civic identity, but did not destroy them. In the consciousness of modern citizens of the Republic of Kazakhstan there is a tendency to preserve the positive foundations of political reforms and strengthening the regulatory role of the state in socio-political process of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

The identification process includes contradictory trends based on the high ratio of citizens' relation to their government, as well as to Kazakhstan's patriotic identity, their knowledge of Kazakh national symbols, but at the same time the low importance to them of their civic identity that we may assert: Kazakhstani people have low political culture, certain dissatisfaction with their life and some other aspects of it – the financial position, the level of security, the spiritual sphere. Social discontent, under certain conditions, can be transferred to the ethnic sphere, which is dangerous.

V. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, developing in a specific historical context, civic identity depends on the particular peculiarities of political, economic and cultural life of society. In this connection, separation of the civil identity by Kazakhstani people as less important in the allocation of priorities of self-assessment of the Republic of Kazakhstan's citizens (the state identity - on the first place, the family identity - on the second, the national identity - on the third, the civil identity - on the fourth) lies in the sphere of low social stability.

Transformations in the Kazakh society shook foundations of civic identity, but did not destroy them. In the consciousness of modern citizens of the Republic of Kazakhstan there is a tendency to preserve the positive foundations of political reforms and strengthening of the regulatory role of the state in socio-political process of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

The identification process includes contradictory trends. Based on the high ratio of citizens' relation to their government, as well as to Kazakhstan's patriotic identity, their knowledge of Kazakh national symbols, but at the same time the low importance to them of their civic identity, it can be argued that Kazakhstani people have low political culture, certain dissatisfaction with their life and with some other aspects of it – the financial position, the level of security, the spiritual sphere. Social dissatisfaction, which solidalirized against an external "other", under certain conditions, can be transferred to the ethnic sphere, which is dangerous.

Obviously, the basic model of socialization, and in this regard, civic identity is determined by how society is committed to the values and what type of social interaction should be reproduced. The study shows the increase of young people's status in all fields of identification, especially in religious and ethnic. At the same time status self-esteem of the youth in citizenship has reduced. This primarily concerns the significance of ethnicity in the consciousness of people. If in the ordinary, everyday life we can observe the decreasing role of ethnicity, the prevalence of human values (family, individual), but in the system of ethno-political categories the ethnic identity strengthened its position. This circumstance is due to two factors: the politics of sovereignty, aimed at reviving the national culture of the Kazakhs, on the one hand, and on the other, still weak position of common Kazakh people's civic identity, which is not entrenched in the consciousness of people. Consequently, national and state identity are formed.

Changes in emotional and evaluative components will inevitably entail the transformation of other component of ethnic identity - a behavioral component. Thus, strengthening of ethnic-affeliative orientations, the desire to follow the rules and standards of its people, has led to some narrowing of the range to use the Russian language, an increase in the number of citizens who want to master three languages. Also, there is a tendency to move away from atheistic beliefs to religious beliefs.

Today in Kazakhstan the process of identity runs on several fronts:

the first – national - state identity is formed by a state-formed ethnicity;

the second - the state identity has been developed in ethnic groups inhabiting the territory of Kazakhstan, a symbol of the Kazakhstan nation, transmitting the identity of the Kazakh people on the basis of the spiritual culture of the Soviet era and ethnicity, which is represented by a system of symbols as holidays such as March 8, New Year, May 9, Nauruz (New Year for Kazakh ethnic);

the third – is that civic identity is slowly forming in Kazakhstani people.

In this case, the multi-ethnic population of the region where the development of inter-ethnic tensions is more likely, the respondents showed a more balanced level of tolerance. The longer is the contact with people of other nationalities, the more positive is inter-ethnic behavior-oriented policy.

Ultimately, we are talking about the formation of civic and cultural outlook, tolerant principles, and personal and social behavior skills.

REFERENCES

[1] Samsonov, L.V. (2005) *'K voprosu o formirovanii edinoi kazakhstanskoi nacii'*, Vestnik KASU: 4.
[2] Beisenova, G. (2009) *Problemy globalizacii i identichnosti*, Almaty: Print-s
[3] Shahanov, M. (2009) *'Gosudarstvennyi yiazyk'*, *Egemen Kazakhstan*, 15 November, 6(4): 83–112.
[4] Kenneth, L. and Karst, S. (1986) '*Paths to Belonging: The Constitution and Cultural Identity'*, *North Carolina Law Review*, pp. 301-303.
[5] Gadgiev, K.S. (1999) *Amerikanskaiya naciya: nacionalnoe samosoznanie I kultura*, Moskva
[6] Makeev, S. (1998) *'Processy socialnoi strukturizacii v sovremennoi Ukraine'*, *Polis* 3:50-51
[7] Kordonskii, S. (2000) *Rynki vlasti: administrativnye rynki Rossii I SSSR*, Moskva: OGI, 188-190
[8] Izdibaev, T. (2006) *'Statagenstvo podvelo predvaritelnye itogi perepisi naselenia I socialno-ekonomicheskogo razvitia'*, Panorama (15): 15 aprelya, 28.
[9] Nysanbaev, A.N. (1999) *'Problemy duhovno-nravstvennoi bezopanosti Kazakhstana'*, Sayasat, 6:28.
[10] Samsonov, L.V. (2005) *'K voprosu o formirovanii edinoi kazakhstanskoi nacii'*, Vestnik KASU: 4.
[11] Buluktaev, Y. (2001) *Osobennosti identifikacionnyh processov v Respublike Kazakhstan*, Almaty.
[12] Mustafaev, E. (2010) *Nacia I nacionalnost*, Almaty.
[13] Shadge, A.Y. (1996), *Grazhdanskai identichnost, Moskva*.
[14] Utalieva, Zh.T. (1994), *Yiazyk kak factor formirovanii etnicheskoi identichnosti*, Moskva.
[15] Pogorelyi, A.P. (2004) *Patriotizm kak cennost rossiiskogo obshestva, Moskva*, pp. 9-10.
[16] Selivanova, V.Y. (2003) *'Nacionalizm I patriotism: popytka pereosmaslenia poniatii'*, Vestnik MGU, 18 (1), pp. 91-93.
[17] Ashimbaev, M.S. (2004) *Problemy I perspektivy grazhdanskoi identifikacii naselenia Kazakhstana, Almaty: KISI*, pp. 20 - 21.

E. Asyltaeva is a PhD student at the Kazakh National University named after al-Farabi. She is a researcher at the Center for Research on ethnic relations at the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Her area of study is civic identity, nation building, interethnic relations, ethno-political conflict studies.

Zh. Aldubasheva is a PhD student of the Kazakh National University named after al-Farabi and a lecturer at the same university. She is specializing in domestic and foreign policy of Kazakhstan and the United States, Central Asia, the author of several research articles on national security, the Kazakh-American cooperation, the problems of formation of civil society.

Zh. Tolen is a PhD student of the Kazakh National University named after al-Farabi. His area of study is Political culture and political stability of Kazakhstan, State Policy and Political Processes in the Republic of Kazakhstan.