

ABSTRACT

of the thesis on the topic “Specifics of Media Discourse: A Linguocultural Aspect (based on Kazakh and English media materials)” submitted by Nazerke Bolekbayqyzy Agymedullayeva for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) under the educational programme “8D02304 – Philology”

Description of the thesis topic. Linguistic studies at the end of the twentieth century are characterized by a turn toward the anthropocentric paradigm, which, in turn, contributed to the widespread acceptance of the view that all meanings of the elements of natural language are “inherently subjective, anthropo- and ethnocentric,” and oriented linguistic problems toward the analysis of the human factor. Since a person knows the culture of their people through language and therefore cannot live outside language, the formation of the anthropocentric paradigm opened the way for the development of linguoculturology as a field that studies the dialogue and mutual interaction of language and culture. Language, accumulating and transmitting information, functions as a mirror of culture, in which not only the real world surrounding the human being is reflected, but also the mentality of the people, national character, traditions, customs, morality, system of values, and picture of the world. National-cultural specificity is inherent at all levels of language; however, it is especially evident through aphorisms, since their inner form preserves and displays the worldview of a particular ethnos.

Contemporary media discourse is the complex interaction of language and other sign systems (including visual images) realized within the sphere of mass media. It not only transmits information but also ensures the construction of meaning in society, influencing the perception of the audience. Of particular importance is political media discourse—a communicative activity in the socio-political sphere in which language is used as a tool of power and influence. In the broad sense, by political discourse we understand any verbal structures whose content pertains to the sphere of politics. Public speeches of heads of state disseminated through the mass media belong to the core of political media discourse. Such speeches not only perform an informational function but also reflect the struggle for power, ideological beliefs, and the formation of public opinion. The media nature of these speeches (their dissemination through television, the internet, and the press) amplifies their impact, because the media actively employs linguistic means and images to construct a particular picture of the world.

Research relevance is due to several factors. First, under conditions of globalization and the expansion of intercultural ties, the boundaries between national information spaces are gradually being erased. Political leaders increasingly address not only domestic audiences but also the global community, and their speeches immediately become part of international media discourse. Each national culture leaves its mark on leaders’ rhetoric: values, historical orientations, and linguistic norms characteristic of different linguocultures are manifested in their speeches. Therefore, a comparative study of media discourse from the perspective of linguoculturology based on the material of political speeches delivered publicly in Kazakh and English is considered topical and scientifically significant. Second, up

to the present time, virtually no comprehensive comparative works have been carried out that are directly devoted to Kazakh- and English-language political media discourse. The speeches of Kazakhstani politicians have been insufficiently studied from a linguoculturological perspective, especially in comparison with the speeches of Western leaders. Meanwhile, an analysis of such speeches grounded in language and culture makes it possible to reveal the distinctive features of each linguocultural tradition and the general regularities of political communication. Third, particular interest is aroused by the question of which linguistic means are used in different cultures to realize the universal techniques of political rhetoric (persuasion, manipulation, appeal to values). A study that prioritizes national-cultural concepts, phraseology, and nonverbal components of speech responds to an important demand of contemporary linguistics—to investigate in depth, within the media environment, the connection between language, culture, and political communication.

Thus, the relevance of the study is determined by the need for a theoretical understanding of media discourse as a space of interaction between language and culture, as well as by the practical significance of its results for intercultural communication and media practice. This work fills an existing gap in the comparative study of Kazakh and English political media discourse and contributes to the development of the linguoculturological study of media speech.

Research aim is to identify and analyze the linguocultural features of media discourse in the socio-political sphere in Kazakh and English. To achieve this aim, the following **objectives** are set:

1. To describe the theoretical foundations of media discourse and linguoculturology;
2. To identify the linguocultural features of Kazakh and English media discourse on the basis of the speeches of political leaders;
3. To determine the national-cultural concepts that reflect the value-semantic dominants manifested in the speeches of politicians of Kazakhstan and the USA;
4. To analyze the role of phraseological units (set expressions, proverbs, idioms) in shaping the linguocultural features of this media discourse;
5. To conduct a corpus-based quantitative analysis as a result of an experiment in order to determine, from an intercultural perspective, the specifics of the reception of manipulative and rhetorical strategies used by speakers.

Research object – media discourse in the public-political genre. Within the scope of the study, official public speeches disseminated via the mass media, which are regarded as a special form of institutional discourse relating to the activities of the highest officials, are analyzed.

Research subject – the linguocultural features of media discourse in the public speeches of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan Kassym-Jomart Tokayev and the 45th President of the United States Donald Trump. That is, the study is aimed at identifying how national-cultural values and pragmatic stances are manifested through linguistic means and discursive practices in the speeches of these political leaders.

The theoretical and methodological background of the study consists of works in the fields of linguoculturology, mediallynguistics, and political discourse, as well as general works related to discourse theory. The principal stance is the anthropocentric orientation of modern linguistics, according to which language is considered in its interrelation with the human being and culture. As V. I. Karasik notes, linguoculturology is “a comprehensive scientific field that studies the interrelation and mutual influence of language and culture.” This approach relies on the works of domestic and foreign scholars who have investigated the interaction of language and cultural values: I. A. Bondarchuk, V. I. Karasik, V. V. Krasnykh, Yu. S. Stepanov, E. I. Sheygal, etc. In the theory of linguoculturology, special attention is paid to the concept of “concept,” which is the basic unit in the cultural dimension of consciousness that finds linguistic expression. In scholarship, the concept is understood as “a collective mental structure that fixes the distinctiveness of a particular culture” or as “a verbalized cultural meaning.” In other words, concepts are units that unite meanings important for each culture, and they are manifested through words and set expressions. In this study, in analyzing the speeches of politicians of Kazakhstan and the USA, the notion of national-cultural concept comes to the fore.

Another theoretical part of the work relates to mediallynguistics: this is the field that studies the language of the mass media (T. G. Dobrosklonskaya, I. V. Annenkova, etc.). In mediallynguistics, the ideas of critical discourse analysis occupy an important place; they show how media language shapes socio-political reality (N. Fairclough, R. Wodak, R. Fowler, etc.). For example, R. Fowler emphasized that the language of news is not neutral, that it reflects the ideological stances of society, and that it is “a product of the social and political world.”

Political media discourse is also considered from the perspective of political linguistics: the works of E. I. Sheygal on the semiotics of political discourse, A. P. Chudinov’s studies of metaphors in political speech, T. A. van Dijk’s works on the discursive reproduction of ideologies, and the works of M. Fowler and N. Fairclough on issues of power and language in media texts—all of this laid the methodological foundation for studying the language of politics in the media. According to the concepts of T. A. van Dijk and his followers, political discourse in the media is an integral part of social activity aimed at establishing power and control over the consciousness of the audience.

Methodologically, the study relies on the principles of comparative discourse analysis and linguoculturological analysis. The idea of interdiscursivity (V. I. Karasik, M. Bakhtin) is also taken into account—it considers the interconnection of several discourses (political, media, cultural) within a single text. The principles of the theory of phraseology (N. F. Alefirenko) are used to explain the role of set expressions as carriers of cultural connotations. In analyzing visual-communicative components, the principles of the theory of multimodal communication (G. Kress, T. van Leeuwen) are applied, wherein, in addition to the verbal code, gestures, facial expressions, symbolism, and the visual context of speech play an important role. Thus, the theoretical-methodological foundation, by integrating achievements in the works of Kazakhstani (A. O. Mukasheva, etc.), Russian (V. I. Karasik, E. I. Sheygal,

V. Z. Demyankov, etc.), and foreign (T. van Dijk, N. Fairclough, etc.) scholars, creates the conditions for a comprehensive study of political media discourse.

Research sources. The empirical basis of the research is a corpus of public speeches (a total of 100 texts)—including 50 speeches by K. Tokayev from 2020–2025 and 50 speeches by D. Trump from 2020–2025. The selection of materials was carried out from official transcripts and recordings from the period when these politicians held high office. K. Tokayev’s speeches consist of addresses to the people of Kazakhstan, reports at international forums, and other public-political statements in Kazakh (in some cases with parallel translations into Russian). D. Trump’s speeches were collected from his pre-election rallies, inaugural addresses, addresses to Congress, statements made on the international stage, etc. The selection of such sources ensures comparability in terms of genre (official public speech) and topic (domestic and foreign policy, national development, security, values). The overall size of the corpus reaches several hundred thousand words, which is a sufficient volume to reliably identify, within each subcorpus (Kazakh-language and English-language), frequently used lexis, phraseology, and key concepts. These speeches were transcribed and adapted for written analysis.

For the survey, video materials from open sources were used. One of them is the address of the 45th President of the United States, Donald Trump, from the Oval Office on March 11, 2020, dedicated to the COVID-19 pandemic. The other is the live address to the people of Kazakhstan by the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Kassym-Jomart Tokayev, on July 8, 2020.

Research methods. To solve the stated tasks, a set of methods combining quantitative and qualitative analysis was employed:

1. Corpus analysis, in which word frequencies, keywords, and comparative statistical analysis of texts were conducted to determine what lexis, phraseologisms, and significant concepts are characteristic of each subcorpus (Kazakh-speaking and English-speaking). This method ensures the objectivity and representativeness of the study.

2. Linguoculturological analysis, which made it possible to interpret the identified linguistic units in terms of cultural marking. References to historical events, real phenomena, and values preserved in the content of words and word combinations were analyzed. Core concepts typical of Kazakh and American political consciousness (for example, “unity,” “independence,” “development” in K. Tokayev’s speeches; “freedom,” “greatness,” “security” in D. Trump’s speeches) were identified. By analyzing each significant concept, similarities and differences in the conceptual pictures of the two linguocultures were examined.

3. Semantic analysis, in which the meanings and functions of individual linguistic units used by the orators—phraseologisms, metaphors, epithets, euphemisms—were considered. An analysis of the components of set expressions made it possible to determine what cultural meanings they centralize and reproduce. At the same time, the pragmatic aspect of semantics (implications, evaluative elements) was taken into account, and the latent features that impart a manipulative function to speech were examined.

4. Quantitative, quasi-experimental analysis. Two parallel groups were formed (a Kazakh-speaking and an English-speaking audience); each had $n = 50$ respondents. Sampling was purposive and by the “snowball” method via university distributions and social networks. Inclusion criteria: ≥ 18 years, not a member of a political party, obtaining informed consent.

In addition, explanatory and comparative methods were used: for each of the above methods, the results obtained were compared between the two corpora (Kazakh and English), and contrastive characteristics were identified. Overall, the research methodology is comprehensive and interdisciplinary, which corresponds to the complexity of media discourse at the intersection of language, culture, and politics.

Main provisions submitted for defense:

1. The public speeches of heads of state disseminated through the media constitute an autonomous genre of institutional discourse with its own distinctive features. Although Kazakh- and English-language political media discourse share common communicative goals—providing information, persuading, and strengthening the legitimacy of power—each is characterized by its own linguocultural features due to the historical-cultural context of the respective country. This discourse combines features of the official-business style and oratory and purposefully employs structures and rhetoric oriented to a mass audience.

2. The peculiarities of the linguistic formation of cultural values and ideological stances in the speeches of K. Tokayev and D. Trump have been identified. The Kazakh socio-political discourse (in K. Tokayev’s speeches) is characterized by appeals to collective values such as unity, interethnic harmony, and continuity of tradition; it widely employs lexicon with positive connotations that conveys diplomatic and respectful meanings. The English (American) discourse (in D. Trump’s speeches), on the contrary, is distinguished by an emphasis on individualistic ideals such as freedom, personal achievement, and the “American dream,” as well as by an open, sometimes conflictual style of communication. Thus, each discourse reflects the national mentality: within it, the principal values characteristic of the corresponding linguoculture are conveyed through linguistic means.

3. As a result of the study, a set of key concepts in the public speeches of the two politicians—distinct yet each with its own specificity—was identified. In the Kazakh discourse, the concepts “Unity of the Nation,” “Independence,” and “Development” occupy a central place; they imply historical memory (the ideas of independence and sovereignty after the acquisition of statehood) and the orientation of society toward the common good. The American discourse in D. Trump’s speeches is characterized by such concepts as “Freedom,” “Greatness” (especially the slogan “Make America Great Again” (let us make America great again)), “Security,” and “Prosperity,” which form the idea of the country’s special place and achievement and demonstrate the pragmatic, patriotic facet of American culture. Although some universal notions (for example, progress, security) are found in both politicians, their content and emphasis appear differently in accordance with each country’s national-cultural context.

4. Phraseologisms and paremiology are shown to be important means of conveying linguocultural specificity and emotional-expressive impact in political speeches. In K. Tokayev's speeches, Kazakh proverbs and sayings (sometimes with their Russian equivalents) are frequently encountered; they add the authority of folk wisdom and cultural tradition to the reports and supplement them with meanings readily understood by the national audience. For example, "Төртеу түгел болса, төбедегі келеді," etc. In D. Trump's speeches, American idioms and catchphrases associated with everyday culture and the popular mind (for example, "drain the swamp" (to drain the swamp), "the American dream" (the American dream), "make our country great" (let us make our country great)) occur frequently; they clearly display features typical of populist rhetoric and leave a memorable impression on the public. The comparison showed that the Kazakh discourse is closer to elevated style and proverbs, whereas the American discourse tends toward colloquial idioms and slogans. In both cases, phraseological units serve to intensify the emotional state of the audience and to reinforce the key concepts through impactful turns of phrase.

5. The analysis shows that both K. Tokayev and D. Trump employ a number of linguistic techniques that influence the audience, but each implements them in accordance with different cultural-rhetorical traditions. In the Kazakh political discourse, strategies that promote unity predominate: highlighting common achievements, expressing collective responsibility, using inclusive lexis such as "we," "our people," as well as softening negative aspects in discussing acute issues through euphemisms. All of this, by imparting a diplomatic and respectful character, signals esteem and concord that are valued in Kazakh culture. In D. Trump's speech, direct strategies of persuasion—at times reaching signs of aggressive language—are more frequently observed: frequent opposition of "us" and "others" ("we vs. they"), deliberate aggravation of certain topics, and the use of hyperbole and simple dichotomies to amplify antagonism. This is a method typical of American populist discourse, for it relies on the audience's emotions (pride, anger, fear), prompting them to adopt an active stance. Nevertheless, both leaders employ some common techniques of manipulating consciousness: repeatedly emphasizing key theses (refrain), asking rhetorical questions, appealing to authoritative figures or traditions, and telling brief anecdotes to convey their ideas. As a result, the manipulative technique is present in the media discourse of both cultures; only its linguistic manifestation varies according to national speech norms—from sober argumentation to open exhortation.

6. An analysis of the visual aspect of public speeches showed that nonverbal elements (body movement, attributes, symbols) that complement and reinforce the verbal message play a very important role in political media discourse. K. Tokayev's manner of speaking is distinguished by restraint and respectfulness: minimal gesturing, a calm intonation, formal business attire with national elements (for example, a badge with the state emblem). Such restraint corresponds to Kazakh communicative culture, in which restraint and respect for the audience are highly valued; it strengthens the leader's rational and unifying image. D. Trump, on the contrary, is known for a distinctly expressive style: active arm movements (pointing with the index finger, broad sweeping gestures), marked facial expressions, and

modulation of voice. He often speaks against a backdrop of bright decorations (flags, posters with slogans such as “Keep America Great”), thereby reinforcing his words with visual symbolism. This produces an effect akin to spectacle and creates a sense of closeness to the people, as in American political culture the leader’s charisma and show-like character are highly valued. An important point is that in both cases, statements about national values are accompanied by the display of corresponding symbols. Thus, the channel of visual communication resonates with the verbal message, amplifying the emotional impact. The conclusion about the multimodal nature of media discourse is confirmed: not only “what is said” but also “how it is said” matters. Nonverbal means become part of a unified discursive space that contributes to shaping the image of the politician and conveying the key ideas.

Description of the research main findings. In accordance with its principal aim, the study, by comprehensively comparing Kazakh- and English-language political media discourse, identified the linguocultural, discursive, and multimodal features manifested in the public speeches of state leaders (Kassym-Jomart Tokayev and Donald Trump).

The speeches of heads of state disseminated through the media were identified as a special institutional discourse that combines the official-business style and oratory. Although this genre is based on common communicative goals—providing information, persuading the audience, and strengthening the legitimacy of power—the historical-cultural context of each country enriches it with distinctive rhetorical structures.

In K. Tokayev’s speeches, the notions that consolidate collective interests—“unity,” “interethnic harmony,” “continuity of tradition”—are manifested through diplomatic lexis, whereas in D. Trump’s rhetoric individualistic ideals such as “freedom,” “personal achievement,” and the “American dream” are intertwined with an open, confrontational style. These linguistic differences reflect the cultural mentality of each people through language.

In the Kazakh discourse, the concepts “Unity of the Nation,” “Independence,” and “Development,” and in the American discourse, the concepts “Freedom,” “Greatness,” “Security,” and “Prosperity” form the core. Universal notions (security, progress) are present in both discourses, but their semantic emphasis and ideological load vary depending on the national context.

Both leaders actively employ phraseological units to intensify the emotional-expressive impact. In K. Tokayev’s narratives, through Kazakh proverbs and sayings, the authority of cultural heritage and proximity to the audience are established. In D. Trump’s speeches, everyday idioms and slogans impart a populist effect and create a memorable rhetorical pattern.

The study showed that in both discourses common techniques that influence consciousness (refrain, rhetorical question, appeal to authority) are used. However, the strategies in the Kazakh discourse are inclined to present consensus and concord softly, while the American discourse is characterized by sharp persuasive methods relying on opposition, hyperbole, and the “us–them” dichotomy.

Visual elements that complement the verbal message strengthen the leader’s image. K. Tokayev creates a rational-unifying image through restrained gestures,

formal attire, and national emblems. D. Trump, employing expressive movement and symbolic decoration (national flags, slogan placards), forms an effect of charismatic show-like character.

Justification of research novelty and its significance.

The scientific novelty of the study lies in the fact that, for the first time, the media discourse of public-political speeches in Kazakh and English is systematically compared from a linguoculturological perspective. The study introduces, for the first time on a broad scale, K. Tokayev's speeches into scholarly circulation as a manifestation of contemporary Kazakhstani political discourse, which had previously been considered comparatively little. New data have been obtained regarding the features of the verbalization of core national-cultural concepts in Kazakh and Anglo-American cultures. For the first time, an in-depth analysis was carried out of the system of Kazakh paremias, proverbs, and other phraseologisms used in the official speeches of the President of Kazakhstan (in comparison with English-language reports), which made it possible to reveal the distinctive properties of the national oratorical tradition. Another novelty is the use of a multimodal approach: comparative studies addressing visual-communicative aspects (nonverbal behavior, the use of state symbols, the staging of the speech) with respect to these two cultures have previously been rare. The combination of corpus-based quantitative analysis and in-depth qualitative linguoculturological analysis made it possible to identify subtle features and similarities in the communicative strategies of the leaders of the two countries. Thus, the dissertation study enriches the theory of media discourse with new empirical materials and offers fresh conclusions regarding the national-cultural character of political communication.

Theoretical significance of the research.

The results of the dissertation research contribute to the further development of the theoretical base of political discourse and mediallynguistics by supplementing it with new data on Kazakh-English linguocultural features. The established principles and conclusions open the way to a broader understanding of how national-cultural meanings are manifested in political language and how the media influences the form and content of public speech. The comprehensive analytical model proposed in the work (encompassing conceptual, phraseological, pragmatic, and visual aspects) can be applied to studies of the media discourse of other countries and language pairs. The theoretical propositions regarding concepts and rhetorical strategies in Kazakh and English discourse contribute to the development of linguoculturology, since these methods are shown to be applicable in studying current phenomena of mass communication.

Practical significance of the research.

The results of the work can be applied in practical terms in several areas. First and foremost, in education: the research materials can be useful in developing special courses and teaching aids in linguoculturology and translation studies. A comparative analysis of speeches in Kazakh and English with consideration of culture can be used in the training of specialists in international relations, diplomats, and journalists working in a multilingual environment. The collected speech corpus and the identified high-frequency units can be used in compiling bilingual

dictionaries and reference books on the phraseology of contemporary political communication and the terminology of new realities.

Research evaluation. The main results and conclusions of the study were discussed in domestic and foreign research institutions and universities: at the International Antalya Congress of Scientific Research and Innovative Studies (Antalya, February 13–14, 2023), at the 19th International Scientific Conference “Youth, Science and Innovation” of young scientists, PhD doctoral students, master’s students, and undergraduates (Aktobe, April 12, 2023), at the international symposium “Türk Dünyasına Genç Bakışı” (“A Young View of the Turkic World”) (Ankara, April 25–26, 2024), and in reports at the 21st International Scientific-Practical Conference “Youth, Science and Innovation” (Aktobe, April 14, 2025).

To analyze the specifics of the intercultural reception of political media discourse in the context of the pandemic, a quasi-experiment was conducted on the basis of K. Zhubanov Aktobe Regional University using the Google Forms virtual platform. As an experimental stimulus, a sequential video interview on the topic of COVID-19 was used, in which the addresses of the 45th President of the United States Donald Trump and the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan Kassym-Jomart Tokayev were presented in parallel, and the influence of rhetorical-manipulative strategies and figurative-linguistic means was evaluated. Two independent samples participated in the study—a Kazakh-speaking sample (n = 50, local audience) and an English-speaking sample (n = 50, Harvard University students)—thus the total sample size amounted to 100 people. After viewing the video, participants completed a structured questionnaire and evaluated their reactions according to such indicators as emotional tonality, speaker credibility, degree of manipulateness, and the recognition of rhetorical techniques; these data subsequently served as the basis for statistical analysis to identify intercultural differences and to model the effect of the interaction between strategies and audiences.

Research approval and publication:

Seven articles were published on the topic of the dissertation, including 1 article in a journal indexed in the Scopus scientific database, 2 articles in publications recommended by the Committee for Quality Assurance in the Field of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan, and 4 articles in the proceedings of international conferences.

Article published in a journal indexed in the Scopus scientific database:

1. Political Media Discourse in the Post-Truth Era: A Cross-Linguistic Analysis of Rhetorical Strategies in Kazakh and English // *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 13(1), 289–307. Percentile 86, Q1. <https://doi.org/10.22034/ijscsl.2025.2054162.3933>

Articles published in publications recommended for disseminating results by the Committee for Quality Assurance in the Field of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan:

1. Factors influencing the formation of a regional media discourse // *Bulletin of L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University*. – 2024. 3(148) – 8–17 pp.

2. Manifestation of Cultural Features in Media Discourses // *Bulletin of the Abylai Khan Kazakh University of International Relations and World Languages*. – 2025. – No. 2(77). – 13–28 pp.

Articles published in the proceedings of international conferences:

1. The Character of the “Media Text” in National Media Discourses (based on Kazakh–English media text materials) // *International Antalya Congress of Scientific Research and Innovative Studies*, 13–14 February, 2023. Turkey, Antalya. 944–945 pp.

2. Rendering of the Media Text in Translation in the Linguocultural Aspect // *XIX International Scientific Conference of Young Scientists, PhD Doctoral Students, Master’s Students and Undergraduates “Youth, Science and Innovation”*, 12 April, 2023. Republic of Kazakhstan, Aktobe. 9–12 pp.

3. The Character of Media Discourse in the Kazakh and Turkish Languages (based on proverbs and sayings in the Kazakh and Turkish languages) // *International Symposium “Young View of the Turkic World” (Türk Dünyasına Genç Bakışı)*, 25–26 April, 2024. Turkey, Ankara. 401–405 pp.

4. Media Discourse in the Contemporary Linguistic Paradigm // *XXI International Scientific and Practical Conference “Youth, Science and Innovation”*, 14–15 April, 2025. Republic of Kazakhstan, Aktobe. 169–172 pp.

Research structure and scope. The dissertation consists of an introduction, three chapters, a conclusion, a list of references used, and appendices. The total volume of the scientific study is 176 pages.

The dissertation research was prepared in accordance with the development directions of relevant fields of linguistics—**media linguistics, cognitive linguistics, linguoculturology, discourse studies**—and with the State Programmes of **the Republic of Kazakhstan**:

– Resolution of the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 914 of 16 October 2023. “On approval of the Concept for the Development of Language Policy in the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2023–2029.”

– Decree of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 659 of 13 September 2021. On measures to implement the Address of the Head of State to the People of Kazakhstan of 1 September 2021 “The unity of the people and systemic reforms are the basis of the prosperity of a strong nation” (with amendments of 17.04.2023).

– Resolution of the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan. “On approval of the national project ‘National Spiritual Revival’”: approved by Order No. 724 of 12 October 2021.

– Historical and cultural heritage and spiritual values of Kazakhstan. The commonality of history and culture, literature and language, customs and values // On approval of the State Programme for the Development of Education and Science in the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2020–2025: Resolution of the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan No. 988 of 27 December 2019.

The Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated June 19, 2024 № 93-VIII LRK “On mass media”

PhD candidate's contribution to preparing each research publication.

The author independently performed the entire volume of the dissertation, the selection of the research method and the solution of the tasks in accordance with the aim of the research, and the preparation of publications on the research. The assignment of tasks according to the research topic and the discussion of the results obtained were carried out jointly with the academic supervisors.