ARTICLE

Linguistic and Sociolinguistic Profile Characteristics in Religious Discourses

Elena Burova [1] , *Sholpan Jamanbalayeva* [1] , *Alyona Adamidi* [2]*, *Shyryn Tlenchiyeva* [1] , *Assem Ibraimova* [1]

[1] *Institute of Philosophy, Political Sciences and Religious Studies, Kurmangazy Street, 29, Almaty 050010, Kazakhstan*

[2] *Faculty of Foreign Languages, Karaganda Buketov University, University Street, 28, Karaganda 100024, Kazakhstan*

ABSTRACT

This article presents the results of an interdisciplinary study on respondents' linguistic profiles in relation to their ethnic and religious identities. The research focuses on how ideologemes about religion are perceived in a multilingual and multiethnic society. Since the 1990s, with the onset of sovereign development, societal values related to cultural mapping have shifted. Multilingualism, multiethnicity, and religious diversity contribute to a range of perspectives, leading to both consensus and disagreement. Discussions and communication practices reveal diverse views on key social developments, including the role and influence of religion. The study aimed to identify the linguistic and sociolinguistic profiles of respondents in their perception of religious ideologemes. Conducted at the intersection of sociolinguistics, religious studies, and sociology, the research analyzed sociological survey data and established correlations (using SPSS) between respondents' connotations of religion and their complex self-identification (ethnic, linguistic, and religious) (N = 1800). Demarcations in understanding religion's influence and its role were identified in both public and expert consciousness (N = 107). The study employed interdisciplinary sociocultural methods, including discourse analysis, content analysis, correlation analysis, census data analysis, comparative methods, and theoretical reconstruction. This approach allowed the researchers to establish links between the connotations of religion and respondents' multidimensional self-identification, while identifying their linguistic and sociolinguistic typological profiles and value-based distinctions. The findings may be of interest to researchers in contemporary sociolinguistics, the sociology of mass consciousness,

*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Alyona Adamidi, Faculty of Foreign Languages, Karaganda Buketov University, University Street, 28, Karaganda 100024, Kazakhstan;
Email: minehexfire@gmail.com

and identity studies.

Keywords: Bilingualism; Sociolinguistic Profile; Religious Ideologemes; Interdisciplinarity; Turkic Languages; Kazakhstan

1. Introduction

Kazakhstan is a multiethnic state (with over 130 ethnic groups), multireligious (18 confessions), and multilingual, situated at the center of the Eurasian cultural space. Since the 1990s, following the dissolution of the Soviet Union, citizens have undergone identity transformations, with shifts in worldview regarding religiosity and expanded linguistic competencies. These changes have significantly influenced the mentality and value systems of society, altering their content. Kazakh has become the official state language, bilingualism has expanded, and studies on the country's linguistic landscape have gained importance. In political discourse, the roles of communication languages and citizens' linguistic self-identification have become subjects of debate.

The main research question focuses on identifying the relationship between linguistic, ethnic, and religious identities, and determining how these identities influence axiological judgments about religion in both mass and expert consciousness. The study is aimed at theoretical reconstruction of the typological linguistic and sociolinguistic profiles of respondents. This task is addressed through the empirical analysis of sociological, statistical, and theoretical research data. The study reveals the specific value-based differences associated with linguistic, ethnic, and religious identities.

Research Hypothesis: Kazakhstan's multiethnic population, the free choice of communication languages, and ideological pluralism provide a unique opportunity for diverse linguistic and worldview self-identification. This creates a foundation for the development and functioning of various typological sociolinguistic profiles.

The importance and relevance of this research lie in the fact that the issues of cultural transformation, in relation to language, ethnicity, and religion, have become highly debated and politicized, yet remain largely under-studied. This has created significant social tension, leading to the distancing of social groups and individuals based on religious and linguistic affiliations. Thus, the research context is not only of innovative theoretical importance but is also practically relevant for informing language policy decisions at the state level.

The research goal is achieved through an interdisciplinary approach, employing a combination of socio-humanitarian methods, phased analysis, and a comprehensive examination of the study's subject.

2. Materials and Methods

Interdisciplinary approaches, methods, and strategies were employed in the study. The research drew on sociological data from 2020 and statistical data from 2021. The sociological data were collected through surveys based on a nationally representative sample of 1,800 respondents and 107 experts. The methodology for both mass and expert surveys was initiated and developed by the research team, which included the article's authors. The fieldwork and data processing were conducted by BISAM Central Asia.

The mass survey used a stratified random probability sample, representative of regional, settlement, gender, age, and ethnic profiles of the population. Data were collected through standardized face-to-face interviews using the CAPI method, as well as telephone interviews, justified by limited access to respondents at their residences due to COVID-19 restrictions. The sampling error at a 95% confidence interval did not exceed ±2.5%. The analysis of the sociological survey data was based on a descriptive, non-experimental cross-sectional design. Data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics 25, including assessments of data normality, scale reliability, and group comparative correlation analysis (Spearman's rank correlation coefficient) [1].

The expert survey was conducted among scholars (religious studies experts, linguists, sociologists, political scientists), government officials, heads of public institutions, opinion leaders, NGO activists, journalists, and university professors. In-depth interviews and standardized formal surveys were used. The data were analyzed through discourse analysis, employing intertextuality techniques.

At various stages of the sociological and sociolinguistic research:

• discourse analysis of expert statements was conducted, and ideologemes regarding the influence of religion were reconstructed using intertextuality;

• ideologemes related to religion were categorized into positive and negative connotations;

• a comparative analysis of the hierarchy of religious functions, as perceived by the public and experts, was performed, revealing axiological discrepancies between mass and expert opinions;

• positive and negative connotations of religion, identified in the sociological survey, were classified, forming the basis for further correlation analysis;

• a correlation analysis of positive and negative ideologemes concerning the influence of religion was carried out, in relation to respondents' linguistic, ethnic, and religious self-identification;

• linguistic and sociolinguistic profiles of the respondents were identified and interpreted;

• a comparative analysis of the established profiles was conducted.

• The statistical study is based on content analysis and the reconstruction of data from the national population census conducted in 2021 [2]. Theoretical reconstruction of the population data was carried out based on criteria such as ethnicity, proficiency in native and Kazakh languages, revealing patterns of linguistic identification and features of bilingualism. In the course of the study and data reconstruction, the following aspects were addressed:

• Analysis of social statistics related to ethno-linguistic self-identification, which highlighted the nature of bilingualism among the population and allowed for its depiction in an outlined sociolinguistic framework;

• Reconstruction of census data focused on identifying types of bilingualism and understanding the extent of usage of the state language (Kazakh) across various spheres of life.

2.1. Thesaurus

The article uses terms from the social and human sciences, making it important to clarify the contexts and definitions. Discourse is understood to include two components simultaneously: the dynamic process of language activity embedded in its social context and its outcome (i.e., the text). This interpretation is considered the most appropriate [3]. Discourse, as an element of the communicative process, encompasses both pragmalinguistic and cognitive aspects [4]. Thus, discursive space is understood as a logical environment where discourses and the individuals producing them coexist. In this context, we examine discourses on religion and language.

Discursive space, in addition to its logical structure, is imbued with axiological narratives that reflect the ethnosemiometry of value meanings [5]. Speech behavior of a linguistic personality represents an intersubjective experience of the semantic diversity of the real world: "The system-forming role of discursive space is determined by its categorical significance from the perspective of the linguistic representation of constants in social interaction—strategic methods and principles" [6]. Based on this understanding, we incorporate the ethnic component into the linguistic and sociolinguistic profiles of the informants in our study.

A dominant language is one that carries the highest functional load across most communicative domains, including professional activities and education. The dominant language is not necessarily the native language; it may or may not coincide with it and often functions as the language of interethnic communication [7].

An ideologeme is understood as a cognitive-level unit, a "multilevel concept whose core or peripheral features include ideologically marked attributes, reflecting collective, often stereotypical or even mythologized perceptions of power, the state, the nation, civil society, and political and ideological institutions held by language users"[8].

In our research, we conduct discourse analysis of

expert opinions on religion and reconstruct them into ide-ologemes.

Bilingualism is defined as: 1) the ability to use, in addition to one's native language, another language at a level sufficient for communication with representatives of another ethnic group across various domains (e.g., Russian-Kazakh or Kazakh-Russian bilingualism); 2) the use of the state Kazakh language by those for whom neither Kazakh nor Russian is a native language (Kazakh-national or Russian-national bilingualism).

Types of Bilingualism – These are defined through a comparative analysis of language proficiency within a specific sociocultural context. In the context of Kazakhstan, the following types of bilingualism are observed:

• Group and Individual Bilingualism (based on the number of bilinguals);

• Mass Bilingualism (based on both the number of bilinguals and its social significance in society);

• Balanced and Unbalanced Bilingualism (based on the level of language competence of the bilingual) – also known as equal or dominant bilingualism;

• Symmetrical and Asymmetrical Bilingualism (based on the social role and functional equality of the two languages);

• Passive and Active Bilingualism (based on predominant speech skills and types of speech activities);

• Natural and Artificial Bilingualism (based on how the second language is acquired);

• One-sided and Two-sided Bilingualism (types of collective bilingualism based on whether both or only one of the interacting groups speaks both languages);

• Intragroup and Intergroup Bilingualism (based on the characteristics of external and internal social group connections);

• Contact and Non-contact Bilingualism;

• Cultural Bilingualism (based on the predominant communication situations of bilinguals);

• National Bilingualism (based on the ethnolinguistic characteristics of the bilinguals);

• Functional Bilingualism (based on the predominant domains in which the second language is used);

• Initial – Residual, Progressive – Regressive Bilingualism (as a description of language shift stages) [9].

Monolinguals – Individuals who are proficient in only one language and do not possess knowledge of any other natural languages.

Sociolinguistic Profile of Respondents – An identification characteristic of the informant (respondent), based on the interconnections of linguistic, ethnic, and confessional self-identification (author's definition).

Turkic Language Speakers – A descriptor of the ethnic community in Kazakhstan, representing a conglomerate of peoples who speak Turkic languages and share Turkic origins.

3. Results

3.1. Linguistic Picture of Reality

3.1.1. Outlines of the Linguistic Situation

According to the 2021 national census, Kazakhstan is a multilingual and multiethnic society, with Kazakhs as the dominant state-forming ethnic group. With independence, the Kazakh language became the state language, marking a significant shift in the linguistic landscape of Kazakhstan. The population of the country comprises more than 130 ethnic groups, each with its own distinct culture, language, and historical background. The largest ethnic groups include Kazakhs, Russians, Uzbeks, Ukrainians, Uyghurs, Germans, Tatars, Azerbaijanis, Koreans, Turks, Dungans, Belarusians, among others (**Table 1**).

Kazakhstan has developed a practical scenario of both Kazakh-Russian and Russian-Kazakh bilingualism. The Kazakh language belongs to the Turkic language family, making it accessible and understandable to speakers of other Turkic languages. Many members of various ethnic groups are not only bilingual but also trilingual, using Kazakh, Russian, and their native languages for different purposes such as thinking, education, and communication. In addition to the policy of bilingualism, there is a growing recognition of the importance of trilingualism (Kazakh, Russian, and English), along with an increasing interest in Turkic languages and the expanded use of Chinese. Given the historical and sociocultural context, the linguistic profiles of the population are complex and shaped by the country's multiethnic composition, offering a wide range

of language practices.

Kazakh linguists identify 126 types of bilingualism, comprising 125 national languages alongside Russian, approximately twenty forms of Russian-national and national-Kazakh bilingualism, and at least ten types of national-national bilingualism. Additionally, trilingualism is represented by the triad of Kazakh, Russian, and national components [10].

The unique aspect of Kazakhstan's linguistic situation is not so much a "total and diverse linguistic cacophony" but rather the co-functioning of two demographically and communicatively powerful partner languages—Kazakh and Russian—in a single communicative space [11]. Russian, which until the 1990s served and continues to function as the official language and medium of interethnic communication, justifies its status in Kazakhstan as a polyethnic language [12]. The results of the national census present Russian as a polyethnic language. During the prolonged period of so-called "Russification," Russian, a non-native language, became dominant and was used by Kazakhs and Turkic-speaking ethnic groups in many spheres. The changing demographic situation (with an increase in the Kazakh and Turkic-speaking populations and a decline in the Russian population) has objectively led to the loss of Russian's status as the dominant language [13].

Today, subordinate bilingualism predominates in Kazakhstan, characterized by the concept of a "dominant language." Over the past 20–30 years, as a result of state language policy, bilingualism has increasingly centered around Kazakh as the state language, with a growing trend toward learning Kazakh as a non-native language. Consequently, there is a shift from individual Russian-Kazakh bilingualism to group Russian-Kazakh bilingualism. Kazakh-Russian bilingualism has developed over a long period and is currently active, while Russian-Kazakh bilingualism is still forming and can be classified as passive bilingualism [14].

Numerous types of bi- and multilingualism have emerged in Kazakhstan, varying by region, scope of language use, the influence of the first language on the second, and the dominance of a particular language.

3.1.2. Statistics, Nature, and Typology of Population Bilingualism: Theoretical Reconstruction of the Language Situation

The evaluation of linguistic mapping of the population was conducted based on the following criteria: (1) native language (whether it is the language of one's own or another national group) and (2) proficiency in the state (Kazakh) language. A comparative analysis of statistical data (**Table 1**) revealed distinctive features of the current sociolinguistic landscape in the country.

Table 1. Population by proficiency in their native language, other national languages, and the state language (Kazakh).

Ethnicity	Total Population	Indicated Native Language		Population Proficient in the State Language (Kazakh)		
		Own Ethnicity	Another Ethnicity	Proficient	Use in Daily Life	Not Proficient
		%	%	%	%	%
Total, including:	19 186 015	94.4	5.6	80.1	49.3	19.9
Kazakh	13 497 891	99.3	0.7	99.6	63.4	0.4
Russian	2 981 946	96.4	3.6	25.1	9.3	74.9
Uzbek	614 047	95.2	4.8	72.0	47.4	28.0
Ukrainian	387 327	14.7	85.3	23.7	7.6	76.3
Uyghur	290 337	89.7	10.3	71.7	45.4	28.3
German	226 092	25.6	74.4	25.2	8.4	74.8
Tatar	218 653	52.7	47.3	50.5	22.8	49.5
Azerbaijani	145 615	73.4	26.6	58.5	32.1	41.5
Korean	118 450	36.7	63.3	36.5	16.1	63.5
Turkish	85 478	86.1	13.9	61.0	35.9	39.0
Dungans	78 817	95.8	4.2	50.2	26.7	49.8
Belarusian	76 484	64.8	35.2	22.8	6.5	77.2

Tajik	49 827	93.2	6.8	63.6	41.4	36.4
Kurd	47 880	89.1	10.9	59.2	32.4	40.8
Polish	35 319	26.2	73.8	22.1	5.2	77.9
Kyrgyz	34 184	73.7	26.3	58.5	34.7	41.5
Chechen	33 557	82.1	17.9	40.9	19.3	59.1
Other ethnicities (incl. unspecified)	264 111	38.4	61.6	31.8	14.6	68.2

Note:* The table was compiled by the authors based on data from the 2021 National Population Census of the Republic of Kazakhstan [2].

It is evident that social statistics capture quantitative changes but do not reflect the qualitative and humanistic aspects of the influence of complex identities. The interpretation of census data in terms of linguistic self-identification is carried out from the perspective of sociological typology of bilingualism [15].

The analysis of native language preferences and proficiency in the state (Kazakh) language reveals the following trends in ethnolinguistic self-identification:

• Kazakh language proficiency: 99.6% of Kazakhs, 76.2% of Uzbeks, 71.7% of Uyghurs, 63.6% of Tajiks, 61% of Turks, 59.6% of Kurds, 58.5% of Kyrgyz, 50.2% of Dungans, and 50.5% of Tatars speak Kazakh. These ethnic groups form the core of widespread Kazakh-national bilingualism, serving as examples for those with lower proficiency in the Kazakh language;

• Use of Kazakh in daily life: 63.4% of Kazakhs, 47.4% of Uzbeks, 45.4% of Uyghurs, 41.4% of Tajiks, 35.9% of Turks, 34.7% of Kyrgyz, 32.4% of Kurds, 32.1% of Azerbaijanis, and 26.7% of Dungans. It is evident that Kazakh-national bilingualism is primarily influenced by the linguistic and ethnic proximity of Turkic-speaking groups;

• Lack of Kazakh proficiency: 76.3% of Ukrainians, 74.8% of Germans, 77.9% of Poles, 77.2% of Belarusians, 74.8% of Russians, 68.9% of those who did not disclose their ethnicity, and 63.5% of Koreans do not speak Kazakh. These groups form the core of Russian-national bilingualism;

• Russian as the native language: 85.3% of Ukrainians, 74.4% of Germans, 73.8% of Poles, 65.3% of Koreans, and 61.6% of other ethnic groups identified Russian as their native language.

A comparative analysis of Kazakh-national and Russian-national bilingualism, in line with existing classifications, suggests their natural functioning, with sociocultural factors determining the recognition and use of a language as one's native language. The major types of bilingualism are widespread and exist within both homogeneous (Kazakh-national Turkic bilingualism) and heterogeneous (Russian-national bilingualism) language groups.

Kazakh, with a proficiency and daily usage rate of 49.3%, has not yet surpassed Russian as the dominant language but has achieved parity. The linguistic landscape in Kazakh society is characterized by multidimensionality, diversity, and dynamism.

3.2. Discourse Analysis for Reconstructing Religious Ideologemes

3.2.1. Expert Discourse on the Influence of Religion

An intertextual factor analysis of expert discourse reveals varied public interest in the increasing role of religion in society.

1. Markers, Conditions, and Causes of the Growth and Renaissance of Religiosity in Kazakhstan during Sovereign Development:

• The markers of increasing religiosity are primarily external forms, reflected in clothing attributes and the rising number of visits to places of worship;

• There is a noticeable rise in the number of individuals identifying as religious, regularly attending mosques and churches, and adopting religious attire, including at work. For example, it has become common to see junior medical staff in hospitals wearing Muslim clothing;

• Interest in religion, particularly among youth, has surged. There is a growing adoption of cultural elements not traditionally associated with local practices, such as the hijab, and more recently, the niqab, as well as the wearing of beards and cropped trousers.

2.Characteristics of Religious Expression:

• The construction, opening, and development of mosques and churches have increased, alongside a rise in religious literature. More citizens are participating in religious rituals and adhering to the religious calendar;

• Religiosity has intensified, with religious rituals, traditions, and celebrations becoming more frequent. For example, the observance of fasting, weddings, baptisms (in particular), Easter, and Christmas has become more common;

• People are more open about discussing God, and there is a noticeable increase in the number of individuals attending mosques, churches, and prayer houses, according to their faith;

• Many religious denominations now openly observe various rituals, and there is a more tolerant attitude towards religious practices and even active participation in them;

• Pilgrimages to holy sites are becoming a mass phenomenon, among other developments.

3. Social initiatives conducted by religious organizations:

• Providing aid to those in need through church funds (for instance, Lutherans support the impoverished and participate in various programs, such as working with women who are considering giving up their children at birth, aiming to help them keep their child and providing support to these women).

4. Growth in the number of believers, including:

There is an increasing number of people showing interest in traditional religious practices, with a rise in followers of Islam, traditionally practiced in Kazakhstan, as well as an increase in Christian believers;

• The number of religious Kazakh youth practicing Islam is growing;

• The population has become more religious. Many Kazakhs have embraced the Muslim faith, while the number of Orthodox Christian believers has also increased;

• There has been a notable rise in sects, which are particularly popular among marginalized groups. This is largely due to a lack of understanding of religious movements, with people often confusing traditional organizations with sects.

5. Distinction between external (following trends) and internal religiosity (spiritual need for faith and trust):

• Many people turn to religion not out of internal motivations, but due to trends: "My boss goes to the mosque, so do I." This has led to increased interest in faith, but it is not always sincere;

• People have begun to place more trust in God or Allah, and frequently visit churches and mosques;

• Interest in religion has grown, leading people to trust one another more, becoming kinder, more compassionate, and tolerant. Faith has started to shape their character and personality.

6. Impacts of religious pluralism:

Religious diversity has both positive and negative consequences. A large segment of the population is involved in sects, with Muslims converting to Christianity and vice versa, leading to the emergence of religious outcasts.

7. Network organization of religions:

The religious landscape has shifted in a way that alters the functions of religion. In addition to its spiritual significance, belonging to a religious organization now expands the social networks of believers.

8. Religious characteristics related to marriage and family relationships:

An increasing number of young believers are attending mosques. A notable trend is that modern men are seeking wives who are devout, wear hijabs, and live according to Sharia law.

9. Motivational factors driving interest in religion:

The desire to attain religious status, which is significant for personal identity, is linked to an existential crisis that has arisen in parallel with social changes.

Why do Kazakhstani people turn to religion?

This is a deeply philosophical question. Some see religion as tradition or a part of their culture. Others lack knowledge and worldviews. Human consciousness, as we know, does not tolerate a void, so people seek to fill it by finding answers to existential questions in religion. Once they find these answers, they feel at peace. Some fear death and use religion to manage their fear. Others get involved through naivety, influenced by their environment and subjected to simple psychological manipulation. Some

view religion as a profitable business. There are also those who never question anything and just follow the crowd, perhaps because it's fashionable. Finally, there are those who seek answers to fundamental questions, who understand the essence of good and evil, and thus, choose God, committing to good for life.

10. Crisis of ideology and loss of value systems:

• Religion fills the spiritual and ideological vacuum left after the fall of the Soviet Union;

• Secular values, ideas, and ideologemes of states change, and states themselves come and go, but religion remains eternal and unchanging;

• A religious need arises in a person, offering them a "light at the end of the tunnel"—hope and a sense of purpose in life.

The collapse of communal illusions from the former socialist society prompts a search for consolidation based on shared identities:

• Shared religious affiliation serves as a unifying factor;

• The search for spiritual values and the formation of collective consciousness are closely linked to a crisis of identity. The desire to hold onto something meaningful has led to a shift from belief in a bright future and earthly communism to belief in the same ideals in eternal (religious) life.

11. Preservation of sociocultural identity through engagement with traditional religion:

• Religion is now viewed as one of the key factors in the search for national identity (for the indigenous population) and in preserving ethnic identity (for non-titular ethnic groups);

• As at any other time, religion serves as a "supportive" factor during difficult periods. In times of crisis, unsolvable problems and complex situations increase for everyone, leading to a desire to resolve them—or, when that's not possible, to minimize them—through religious solace.

12. The function of social support (social therapy) provided by religion during periods of crisis:

Religion helps vulnerable groups address social problems that society and the state are unable to resolve. It offers moral support, material assistance, and helps people overcome extreme states of despair. While some individuals - particularly those who feel weak or uncertain - seek help and support, or turn to religion when faced with the death of loved ones or illness, others are drawn to it simply to follow trends or imitate their elders and colleagues in order to "fit in."

Thus, discourse analysis reveals that experts do not exclude a wide range of motivations, from (a) the "need to understand one's purpose on earth" to the desire to "shift personal problems onto someone else" and overcome difficult situations by projecting hope for a better future, or (b) from a "spiritual need" to "structuring one's free time" - with some now attending church or mosque for socializing or as a form of recreation.

In the search for a lost religious identity during the years of societal atheism and in the context of worldview pluralization, there has been not only a renewed awareness of the need for religion and a return to traditional religious spirituality, but also a rethinking of the meaning and purpose of religion. For Muslims, the core understanding of religion is to follow religious norms and rituals and to do good for others [16].

Based on contextual discourse analysis of these and other expert assessments, we have theoretically reconstructed significant ideologemes concerning the functions of religion (**Table 2**), the reasons for religious revitalization (**Tables 3, 4** and **5**), the positive functional impact of religion (**Table 6**), and the negative dysfunctional effects of religion (**Table 7**).

3.2.2. Comparative Connotations of the Public and Experts

Respondents and experts were asked about the impact of religion on individuals and society. A comparative analysis of how the public and experts perceive and evaluate the influence of religion reveals differences in their positions and connotations. The following key features were identified:

Experts more frequently emphasize existential-psychological influences (in the sense of "alleviating emotional suffering and pain") and religious-ideological influences (ranked 1st to 3rd).

The public, on the other hand, more often highlights

normative-regulative influences (in the sense of "promoting morality and preventing immoral actions" - 1st place), cultural-transmissive influences ("preserving national culture and traditions" - 2nd place), spiritual-moral influences ("spiritually enriching individuals" - 3rd place), existential-psychological influences ("purifying the soul, fostering repentance" - 4th place), and religious-ideological influences ("uniting people of the same faith," "alleviating emotional suffering and pain," "prescribing behavioral norms in daily life" - 5th place).

The ideology of religion's integrative influence (in the sense of "contributing to societal cohesion") is similarly ranked by both groups (5th to 6th place in the hierarchy), but experts rank it higher than the public.

Religious-ideological ideologemes, in various senses ("purifying the soul, fostering repentance," "clarifying the meaning of reconciliation with death," "showing the path to eternal life"), as

well as existential-psychological ideologemes ("helping find meaning in life") are ranked higher by experts (70% of respondents) than by the public (51.6%) in both status hierarchy and scope of influence.

The value-motivational ideologemes ("religion, by mythologizing life, promotes a positive perception of reality") is similarly ranked by both the public and experts (8th place).

Both groups also hold similar views on the negative influence of religion, where "it fosters illusory perceptions of life that hinder proper socialization, leading to a decrease in human potential" (ranked 9th-10th), as well as the displacement (substitution) of secular institutions' functions (educational, cultural, and ideological) by religion (ranked 9th) (**Table 2**).

Table 2. Perception and ranking of ideologemes regarding the functions of religion by the population and experts (population sample, N = 1500; experts, N = 107, 2021).

Ideologemes on the Influence of Religion	Subjects for Evaluation	
	Population	Experts
	Ranking in Hierarchy of Choice	
Encourages morality and deters immoral behavior	1	4
Contributes to the preservation of national culture and traditions		7
	2	
Spiritually enriches a person		
Brings peace, helps endure difficulties	3	2
Promotes the cleansing of the soul, repentance	4	
Unites people of the same faith		6
Eases emotional suffering and pain	5	1
Prescribes norms for daily behavior		6
Contributes to societal cohesion		5
	6	
Helps to find the meaning in life		3
Clarifies the meaning of reconciliation with death		
	7	5
Shows the path to eternal salvation		
Mythologizes life, promotes a positive outlook	8	8
Forms illusory perceptions of life, hinders proper socialization, reducing human potential		10
	9	
Replaces the functions of secular institutions (educational, cultural, ideological, etc.)		9

3.3. Reconstruction of Respondents' Linguistic Profile

3.3.1. Analysis of the Causes of the Religious Renaissance Based on Language Use

The analysis of the causes behind the resurgence and spread of religion in Kazakhstan from the 1990s to the present was conducted based on the respondents' language use across four areas of life: family, work, public spaces, and government institutions. The study covered 1,800 respondents from all regions of the country. For each sphere, language use was categorized into four modalities: "only

Kazakh," "only Russian," "mainly Kazakh with some Russian," and "mainly Russian with some Kazakh."

A correlation analysis of respondents' positions, based on their predominant language use in various spheres of activity, revealed two key trends:

• I: A dissensus between exclusively Kazakh-speaking and exclusively Russian-speaking respondents, both in their positive and negative connotations of religion;

• II: A "mosaic" effect, where both positive and negative connotations of religion are mixed, depending on the predominant choice of two languages across different spheres.

Overall, respondents who predominantly or exclusively use Kazakh as their means of communication in most or all areas of life view the revival of religion more positively and favorably (except for the opinion that "religion is a return to outdated worldviews"). Conversely, those who predominantly or exclusively use Russian as their primary language of communication in most or all areas express a more critical view of the causes of the religious renaissance, though they acknowledge its role in fulfilling the need for moral norms and ethical values. (**Table 3**).

Table 3. Correlation analysis of the reasons for the resurgence of religion by language of communication

Language and Sphere of Communication		Religion Is…									
		a return to outdated worldviews	a return to traditions, including religious traditions and faith	the affirmation of true spirituality that nurtures a person	a way of finding truth and the meaning of life	the restoration of world history and culture	the revival of ideology	the fulfillment of the need for moral norms and ethical values	a way of manipulating society	imitation of a "fashion for religiosity" (it's fashionable to be religious)	a political game using religious feelings
at home	Only Kazakh	+0.129**	+0.128**	+0.099**	+0.096**	+0.092**	+0.080**	+0.067**			
	Only Russian	−0.108**	−0.111**	-0.175**	-0.123**	-0.107**	-0.095**	-0.089**	+0.058*	+0.051*	
	Primarily Kazakh and partially Russian			+0.066**	+0.057*				-0.071**		
	Primarily Russian and partially Kazakh	-0.050*	-0.076**		-0.051*				+0.050*		
at work/school	Only Kazakh	+0.082**	+0.072**	+0.065**	+0.090**	+0.068**	+0.080**	+0.058*			
	Only Russian	-0.085**	-0.101**	-0.138**	-0.107**	-0.129**	-0.093**				
	Primarily Kazakh and partially Russian	-0.079**	+0.076**	+0.115**	+0.068**	+0.062*			-0.066**	-0.058*	
	Primarily Russian and partially Kazakh										
in public place	Only Kazakh	+0.062*	+0.071**	+0.055*	+0.075**	+0.098**	+0.067**				
	Only Russian	-0.079**	-0.116**	-0.122**	-0.111**	-0.101**	-0.105**	-0.085**	+0.052*		+0.051*
	Primarily Kazakh and partially Russian		+0.068**	+0.100**	+0.089**				-0.064*		-0.061*
	Primarily Russian and partially Kazakh				-0.051*					+0.075**	

in government institutions учреждениях									
Only Kazakh	+0.066**	+0.088**	+0.087**	+0.075**	+0.067**	+0.059*			
Only Russian	-0.082**	-0.078**	-0.117**	-0.099**	-0.109**	-0.103**	+0.059*		
Primarily Kazakh and partially Russian		+0.050*		+0.056*				-0.054*	-0.051*
Primarily Russian and partially Kazakh		-0.064*			+0.065**				

Note: **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed).

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed).

3.3.2. Positive and Negative Perceptions of Ideologemes by Monolinguals and Bilinguals

Respondents who communicate exclusively in Kazakh at home, work, in public spaces, and in government institutions, as well as those who predominantly speak Kazakh and partly Russian in these settings, attribute the widespread rise of religion to a return to traditions, including religious ones. In contrast, those who speak only Russian at home, work, and in government institutions, as well as those who primarily use Russian and partially Kazakh, generally do not regard the spread of religion as a return to traditions as significant.

For respondents whose primary language of communication at home is Kazakh, the spread of religion is associated with the fulfillment of a need for moral and ethical norms, the restoration of global history and culture, the revival of religious ideology, the search for truth and meaning in life, the affirmation of true spirituality that fosters personal growth, and the return of outdated worldviews.

Respondents who communicate primarily in Kazakh and partly in Russian at home believe that the spread of religion is linked to the search for truth and meaning in life, as well as the affirmation of true spirituality that nurtures individuals.

An analysis of the respondents' typological linguistic profiles, based on language use across different communication spheres, revealed the following trends:

Kazakh monolinguals and Kazakh-Russian bilinguals use Kazakh, and partly Russian, more frequently and across a wider range of communication contexts compared to Russian monolinguals and Russian-Kazakh bilinguals;

Kazakh monolinguals and Kazakh-Russian bilinguals are more likely to have a positive perception of religious ideologemes compared to Russian monolinguals and Russian-Kazakh bilinguals;

Russian monolinguals and Russian-Kazakh bilinguals are more likely than Kazakh monolinguals and Kazakh-Russian bilinguals to have a negative perception of the influence of religion (**Table 4**).

Table 4. Comparative analysis of positive and negative perceptions of religious ideologemes across different spheres of communication by language use.

Ideologemes about Religion/ Respondent Profiles	Positive Attitudes toward Religion and Support for Religious Ideologemes Expressed by Respondents Who Use…	Negative Attitudes toward Religion and Rejection of Religious Ideologemes Expressed by Respondents Who Use…
Religion is a return to outdated worldviews	- only Kazakh in communication at home, work/study, public spaces, and government institutions	- Only Russian in communication at home, work/study, public spaces, and government institutions
linguistic profile	Kazakh monolinguals (4)	Russian monolinguals (3)
Religion is a return to traditions, including religious traditions and faith	- only Kazakh in communication at home, work/study, public spaces, and government institutions, - mainly Kazakh and partially Russian at work/study, public spaces, and government institutions	- Only Russian in communication at home, work/study, public spaces, and government institutions, - mainly Russian and partially Kazakh at home and in government institutions
linguistic profile	Kazakh monolinguals (3) and Kazakh-Russian bilinguals (3)	Russian monolinguals (3) and Russian-Kazakh bilinguals (2)

Religion is the affirmation of true spirituality that nurtures a person	- only Kazakh in communication at home, work/study, public spaces, and government institutions, - mainly Kazakh and partially Russian at home, work/study, public spaces	- only Russian in communication at home, work/study, public spaces, and government institutions
linguistic profile	Kazakh monolinguals (3) and Kazakh-Russian bilinguals (2)	Russian monolinguals (3)
Religion is a way of finding truth and the meaning of life	- only Kazakh in communication at home, work/study, public spaces, and government institutions, - mainly Kazakh and partially Russian at home, work/study, public spaces, and government institutions	- Only Russian in communication at home, work/study, public spaces, and government institutions, - mainly Russian and partially Kazakh at home and in public spaces
linguistic profile	Kazakh monolinguals (4) and Kazakh-Russian bilinguals (4)	Russian monolinguals (3) and Russian-Kazakh bilinguals (2)
Religion is the restoration of world history and culture	- only Kazakh in communication at home, work/study, public spaces, and government institutions, - mainly Kazakh and partially Russian at work/study, and government institutions	- Only Russian in communication at home, work/study, public spaces, and government institutions
linguistic profile	Kazakh monolinguals (3) and Kazakh-Russian bilinguals (2)	Russian monolinguals (4)
Religion is the revival of ideology	- Only Kazakh in communication at home, work/study, public spaces, and government institutions	- Only Russian in communication at home, work/study, public spaces, and government institutions
linguistic profile	Kazakh monolinguals (3)	Russian monolinguals (4)
Religion is the fulfillment of the need for moral norms and ethical values	- Only Kazakh in communication at home, work/study, - Only Russian in government institutions	- Only Russian in communication at home, in public spaces
linguistic profile	Kazakh monolinguals (2) and Russian monolinguals (1)	Russian monolinguals (2)
Religion is a way of manipulating society	- Only Russian at home and in public spaces, - Mainly Russian and partially Kazakh at home	- Only Kazakh and partially Russian in communication at home, work/study, public spaces, and government institutions
linguistic profile	Russian monolinguals (1) and Russian-Kazakh bilinguals (1)	Kazakh-Russian bilinguals (4)
Religion is imitation of a "fashion for religiosity" (it's fashionable to be religious)	- Only Russian at home, - Mainly Russian and partially Kazakh in government institutions	- mainly Kazakh and partially Russian at work/study
linguistic profile	Russian monolinguals (1) and Russian-Kazakh bilinguals (1)	Kazakh-Russian bilinguals (1)
Religion is a political game using religious feelings	- only Russian in public spaces	- Mainly Kazakh and partially Russian in public spaces and government institutions
linguistic profile	Russian monolinguals (1)	Kazakh-Russian bilinguals (2)

Note: The number of communication spheres in which the language is used is indicated in parentheses.

3.4. Sociolinguistic Profile of Respondents Regarding Ideologemes on the Revitalization and Purpose of Religion in Kazakhstani Society

3.4.1. Ideologemes on the Revitalization of Religion from a Sociolinguistic Perspective

A correlation analysis based on ethnic, linguistic, and religious self-identification revealed distinct divisions in axiological perceptions among different respondent cohorts. On one hand, Kazakhs, Turkic speakers, and respondents identified with Islam share a similar axiological stance. On the other hand, Russians, Russian speakers, and Orthodox Christians show parallel connotations, yet these two groups hold polarized positions relative to one anoth-

er, forming a dissensus.

Russians, Russian speakers, and Orthodox Christians interpret ideologemes regarding the widespread rise of religion since the 1990s in a broad range of meanings - from the restoration of cultural traditions and affirmation of true spirituality to a revival of religious ideology in response to a values crisis and the restoration of outdated worldviews.

In contrast, Kazakhs, Turkic speakers, and Muslims do not consider these trends as particularly significant. The exception is Turkic-speaking respondents, who believe that the revitalization of religion is driven by the "fashion" of religiosity, as being religious has become fashionable.

Muslim respondents associate the revitalization of religion with a method of manipulating (controlling) society (**Table 5**).

Table 5. Sociolinguistic Profile of Respondents on the Perception of the Causes of Religious Revitalization.

Ideologemes on the Causes of Religious Revitalization	Ethnicity (Kazakhs, Russians, Others)	Language Identity (Turkic-Speaking, Russian-Speaking, Bilingual)	Religion (Islam, Orthodoxy)
Return to traditions, including religious traditions and faith	Kazakhs -0.126** Russians 0.131**	Turkic-speaking -0.074** Russian-speaking 0.104** Bilingual 0.055*	Islam -0.145** Orthodoxy 0.090**
Fulfilling the need for moral norms and values	Kazakhs -0.080** Russians 0.093**	Turkic-speaking -0.090** Russian-speaking 0.062**	Islam -0.082** Orthodoxy 0.081**
Search for an ideal, filling a spiritual void	Russians 0.057*		Orthodoxy 0.063**
Reaction to the crisis of values	Russians 0.062**		Orthodoxy 0.071** Islam -0.053*
Restoration of world history and culture	Kazakhs -0.093** Russians 0.076**	Turkic-speaking -0.086** Russian-speaking 0.096**	Islam -0.131** Orthodoxy 0.074**
Imitation of the "fashion for religiosity" (being religious is fashionable)		Turkic-speaking 0.063**	
Revival of religious ideology	Kazakhs -0.86** Russians 0.108**	Turkic-speaking -0.086** Russian-speaking 0.104**	Islam -0.106** Orthodoxy 0.090**
A means of finding truth and meaning in life	Kazakhs -0.093** Russians 0.102**	Turkic-speaking -0.099** Russian-speaking 0.106**	Islam -0.127** Orthodoxy 0.088**
A method of manipulating (controlling) society			Islam 0.059*
Affirmation of true spirituality that nurtures a person	Kazakhs -0.080** Russians 0.105**	Turkic-speaking -0.071** Russian-speaking 0.096**	Islam -0.137** Orthodoxy 0.078**
Return to outdated worldviews:	Russians 0.119** Kazakhs -0.119**	Russian-speaking 0.108** Turkic-speaking -0.084**	Orthodoxy 0.101** Islam -0.097**

Note: **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed).

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed).

3.4.2. Ideologemes on the Purpose of Religion from a Sociolinguistic Perspective

Correlation analysis of the perception of ideologemes concerning the purpose of religion revealed a dissensus in the interpretation of religion's existential, moral-spiritual, philosophical, and regulatory functions, marked by language, ethnicity, and religious affiliation.

Kazakhs, Turkic speakers, and Muslims believe that religion does not provide peace of mind or help in enduring hardships. In contrast, Russians, Russian speakers, and Orthodox Christians believe that religion does offer comfort and helps in overcoming difficulties. Turkic speakers and Muslims do not view religion as spiritually enriching, while Russian speakers and Orthodox Christians do.

Muslims argue that religion does not ease emotional pain, cleanse the soul, or encourage repentance. Kazakhs, Turkic speakers, and Muslims do not believe that religious norms and traditions are necessary in a secular society or obligatory for both believers and non-believers, whereas Russians, Russian speakers, and Orthodox Christians hold the opposite view. Additionally, Kazakhs, Turkic speakers,

and Muslims do not believe that religion shows the way to salvation and eternal life, while Russians, Russian speak- ers, and Orthodox Christians affirm this belief (**Table 6**).

Table 6. Correlation Analysis of Ideologemes on the Purpose of Religion with Positive Connotations Across Sociolinguistic Profiles (Language, Ethnicity, Denomination).

Ideologemes with Positive Connotations About Religion	Ethnicity (Kazakhs, Russians, Other Ethnicities)	Language Identity	Religious Affiliation	Agree with the Connotation	Disagree with the Connotation
Religion helps to find meaning in life	Kazakhs -0.114** Russians 138**	Turkic-speaking -0.128** Russian-speaking 0.129**	Islam -0.211** Orthodoxy 0.126**	Russians, Russian-speaking, Orthodox	Kazakhs, Turkic-speaking, Muslims
Religion shows the way to save the soul and leads to eternal life	Kazakhs -0.085** Russians 0.095**	Turkic-speaking -0.087** Russian-speaking 0.086**	Islam -0.144** Orthodoxy 0.078**	Russians, Russian-speaking, Orthodox	Kazakhs, Turkic-speaking, Muslims
Religious norms and traditions are necessary in a secular society and mandatory for both believers and non-believers	Kazakhs -0.085** Russians 0.089**	Turkic-speaking -0.097** Russian-speaking 0.100**	Islam -0.134** Orthodoxy 0.064**	Russians, Russian-speaking, Orthodox	Kazakhs, Turkic-speaking, Muslims
Religion unites society	Kazakhs -0.083** Russians 0.087**	Turkic-speaking -0.090** Russian-speaking 0.087**	Islam -0.149** Orthodoxy 0.057*	Russians, Russian-speaking, Orthodox	Kazakhs, Turkic-speaking, Muslims
Religion sets rules for everyday behavior	Kazakhs -0.082** Russians 0.122**	Turkic-speaking -0.079** Russian-speaking 0.100**	Islam -0.131** Orthodoxy 0.135**	Russians, Russian-speaking, Orthodox	Kazakhs, Turkic-speaking, Muslims
Religion brings comfort and helps to endure difficulties	Kazakhs -0.064** Russians 0.080**	Turkic-speaking -0.091** Russian-speaking 0.089**	Islam -0.146** Orthodoxy 0.068**	Russians, Russian-speaking, Orthodox	Kazakhs, Turkic-speaking, Muslims
Religion spiritually enriches a person		Turkic-speaking -0.076** Russian-speaking 0.080**	Islam -0.124**	Russian-speaking	Turkic-speaking, Muslims
Religion eases emotional pain, cleanses the soul, and promotes repentance			Islam -0.067**		Muslims

Note: **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed).

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed).

Correlation analysis revealed that respondents with differing sociolinguistic profiles evaluate ideologemes on the negative influence of religion in distinct ways. Kazakhs, Turkic speakers, and Muslims believe that religion does not limit the influence of modern technologies, including information technologies, whereas Russians, Russian speakers, and Orthodox Christians believe it does.

Kazakhs, Turkic speakers, and Muslims disagree that religion fosters passivity, submission, or advocates for a strict lifestyle, while Russians, Russian speakers, and Orthodox Christians consider these effects significant. Trilingual Kazakhs do not see religion as a source of support in life. Muslims and representatives of other ethnic groups perceive a divisive potential in religion. Kazakhs, Turkic speakers, and Muslims do not believe that religion unites society, whereas Russians, Russian speakers, and Orthodox Christians hold the opposite view. Trilingual individuals and Orthodox Christians also note that religion distracts from addressing practical life challenges. Russian and Russian-speaking respondents suggest that religion

encourages a mythological worldview (**Table 7**).

Table 7. Correlation Analysis of Ideologemes on Religion with Negative Connotations Across SociolinguisticProfiles.

Ideologemes with Negative Connotations about Religion	Ethnicity (Kazakhs, Russians, Other Ethnicities)	Language Identity	Religious Affiliation	Agree with the Connotation	Disagree with the Connotation
Religion limits the influence of modern technologies, including information	Kazakhs -0.082** Russians 0.073**	Turkic-speaking -0.047* Russian-speaking 0.075**	Islam -0.072** Orthodoxy 0.103**	Russians, Russian-speaking, Orthodox	Kazakhs, Turkic-speaking, Muslims
Religion fosters inaction, submission, and promotes a strict way of life	Kazakhs -0.068** Russians 0.082**	Turkic-speaking -0.075** Russian-speaking 0.102**	Islam -0.078** Orthodoxy 0.132**	Russians, Russian-speaking, Orthodox	Kazakhs, Turkic-speaking, Muslims
Religion is not a support in a person's life under modern conditions	Kazakhs -0.051*	Trilinguals -0.046*			Kazakhs, Trilinguals
Religion divides people of different faiths	Other ethnicities 0.084**		Islam 0.052*	Other ethnicities, Muslims	
Religion distracts from solving practical life tasks		Trilinguals 0.046*	Orthodoxy 0.063*	Trilinguals, Orthodox	
Religion contributes to a mythological perception of life		Russian-speaking 0.057*		Russians	

Note: **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed).

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed).

Thus, the interpretation of the data within the context of correlation analysis [17] made it possible to identify the linguistic and sociolinguistic profiles of the informants and to determine how ideologemes about religion are interpreted based on the multidimensional aspects of language, ethnicity, and religious self-identification.

4. Discussion

The novelty of the research subject allowed for the integration of interdisciplinary approaches, including methods for its examination. The study systematically analyzed social statistics and identified the typological characteristics of bilingualism. It conducted a comparative discourse analysis of ideological constructs on religion as perceived by the population and experts. Additionally, a correlation analysis of the positive and negative perceptions of religion's influence in linguistic and sociolinguistic contexts was performed, revealing typological profiles and demarcations among respondents. These profiles demonstrated both overlapping and divergent views on religion and its institutions.

The hypothesis was confirmed that complex iden-

tities contribute to the reproduction of a broad range of meanings, highlighting challenges in understanding and reaching consensus on various socio-humanitarian markers. The exoglossic nature of the linguistic situation in contemporary Kazakhstan is characterized by linguistic diversity, shaped by the unique ethnic composition of the population. This diversity enabled the identification of sociolinguistic profiles of informants in their preferred ideological constructs regarding religion.

The study and its results are innovative in the following ways:

For the first time, typological identification profiles of individuals representing religious narratives, framed as ideological constructs, have been identified and verified within the context of respondents' multidimensional (linguistic, ethnic, religious) self-identification;

The identified demarcations in the preferred judgments about religion, its functions, impacts, and influences revealed diametrically opposed positions in the understanding and interpretation of the institutional effects of religion, depending on the sociolinguistic profiles of the respondents;

New results from comparative correlation measure-

ments challenge the existing ideologized notion in Kazakhstani discourse, that connotative meanings related to religion—as a unifying force, an existential paradigm, or a normative regulator of behavior—are uniformly perceived across different ethnic and religious groups;

The variations in perception and understanding, as well as the demarcation lines established during the study, confirm that in the political and public discourse of the state, such areas of self-identification as linguistic and religious reformatting remain highly sensitive, potentially contentious, and in need of continuous scholarly monitoring.

We believe that further research into the sociolinguistic profiles of informants, particularly in terms of generational differences, social and educational status, income level, and place of residence, holds promise for future investigation into this issue.

5. Conclusions

The reconstruction of sociolinguistic profiles of informants based on their perceptions and evaluations of institutional religious influence holds both scientific and practical significance.

Scientific reflection and an interdisciplinary approach, combined with modern socio-humanitarian methods, contribute to a relevant understanding of social changes, including the linguistic landscape of society.

The study revealed significant dissensus in the typological sociolinguistic profiles of informants regarding their preferences and evaluations of religion's role. The primary markers of this dissensus were language, ethnicity, and religious affiliation.

It became evident to the authors that current societal processes are not fully regulated by state policies, which may lead to conflict-prone tensions in their functioning.

This research contributes to a deeper understanding of the characteristics of contemporary identification processes.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization, E.B., methodology, S.J., E.B.; software A.K., S.T.; validation, A.K., S.T., A.A.; formal analysis, A.A., A.K., S.T.; research, E.B., S.J., A.A., A.K., S.T.; resources A.A.; data processing, A.K., S.T.; writing---preparation of the initial draft, E.B.; writing---review and editing, S.J.; visualization, A.A.; author's supervision, E.B.; project administration S.J. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement

Data for the study is obtained from publicly available sources, which incorporated within the article.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Sazonov, V.F., 2009–2022. Correlation and its meaning [Electronic resource]. Kineziolog. Available from: https://kineziolog.su/content/korrelyatsiya-i-ee-smysl (cited 20 September 2024).
[2] Office of National Statistics, Agency for Strategic Planning and Reforms of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2022. Itogi Natsional'noy perepisi naseleniya 2021 goda v Respublike Kazakhstan [Results of the 2021 National Population Census in the Republic of Kazakhstan]. 30 December 2022.

[3] Prokoshenkova, L. P., Getskina, I. B., 2006. Discourse analysis and its role in modern linguistic. Vestnik Chuvashskogo Universiteta. (4), 99–105. https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/diskursivnyy-analiz-i-ego-rol-v-sovremennoy-lingvistike

[4] Grigoryeva, V. S., 2007. Discourse as an element of the communicative process: Pragmatic and cognitive aspects. Tambov State Technical University: Tambov, Russia. pp. 241-257.

[5] Kazydub, N. N., 2008. Diskursivnoe prostranstvo kak aksiologicheskaya sistema [Discursive space as an axiological system]. Ethnosemiometry of Value Meanings: A Collective Monograph. Irkutsk State Linguistic University: Irkutsk, Russia. pp. 233–256.

[6] Kazydub, N. N., 2006. Diskursivnoe prostranstvo kak fragment yazykovoy kartiny mira (teoreticheskaya model') [Discursive space as a fragment of the linguistic worldview (theoretical model)] Irkutsk State Linguistic University: Irkutsk, Russia. pp. 200-211.

[7] Mirzoeva, L. Yu., Akhmetzhanova, Z. K., 2019. On the issue of interference errors as an element of the linguistic landscape under conditions of subordinative multilingualism. Vestnik Tomskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta. Filologiya. (60), 45–65.

[8] Malysheva, E. G., 2009. Ideologem as lingo-cognitive phenomenon: Definition and classification. Politicheskaya Lingvistika. 4(30), 32–40. https://politlinguistika.ru/images/4-2009/3.pdf

[9] Kozhemyakina, V. A., Kolesnik, N. G., Kryuchkova, T. B., Parfenova, O. S., et al., 2006. Glossary of Sociolinguistic Terms, 1st ed. Russian Academy of Sciences: Moscow, Russia. pp. 50-100.

[10] Khasanov, B. K. (1989). Natsionalnye yazyki, dvuyazychiye i mnogoyazychiye: Poiski i perspektivy [National languages, bilingualism, and multilingualism: Searches and prospects] Almaty: Kazakhstan. pp. 29–33.

[11] Suleimenova, E.D.; Shaimerdenova, N.Zh.; Akanova, D.Kh., 2007. Languages of the Peoples of Kazakhstan: A Sociolinguistic Handbook. Arman-PV Publishing: Astana, Kazakhstan. pp. 14-104.

[12] Bakhtikireeva, U. M., 2014. Is Russian a polyethnic language? Vestnik Rossiyskogo Universiteta Druzhby Narodov. Seriya Lingvistika. (2), 16–30.

[13] Suleimenova, E. D., Akanova, D. K., Aimagambetova, M. M., 2021. Biz birgemiz, or Once again about the diversification of the Russian language in Kazakhstan. Vestnik Rossiyskogo Universiteta Druzhby Narodov. Seriya: Teoriya Yazyka. Semiotika. Semantika. 12(1), 7–22.

[14] Zharkynbekova, Sh. K., Chernyavskaya, V. E., 2022. Kazakh-Russian code-switching: A metacommunicative perspective. Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo Universiteta. Yazyk i Literatura. 19(4), 780–798.

[15] Vereshchagin, E.M., 2014. Psychological and Methodological Characteristics of Bilingualism. Direct-Media: Moscow, Russia. Available from: https://biblioclub.ru/index.php?page=book&id=252566 (cited 27 September 2024).

[16] Zabirova, A., 2024. Religioznost' v Kazakhstane: Tsennosti i smysly [Religiosity in Kazakhstan: Values and meanings]. Kazakhstan-Spektr. 110(2), 24-36.

[17] Grzybovsky, A.M., 2008. Correlation analysis. Human Ecology [in Russian], (9), pp. 50–60. Retrieved from: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/korrelyatsionnyy-analiz