Introduction

To engage a wide range of cultural and artistic meanings and the diversity historical world outlooks by means of the disclosure of identity of national cultures is the most important task of the study of art and cultural sciences in the contemporary education system. The Nation Plan, 100 specific steps to implement the five institutional reforms of President Nursultan Nazarbayev, is a response to the global internal calls, the modern emergence of ethnic culture in education and
at the same time NATION PLAN for entry into the 30-ku developed countries under the new historical conditions (quoting President Nursultan Nazarbayev. (Plan nacii, 2015).

Humanitarian knowledge in the study of art history and cultural studies serves as the relationship of the universal and the regional. That is why the educational curricula and programs in the Republic of Kazakhstan are based on ethno-cultural model of general and vocational education, in connection with the national and regional components. Art education leads to creativity motivating young people to ask questions about forms of self-expression and think about dominant ideological discourse. Learning arts contributes to the cultural education of the individual, which is a very important factor, as the identity and mentality of any social group are based on the culture of its members.

Schools play an important role in helping people to understand the cultures of other ethnic groups in multi-cultural countries. Innovative curricula and programs that use creative disciplines and creative pedagogy enhance cross-cultural understanding and tolerance. This ability is particularly important in the face of threats facing society in the XXI century. For example, due to changes in society that affect the family structure, children are often deprived of parental attention. In addition, due to lack of communication and the ability to build relationships within the family, children often run into a number of emotional and social problems. Moreover, it becomes more difficult (especially in urban areas) to transmit cultural traditions and creative skills within the family (Praliev et al., 2014).

Today, Kazakhstan's culture continues to evolve, based on the same principles of unity and desire for peace. Peoples of Kazakhstan celebrate the ancient nomads' holiday Nauryz and Orthodox Easter, the Muslim KurbanAit and the Christmas Day with the same joy. To speak in three languages - Kazakh, Russian and English has become a natural norm for the young generation of Kazakhstan (Praliev et al., 2014).

Aim of the Study
To investigate the potential art of Kazakhstan and its role in the educational system.

Research questions
What is the essence of “art-pedagogy”?

Method
The main purpose of teaching "History of Art of Kazakhstan" is the formation of ethnic and cultural identity of students who are focused on the artistic culture of Kazakhstan in relation to other cultures and on the development of artistic and future specialists' humanitarian consciousness that could fit the purpose of ethnic and cultural education.

Art is one of the forms of social consciousness, a particular kind of almost spiritual development of the world (citation from the Philosophical Encyclopedia, 1983). Art, modeling a certain type of culture, vividly recreates the complete "picture of the world" of the era. Tradition is a fundamental notion of artistic culture as the existence of artistic culture without traditions is impossible. Concepts such as continuity, heritage and identity are related with the term "tradition". The traditional Kazakh art culture is based on ancient multigenre
culture that include the synthesis of different types of arts. Its important component is the valuable and informative indicator reflecting its originality and integrated features. It could be considered as means of esthetic, musical and art education of the personality. (Baltabaev M.H. Educational Cultural Studies: Textbook. Almaty, RISC KAO name Altnysarin. 2000, 268 p. - P.122.)

Human creative possibilities of art were seen by society long before the formation of representations about art pedagogy. In this regard, the logic of the study required the analysis of the historical experience of the deliberate involvement of art to the solution of pedagogical problems. We needed to figure out the place of the arts in education and social services in different historical periods, the role of art in the process of becoming a person withdrawn by known philosophers, educators and thinkers of the past.

Special interest was shown in the history and development of the professional theater, music and art education, the history of Russian and other foreign cultures. The publication of artistic activities in the historically significant pedagogical trends (Waldorf pedagogy, the French group "New Education", "School of Dialogue of Cultures", museum education, theatrical pedagogy) were studied. In particular, in the concept of the art education developed by M. H. Baltabayev it is noted that perception of different types of art in their interrelation solves problems of art education of the personality. (Baltabayev M. H. Modern art culture of Kazakhstan: gnoseology, mentality, continuity, prospects. – Almaty, 1997. – 156 c.).

The current experience of using art in the social and educational sphere was studied by analyzing

- the programs in the system and additional general education (Pralievet al., 2014);
- the publications reflecting artpedagogicheskoy practice activities in educational institutions of various types in different regions of Kazakhstan (Almaty, Astana, Shymkent, Karaganda, Taldykorgan, Ust-Kamenogorsk, etc.);
- personal observations.

Analytical description of the historical and contemporary experience of using art in the social and educational spheres is complicated by the need of studying a wide range of interrelated and interdependent phenomena, processes and facts.

Data, Analysis, and Results

Thus, combined with an analysis of the contemporary experience of the use of art in education the historical perspective suggests that the pedagogical potential of art was always in demand, and is becoming increasingly relevant in the last decade. There is no coincidence in the fact that the modern pedagogical science is conducted in an active search for the term that most adequately reflects the specificity of practical activities which uses art in order to optimize the solution of problems of education, training, development, formation and support (Davydovskaya et al.). In parallel, there is a formation of the corresponding scientific field called art pedagogy. Extensive practical experience and conflicting scientific research require their scientific systematization and theoretical generalization.

The following result can be stated on the basis of a comprehensive multidisciplinary study of the phenomenon of art and its social and educational
functions and the nature of effects on human. Art, as a dynamic, multifunctional system, has a distinct potential to address problems of education, training, development, support and socialization of the person. The essential closeness of art and pedagogy and deep relationship between artistic and educational activities emphasize the need to deliberate the resource actualization of art in order to improve the image of the masticatory efficiency of the process. The analysis of the psycho-physiological, psychological, socio-cultural aspects of the impact of different types of art per person allowed to reveal and justify the purpose of the means of art in education. By affecting cognitive, emotional, behavioral spheres of the person, the rational and the intuitive, the conscious and unconscious aspects of the human psyche, art can similarly solve a significant amount of pedagogical tasks, providing a holistic inclusion of participants in the educational process.

The results of the analysis of the historical and the contemporary experience of art opportunities in the social and educational sphere allow us to formulate an important position for further research. Since ancient times the pedagogical culture of mankind has practiced different approaches to the integration of the art facilities in the context of educational activities:

- as a special training in the arts (art, music, dance, theater education);
- as a means of therapy and correction;
- as a means of solving specific problems of education, training, development, socialization, and support for the younger generation.

The experience of integrating pedagogy and arts in cultural-historical perspective normally proposed varying and advisable use of different types of art (music, theater, visual arts, dance, etc.) or their syncretic unity. One of the conditions to achieve the pedagogical effect of the action of art in a productive educational experience is free self-expression, spontaneous manifestation of itself in art, as well as providing students with the right to independently look at, listen to and feel the perception of works of art and share their experiences with others. A priority trend of therapeutically-oriented use of arts in teaching activities, current in modern practice, unnecessarily narrows the pedagogical potential of art and sends it in a narrowly delineated harmonizing track!

At the same time, the analysis of historical and contemporary experience of the use of the pedagogic potential of art suggests the existence of objective historical and cultural preconditions for the conscious use of the potential of art in a purely pedagogical purposes and the formation of art pedagogy as an independent direction of pedagogical science, exploring the possibilities of art as a means of solving problems of education, training, support and socialization of the person. Art pedagogy carries interdisciplinary, practice-oriented trait, which fully reflects the trend towards the integration of knowledge specific for modern human cognition. As one of the promising areas of application of pedagogical potential of art in the context of art pedagogy is the process of training of the future teacher in the conditions of high school.

**Discussion and Conclusion**

Despite the fact that Kazakhstan has accumulated practical material on the use of the potential of art in the upbringing of children, art pedagogy begins to form as an evidence-based method just now. Until recently, this perspective
direction uniting educational opportunities for all forms of artistic activity of the subject was not known enough. It was the reason for its disparate interpretations.

Thus, the existing research on art pedagogy, together with scientific and methodical publications, is extremely small, which creates the urgent need for meaningful disclosure of the term "art pedagogy". The modern term "art pedagogy" is a two-part synthetic method of education. According to researchers conducted by G.I. Zhelezovsky, D.S. Lotte, V. I. Skvortsovaet. Al. (Zhelezovsky & Eremin, 1999) it is the simplest form of foreign-language terms, phrases that most vividly express the defined (in the form of a noun) and the determiner (in the form of adjective, rarely - the communion or noun) elements that have arisen in domestic science by tracing the inner form and the outer form of borrowing an established English-language term.

Thus, the term "art pedagogy" itself includes two concepts. The first of them is "Art". Being taken from English it means skill, crafts, arts. The second concept "pedagogy" (Greek paydos – child; ago –to lead; to lead a child) - the science of education, development and human learning. Combining these two terms-the element art pedagogy has an integrity and a new entity that cannot be reduced to a set of its components, and becomes "more than the sum of these components."

So, literally we understand the pedagogy of art as education and human development through art. One of the most prominent founders of "Education through Art" - G. Reid once attached a particular importance to this term. According to his concept, the combined concepts of "art" and "pedagogy" expose a conscious shift from "processes of education" in its conventional sense to living a constructive alliance between child and adult in the space of art. This definition lets us avoid any sense of authoritarianism in parenting. "Not training in art, not a place of art in the upbringing, but the education of humanistic path through art"(Shestakov, 1979). G.Rid designated art as the only way of education, pushing it to the role of a comprehensive activity.

The term "artpedagogy" appeared relatively recently in the domestic science- in 1997 - after the publication of Y.S.Shevchenko's and L.V.Krepitsa’s scientific-methodical manual "Principles of art therapy and art pedagogy in working with children and adolescents». However, the most intensive dissemination of the term "art pedagogy" comes later in 2001, after the publication of the textbook "Art Pedagogy, Art Therapy and Special Education» (Medvedeva et al., 2001).

In recent years, this term (and its syntactical variant of “art-pedagogy” with the hyphenated version) is increasingly being implemented in the conceptual and categorical apparatus of domestic pedagogy and psychology. However, the absence of it in pedagogical dictionaries and textbooks during the time of high implementation of art pedagogic practice contributes to the variety of shades of meaning of the term and to blurring of the functional boundaries of art pedagogy. As an example, we will bring forth a few definitions of art pedagogy as the "synthesis of the two business areas (pedagogy and arts), providing pedagogical process of social formation and development of an adolescent" (Valeeva, 2007); as "a set of tools and techniques of art of artistic and creative activities to achieve educational goals" (Starikov, 2008); as a ‘cultural value orientation and the orientation of the subjective personality of the child support problems in the development of its socio-cultural formation through art” (Medvedeva, 2007); as a “pedagogical technology that provides comprehensive educational impact through an integrated series of influence of organized forms of artistic activity of children
The aforementioned interpretations of the term illustrate the idea of the plurality of values and contradictory definitions of "art pedagogy". This, in our opinion, can be explained by the "adolescence" of art pedagogy, designed by its weak conceptual apparatus, as well as distortions in the translation of texts from other languages. However, to analyze the set of definitions of art pedagogy in modern Russian theory and practice we have identified several key approaches to the interpretation of the term (Taranova, 2012).

At the heart of the art pedagogy there are theoretical and methodological approaches of pedagogy associated with the use of art as a means of education and pedagogical support of the participants of the educational process (children, teenagers, teachers, parents), that is, as a means of the formation of the totality of their personality and the development of individually valuable intentionality. Art pedagogy, from this point of view, focused on the implementation of educational, developmental and value-defining functions. It emphasizes features, existential support and encouragement of individuality as well.

In the conceptual field of pedagogical category the term "artpedagogy" is identified more often as the concept of "art education". However, E.A. Medvedev said (2001): "the concept of" artpedagogy"does not replace the narrower term" art education ". Artpedagogy can be considered within the framework of special education and is not only an artistic education, but all the components of the correction and development process (development, education, training and correction) by means of art, as well as the formation of the fundamental of the artistic culture of "(Medvedev et al., 2001).

The main purpose of art education is most often determined by the formation of a "culture of rights", the aesthetic development of the individual, as becoming her emotionally-valuable relation to works of art, artistic taste, aesthetic interests, the development of artistic skills and abilities, etc. (Bakushinski et al., 2008). Art education as a process of deliberate action by means of art per person is directed at, above all, the formation of tumor in the structure of personality, which are connected with the arts and enable effective communication with him (artistic sensibilities and taste, love of art, evaluation, artistic sensibility, and so on).

At the same time a central place in art education is given to the development of human creativity. "The main task of art education is to discover and develop potential creative abilities" (Bakushinski A., 2008). In addition, art education is seen mainly in the context of learning the art, when the new formation of groups of aesthetically-oriented personality occurs through the primary focus on practice-oriented creative human activity and the accumulation of practical skills.

In contrast to the artistic education, the problem of formation of personality's individual extra-aesthetic phenomena is distinguished first, i.e., the formation of motivational-semantic sphere of the person, his spiritual world, attitude and perception of the world outlook. At the same time, being not as a priority, the artistic development of the individual is also carried out, but it takes place in parallel and does not become an end in itself. Besides, art-pedagogy does not involve the direct teaching of art or study of subjects of artistic and aesthetic cycle. As a result, all kinds of artistic diversity of human activities are implemented more freely and diversely, not only in the artistic and educational process.
Thus, the carried out analysis of art pedagogy in the conceptual field of teaching and art therapeutic categories allowed differentiating this area of scientific knowledge from close and somehow related phenomena of pedagogical theory and practice. This creates the possibility of determining the phenomenological characteristics of art pedagogy at the present stage of its development, which activates mechanisms of personal development and define the specifics of its pedagogical potential.

Thus, under art pedagogy we understand integrative area of modern humanitarian knowledge of the laws, principles and mechanisms of the use of pedagogical potential of different kinds of art and the forms of artistic activity of the individual in order to optimize the professional pedagogical solutions of its education, training and development (not pursuing meanwhile the special purposes of serious art education).

The humanitarian nature of the study, announced at the level of methodology, goals and objectives led to the specifics of the arrangement, content and evaluation of the results of experimental work on testing art pedagogic model for training teachers. Experimental training was carried out in searching and approbating mode, which resulted in the gradual build-up range of implemented forms of art pedagogic activities, the variability of combinations of supporting areas, and in multiple testing copyright of the art-pedagogic lessons on similar topics. Some of the components of the theoretical model were worked out simultaneously in different classrooms, maintaining the original design, value-sense orientation, goals, objectives, content, common logic and strategy of assignments completion. At the same time, the methods, techniques, ”set” of art pedagogic funds, equipment and methodical course of employment varied depending on the characteristics of the audience.

In our opinion, such an approach is the most adequate to the content of the concept ”support”, which implies not algorithmic steps, but the variation in the choice of means used situationally, and based on specific educational tasks and conditions of pedagogical interaction. During the course pilot / experimental groups of students were not allocated deliberately, as this would conflict semantically with the humanitarian nature of our research.

Students, as subjects of the educational process, have characteristics of absolute uniqueness. Because of this, the personal composition of any group is unique like an integrated socio-psychological body, so attempts to use comparisons of aggregate subjects that are of different nature to identify the dynamics of the results are incorrect. The fact that the composition of students of parallel groups by level of preparedness for premised art pedagogic interaction, by the level of general cultural development and by the level of the formation of emotional, intellectual, motivational and other areas (as the diagnosis showed) is significantly different from each other can be an additional argument for this claim.

Not only the specifics of the pedagogical process itself, but also the nature of art pedagogy based on the inclusion of the art facilities in the training process was taken into account during the arrangement of experimental learning outside the context of intergroup comparisons. The perception of art and artistic expression is priory subjective, multi-layered, and therefore biodiverse.

The refusal to release the control groups was also dictated by psychological reasons. Simultaneous work of the teacher in experimental and control groups
objectively compels her/him to work in each of the groups in different ways. It affects the action of Pygmalion effect (self-fulfilling prediction) when the researcher inadvertently acts so as to obtain the desired difference between the control and experimental groups, confirming the validity of the hypothesis and protected ideas. It seems that such a position is contrary to the nature and ethics of humanitarian cooperation, which art pedagogy is based on.

The comparison of the results of training students in the group, where the author of the study worked, and in the groups, where other teachers worked is meaningless because the study did not attempt to prove that the use of art pedagogy ensures the best and the only possible result in the preparation of teachers. We are talking about the development and testing of one of the possible ways to improve the modern training of future teachers in the educational process ensuring the complementarities of cognitive, emotional, and activity experience in the profession and personal development. Art pedagogic means in this case is considered as an innovative resource of modernization (optimization) of the educational process of the university. Art pedagogic, for the time being, is complementary in nature in relation to the traditional forms of teacher training. The study offers one of the innovative ways to solve problems of art pedagogy in preparing teachers.

Its predictive capacity is offered by the possibility of organizing on theoretical and methodological basis of a number of areas of work. In particular, what seems to be perspective here is the experimental study of the specifics of art pedagogy in vocational teacher education levels of undergraduate and graduate programs, as well as study of the feasibility of art pedagogy at other stages of continuous pedagogical education (core classes, teacher training colleges, training of educators).

At the theoretical and methodological level further in-depth study of the mechanisms of pedagogy’s integration with different types and genres of art is necessary to identify patterns of their pedagogical system combination. Special attention is required to study the pedagogical potential of the national art and its application of opportunities within art pedagogic support of future teachers’ training.

The improvement of the technological support of art pedagogy assumes its specification, taking into account the individual characteristics of private educational process (age, gender, ethnic and cultural characteristics of the participants, the scale of educational space, the type of educational institution, etc.). The art pedagogic software in various disciplines of professional training of future teachers requires further scientific and methodological development and testing.

Objective ability to fully influence the art of human body with its complex mental spiritual nature speaks about the viability and relevance of the ideas of the art of pedagogy, which plays an important role in solving the problems of humanization and humanization of modern education.
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