THE DEVELOPMENT OF DIPLOMATIC TRAINING AND RESEARCH CENTERS IN KAZAKHSTAN: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS AND PROSPECTS FOR MODERNIZATION

* Konysbayeva A.B. [1], Assetkyzy Zh. [2], Aliyeva S.K. [3]
*[1,3] L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University,
Astana, Kazakhstan
[2]Kazakhstan Institute for Strategic Studies
Astana, Kazakhstan

Abstract. The changing global balance of power and the growing importance of middle powers demonstrate the need for highly qualified diplomats to promote international cooperation. For Kazakhstan, this means the need to establish a modern system of diplomatic training capable of responding to global challenges and actively participating in global discussions.

In this context, there is a limited number of studies, particularly on how Kazakhstan trains its diplomats. The purpose of this article is to examine how Kazakhstan is modernizing its system of diplomatic training and what it can adopt from countries such as the United States and China. To achieve this objective, the study employs comparative case analysis and content analysis to identify key ideas and directions for improving educational programs and training for diplomats.

The study shows that Kazakhstan's diplomatic training system is based on national traditions and has begun to move toward international standards. This includes the use of digital tools, participation in global initiatives, an emphasis on soft power, and cooperation with research organizations. Particular attention is given to analytical centers such as the Kazakhstan Institute for Strategic Studies. However, the study finds that, unlike the United States and China, Kazakhstan has not yet fully integrated these research centers into its official system of diplomatic training.

The results indicate that Kazakhstan has focused on practical training, such as role-playing exercises and internships implemented at the Institute of Diplomacy under the Academy of Public Administration. Significant attention is paid to improving digital skills and strengthening links with analytical centers. Recent reforms have emphasized the importance of multilingualism and encouraged the study of foreign languages. The article concludes that combining Kazakhstan's national values with best global practices will enable the country to compete more effectively in a multipolar world.

The scientific contribution of the work lies in the systematization of the Kazakhstani model of diplomatic training and a comparative analysis of its differences from the practices of the US and China in engaging expert centers. The practical significance is in the developed recommendations for integrating the research community into diplomat training programs.

Keywords: diplomatic training, the Kazakhstan Institute for Strategic Studies KazISS, diplomatic institutes, training practices, diplomatic education, think tanks, digital diplomacy, soft power

Introduction

The international system is undergoing a significant transformation, as great power states gain increasing influence and reshape traditional power hierarchies. As Shakleina notes, the United States remains the only country that fully meets the classical criteria of a great power, while other actors continue to strengthen their political, economic, and diplomatic capabilities [1]. These developments indicate a shift toward a more complex and less predictable global order.

In this environment, diplomacy has become essential for middle power states not only as a tool for advancing national interests, but also as a key instrument of survival and sustainable development. The growing importance of international agreements is accompanied by rising risks, including regulatory fragmentation and intensified strategic competition. As a result, the demands placed on diplomatic personnel have increased substantially. Contemporary diplomats are expected to understand cultural and geographic specificities, interpret the objectives of diverse actors, and make informed decisions under conditions of uncertainty.

Diplomatic practice itself has evolved beyond traditional negotiation and representation. It increasingly involves long-term trust-building, the management of intergovernmental communication across multiple platforms, and engagement with a broad range of state and non-state actors. Consequently, the quality of diplomatic training has acquired strategic importance: the level of professional preparation of diplomats directly affects the effectiveness of foreign policy implementation and a state's ability to adapt to changing global conditions.

These global dynamics are particularly relevant for Kazakhstan, which pursues a multi-vector foreign policy and actively participates in regional and international institutions. The need to improve the quality and strategic orientation of diplomatic training is explicitly articulated in the Foreign Policy Concept of the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2020–2030 [2]. This document emphasizes the modernization of foreign service education, the strengthening of analytical capacity, and the development of professional competencies within the national diplomatic corps, providing a policy framework for reform in this area.

At the same time, contemporary challenges require diplomats not only to master classical diplomatic methods, but also to adapt to a rapidly changing international environment through the use of digital technologies and analytical tools for forecasting global trends [3, 7]. Recent research highlights that "tech diplomacy is becoming a vital tool for nations to engage in the digital economy and address its challenges and opportunities" [3]. These trends underscore the growing importance of digital literacy, data analysis, and strategic communication within diplomatic education.

Kazakhstan's expanding international engagement has contributed to the establishment of diplomatic education and research institutions; however, the existing system continues to face structural limitations. In particular, the integration of analytical capacity, digital diplomacy, and international best practices remains uneven. This has resulted in a gap between academic education, applied diplomatic practice, and policy-oriented research, indicating the need for a systematic assessment and modernization of the current model of diplomatic training.

Against this backdrop, this study examines how international models of diplomatic education can inform the modernization of Kazakhstan's diplomatic training system and contribute to strengthening its long-term foreign policy capacity. The analysis focuses on the evolution and current state of diplomatic training in Kazakhstan, with particular attention to institutions that support professional development and policy expertise, including the role of think tanks such as the Kazakhstan Institute for Strategic Studies [11].

This study makes several contributions. Theoretically, it advances understanding of how international models of diplomatic education can be adapted to the needs of emerging middle powers. Practically, it identifies institutional practices and training methods that may enhance the quality of diplomatic education in Kazakhstan. From a policy perspective, the study offers recommendations for integrating analytical and digital competencies into national diplomatic training programs in line with global standards.

The article is structured as follows. The next section outlines the materials and methods used in the study. The results section presents a comparative analysis of diplomatic training models in Kazakhstan, the United States, and China. The discussion interprets the findings in light of contemporary theoretical approaches and systemic challenges in diplomatic training. The conclusion summarizes the main findings and identifies directions for further research.

Materials and Methods
Researcher's Position and Paradigm. This study is grounded in an interpretivist paradigm, which emphasizes understanding social phenomena through the meanings and experiences of individuals and institutions involved

in diplomatic education. The researcher adopts a constructivist position, recognizing that knowledge is co-created through interactions between researcher, participants, and analyzed documents. This position aligns with the study's focus on understanding how different national systems—Kazakhstan, the United States, and China—conceptualize and implement diplomatic training within their socio-political contexts.

Research Design. This research employs a qualitative comparative case study design combined with systematic content analysis. The chosen methodological framework ensures transparency, verifiability, and analytical rigor, enabling a structured comparison of three national models of diplomatic training—Kazakhstan, the United States, and China. The comparative case study approach is appropriate because it allows examination of similarities and divergences across different institutional, political, and educational environments.

The analysis concentrates on institutional reforms, curriculum modernization, and professional development mechanisms designed to strengthen the competencies of foreign policy personnel and align training practices with contemporary international challenges.

Sampling. A purposive sampling strategy was applied to select countries and institutions representing distinct and well-documented models of diplomatic training. The selected cases—the United States, China, and Kazakhstan—reflect diverse approaches to foreign service education, encompassing Western liberal, Eastern centralized, and hybrid/post-Soviet frameworks.

United States – representing the Western liberal and pragmatic model, with an emphasis on analytical reasoning, leadership development, interdisciplinary specialization, and adaptive learning (U.S. Foreign Service Institute, FSI).

China – exemplifying an Eastern centralized model rooted in state ideology, hierarchical career structures, and strategic national development objectives (China Foreign Affairs University, CFAU).

Kazakhstan – a transitional hybrid model combining national traditions with international standards, represented by the Academy of Public Administration and the Kazakh Institute of Diplomacy.

The selection criteria were explicitly defined to ensure relevance, comparability, and transparency:

- Temporal relevance: inclusion of reforms implemented within the last 15 years (2010–2025).

- Institutional diversity: coverage of educational, analytical, and state-level training components.

- Public accessibility: availability of official documentation, policy papers, and institutional reports for independent verification.

- Policy significance: selection of institutions directly linked to the formulation and implementation of foreign policy.

- The data sources comprised four categories of sources:
- Official documents – including foreign policy concepts and institutional reports [2, 16, 19].
- Academic publications – peer-reviewed articles and monographs on diplomacy and diplomatic training [4–6, 8, 9, 13].
- Analytical reports – materials from research and training organizations, including DiploFoundation [7, 10].
- Institutional materials – documents and resources from key diplomatic training institutions (FSI in the United States, CFAU in China, and the Institute of Diplomacy in Kazakhstan) [14, 16, 19].

Sources were collected in English, Russian, and Kazakh, ensuring cross-lingual coverage. Searches were conducted through Google Scholar, Scopus, ResearchGate, MFA repositories, and official institutional websites.

Data were collected systematically from primary and secondary sources, following the purposive sampling criteria outlined above. This ensured that all materials were relevant, comparable across countries, and methodologically coherent.

Primary sources included:
- Strategic education and foreign policy plans and institutional materials [2, 14, 16, 19];
- Analytical reports and methodological guidance from training-oriented organizations [7, 10];
- Academic literature on diplomatic training, soft power, and professional identity [4–6, 8, 9, 13].

Secondary sources included peer-reviewed journal articles, monographs, open-access databases, and policy archives. Data collection emphasized transparency, triangulation, and reproducibility.

Regarding ethical considerations, all data were derived from publicly available documents and institutional sources, avoiding privacy violations or the need for direct human participation. Ethical review approval was not required due to the non-intrusive nature of data collection and absence of human subjects.

Results

Benchmark Models of Diplomatic Training. The United States and China serve as benchmark cases, representing distinct approaches to diplomatic education.

The American model emphasizes analytical reasoning, leadership development, interdisciplinary specialization, and adaptive learning. Training and institutional programming are structured through the U.S. Foreign Service Institute (FSI), which provides a broad course portfolio and professional preparation for diplomatic personnel [16].

China employs a centralized training system emphasizing state ideology and hierarchical career progression. A key institutional role in this model is played by the China Foreign Affairs University (CFAU), which develops training programs and supports curriculum modernization for foreign affairs specialists [19].

The Kazakh model represents a hybrid approach, combining practical training, professional development, and national priorities. Kazakhstan has established the Institute of Diplomacy at the Academy of Public Administration to provide professional education for diplomatic personnel, focusing on analytical skills, practical training, and alignment with national priorities [14]. The system is also discussed in academic literature on diplomatic education and training in Kazakhstan [13], as well as in recent analyses of modern competencies and hybrid models in Kazakhstan's diplomatic education [15].

Findings

The United States possesses a long-standing academic tradition in preparing diplomats. Prestigious institutions such as Harvard University, Princeton University, and Georgetown University offer specialized programs in international relations, diplomacy, and public policy. Georgetown's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, established in 1919, emphasizes intercultural communication and interdisciplinary learning. Undergraduate students complete a liberal arts core before specializing in fields such as Science, Technology, and International Affairs, integrating natural sciences, ethics, and political theory to prepare for the multifaceted challenges of modern diplomacy.

The U.S. Foreign Service Institute (FSI), under the Department of State, offers extensive training covering regional studies, cyber diplomacy, crisis response, intercultural negotiation, leadership, and language training. The institute is structured into schools for language studies, professional and area studies, applied information technology, and leadership and management, alongside supporting units such as the Office of the Historian and a Transition Center. Training methods include virtual diplomacy simulations, interagency coordination exercises, and fellowship programs to enhance inclusivity in the diplomatic service.

China's diplomatic training system is centralized and ideologically coordinated. Key institutions—including the China Foreign Affairs University (CFAU), Peking University, Tsinghua University, and Fudan University—play a leading role in preparing future diplomats. CFAU, affiliated with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, has trained more than 20,000 specialists, including over 500 ambassadors, and continues to modernize its curriculum.

Training programs integrate diplomacy, international law, public diplomacy, cybersecurity, regional studies, and intensive language preparation, complemented by internships in Chinese embassies and international organizations such as the

UN and ASEAN. China's diplomatic philosophy emphasizes unified strategic narratives and soft power. Institutions such as the China Institute of International Studies promote state-aligned foreign policy concepts to ensure strategic coherence across diplomatic missions.

Kazakhstan represents a hybrid model that combines elements of Western and Eastern approaches while emphasizing national priorities. The Kazakh Institute of Diplomacy and the Academy of Public Administration provide professional education for foreign service personnel, integrating strategic planning, practical training, and internships alongside civic education.

Between 2011 and 2020, Kazakhstan implemented comprehensive reforms aimed at modernizing higher education and diplomatic training, focusing on professional development of teaching staff, curriculum modernization, and incorporation of digital tools. Participation in international exchange programs and collaboration with research centers such as the Kazakhstan Institute for Strategic Studies strengthened analytical skills and strategic thinking.

Discussion

Theoretical Interpretation of Diplomatic Training Models. Modern diplomatic studies are grounded in several key theoretical frameworks that provide tools for understanding the preparation and professional behavior of diplomats. In this study, these frameworks are operationalized to analyze Kazakhstan's diplomatic training system and its adaptation of international practices.

One of the most influential frameworks is Joseph Nye's theory of soft power [4], which defines a state's ability to achieve desired outcomes through attraction rather than coercion. In the context of Kazakhstan, soft power is examined through the inclusion of courses on cultural diplomacy, public communication, negotiation skills, and digital engagement in the curricula and internship programs of diplomatic institutions. This operationalization allows the study to evaluate how Kazakhstan cultivates diplomats capable of advancing the country's cultural and strategic influence abroad.

Social Identity Theory [5] offers another essential perspective, emphasizing that an individual's identity is shaped by group membership. Within diplomatic training, SIT is used to assess how programs foster a professional and national identity among trainees, promote ethical norms, and develop intercultural competence. These dimensions are critical for diplomats' effectiveness in multilateral negotiations and international representation.

A complementary framework is Iver Neumann's typology of diplomats [6], which distinguishes three archetypes: the bureaucrat, who maintains institutional procedures and stability; the hero, who drives innovation and strategic initiative; and the mediator, who facilitates cross-cultural and political understanding. In this study, the typology is applied to evaluate whether Kazakhstan's training programs develop skills and mindsets corresponding to each archetype, thereby supporting

professional growth and adaptation to complex international environments.

By linking theory directly to empirical analysis, this study ensures that frameworks are actively applied, not merely cited. This multidimensional approach provides a robust lens for understanding how institutional practices, curricula, and professional socialization jointly contribute to the formation of highly qualified diplomats capable of advancing Kazakhstan's foreign policy objectives and projecting national influence through soft power.

Systemic Challenges in Diplomatic Training. Contemporary diplomacy faces several systemic challenges. Globalization and the Fourth Industrial Revolution are transforming the nature of diplomatic communication and decision-making [7]. Diplomats now operate in a multipolar environment characterized by rapid technological change, information overload, and non-traditional threats such as cyber risks and hybrid conflicts.

Another challenge concerns the decline of traditional diplomacy and the rise of new actors — including international organizations, corporations, and civil society. This pluralization of international relations requires diplomats to master interdisciplinary competencies such as digital literacy, data analysis, and public communication [8, 9].

Finally, the politicization of diplomatic appointments undermines professionalism in some states. This trend weakens institutional continuity and effectiveness, making professional training systems increasingly important. In this context, diplomatic education must ensure merit-based selection, continuous professional development, and alignment with international standards.

Comparative Analysis. Across the three countries, four analytical dimensions—institutional structure, curriculum content, training methods and digital integration, and strategic orientation—highlight distinct patterns. The U.S. model prioritizes adaptability, interdisciplinary skills, and crisis management, fostering cross-agency flexibility. China emphasizes ideological alignment, hierarchical career structures, and centralized strategic planning, ensuring consistency in pursuing long-term national objectives. Kazakhstan integrates lessons from both models, enhancing analytical and digital competencies, offering practical training opportunities, and preserving national identity and strategic coherence.

This comparative perspective identifies key strengths, gaps, and opportunities for Kazakhstan's diplomatic training system. Western practices contribute to analytical rigor, leadership development, and international adaptability, while Eastern approaches provide a framework for centralized oversight, strategic narratives, and cohesive national representation. By synthesizing these lessons, Kazakhstan can further modernize its diplomatic education system, aligning with international standards while addressing its unique socio-political context.

Professional Diplomatic Training Programs. Transformational Diplomacy, introduced in 2006 by U.S. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, significantly reformed the training of American diplomats. One major shift was the redistribution of personnel from traditional diplomatic centers in Europe to regions with higher instability, including the Middle East, Asia, and Africa. Diplomats' roles expanded beyond embassy duties to encompass community development, democratization initiatives, and strengthening of public institutions. The reform enhanced language and regional training programs, enabling diplomats to integrate more effectively into host countries. Emphasis was also placed on digital diplomacy, including the use of the internet and social media, and on interagency collaboration with military, intelligence, and development agencies, ensuring a comprehensive approach to international crises. Consequently, Transformational Diplomacy made U.S. diplomatic training more dynamic and oriented toward addressing 21st-century global challenges.

In addition to structural reforms, the U.S. employs professional skills training and simulation games as active learning strategies. Social-psychological training focuses on communication skills, with participants practicing conversation structuring and non-verbal communication in group discussions. Audio and video recordings are used for subsequent error analysis. Simulation games recreate diplomatic negotiations, allowing participants to practice decision-making at each stage, which serves both educational and research purposes.

China's primary institution for diplomatic training is the China Foreign Affairs University, established in 1955 and administered by the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Education. CFAU offers programs in diplomacy, international law, public diplomacy, and international relations, with a strong emphasis on foreign languages and intercultural communication. Since its founding, CFAU has produced around 20,000 graduates, including ministers, ambassadors, and diplomatic advisors, earning recognition as the «cradle of Chinese diplomats». The university comprises multiple departments, a dedicated research institute, and over thirty affiliated research centers. CFAU also trains foreign diplomats, scholars, and government officials through programs that include short-term courses, Chinese language and cultural immersion, professional translation, and master's programs in international relations. Recent reforms have focused on digitalization, the introduction of online courses and simulations, training in cyber diplomacy and big data analysis, and expanding public diplomacy programs to enhance engagement with global media and NGOs.

Overall, both U.S. and Chinese diplomatic training programs demonstrate substantial investment in human capital and digital capacity, as well as interdisciplinary studies and professional standards. Their priorities, however, differ. The U.S. emphasizes adaptability, strategic leadership, inclusion, and interagency collaboration, encouraging flexible deployment of diplomats across

various contexts. China prioritizes ideological alignment, national messaging, and long-term state interests, ensuring cohesion through direct integration of training with national strategy. These comparative insights provide a foundation for understanding how international models of professional diplomatic education may inform the modernization of Kazakhstan's training system.

Digitalization. In recent years, digital technologies have become central to diplomatic training in the United States. The Foreign Service Institute introduced mandatory courses in cybersecurity, digital communication, and big data analysis, equipping diplomats with the tools necessary to operate effectively in a digital international environment. Virtual diplomacy simulations have been implemented, covering crisis negotiation, embassy operations, and complex multilateral discussions, enhancing diplomats' preparedness and adaptability. Initiatives are also underway to establish a Center for the Study of Diplomatic Practice and a dedicated Leadership School aimed at further developing analytical capabilities and leadership under uncertainty. The use of digital diplomacy extends beyond training exercises: during the Syrian conflict, U.S. officials utilized digital tools to communicate the country's position, counter false narratives, and highlight human rights violations, demonstrating the practical integration of technology into diplomatic practice.

China actively integrates technology into diplomatic education, particularly through institutions such as the China Foreign Affairs University and Beijing Foreign Studies University. These universities employ digital platforms for training simulations, including cyber diplomacy and international communication scenarios. Courses include digital literacy, data protection, and public diplomacy in the digital age. CFAU also provides specialized training for foreign diplomats upon official request, covering Chinese language, culture, and international relations. China's digital strategy emphasizes global narrative control and information sovereignty, with diplomats trained to engage effectively with international media, civil society, and opinion leaders. Since President Xi Jinping's 2013 speech, the country has expanded its capacity to shape global discourse and enhance soft power through strategic communication.

Both the U.S. and China are actively embracing digitalization in diplomatic training, albeit with different emphases. The U.S. model prioritizes information security, crisis response, and interagency coordination, fostering flexibility and operational readiness. The Chinese model emphasizes public diplomacy, strategic messaging, and digital narrative management, aligning training closely with national strategic objectives. These contrasting approaches reflect broader geopolitical strategies and diplomatic philosophies and provide valuable insights for Kazakhstan in designing its own technology-enhanced diplomatic training programs.

Kazakhstan's National Approach. Kazakh diplomatic education emphasizes applied learning. Courses such as Diplomatic Protocol and Etiquette and Negotiation Process Technologies combine theoretical instruction with simulations. Students also analyze real-world geopolitical cases such as the Afghan crisis, the Syrian conflict, and instability in the Sahel-Sahara region. Instructors employ active learning strategies including debates, interactive workshops, portfolio assessments, and keyword-based conceptual frameworks, which cultivate communication skills, cultural intelligence, strategic reasoning, and emotional resilience.

Similar to the U.S., Kazakhstan incorporates interactive teaching methods including case studies, simulations, and mandatory internships, helping bridge theory and real-world practice. Like China, Kazakhstan's training is closely linked to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, ensuring that educational programs align with national foreign policy goals. At the same time, the Kazakh model prioritizes regional expertise, multilingualism, and the promotion of the country's image as a neutral and peace-oriented actor. Despite progress in digital diplomacy and participation in international platforms such as the Tech Diplomacy Network, challenges remain, particularly the absence of a unified national strategy for digital diplomacy. Overall, Kazakhstan is developing a training model that blends international experience with the strengthening of national identity while preparing diplomats to navigate both traditional and emerging challenges in global governance.

Think Tanks: The Intellectual Backbone of Modern Diplomacy. This study analyzes the role of research centers in shaping Kazakhstan's foreign policy expertise, using qualitative content analysis of publicly available documents, reports, and institutional publications. The focus is on the Kazakhstan Institute for Strategic Studies under the President (KazISS), examining its research output, institutional collaborations, and contributions to diplomatic training [2].

Internationally, think tanks complement formal education and government policymaking, contributing to the professional development of diplomats. In the United States, for example, cooperation exists between the State Department and leading research institutions to develop policy training modules that enhance diplomats' strategic competencies. Similarly, in China, research institutes work with diplomatic training institutions to produce analytical materials and conduct regional security research, integrating think tank insights into diplomatic training.

In Kazakhstan, KazISS demonstrates a model adapted to national needs. Since 2013, it has expanded academic and regional partnerships with scientific and expert-analytical institutions to strengthen its role in foreign policy development and diplomatic training. KazISS conducts interdisciplinary research, publishes analytical reports, and organizes seminars and workshops that enhance the strategic and analytical competencies of future diplomats. It also collaborates

directly with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Institute of Diplomacy, offering internships and co-organized training programs that integrate research findings into practical diplomatic education [2].

Comparative analysis indicates that think tanks operate differently depending on the political context. In democratic systems, think tanks maintain relative independence, providing fellowships, internships, and expert-led seminars to cultivate critical thinking and policy analysis skills. In contrast, in more centralized systems, think tanks are closely linked to state organs, contributing to ideological alignment and strategic messaging within diplomatic training. Kazakhstan's experience with KazISS lies between these models: the institute functions as a semi-independent research hub that aligns with national priorities while fostering analytical capacity and strategic foresight for diplomatic professionals.

Overall, the analysis shows that integrating think tanks into diplomatic training strengthens evidence-based decision-making, enhances strategic thinking, and supports national policy formulation. In Kazakhstan, further formalization of collaborations between the Institute of Diplomacy and think tanks could expand opportunities for applied research, scenario exercises, and exposure to global best practices in diplomatic training.

Implications for Modernizing Kazakhstan's Diplomatic Training. The theoretical synthesis leads to concrete, evidence-based implications for Kazakhstan. The nation stands at a crossroads, possessing a foundational hybrid model but requiring targeted modernization to enhance its strategic autonomy and global influence.

First, to address its soft power deficit, Kazakhstan must move beyond ad-hoc initiatives and develop a comprehensive strategy for digital and public diplomacy. This involves integrating advanced modules on strategic communication, data analytics, and digital narrative-building directly into the core curriculum of institutions like the Academy of Public Administration, drawing on best practices from both U.S. adaptability and Chinese strategic focus.

Second, to overcome its identity fragmentation, a deliberate program of professional socialization is needed. This could involve enhanced mentorship programs, structured secondments between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, think tanks like KazISS, and academic institutions, and the creation of a shared "corporate culture" for the diplomatic service that bridges the theory-practice divide.

Third, to cultivate a more innovative diplomatic profile, the system must intentionally foster competencies aligned with Neumann's «Hero» and «Mediator» archetypes. This requires pedagogical shifts towards more scenario-based planning, crisis simulation games, and courses on strategic foresight that empower diplomats to be not just executors of policy, but also its architects.

Conclusion

In the context of a rapidly transforming global environment – marked by digitalization, multipolarity, and the emergence of new non-traditional threats – the training of a professional diplomatic corps has become a critical component of national security and international influence. For Kazakhstan, the modernization of the diplomatic education system is not merely an educational policy agenda but a strategic necessity aimed at strengthening sovereignty and enhancing competitiveness in the international arena.

The comparative analysis of the American, Chinese, and hybrid models demonstrates that Kazakhstan has developed a foundational hybrid system of diplomatic training that combines elements of Western adaptability and Eastern strategic coherence while reflecting national priorities and foreign policy objectives. At the same time, the findings indicate that this system requires further consolidation to ensure coherence between academic education, professional training, and analytical support.

Building on these findings, several recommendations can be identified. First, Kazakhstan's diplomatic training system would benefit from the development of a more systematic approach to digital and public diplomacy, including the integration of strategic communication and analytical competencies into core training programs. Second, greater emphasis on professional socialization and institutional coordination between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, educational institutions, and analytical centers could strengthen the formation of a shared professional culture within the diplomatic service. Third, the expansion of practice-oriented training formats, including scenario-based learning and simulation exercises, could further enhance diplomats' capacity to operate effectively in complex and uncertain international environments.

Overall, the study concludes that the modernization of Kazakhstan's diplomatic training system represents a long-term strategic investment in the country's foreign policy capacity. By building on its existing hybrid model and aligning training practices with national priorities outlined in the Concept of the Foreign Policy of the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2020–2030, Kazakhstan can enhance the effectiveness, resilience, and international competitiveness of its diplomatic corps. Further research may focus on assessing the practical outcomes of specific training reforms and on incorporating empirical insights from practitioners involved in diplomatic education and foreign service training.

REFERENCES

[1] Shakleina T.A., Baikov A.A. (eds.). Megatrends: Key trajectories of the evolution of the world order in the 21st century. – Moscow: Aspect Press, 2017.

[2] On the Concept of the Foreign Policy of the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2020–2030. – 2020. – URL: https://www.akorda.kz/en/legal_acts/decrees/on-the-concept-of-the-foreign-policy-of-the-republic-of-kazakhstan-for-2020-2030.

– Date of access: 18.09.2025.

[3] Engtoft Meldgaard A.M., Fletcher T. Digital Diplomatic Representation: The Rise of Tech Ambassadors // The Oxford Handbook of Digital Diplomacy. – Oxford, 2024. – P. 420–436. – DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780192859198.013.23.

[4] Nye J.S. Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics. – New York: PublicAffairs, 2004.

[5] Tajfel H., Turner J. An integrative theory of intergroup conflict // The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations. – 1979. – P. 33–47.

[6] Neumann I.B. At Home with the Diplomats: Inside a European Foreign Ministry. – Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press, 2012.

[7] Kurbalija J., Höne K. The Emergence of Digital Foreign Policy. – Geneva: DiploFoundation, 2021.

[8] Berridge G.R. Diplomacy: Theory and Practice. – 4th ed. – Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

[9] Melissen J. The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations. – Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

[10] DiploFoundation. Diplomatic training: Combining tradition and innovation. – 2020. – URL: https://www.diplomacy.edu/blog/diplomatic-training-combining-tradition-and-innovation/. – Date of access: 18.09.2025.

[11] Kazakhstan Institute for Strategic Studies (KazISS). About KazISS. – URL: https://kisi.kz. – Date of access: 18.09.2025.

[12] Warwick D. Think tanks and the delivery of social policy advice // Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis. – 2000. – Vol. 2, No 1. – P. 91–115.

[13] Kussainova A. Education and Training of Diplomatic Personnel in Kazakhstan // Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences. – 2013. – Vol. 89. – P. 337–341.

[14] Institute of Diplomacy, Academy of Public Administration. Institute of Diplomacy. – URL: https://www.apa.kz/en/institute-of-diplomacy/. – Date of access: 18.09.2025.

[15] Modern competencies and hybrid models in Kazakhstan's diplomatic education // Central Asian Journal of Trade and Strategy. – 2024. – URL: https://cajts.ablaikhan.kz/. – Date of access: 18.09.2025.

[16] U.S. Department of State. Foreign Service Institute (FSI): Overview and programs. – URL: https://www.state.gov/foreign-service-institute/. – Date of access: 18.09.2025.

[17] Rice C. Transformational Diplomacy. – U.S. Department of State, 2006. – URL: https://2001-2009.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2006/08/70707.htm. – Date of access: 18.09.2025.

[18] Sandre A. Digital Diplomacy: Conversations on Innovation in Foreign Policy. – Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015.

[19] China Foreign Affairs University. Annual report: Curriculum reforms and global engagement strategy. – Beijing, 2022.

[20] Semenov A., Tsvyk A. China's foreign policy narratives // International Affairs Journal. – 2021. – Vol. 67, No 2. – P. 91–105.

ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ ДИПЛОМАТИЯЛЫҚ ДАЯРЛАУ ЖӘНЕ ЗЕРТТЕУ ОРТАЛЫҚТАРЫНЫҢ ДАМУЫ: САЛЫСТЫРМАЛЫ ТАЛДАУ ЖӘНЕ ЖАҢҒЫРТУ ПЕРСПЕКТИВАЛАРЫ

* Қонысбаева А.Б.[1], Ассетқызы Ж.[2], Алиева С.К. [3]
*[1,3] Л.Н. Гумилёв атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті,
Астана, Қазақстан
[2] Азия зерттеулері кафедрасы, Қазақстан стратегиялық зерттеулер институты,
Астана, Қазақстан

Аңдатпа. Әлемдік күштер тепе-теңдігінің өзгеруі және орта державалардың маңыздылығының артуы халықаралық ынтымақтастықты дамыту үшін жоғары білікті дипломаттарға деген қажеттілікті көрсетеді. Қазақстан үшін бұл жаһандық сын-қатерлерге жауап бере алатын және халықаралық пікірталастарға белсенді қатысатын дипломаттарды даярлаудың заманауи жүйесін қалыптастыру қажеттігін білдіреді.

Осы тұрғыда Қазақстанның дипломаттарын қалай даярлайтынына арналған зерттеулер саны шектеулі болып отыр. Аталған мақаланың мақсаты – Қазақстанның дипломатиялық даярлау жүйесін қалай жаңғыртып жатқанын және АҚШ пен Қытай сияқты елдердің тәжірибесінен қандай элементтерді қабылдай алатынын зерттеу. Осы мақсатқа жету үшін зерттеуде салыстырмалы кейстік талдау және контент-талдау әдістері қолданылып, дипломаттарға арналған білім беру бағдарламалары мен даярлау жүйесін жетілдірудің негізгі бағыттары айқындалды.

Зерттеу нәтижелері Қазақстанның дипломатиялық даярлау жүйесінің ұлттық дәстүрлерге негізделгенін және біртіндеп халықаралық стандарттарға қарай бет алып келе жатқанын көрсетеді. Бұл үдеріс цифрлық құралдарды қолдануды, жаһандық бастамаларға қатысуды, жұмсақ күшке басымдық беруді және зерттеу ұйымдарымен ынтымақтастықты қамтиды. Ерекше назар Қазақстан стратегиялық зерттеулер институты сияқты аналитикалық орталықтарға аударылады. Алайда, зерттеу АҚШ пен Қытайға қарағанда, Қазақстанда бұл зерттеу орталықтарының дипломаттарды даярлаудың ресми жүйесіне әлі толық енгізілмегенін анықтайды.

Зерттеу нәтижелері Қазақстанның практикалық оқытуға, атап айтқанда Мемлекеттік басқару академиясы жанындағы Дипломатия институтында жүзеге асырылатын рөлдік ойындар мен тағылымдамаларға басымдық бергенін көрсетеді. Цифрлық дағдыларды жетілдіруге және аналитикалық орталықтармен байланыстарды нығайтуға ерекше көңіл бөлінеді. Соңғы

реформалар көптілділіктің маңыздылығын атап өтіп, шетел тілдерін меңгеруді ынталандырды. Мақалада Қазақстанның ұлттық құндылықтарын үздік әлемдік тәжірибелермен ұштастыру елдің көпполюсті әлемдегі бәсекеге қабілеттілігін арттыруға мүмкіндік беретіні туралы қорытынды жасалады.

Ғылыми үлес – Қазақстанның дипломатиялық даярлау моделін жүйелеу және оның АҚШ пен Қытай тәжірибесінен сараптамалық орталықтарды тарту жөніндегі айырмашылықтарын салыстырмалы талдау. Практикалық маңыздылығы – дипломаттарды оқыту бағдарламаларына зерттеуші қауымдастықты біріктіру бойынша әзірленген ұсынымдарда.

Тірек сөздер: дипломатиялық даярлау, Қазақстан стратегиялық зерттеулер институты (ҚСЗИ), дипломатиялық институттар, даярлау тәжірибелері, дипломатиялық білім беру, талдамалық орталықтар (think tanks), цифрлық дипломатия, жұмсақ күш

РАЗВИТИЕ ДИПЛОМАТИЧЕСКОЙ ПОДГОТОВКИ И ИССЛЕДОВАТЕЛЬСКИХ ЦЕНТРОВ В КАЗАХСТАНЕ: СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ МОДЕРНИЗАЦИИ

* Конысбаева А.Б.[1], Ассеткызы Ж.[2], Алиева С.К.[3]
*[1,3] Евразийский национальный университет имени Л.Н. Гумилёва,
Астана, Казахстан
[2] Казахстанский институт стратегических исследований,
Астана, Казахстан

Аннотация. Изменяющийся мировой баланс сил и растущее значение стран средних держав показывают необходимость высоко квалифицированных дипломатов для развития международного сотрудничества. Для Казахстана, это означает необходимость создания современной системы подготовки дипломатов, способных реагировать на мировые вызовы и активно участвовать в глобальных дискуссиях.

В этой связи существует ограниченное количество исследований, особенно в контексте того, как Казахстан готовит своих дипломатов. Целью данной статьи является исследование того, как Казахстан модернизирует свою систему дипломатической подготовки и что он может перенять от таких стран, как США и Китай. Для этого в исследовании используется сравнительный анализ кейсов и контент-анализ для выявления ключевых идей и направлений для улучшения образовательных программ и тренингов для дипломатов.

Исследование показывает, что система дипломатической подготовки Казахстана основана на национальных традициях и начала двигаться в сторону международных стандартов. Это включает использование цифровых

инструментов, участие в глобальных инициативах, акцент на мягкую силу и сотрудничество с исследовательскими организациями. Особое внимание уделяется аналитическим центрам, таким как Казахстанский институт стратегических исследований. Однако исследование обнаруживает, что в отличие от США и Китая, Казахстан еще не полностью включает эти исследовательские центры в свою официальную систему подготовки дипломатов.

Результаты исследования показывают, что Казахстан сосредоточил внимание на практическом обучении, таком как ролевые игры и стажировки, реализуемые в Институте дипломатии при Академии государственного управления. Важное внимание уделено улучшению цифровых навыков и укреплению связей с аналитическими центрами. Недавние реформы подчеркнули важность многоязычности и стимулировали изучение иностранных языков. В статье делается вывод, что сочетание национальных ценностей Казахстана с лучшими мировыми практиками поможет стране более эффективно конкурировать в многополярном мире.

Научный вклад работы – систематизация казахстанской модели диппподготовки и сравнительный анализ её отличий от практик США и Китая в привлечении экспертных центров. Практическая значимость – в разработанных рекомендациях по интеграции исследовательского сообщества в программы обучения дипломатов.

Ключевые слова: дипломатическая подготовка, Казахстанский институт стратегических исследований (КИСИ), дипломатические институты, практики подготовки, дипломатическое образование, аналитические центры (think tanks), цифровая дипломатия, мягкая сила

Information about authors
Konysbayeva A.B. – PhD candidate, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University (ENU), Astana, Kazakhstan, e-mail: aizhandoc@gmail.com, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0007-6914-671X
Assetkyzy Zh. – Researcher, Kazakhstan Institute for Strategic Studies under the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Astana, Kazakhstan, e-mail: zhadyraaset@gmail.com, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0007-2052-4441
Aliyeva S.K. – Candidate of Sciences, Associate Professor, Acting Professor, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University (ENU), Astana, Kazakhstan, e-mail: aliyeva_sk@enu.kz, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0004-6464-7660

Авторлар туралы мәлімет

Қонысбаева А.Б. – PhD докторанты, Л.Н. Гумилёв атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті (ЕҰУ), Астана, Қазақстан, e-mail: aizhandoc@gmail.com, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0007-6914-671X

Ассетқызы Ж. – ғылыми қызметкер, Қазақстан Республикасының Президенті жанындағы Қазақстан стратегиялық зерттеулер институты, Астана, Қазақстан, e-mail: zhadyraaset@gmail.com, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0007-2052-4441

Алиева С.К. – ғылым кандидаты, доцент, профессор м.а., Л.Н. Гумилёв атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті (ЕҰУ), Астана, Қазақстан, e-mail: aliyeva_sk@enu.kz, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0004-6464-7660

Информация об авторах

Конысбаева А.Б. – PhD докторант, Евразийский национальный университет им. Л.Н. Гумилёва (ЕНУ), г. Астана, Республика Казахстан, e-mail: aizhandoc@gmail.com, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0007-6914-671X

Ассеткызы Ж. – научный сотрудник, Казахстанский институт стратегических исследований при Президенте Республики Казахстан, г. Астана, Республика Казахстан, e-mail: zhadyraaset@gmail.com, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0007-2052-4441

Алиева С.К. – кандидат наук, доцент, и.о. профессора, Евразийский национальный университет им. Л.Н. Гумилёва (ЕНУ), г. Астана, Республика Казахстан, e-mail: aliyeva_sk@enu.kz, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0004-6464-7660