

Cross-cultural Analysis of the Strategy of Tolerance in the Republic of Kazakhstan

N. K. Satybaldina, A. G. Karabayeva, Z. N. Ismagambetova

Abstract—The modern Kazakh society is characterized by strengthen cross-cultural communication, the emergence of new powerful subcultures, accelerated change in social systems and values. The socio-political reforms in all fields have changed the quality of social relationships and spiritual life. Cross-cultural approach involves the analysis of different types of behavior and communication, including the manifestation of the conflict, and the formation of marginal destructive stereotypes.

Keywords—Attitudes, Ethnic, Communication, Cross-cultural, Multiethnic, Multicultural, Society, Stereotype, Strategy, Tolerance

I. INTRODUCTION

FOR the modern Kazakh society the strengthening of cross-cultural communication is more applicable, the emergence of new powerful subcultures, accelerated change in social systems and values. The socio-political reforms in all fields have changed the quality of social relationships and spiritual life. Kazakhstan is multinational country, in which the complexity of ethnic structure defines the modern political processes. Society and the government face the challenge of deep-value motivation for tolerance at the individual and group level, the transformation of the formal principles of tolerant communication. Civil society is implementing a strategy to protect the ideas of tolerance and extension of the principles of harmonious interaction in the community.

II. DEFINITION

A. Subject

The problem of tolerance is currently the focus of the post-Soviet society. Local ethnic conflicts, extremism, xenophobia and terrorism - the hallmark of modern society, retarding the development of intercultural cooperation. Tolerance in psychology taken into account as equality and respect, the rejection of domination and violence, recognition of the diversity of human culture, social norms, beliefs and non-uniformity of cultures [1,2,3]. Tolerance in this sense is an important component of psychological culture of personality.

Ethnic tolerance is defined as the entity that is a component of the social attitudes of the individual. It is found in conflict situations, interaction with other ethnic groups and social studies through a set of personality [4,5,6]. The Republic of Kazakhstan as a social institution, like many other nations of the world, is a multiethnic state. There are about 130 different ethnic groups in Kazakhstan. The consideration of issues of ethnic tolerance at state, inter-group and individual levels is relevant for Kazakhstan. It is a multiethnic state, and ethnic identity takes precedence over the civil identity in Kazakhstan.

Interethnic Relations in the RK the government regulates on the basis of the legal framework, including the Constitution of the RK and the relevant bodies and institutions. At the same time, the concept of public policy in the field of ethnicity in the Republic has not been developed.

Independent expert on minority issues Gay McDougall in her report says that the RK taken various measures to preserve the language, culture and traditions of minorities. At the same time in her report she noted that members of minority groups do not accept real participation in political life. Further, McDougall concluded that, in general, in society of Kazakhstan there is inter-ethnic tolerance. The main approaches to the study of ethnic identity and tolerance were developed by A. Asmolov with colleagues in the mid 80s of the last century [7]. The main methodological base for the study of ethnic tolerance is a cultural-historical study of the concept of mind by L.S. Vygotsky, A.R. Luria and A.N. Leontiev [8]. Ethnic tolerance is a fundamental component of the tolerance. The definition of ethnic tolerance, understood by Kazakhstani people, depends on the affiliation to a particular ethnic group. For larger ethnic groups it is identified with the indifference to distinctions, while for small groups it can mean even the desire for assimilation. The analysis shows that in democratic society in Kazakhstan multicultural model of inter-ethnic interactions prevails. Theoretical and political basis of ethnic tolerance in the RK is a consolidation of all ethnic groups by the type of civic nation, the formation of civil (supra-ethnic) identity, while preserving the ethnic and cultural pluralism.

Tolerant attitudes of consciousness, as far as intolerant, are formed in different areas. It should be noted that education is the most important area for the formation of tolerance. However, for tolerance formation it is not enough just to introduce various theoretical courses on tolerance in the educational process. To create a tolerant behavior it is necessary to construct motivations, as A. Asmolov points out. Motivations are formed not by the verbal rational education that creates only indifferent values, but through the emotional sphere, the mass media. This means that it is necessary to involve the sphere of cinema and art, using the channels of suggestion, contamination and other methods of social and

psychological impact. Thus, the strategy of tolerance – is a formation of the culture of tolerance, which begins with the individual. It is recognized that a person’s right to be different from the others and respect of his or her dignity to be an individual. While conflict resolution of arguments, rather than compromise and understanding of different points prevail in society – form of tolerance is impossible.

The aim of our study was to examine ethnic tolerance among members of certain ethnic groups in Kazakhstan. In the psychology of ethnic tolerance can be studied in terms of the social distance towards members of an ethnic group. The concept of "social distance" was introduced by E. Bogardus in 1925. It shows the closeness and alienation of ethnic groups, individuals [9]. Bogardus scale used to determine the distance related to national, racial or other origin. With the scale of social distance can be judged on the psychological proximity of people. The maximum social distance may mean that the ethnic group retains autonomy in relations with other ethnic groups, and prefers to stay apart. In this case, between ethnic groups are supported by formal relations based on the rules of etiquette and courtesy. Representatives of ethnic groups do not tend to close interaction and learning another culture. In the case of the minimal social distance ethnic groups show a tolerant attitude towards each other.

B. Researches

Ethnic tolerance has been studied through the definition of a component of ethnic consciousness as a generalized setting of the individual in relation to a particular ethnic group identification, and the acceptability of another individual as a representative of a particular ethnic group. E. Bogardus suggested in 1925 to conduct cross-cultural study a special form of the scale of social distance (by nationality).

TABLE I
 SCALE OF SOCIAL DISTANCE BY E.BOGARDUS

Category	Nationality		
	The Swedes	The Germans	The Poles
1. Till close kinship by marriage			
2. Prior to my membership in the club as a personal friend			
3. Prior to working at my profession			
4. Prior to the citizenship of my country			
6. In my country, just as the foreign tourist			
7. I would prefer not to see in my country			

The subject is asked to check all possible categories of social distance for each of the proposed ethnic groups, which he accepts. For our studies was chosen a modified version of the scale of social distance by E.Bogardus proposed by S.Pavlenko and V.Taglin [10]. In fact that some categories of

the scale (for example, "club membership") are not acceptable for our country and have been changed. In addition, E. Bogardus believed that the selected and marked for one or another ethnic group, level of social distance automatically assume that a representative of this group would be acceptable and in all other roles, which take on the form of a lower ranking position. For example, if the respondent is willing to accept the representative of a particular ethnic group as a spouse by marriage, the more it agrees to accept as a colleague, neighbor or friend. However, according to S.Pavlenko and V. Taglin, in the views of the rank of a role there is no unity. That is, the choice of a representative of an ethnic group as the spouse of the respondent does not mean that he is willing to accept him as a friend or boss. Having said that, in our studies in our studies, we used the following form of a modified version of the scale of social distance:

TABLE II
 MODIFIED VERSION OF THE SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE

The social role	Ethnic group					
	Russian	Kazakh	Uighur	Korean	Chechen	Jews
The spouse						
The neighbor						
A friend						
A colleague						
Area Manager						
The production manager						
Resident of my region						

In our studies, modification of the scale of Bogardus was used to analyze the ethnic attitudes of a single subject. The selected six ethnic groups (Russian, Kazakh, the Uighurs, Koreans, Chechens and Jews) as the most widely represented in the region. The representatives of these ethnic groups were endowed with these social roles: 1. Husband, 2. A neighbor, 3. Friend, 4. A colleague, 5. Area Manager 6. Head of Production, 7. A resident of my district. Surveys carried out on three samples of respondents: students Russian offices - Russian and Russian-speaking Kazakhs and Kazakh students offices – Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs. In the survey involved 109 students of Kazakh and Russian branches of chemistry, philosophy and history departments of the Kazakh National University named after al-Farabi. Respondent to mention all the social roles that the respondent agrees to provide representative samples of a particular ethnic group. Particular importance was attached to the word "typical", since the subject can be guided in completing the questionnaire is not on the general image, and on their particular friends. In processing the results calculated sum of pluses in each column (by ethnic group). The value of the indicator ranges from 0 (at least for a favorable and, accordingly, the greatest social

distance) to 7 (which would indicate a pronounced positive attitude representative of this ethnic group). In accordance with these were ranked by all ethnic groups in terms of their acceptability to the subjects. The sum of pluses in each row describes the importance to the role of ethnicity of applicants. The smaller the value of this index, the more important ethnicity of the applicant for the role. Calculated average for all subjects.

III. DISCUSSION

We obtained the following data for students of Kazakh offices. The acceptability of ethnic groups in rank to students Kazakhs (Kazakh-speaking): 1p (6.2) - Kazakhs, 2p (5.5) - Russian, 3p (5.3) - Koreans, 4p (2.9) - Uighurs, 5p (0.5) - Chechens, 6p (0.4) - the Jews. The degree of adoption of Russian students of ethnic groups by rank were as follows: 1p (6.7) - Russian, 2p (5.3) - Kazakhs, 3p (5.2) - Koreans, 4p (4.2) - Jews, 5p (4.0) - the Uighurs, 6p (3.0) - Chechens. The ranks of the adoption of ethnic groups for students of Kazakh Russian offices were as follows: 1p (5.7) - Kazakhs, 2p (3.3) - Russian, 3p (1.9) - Jews, 4p (1.1) - Koreans, 5p (1.0) - Uighurs, 6p (0.9) - Chechens. Data analysis shows that most respondents give preference to their own ethnic group, namely, respondents Kazakhs - Kazakhs, respondents Russian - a Russian, as expected. After choosing their own ethnic group in the second place are ranked for the students of Kazakh - Russian and Russian to students - the Kazakhs. 3rd place ranking among the Russian and Kazakh students (Kazakh-speaking) was given to the Koreans, while the Russian-speaking Kazakhs in 3rd place were Jews. At the same time, the Kazakhs, Jews Kazakh-speaking students in rank were in last place (6 Rank). It should also be noted that the degree of acceptance of students Kazakh-speaking slightly high (4p) than in Russian-speaking Kazakhs (5p). All respondents give the Chechens lower rank places in the questionnaire (5p) a Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs, 6p - 6p from Russian and - at the Russian-speaking Kazakhs). This result can be explained in part the small number of Chechen ethnic group, which may influence the breadth of communication and interaction between ethnic groups, although not ruled out other explanations, including the presence of negative ethnic stereotype of Chechens.

Qualitative analysis form provides information about the representatives of ethnic groups which are most desirable in this role, as representatives of the public - are not acceptable (line analysis). Analysis of the form to determine what roles the respondent considers it possible to provide representatives of ethnic groups, and what role - is unacceptable (the analysis of the columns). There have been also rankings of social roles based on ethnicity. For all respondents the most significant ethnicity of the spouse. Russian students give the social role of the first rank of 1p (3.0), Kazakhs Kazakh-speaking-1p (1.2) and Russian-speaking Kazakhs-1p (2.4). For Russian-speaking Kazakhs, second in rank is the national membership of colleagues - 2p (2.1), then follow the ranks of the area manager-3p (2.7), the production manager-4p (2.8), neighbor - 5p (3.8), other - 6p (3.9) and resident District - 7p (4.5).

On the other hand, the Kazakhs Kazakh-speaking ranks of social roles based on ethnicity as follows: husband-1p (1.2),

the production manager - 2p (1.6), the area manager - 3p (1.5), a friend, neighbor and colleague - 4.5, 6p (2.2), a resident of my district - 7p (2.5). In Russian respondents gave the following grades of social roles: spouse - 1p (3.0), the territorial director - 2p (3.1), the production manager - 3p (3.3), a colleague - 4p (4.3), one-5p (4.7), neighbor - 6p (5.0), a resident of my district - 7p (5.5).

These data also show that members of their ethnic group in most cases are the most desirable in most roles for Russian students. The least acceptable to most ethnic groups, roles among Russian respondents were Uighurs and Chechens. For Russian-speaking Kazakhs and Russian representatives of their ethnic groups were almost equally desirable in many social roles, and in some roles, Russian is even more preferable than the Kazakhs - for example, in the role of production manager. For Kazakhs Kazakh-speaking respondents least acceptable ethnic groups were Chechens and Jews in the role of wife and neighbor, the Jews and the Uighurs as a friend, Chechens and Jews in the role of colleagues, the Chechens as a territorial and production manager. For Kazakh-speaking respondents most preferred in the majority of roles are Kazakhs, except as colleagues, where priority is given to a small Russian. Further, the degree of preference in all roles are Russian. The least desirable are: the role of wife - the Chechens, as a neighbor - the Koreans, as a friend - the Uighurs, Koreans and Chechens, as a colleague - the Uighurs and Chechens, as a production manager - the Uighurs and Chechens, as well as a territorial manager - Koreans and Uighurs, as a resident of my district - the Chechens. These results suggest that students of Kazakh National University, as representatives of the younger generation, have a positive ethnic tolerance in relation to major ethnic groups in the region and less on the formation of positive or negative ethnic stereotypes. In the next series of our studies examined attitudes towards foreigners as a manifestation of ethnic stereotype. As you know, ethnic stereotypes influence the ethnic setting, determining the behavior of people in different situations of inter-ethnic interaction. Ethnic stereotypes are formed under the influence of political and social conditions, cultural factors, and are a reflection of inter-ethnic attitudes.

In this study we have investigated a generalized setting of the individual - citizen of the Republic of Kazakhstan - in relation to a particular ethnic group among the foreign nationals involved in situations of interethnic interaction and identification of the acceptability of these ethnic groups for the individual. Inter-ethnic relations were studied also by the scale of social distance developed by E. Bogardus. Studies were selected for the six foreign ethnic groups (Americans, Germans, Chinese, Turks, Pakistanis and Arabs), the spectrum of interaction that has wide-ranging nature of the region. The representatives of these ethnic groups were endowed with these social roles: spouse, friend, neighbor, colleague, citizen. In addition, special graphs respondent had to answer, the representatives of the ethnic group, he would prefer not to see in their country, and who is ready to see just as foreign tourists. In scoring these assessments of the respondents also considered. In order to avoid the "feminine" or "masculine" image in the list of nationalities ethnonyms proposed using the plural ("Americans", "Chinese", etc.). Surveys carried out on

three samples of respondents: students Russian offices - and Russian-speaking Kazakhs (Russian language), and students of the Kazakh branch (fluent in Kazakh language). Total in the survey were 113 students of philosophy, chemistry and history faculties nationalnrgr Kazakh University named after al-Farabi. Among them: Russian - 34 kazahoyazychnyh - 41 and the Russian-speaking Kazakhs - 38. Respondent to mention all the social roles that he is willing to provide representative samples of a particular ethnic group. The sum of pluses in each column characterizes the degree of acceptance by the respondent of any ethnic group. The value of the indicator ranges from 0 (most negative attitude and therefore the greatest social distance) to 6 (indicating that the positive attitude expressed by the representatives of this nationality). In accordance with the data obtained were ranked by all ethnic groups in terms of their acceptability to respondents.

The following results for the students of the Kazakh departments. The acceptability of ethnic groups in the rank of the respondents Kazakhs (Kazakh-speaking): 1p-Germans (2.9), 2p-Americans (2.7), 3p - Turks (2.3), 4p - Arabs (2.0), 5p - the Chinese (1.4) and 6p - Pakistanis (1.2). We obtained the following grades for the adoption of ethnic Kazakhs, Russian offices of the respondents (Russian): 1p - the Germans (4.4), 2p - Americans (4.2), 3p - Arabs (2.5), 4p - Turks (2.4), 5p - the Chinese (2.2) and in sixth place and Pakistanis 6p - (2.0). Russian for Russian-speaking students of the University departments the results were as follows: the Americans and the Germans was the same first rank of 1p - Americans and Germans (4.7), 2p - Turks (2.7), 3p - Chinese - (2.8), 4p - Arabs (2.6), 5p - Pakistanis (2.2).

Analysis of the results shows that in all three samples of respondents to the acceptability of the first places are the Germans, with a slight separation from them, Americans. The Turks and Arabs steadily occupy an intermediate position for respondents Kazakhs (Russian and Kazakh-speaking), although there are some differences. Thus, for respondents Kazakh-speaking Turks to occupy a higher rank of the third rank (2.3) than the Arabs (2.0), and for Russian-speaking Kazakhs, a little closer distance with the Arabs than with the Turks (2.5 and 2.4, respectively). It is possible that the proximity of the Turkish and Kazakh as the related Turkic languages to some extent influenced by the ratio of Kazakh-speaking respondents to this ethnic group. In the questionnaire respondents Kazakhs (regardless of ownership of the Kazakh language), Chinese and Pakistanis hold the same rank lower place - the fifth from the Chinese, and the sixth - in Pakistan. The Pakistanis also occupy lower ranking position (2,2) and in the Russian sample, whereas the Chinese are occupied by average rank position (2,8), yielding significantly only to the Germans and the Americans (4, 7), and practically compared with the Turks (2, 7) and Arabs (2.6). If we compare the degree of acceptance of a particular ethnic group among the three samples of respondents, we can see that, in spite of the same rank place of Americans and Germans in almost all samples, the distance from these ethnic groups are much closer to the Russian-speaking samples, as evaluation scores higher in these cases, almost 1.5 times. Representatives of the Russian-speaking samples (Kazakh and Russian) are ready to provide more social roles of representative samples of Germans and Americans. That is, collaborate more, to

communicate in different spheres of life. The research results can indicate the presence of a positive heterostereotypes against the Americans and Germans. At the same time there is more "detached" social distance of all the respondents in relation to the Pakistanis, Chinese, Arabs, and to a lesser extent to the Turks. Many respondents said that would prefer not to see the Chinese and the Pakistanis in this country. Undoubtedly, the formation of these attitudes can influence a variety of factors, including the media. Print, television, film strongly promoted in the mass consciousness of the benefits of the west, the American way of life, the other ethnic groups in the media in a positive perspective, are not so common. There have been also rankings of social roles based on ethnicity. For all respondents, on average the most significant ethnicity of the spouse. However, the degree of significance of ethnicity for the role of a spouse is different. It is most pronounced among respondents Kazakh-speaking - (1.0), then at the Russian-speaking students (1.9) and less often in the Russian-speaking Kazakhs (2.3). We can say that Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs (both men and women) are very "picky" in choosing the nationality of the spouse. Second in importance for all respondents is the nationality of the citizen, as expected. The social role of citizen, based on national origin was ranked second in all samples. The degree of significance of ethnicity for the role of a citizen of the Republic of Kazakhstan in the following descending order. Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs - 2p (1.2), the Russian-speaking Kazakhs - 2p (2.4), the Russian-speaking - (2.9). It also exhibited a high value of national identity and "caution" in granting the role of the citizen representatives of different nations in comparison with Russian-speaking samples (almost two times lower ball estimate) for Kazakh-speaking respondents. The ranks of social roles based on ethnicity for Kazakh-speaking distributed as follows: 1p (1.0) - husband, 2p (1.2) - a citizen, 3p - a neighbor - (1.9), 4p (2.0) - a friend, 4p (2.0) - colleague. As you can see, the ranks of colleagues, friends and neighbors are practically identical. It shows minor differences in the degree of social distance from these roles among the respondents of this group. Similar to the ranks of the Russian-speaking Kazakhs are: 1p (2.3) - husband, 2p (2.4) - a citizen, 3p (2.7) - a friend and colleague, 4p (3.3) - a neighbor. On average in the sample observed values of the proximity rank husband, citizen, friend and colleague, and less importance to the role of ethnicity neighbor. In the Russian-speaking respondents gave the following grades of social roles based on national origin: 1p (1.9) - husband, 2p (2.9) - a citizen, 3p (3.1) - a friend, 4p (3.3) - a colleague, 5p (3.8) - a neighbor. For Russian-speaking respondents most preferred in most social roles are the Americans and Germans, then the Turks and Chinese, and then the Arabs and Pakistanis. Moreover, in many cases, Russian-speaking and Russian-speaking Kazakhs and representatives of Kazakh respondents namely the four groups (Pakistanis, Chinese, Turks, and carts) prefer to see just as foreign tourists, while Americans and Germans, and in some cases play the role only to foreign tourists. For Kazakh-speaking respondents characterized some increase in the proportion of Turks and Arabs, along with the Americans and Germans to provide them with social roles.

The results show the influence of ethnic stereotypes, formed in the mass consciousness to such inter-ethnic setting,

willingness to cooperate in their professional field closely related through marriage, a willingness to recognize the representative of the ethnic group as a citizen of their country, or just as a foreign tourist, a willingness to personal friendship . Thus, the generalized set of the individual in relation to a particular ethnic group influence the formation of positive or negative ethnic stereotypes. Through the study of ethnic stereotypes can be judged on ethnic tolerance in the society.

It should be noted that the study of ethnic consciousness is important for establishing substantial contacts in the international cooperation and requires attention and further study. The Company has not been fully identified the priorities and hierarchies of spheres, and the principles of tolerance and outlook. Cross-cultural approach involves the analysis of different types of behavior and communication, including the manifestation of the conflict, and the formation of marginal destructive stereotypes.

IV. CONCLUSION

The formation of inter-ethnic tolerance is a major task of the modern Kazakh society. The education system has a direct influence on the formation of ethnic tolerance. With the inclusion of Kazakhstan in the Bologna area of inter-ethnic contact has grown immeasurably increases the importance of forming tolerant consciousness attitudes among college students.

REFERENCES

- [1] Солдатова Г.У., Шайгерова Л.А., Шарова О.Д. Жить в мире с собой и другими: тренинг толерантности для подростков. – М.: Генезис, 2000.
- [2] Дробужева Л. Об условиях формирования толерантных установок общественного сознания и поведения групп в российском социуме// Век толерантности. Вып. 3-4.
- [3] Лебедева Н.М. Социальная идентичность на постсоветском пространстве: от поиска самоуважения к поискам смысла. // Психологический журнал. – 1999. – Т. 20. - № 3. – С. 48 – 58.
- [4] Сатыбалдина Н.К., Сейтханова М.Н., Тунликбаева Э.М. Специфика этнических установок казахов и русских как компонентов этнического сознания. Материалы международной конференции по этнопсихологии и этнопедагогике. Алматы, КазГУ, 1998
- [5] Сатыбалдина Н.К. Социальные установки по отношению к иностранцам как проявление этнического стереотипа. Сборник «Актуальные проблемы психологической науки Казахстана», Алматы, 1999. ТОО «ЭВЕРО», вып. 7.
- [6] Сатыбалдина Н.К. Этническая толерантность в современном российском обществе. Современные проблемы высшего образования: достижения и перспективы. Материалы международной научно-практической конференции, посвященной 100-летию академика Т.Т. Тажибаева. Алматы, 2010. стр. 223-227.
- [7] Асмолов А.Г., Шлягина Е.И. Национальный характер и индивидуальность: опыт этнопсихологического исследования. Выпуск 2. – М., 1984.
- [8] Выготский Л.С. Психология развития человека. - М: Изд-во Смысл; Эксмо, 2005. -1136 с.
- [9] Почебут Л.Г. Кросс-культурная и этническая психология.: Учебное пособие. – СПб.: Питер, 2012. – 336 с.
- [10] Павленко В., Таглин С. Общая и прикладная этнопсихология. 2005 - 483 с.