Rural School Stakeholders' Perceptions and Practices of Trilingual Education:

Same or Different?

Shakhrizat Agaidarova

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Multilingual Education

Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education

May, 2019

Word count: 24,110

Declaration

I hereby declare that this submission is my own work and to the best of my knowledge it contains no materials previously published or written by another person, or substantial proportions of material which have been submitted for the award of any other course or degree at NU or any other educational institution, except where due acknowledgement is made in the thesis. This thesis is the result of my own independent work, except where otherwise stated, and the views expressed here are my own.

Signed:

Date: 27.05.2019

NUGSE RESEARCH APPROVAL DECISION

Dear Shakhrizat,

The NUGSE Research Committee reviewed the study proposal entitled "Rural school stakeholders' perceptions and practices of trilingual education: same or different?" and decided:

☐ To grant approval for this study

Approval: This approval is effective for the life of the study. However, any time you change any aspect of your project (e.g., recruitment process, administering materials, collecting data, gaining consent, and changing participants) you will need to submit a request for modification to the NUGSE Research Committee.

Sincerely,

NUGSE Research Committee

CITI Training Certificates

CITI PROGRAM

Completion Date 14-Jul-2018
Expiration Date 13-Jul-2021
Record ID 27619117

This is to certify that:

Shakhrizat Agaidarova

Has completed the following CITI Program course:

Students conducting no more than minimal risk research (Curriculum Group)
Students - Class projects (Course Learner Group)
1 - Basic Course (Stage)

Under requirements set by:

Nazarbayev University

CITI
Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative

Verify at www.citiprogram.org/verify/?w521a1f51-c91d-4b7c-873a-6ac5ce733490-27619117

CITI PROGRAM

Completion Date 02-Oct-2018
Expiration Date 01-Oct-2021
Record ID 28921613

This is to certify that:

Shakhrizat Agaidarova

Has completed the following CITI Program course:

Social & Behavioral Research - Basic/Refresher (Curriculum Group)
Social & Behavioral Research - Basic/Refresher (Course Learner Group)
1 - Basic Course (Stage)

Under requirements set by:

Nazarbayev University

CITI
Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative

Verify at www.citiprogram.org/verify/?wb6ef39e5-c296-4ac4-b8a3-74517e1fa3f5-28921613

Acknowledgments

Abstract

Rural School Stakeholders' Perceptions and Practices of Trilingual Education:

Same or Different?

Trilingual education is one of the drastic reforms in education in the Republic of Kazakhstan that aims at shaping a future generation fluent in Kazakh, Russian and English. Although such initiative appears important, studies say that stakeholders' perceptions of trilingual education may impact the way they practice it in their domains, thus, there is a need to study these perceptions to ensure a successful implementation of the reform. The purpose of the study was to explore various groups of stakeholders' perceptions and practices of trilingual education in a rural school in Almaty Oblast. The study sought answers to the research questions regarding stakeholders' perceptions, practices in different domains and similarities and/or differences in their perceptions of trilingual education. The study applied a qualitative case study design with semi-structured interviews as data collection instrument. The sample included ten participants from the following groups of stakeholders: parents, teachers and administrators. The findings revealed that the stakeholders' perceptions of trilingual education vary from understanding it mostly as the teaching of English to the teaching of three languages or teaching in three languages. As for the language use, the triangulated data uncovered that all three languages were used within their domains, though Russian was neglected in certain levels. From the study findings, it is possible to conclude that the application of triangulation of data sources: parents, teachers and administrators was beneficial because it disclosed insights into the way how trilingual education is differently perceived and practiced by various groups of stakeholders. Thereby, there is an urgent need for creating efficient communication and information channels between policy-makers and schools, between parents and schools to explain trilingual education and its implementation processes.

Аннотация

Восприятие и применение трёхъязычного образования стэйкхолдерами в казахстанской сельской школе: идентичны ли или отличны друг от друга?

Трёхъязычное образование является одной из кардинальных реформ в образовании в Республике Казахстан, направлена на формирование будущего поколения, свободно владеющим казахским, русским и английским языками. Хотя инициатива является важной, исследования показывают, что восприятия стэйкхолдеров трёхъязычного образования могут повлиять на способ его применения в отдельной сфере деятельности, из чего следует, что изучение восприятия стэйкхолдеров необходимо для обеспечения успешной реализации реформы. Целью исследования является изучение восприятия трёхъязычного образования и его практика различными стэйкхолдерами в одной сельской школе Алматинской области. В ходе исследования были получены ответы на вопросы исследования о восприятии и практики в различных областях, а также сходства и / или различия в их восприятии трёхъязычного образования. В исследовании был использован качественный дизайн тематического исследования с применением полуструктурированного интервью в качестве инструмента для сбора данных. Целенаправленная стратегия была использована при отборе десяти участников из следующих групп: родителей, учителей и администраторов. Результаты показали, что восприятия стэйкхолдеров трёхъязычного образования варьируются от понимания его в виде преподавания английского языка до преподавания трёх языков или преподавания на трёх языках. Касательно использования языка, триангулированные данные показали, что все три языка были использованы во всех уровнях образования, хотя в некоторых областях стэйкхолдеры пренебрегали русским языком. Из результатов исследования можно сделать вывод, что применение триангуляции источников данных: родителей,

учителей и администраторов оказалось полезным, поскольку оно раскрыло понимание того, как трёхъязычное образование по-разному воспринимается и практикуется различными группами стэйкхолдеров. Таким образом, существует острая необходимость создания эффективных коммуникационных и информационных каналов между политиками и школами, между родителями и школами для объяснения трёхъязычного образования и процессов его реализации.

Аңдатпа

Ауылдық мектеп стэйкхолдерларының үш тілді білім беруге қатысты түсінігі мен қолданысы: бірдей немесе әртүрлі?

Үш тілді білім беру – болашақ Қазақстандықтарды қазақ, орыс және ағылшын тілдерін еркін меңгеруге бағытталған Қазақстан Республикасының білім беру жүйесіндегі маңызды реформаларының бірі. Зерттеулерге сүйенсек, стэйкхолдерлардың үш тілді білім беруді түсінуі олардың қалай қолданатындықтарына әсер етуі мүмкін, сондықтан реформаның сәтті жүзеге асырылуын қамтамасыз ету үшін стэйкхолдерлардың үш тілді білім беруді қалай түсінетіндігін зерттеу қажет. Осы зерттеудің мақсаты Алматы облысындағы ауылдық мектеп стэйкхолдерларының үш тілді білім беруге қатысты түсінігі мен қолданысын анықтау болып табылады. Зерттеу сұрақтары стэйкхолдерлардың үш тілді білім беруге қатысты түсінігін, қолданысын және түсініктеріндегі ұқсастықтары мен айырмашылықтарын анықтауға бағытталған. Зерттеуде жартылай құрылымдалған сұхбаттарды қолдана отырып сапалы зерттеу түрі қолданылды. Зерттеуге ата-аналар, мұғалімдер және әкімшілік топтарынан он қатысушы қатысты. Осы зерттеу нәтижелеріне келсек, стэйкхолдерлардың көпшілігі үш тілді білім беруді ағылшын тілін оқыту деп түсінсе, аз бөлігі үш тілді оқу және үш тілде оқыту деп түсінді. Тілдердің пайдаланылуына келетін болсақ, үш тіл барлық домендерде қолданылатындығы, бірақ, орыс тілі белгілі бір домендерде пайдаланылмайтындығы анықталды. Әртүрлі стэйкхолдерлардың үш тілді білім беруді қалай түсінетіндігін және қолданатындығын анықтау барысында дерек көздерді жинаудағы триангуляцияны қолдану пайдалы болды. Осы зерттеу жұмысының нәтижесі саясаткерлер мен мектептер, ата-аналар мен мектептер арасындағы үш тілді білім

беруді және оны жүзеге асыру процестерін түсіндіру үшін тиімді коммуникациялық және ақпараттық арналарды құру қажеттілігі туындайтынын көрсетеді.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Introduction

This chapter provides a background to the study considering the international experiences of tri/multilingual education and trilingual education in the Kazakhstani context. Within the national context, the policy documents, school types and the subjects that are taught under the frame of trilingual education are meticulously described. The problem statement provides the rationale for exploring various groups of stakeholders' perceptions and practices of trilingual education. This chapter also outlines the research purpose, research questions, and research benefits to various groups of stakeholders.

Multilingual education suggests the use of multiple languages of instruction and languages-in-education (Cenoz, 2009). The literature analysis revealed a number of multilingual education types: bilingual education refers to teaching academic content in two languages (Cenoz, 2009); trilingual education covers teaching three languages and teaching in three languages (Cenoz, Hufeisen & Jessner, 2001), and multilingual education applies two and more languages in education (Cenoz, 2009). As seen from these definitions, all three types of education refer to using two and more languages in education (Cenoz, 2009). Consequently, the terms bilingual education, trilingual education, and multilingual education are interchangeably used within the scope of this thesis.

Tri/multilingual education is widely used across the world, to illustrate the diversity of its practices a number of examples are presented. The first example of tri/multilingual education relates to the context of Luxemburg. Trilingual education in Luxemburg involves languages such as Luxembourgish, German and French that are primarily introduced as languages in education (Juffermans, 2013). The second example of trilingual education is practiced in the Basque Country, it aims at achieving communicative competence in the Basque, Spanish and English languages. These three languages are used as the mediums of instruction from the primary stage (Cenoz, 2008). Thirdly, trilingual

education in Finland has two mediums of instruction: Finnish and Swedish, whilst German and/or English are the mandatory foreign languages (Björklund, 2005). As for the Asian context, numerous languages and its dialects exist that are regional, local, minority or dominant languages. For instance, the context of Hong Kong has three languages of instruction from primary schooling: Cantonese, the local language; Putonghua is a lingua franca; and English is used as a medium of instruction to meet the international standards in education (Wang & Kirkpatrick, 2013). Overall, trilingual education practices vary from teaching in three languages to teaching in two languages with an additional foreign language. If trilingual education refers to teaching in three languages in Luxemburg, Basque and Hong Kong contexts, in the Finnish context it means teaching in two languages with an additional foreign language. It is important to identify the variety of trilingual education practices from around the world because such awareness of its diversity provides an opportunity for Kazakhstani policymakers to adapt more effective trilingual education policy within our context. Generally, evidence suggest that trilingual education is being practiced across the world, and Kazakhstan is no exception.

The development of trilingual education in Kazakhstan started by the suggestion of the first president N. Nazarbayev in early 2004. The project named "Trinity of Languages" was launched in 2007 which aimed at expanding the use of Kazakh as the state language, Russian as an official language for interethnic communication, and English as an instrument for entering the world arena (MoES, 2010a). This project was supported by a number of policy documents such as State Program for Education Development for 2011-2020 (MoES, 2011), State Program for Development and Functioning of Languages for 2011-2020 (MoES, 2011), "Strategy Kazakhstan-2050: New Political Course of the Established State" (Nazarbayev, 2012), Nation's Plan "100 Concrete Steps" (2015), and Road Map for trilingual education 2015-2020 (MoES, 2015). In the frame of trilingual

education, the State Programme for Development and Functioning of Languages in the

Republic of Kazakhstan for 2011-2020 (2011) foresees Kazakhstanis as the future

trilingual, speaking Kazakh, Russian, and English. The Nation's Plan "100 Concrete

Steps" (2015) portrays a gradual transition of high schools and higher educational

institutions to English medium instruction. Thus, all these policy documents proclaim the

importance and advantages of trilingual education that contributes to the development of

economic competitiveness in the world (Nazarbayev, 2012).

       Trilingual education in the Kazakhstani context is similar to some international

practices. It involves three languages as the mediums of instruction, but, it is used as

mediums of instruction from the 7th grade (Road Map, 2015). Namely, the "History of

Kazakhstan" is expected to be taught in Kazakh and "World History" in Russian in all

schools of the country, regardless of schools' language of instruction from 2018-2019

academic year; secondary schools should offer two of these subjects "Informatics",

"Chemistry", "Biology", "Physics" in English depending on schools' choice from 2019-

2020 (Road Map, 2015). Consequently, trilingual education in Kazakhstan refers to using

three languages: Kazakh, Russian and English as mediums of instruction for the

aforementioned subjects from the 7th grade, and as separately taught languages in

education from the 1st grade.

       The implementation of trilingual education has already started in some schools,

though, the majority of schools seem to be neglected by policymakers because of schools'

poor conditions (Irsaliyev et al., 2017b). The schools that practice trilingual education tend

to have better financial support that include Daryn schools, Nazarbayev Intellectual School

(NIS) and Bilim-Innovation Lyceums (BIL) (Mehisto, Kambatyrova & Nurseitova, 2014;

Irsaliyev et al., 2017b). According to the Road Map for trilingual education 2015-2020

(MoES, 2015), the implementation of the reform in all mainstream schools tend to

continue, regardless of schools' condition and regions by 2020-2021. With that in mind, the number of schools in Kazakhstan is around 7450 units, including various types of schools such as international schools, Daryn schools, NIS, BIL, ungraded schools, and mainstream schools (Irsaliyev et al., 2017a). And 76.3% out of 7450 units of schools are located in rural regions and have insufficient resources and conditions (Irsaliyev et al., 2017a) to implement trilingual education. Thus, the implementation of trilingual education in all mainstream schools from 2020-2021 seems to be unrealistic.

The literature review regarding trilingual education within the Kazakhstani context revealed a shortage of empirical studies. Some of the studies focused on gifted education in the frame of trilingual education (Yakavets, 2014), while others investigated language policy from various perspectives (Ayazbayeva, 2017; Iyldyz, 2017; Karabassova, 2018; Mehisto et al., 2014). The study done by Mehisto et al. (2014) found that teachers, head-teachers, and government officials positively viewed trilingual education accepting its advantages, though, encountered some difficulties such as poor material-technical base, poor linguistic skills, a lack of theoretical guidance and teacher training. More recent studies conducted under the frame of trilingual education in Kazakhstan uncovered stakeholders' unpreparedness and misunderstandings about policy implementation (Ayazbayeva, 2017; Iyldyz, 2017; Karabassova, 2018). Overall, these empirical data disclosed that various groups of stakeholders have faulty understandings about trilingual education, although it is planned to be implemented in all schools regardless of those challenges.

Statement of Problem

The Kazakhstani government has an aim of raising and educating trilingual society by 2020, which is likewise demanded from all school including rural schools (Kazakhstan 2050; SPED 2011-2020). In this regard, the primary aim of trilingual education is the

development of multicultural and plurilingual individuals that will be competitive in the world.

Despite these set goals, a number of problems exist within the implementation of trilingual education in Kazakhstan. Firstly, there is an inadequate improvement of infrastructure, poor teaching materials, and teacher training (Mehisto et al., 2014) that seems to make unrealistic the implementation of trilingual education in all schools, yet, around 76% out of 7450 units are located in rural areas (Irsaliyev et al., 2017a). Consequently, rural school children might suffer from poor educational facilities that seem to reduce their chances of quality in education (Altinyelken, Moorcroft & Draai, 2014; Oladejo, 2006). Therefore, there is an urgent need to investigate rural school stakeholders' perceptions and practices of trilingual education because the number of rural schools outweigh the number of urban ones.

Secondly, there is a necessity to investigate perceptions of parents, teachers and school administration, because previous studies revealed different stakeholders' misunderstandings of the concept of tri/multilingual education (Lee, 1999; Sheffer, 2003). Stakeholders' misunderstanding may lead to certain challenges, impact their practices of tri/multilingual education and/or hinder the reform implementation. Thus, raising the issue of the rural school stakeholders' understanding is significant because rural schools are in much worse conditions compared with the urban schools (National report, 2017). The successful implementation of the educational reform directly depends on principals' knowledge (Padron & Waxman, 2016; Menken & Solorza, 2015), parental involvement (Ritches & Curdt-Christiansen, 2010; Sui-Chu & Willms, 1996; Lao, 2004) and teachers' classroom practices (Oattes, Oostdam, Graaff, & Wilschut, 2018).

Thirdly, the literature review revealed a number of studies that investigated trilingual education from different perspectives, separately. The literature analysis shows a

lack of research on triangulated data by sources, especially from rural contexts. Thus, this study aims at filling in this gap.

In response to these problems, this research proposes to explore rural school parents, teachers and school administrators' perceptions and practices that they apply under the frame of trilingual education. Exploring these stakeholders' perceptions and practices of trilingual education is crucial because firstly, it investigates the current situation of trilingual education practices at the rural school from various perspectives. Secondly, the findings of the research are compared to find out similarities and/or differences in three groups of stakeholders' responses in relation to their perceptions, thus, to take steps in preventing any misunderstandings, if such occur. Thirdly, the data is triangulated to fill the gap in the existing literature of Kazakhstan.

Research Purpose

The purpose of this qualitative case study is to explore various groups of stakeholders' perceptions and practices of trilingual education in one rural school in Almaty Oblast. In this study, different stakeholders refer to parents, teachers and school administrators. To achieve this purpose, the research questions posed in the study are:

1. How do the stakeholders perceive trilingual education?
2. How do the stakeholders practice trilingual education?
3. How similar or different are these stakeholders' perceptions?

This study does not aim to generalise its findings to all secondary school parents, teachers and administrators of rural regions of Kazakhstan. Rather, it focusses on a single case of this specific rural school in Almaty Oblast as this school has been practicing trilingual education since 2007. A qualitative case study with interviews being the main research instrument was applied to achieve the research purpose and answer the research questions.

Significance of the Study

The findings of this study can be of great importance to a number of stakeholders. Firstly, the results of the study might contribute to parents' better understanding of the aims of trilingual education and the importance of parental involvement. Secondly, teachers and school administrators have a chance to self-evaluate their own perceptions and knowledge about trilingual education, that would contribute to the successful policy implementation within schools and better classroom practices. On the other hand, this study can disclose the challenges or any issues that parents, teachers and school administrators encounter which further can be considered and solved by policymakers. Moreover, the study contributes to the field of multilingual education research in the Kazakhstani context as there is a scarce number of triangulated studies related to trilingual education. Triangulation is advantageous to validate the data. This study can be an asset and valuable resource for more effective policy implementation.

Thesis Outline

The thesis structurally composes of six major chapters, references and appendices. Firstly, the Introduction chapter includes background information about the research topic, the problem statement, the research questions and purpose, and the significance of the study. The Literature review is the second chapter that contains key concepts, various groups of stakeholders' perceptions and practices of multilingual education within the international and national contexts. Thirdly, the Methodology chapter provides the descriptions of the applied research design, method, research instruments, data collection procedures and used data analysis. The fourth chapter is the Findings, where the major study results that answer the research questions are represented thematically. Within the Discussion, which is the fifth chapter, the findings are interpreted in relation to the previous research. Finally, the Conclusion chapter summarizes the entire study, briefly

restating the major findings, giving recommendations, implications, limitations of the

study and suggestions for further research.

Literature Review

The purpose of the study is to explore and compare rural school parents, teachers, and school administrators' perceptions and practices of trilingual education within their domains. Therefore, the current chapter provides a review of the existing literature on the notion of *trilingual education*, different groups of *stakeholders' perceptions* and *practices* of trilingual education exploring them in the national and international contexts. Investigating these notions is crucial because it contributes to answering the research questions:

1. How do the stakeholders perceive trilingual education?

2. How do the stakeholders practice trilingual education?

3. How similar or different are these stakeholders' perceptions?

The qualitative approach with a case study design was applied to answer these research questions. The outline of the literature review is as follows: firstly, it starts with the explanation of the key concepts; secondly, it describes the concept of trilingual education. Thirdly, it provides the analysis of *stakeholders' perceptions* on tri/multilingual education with four major subcategories: *stakeholders' understanding of the concept of multilingual education, stakeholders' perceptions of the role of languages, stakeholders' views towards the time of introducing trilingual education*, and *stakeholders' concerns regarding trilingual education,* respectively. Fourthly, it presents the data regarding the stakeholders' practices in providing multilingual education. The subcategories include *stakeholders' use of the languages in their domains, teachers' practices of translanguaging, parents' use of additional resources,* respectively. Finally, the literature review addresses the studies related to *trilingual education in the Kazakhstani context.*

Key Concepts

This section provides the key concepts that help to understand the central phenomenon of the study. The central phenomena are the concepts of *perception* and *practice.* According to Imenda (2014), it is essential to apply a certain framework because it facilitates to "an integrated understanding of issues within a given field of study, which enables the researcher to address a specific problem" with clarity (p. 5). Therefore, the study uses two concepts: *perceptions* and *practices* to further guide and answer the research questions. The outline of the conceptual framework section is as following: firstly, it defines the concept of *perceptions* from various scholars' perspectives and summarizes with the one that corresponds to this study; secondly, it explores the concept of *practices* in education from a number of researchers' viewpoints, then, concludes with the one that is suitable for this study.

The concept of perception

The explanation of the concept of perception is significant because the primary purpose of this study is to explore various groups of stakeholders' perceptions towards trilingual education. Moreover, the main research questions are: how do the stakeholders perceive trilingual education? And How similar or different these stakeholders' perceptions are? Therefore, the discussion of this concept is significant in this study.

The definition of the concept of perception is multidimensional. The literature analysis showed that the concept of perception is defined differently in various fields (Dulton-Puffer & Smit, 2013; Hochberg & Hochberg, 2010; Iannone, 2001; McLeish, 1993; Sandywell, 2011). In philosophy, the concept of perception refers to the understanding of objects by mode of sense (Iannone, 2001; McLeish, 1993). According to Iannone (2001), it is translated from Latin as "gaining knowledge through the senses" and "apprehension with the mind". Generally speaking, the concept of perception in

philosophy is a process of interpreting specific information as one's understanding

(Sandywell, 2011). On the other hand, in psychology, the term refers to the "experience of

obtaining sensory information about the world of people, things, and events and the

underlying processes" (Hochberg & Hochberg, 2010). However, the earlier definition of

the concept of perception was as a "process by which things, events, and relationships

become phenomenally "here," "now" and "real" (Hochberg, 1956, p. 401). Collectively,

analysing the above definitions of the concept of perception it might be explained that

perception is a process of interpreting the knowledge and making it one's own belief,

though it might not correspond with the actual knowledge.

As for its use within the educational field, the concept of perception was applied

within previous empirical studies that explored parents' perceptions of multilingual

education (Ramos, 2007; Riches & Curdt-Christiansen, 2010); teachers and administrators'

perceptions of bi/multilingual education (Dulton-Puffer & Smit, 2013; Padron & Waxman,

2016; Skinnari & Nikula, 2017; Xhaferi & Xhaferi, 2012; Yurdakul, 2015). According to

Yurdakul (2015) perceptions are made of by assigning a meaning to the knowledge.

However, some scholars interchangeably used the concept of *perception* with the concept

of *beliefs* (Dulton-Puffer & Smit, 2013; Riches & Curdt-Christiansen, 2010; Spolsky,

2007). According to Dulton-Puffer and Smit (2013), the psychological terms "perceptions

or beliefs are not identifiable nor observable". Moreover, Dulton-Puffer and Smit (2013)

adapt the definition of beliefs provided by Barcelos (2003) to the concept of perception and

define it as "the participants' intuitive and subjective knowledge of their teaching and

learning" (as cited in Dulton-Puffer & Smit, 2013, p. 549).

All things considered, the definition of the concept of perception was defined and

explained by various scholars' perspectives in order to make it clear for the purpose of this

study. This investigation shows that the concept of perception can be applied in various

fields starting from phycology to philosophy and education. Based on the above analysis, a suitable definition of the concept of perception to this study was chosen which refers to a process of obtaining a subjective knowledge and understanding about certain educational features (Dulton-Puffer & Smit, 2013; Hochberg & Hochberg, 2010). The next subsection below discusses the concept of *practices* in education.

The concept of practices

Another key concept that needs explanation is the stakeholders' practices. The explanation of the concept of practices is significant because the primary purpose of this study is to explore various stakeholders' practices of trilingual education in certain domains. Moreover, one of the main research questions is: how do the stakeholders practice trilingual education? Therefore, discussing and understanding this concept is essential to achieve the research purpose. The concept of practices has been applied to a number of empirical studies. If some scholars investigated multilingual education trends and practices (Bahous, Bacha & Nabhani, 2011; Manan, Dumanig & David, 2017; Pastor, 2009), others explored various groups of stakeholders' practices of bi/multilingual education (Altinyelken et al., 2014; Lao, 2004; Nunan, 2003).

One of the definitions of the concept of *practice* is provided by Spolsky (2007). The scholar (2007) defines practices as "the observable behaviours and choices – what people actually do" (p. 3). Similarly, in their studies Dalton-Puffer and Smit (2013) and Shohamy (2006) applied Spolsky's (2007) conceptualization of *practices*, saying that practices are noticeable actions. In a similar vein, Sutton and Levinson (2001) introduced the concept of *appropriation*, which also refers to the actual *practices*. Considering the definitions of the concept of practices above, a suitable definition of *practices* outlined as follows. In the scope of this thesis, the concept of practices would refer to the various groups of stakeholders' actual practices in enacting trilingual education in their domains

which might include: involvement, applying certain strategies and/or pedagogical approaches (Spolsky, 2007; Sutton & Levinson, 2001).

To sum up, the key concepts that are being applied within this study are perceptions and practices. As this study explores various groups of stakeholders' perceptions and practices of trilingual education it is determinative to clearly explore these two concepts because it helps to answer the research questions and achieve research purpose. In the scope of this study, the concept of perception would refer to the process of obtaining a subjective knowledge and understanding about certain educational features (Dulton-Puffer & Smit, 2013; Hochberg & Hochberg, 2010), and the concept of practices would refer to the various groups of stakeholders' actual practices in enacting trilingual education in certain domains which might include: involvement, applying certain strategies and/or pedagogical approaches (Spolsky, 2007; Sutton & Levinson, 2001).

The Concept of Trilingual Education

This section of the literature review discusses the concept of trilingual education and its practices in the international context. The paragraphs are outlined as follows: firstly, it discusses the concept of trilingual education from different scholars' perspectives. Secondly, the chapter explains the distinction of trilingual education from third language acquisition because of the misunderstanding of these two concepts by various stakeholders. Lastly, it provides a review of the language components in the frame of tri/multilingual education across the world as there is a tendency to consider tri/multilingual education as learning English.

The concept of trilingual education should be clearly defined in order to reach the research aim and answer the research questions. The scholars in the field of multilingual education do not achieve a consensus regarding the definition of the concept of trilingual education because of the complexity of the term. Some scholars claim that the concept of

trilingual education refers to teaching in three languages (Ytsma, 2001), while others give a broader definition saying that the concept of trilingual education refers to two-way immersion with an additional foreign language (Cenoz, 2009). The only feature of the trilingual education that all scholars agree with is the complexity of its definition (Brohy, 2005; Cenoz, 2009; Ytsma, 2001). The earlier paper of Cenoz et al. (2001) define trilingual education as the "use of three languages of instruction" (p. 3). On the other hand, Brohy (2005) claims that the concept of trilingual education is an umbrella term for different types of education. Moreover, Brohy (2005) provides the different forms of trilingual education: a) strong form – three languages as mediums of instruction; b) intermediate form – bilingual education with third language acquisition; c) weak form – L2 and L3 language classes (p. 140). Finally, Ytsma (2001) proposes a definition of the concept of trilingual education where "three languages are both taught as school subjects and used as mediums of instruction" (p. 12). Considering those definitions, Ytsma's (2001) definition seems to be more suitable to the scope of this thesis, because it corresponds with the explanation of the concept of trilingual education (Road Map, 2015) which is applicable in the Kazakhstani context. The next subcategory provides the distinction of trilingual education from third language acquisition.

Another aspect that needs clarification in the frame of trilingual education is the distinction between trilingual education and third language acquisition. It is significant to identify its differences for this study because the accepted definition of trilingual education by the Kazakhstani policy documents is different from third language acquisition. According to Brohy (2005) and Cenoz et al. (2001) there is not yet a clear distinction between trilingual education and third language acquisition. Plenty of empirical studies investigated the role of third language acquisition (Bardel & Falk, 2007; Cenoz, 2003; Magiste, 1984; Sanz, 2000). A number of studies have explored trilingual education from

different perspectives such as ethnic language speakers, various contexts and majority languages (Adamson & Feng, 2009; Cenoz et al., 2001; Genesee & Lambert, 1983; Ytsma, 2001). However, the distinction between the following two notions: third language acquisition and trilingual education have not yet been separated. It is blurred (Cenoz et al. 2001). For the purposes of this study, it is crucial to identify the difference of trilingual education from third language acquisition because this study seeks to explore how various groups of stakeholders perceive trilingual education. The misidentification of these concepts may lead to misinterpretation and subsequently, incorrect findings. Although there is no clear consensus upon these two concepts, trilingual education would refer to using three languages as mediums of instructions and third language (L3) acquisition would refer to learning a third foreign language in the scope of this thesis.

Finally, another aspect that needs clarification within the frame of trilingual education is its language components. Basically, the language components mean the languages involved in trilingual education. Although the literature review explores various contexts, the language which is mostly associated with multilingual education is – English. English is used as a lingua franca, medium of instruction and as an international foreign language (Lao, 2004; Oladejo, 2006). For instance, English in the US context is used as the medium of instruction with additional Spanish and Chinese languages (Lao, 2004; Menken & Solorza, 2013; Padron & Waxman, 2016; Shin & Krashen, 1996). On the contrary, in Hong Kong, China, Finland, the Netherlands - English is used as an additional foreign language which is introduced as a mandatory international language or the language of instruction (Chung, 2008; Jian, 2013; Oladejo, 2006; Wang & Kirkpatrick, 2013; Xhaferi & Xhaferi, 2012). Knowing that English is a widely applied language component of multilingual education across the world is significant to this study because the Kazakhstani context is no exception. It also employs English as a component of trilingual education. An

awareness of the role of English within international contexts may explain some

stakeholders' perceptions of trilingual education which is discussed in the next paragraph.

Stakeholders' Perception of Tri/multilingual Education

This section provides an analysis of the international literature on three different

groups of stakeholders' perceptions towards bi/multilingual education. The subcategories

include *stakeholders' understanding of the concept of multilingual education,*

stakeholders' perceptions of the role of languages, stakeholders' views towards the grade

of introducing trilingual education, *stakeholders' concerns regarding trilingual education.*

Due to the variety of international literature, within the scope of this thesis, the concepts

such as bi/multilingual education and trilingual education are used interchangeably.

Stakeholders' understanding of the concept of tri/multilingual education.

Stakeholders' clear understanding of multilingual education appears to be crucial for its

development and successful implementation. With this regard, a number of studies exist

that investigated multilingual education from various stakeholders' perspectives. Most

studies tend to focus on parents' views on language aspects of bilingual education and their

reasons for enrolling children to such schooling (Chung, 2008; Oladejo, 2006, Lao, 2004;

Ramos, 2007). Other scholars investigated teachers and administrators' perceptions of

language policy implementations at schools (Basurto, Wise, & Unruh, 2006; Menken &

Solorza, 2013; Wang, 2008). As for stakeholders' understanding of educational reform, all

three groups of stakeholders had contrasting views.

Firstly, the studies show that parents had various understandings regarding

bilingual education (Lao, 2004; Lee 1999; Shannon & Milian 2002; Sheffer, 2003). If

some parents had a clear understanding of the concept and its principles, viewing it as

development of academic English and native language (Lao, 2004; Shannon & Milian

2002), others misunderstood the educational goals and even were unaware of education

type their children enrolled to (Lee, 1999; Sheffer, 2003). In the surveys conducted by Lao (2004) and Shannon and Milian (2002), the majority of the parents valued and understood the underlying principles of bilingual education. Lao (2004) states that parents understood the importance of "being bilingual and biliterate" (p. 113) and its advantages. As for those who misunderstood the concepts, Lee (1999) and Sheffer (2003) found that some parents were not aware of the education type and its goals that their children were enrolled to. Sheffer (2003) discovered that only a small proportion of parents who were surveyed knew the peculiarities of bilingual education, others were unacquainted with it. Similarly, the earlier study done by Lee (1999) concluded that although some parents were aware of bilingual education in general, they had "little understanding of different models and programmes" of it (p. 204).

Secondly, educators' understanding regarding bi/multilingual education differed, too. In general, teachers and administrators' understandings of the concept of bi/multilingual education mostly depended on their prior knowledge and educational background. The scholars found a correlation between these variables such as educators' educational background and knowledge with their understandings of the educational reform (Menken & Solorza, 2015; Menken & Solorza, 2013; Shin & Krashen 1996). The earlier study of Shin and Krashen (1996) investigated how teachers understood bilingual education and its theoretical underpinnings and found that around 70% of surveyed respondents' answers were "in agreement with the underlying principles of bilingual education" (p. 48). In other words, the surveyed teachers' understandings of bilingual education coincided with its definition. Moreover, the scholars (1996) claim that those teachers who had sufficient background and knew more about bilingual education tended to support it. Similarly, Menken and Solorza (2015) and Menken and Solorza (2013) concluded that the school administrators that had an educational background in

bilingualism had a clear understanding of the concept of bilingual education, those who did not have appropriate education misunderstood the concept.

Collectively, these studies show the importance of all three groups of stakeholders' understandings regarding bi/multilingual education as they are the main actors of education provision. Misunderstanding of certain educational concepts by those stakeholders probably hinder its implementation process, impact their practices or even change its direction. Therefore, further investigation is needed to explore various groups of stakeholders' understandings and the factors that affect their understanding and/or misunderstanding. The next section below presents the literature review regarding the stakeholders' perceptions of the role of languages.

Stakeholders' perceptions of the role of languages. This section of the literature review will cover various groups of stakeholders' perceptions towards the role each language plays in tri/multilingual education. This part is outlined as following: firstly, it describes how different groups of stakeholders perceived their primary language, first language or native language, secondly, it examines how three groups of stakeholders perceived the role of English, thirdly, as Russian is one of the components of trilingual education in Kazakhstani context, it will investigate the role of Russian in our context.

A large and growing body of literature has investigated different groups of stakeholders' perceptions towards native language, though, most of them were from parents' perspective (GuatPoh et al. 2017; Park & Sarkar, 2007; Riches & Curdt-Christiansen, 2010; Shin, 2000; Zhang & Slaughter-Defoe, 2009). Moreover, various concepts were utilized to describe one's first language. Therefore, in the scope of this research, the terms: primary language, first language, mother tongue and/or native language would refer to the speaker's main language and would be interchangeably used. Much of the current literature on learners' L1 pays particular attention to how parents

perceive their native language (GuatPoh et al. 2017; Park & Sarkar, 2007; Riches & Curdt-Christiansen, 2010; Shin, 2000; Zhang & Slaughter-Defoe, 2009) because parents' views towards their native language impacts on the type of education they choose for their children. Analysis of these studies revealed that parents' views towards the first language can be divided into two directions. If some parents considered maintaining their first language (L1) as advantageous for literacy transfer skills (Shin, 2000), others perceived L1 as a bridge to maintain culture and identity (GuatPoh et al. 2017; Riches & Curdt-Christiansen, 2010). On the one hand, Shin (2000) found that the majority of respondents maintain their L1 as it helps them to acquire English better, stating that "primary language is necessary to facilitate acquisition of English" (p. 96). In other words, his research participants emphasized that knowing L1 is important to better foster the acquisition of other language components of tri/multilingual education. On the other hand, Riches and Curdt-Christiansen (2010) claim that L1 is necessary as it describes one's ethnic and sociocultural identity and a "sense of belonging within their culture" (p. 550). Similarly, GuatPoh et al. (2017) found that one's native language is an important feature that defines one's ethnic identity. In short, those studies declare that most respondents stress the importance of preserving their first language and/or native language as they perceive it would facilitate children to identify their culture and ethnicity.

As for the role of English as one of the main language components of tri/multilingual education, it is perceived the language of higher education and better employment by some groups of stakeholders (Curdt-Christiansen & Wang, 2018; Lao, 2004; Ramos, 2007; Shin, 2000; Young & Tran, 1999). According to Crystal (1997), English is the global language, it occupies the role of the foreign language in education, and taught in more than one hundred countries. Such positive perceptions towards the role of English is supported by a number of groups of stakeholders within empirical studies

below. Curdt-Christiansen and Wang (2018) assert that English plays a significant role in education, as the majority of respondents of their study claimed that English brings "professional opportunity, educational possibility and international social mobility" for learners (p. 13). Moreover, such practical advantages of English were defined as an instrumental value of the English language, meaning its advantages for education, employment and socialization (Curdt-Christiansen & Wang, 2018). In the same vein, Ramos (2007) and Shin (2000) investigated that the majority of parents valued English for its career-related advantages and positive self-image of the speaker. As for the school administrators, Wang and Kirkpatrick (2013) claim that they perceive the role of English as the language of "learning environment" (p. 107). Overall, there is a tendency to consider English as the language of higher education and career-related opportunities for students by various groups of stakeholders.

As for Russian, its role in the Kazakhstani society is defined by the Law on Languages (1997) where it states that Russian can be used in all managerial positions along with the Kazakh language. Moreover, the amendment to the Law on Education (2007) asserts that Russian is a mandatory subject in all educational levels. Furthermore, the State Program of Education Development 2011-2020 set an aim that 90% of all population will speak Russian by 2020 (MoES, 2011). The current language policy developed from the project "Trinity of Languages" initiated by the President in 2007 outlines the roles of each of three languages as following: "Kazakh as the national language, Russian as the language of interethnic communication, and English as the language of successful integration in the global economy" (Nazarbayev, 2007, p. 38). Collectively, these initiatives demonstrate the importance of the Russian language in the Kazakhstani society. It seems to impact various groups of stakeholders in the way they perceive the role of Russian in the Kazakhstani context. According to Pavlenko (2006), Russian is mostly used as a lingua franca in

Kazakhstan. Similarly, an empirical study was done by Matuszkiewicz (2010) also found that Russian is used in most domains regardless of the speakers' ethnicity. Those studies are supported by a more recent one done by Sabitova and Alishariyeva (2015), who investigate the use of Russian in Kazakhstan. Sabitova and Alishariyeva (2015) found that Russian "functions in parallel with the Kazakh language and which increasingly gains the role of the leading language" (p. 216). Based on these empirical data and official documents, Russian seem to have a role of lingua franca in the Kazakhstani context. However, Smagulova (2005) states that there is a lack of research regarding the role of Russian in our society and further research is needed.

The stakeholders' views towards the time of introducing multilingual education. Stakeholders' views towards the grade of introducing trilingual education are important because it affects the way stakeholders perceive multilingual education. Opposing views exist among various groups of stakeholders towards the age of foreign language acquisition. Some scholars claim that based on the Critical Period Hypothesis (Singleton, 2005) foreign language acquisition is beneficial at an early age. The Critical Period Hypothesis refers to an ideal time span to acquire a foreign language, that appears to be from arrival until puberty (Lenneberg, 1967). Others negate the idea of the Critical Period Hypothesis and that learning a foreign language would be successful until puberty, stating that foreign language acquisition can be successful at any time (Dechert, 1995; Rothman, 2008). For this study, it is crucial to be aware of such theories of foreign language acquisition because it seems to be a foundation for various groups of stakeholders' understanding regarding the introduction time of language components of multilingual education.

Review of the literature on parents' views towards the introduction time of the language components of multilingual education revealed mostly unanimous respond.

Recent evidence suggest that the majority of parents viewed the early introduction of foreign languages as beneficial for their children. Moreover, English was mostly associated as a foreign language in most cases (Chung, 2008, Griva & Chouvarda, 2012; Enever & Moon, 2009; Oladejo, 2006). Oladejo (2006) found that parents' preference for the early introduction of a foreign language was linked to parents' anxiety of failure to meet the international standards of English proficiency level by their children. In the same vein, Chung (2008) discovered that parents viewed the early introduction of the foreign language advantageous because the majority of parents believed that early start will "bring about better learning results" for their children (p. 433). Some scholars adopted a broader perspective claiming that parents' supported the early foreign language introduction, in these cases English, because they believed it to have social and economic benefits for social mobility, better employment opportunities and status (Griva & Chouvarda, 2012; Enever & Moon, 2009). The evidence presented in this section suggests that the majority of parents' group of stakeholders perceived early foreign language introduction as useful because of its social benefits.

As for the teachers' views regarding the time of foreign language introduction, it was also revealed that the majority of teachers positively perceived early introduction. Surveys such as that conducted by Othman and Kiely (2016) have shown that around 95% of all responding teachers expressed that "the earlier English is taught to children the better the results" (p. 53). Similarly, such teachers' beliefs regarding the early introduction of foreign languages correspond with earlier works done by Moon (2000) and Liao (2007). Although several studies have explored teachers' beliefs towards the early introduction of foreign languages and revealed positive perceptions towards it, (Muñoz, 2010; Nikolov & Djigunovic, 2011; Roothooft, 2017), there is still insufficient data because these studies mostly focused on teachers' foreign language teaching methodology to young learners. As

for the school administrators, no studies were found regarding administrators' perceptions of early foreign language introduction. Collectively, these studies outline a critical role for the early foreign language introduction, parents perceived early foreign language introduction to be important for social and economic benefits, teachers tend to focus more on educational benefits of early foreign language introduction.

Stakeholders' Practices of Tri/multilingual Education

This section provides the literature review regarding the different groups of stakeholders' practices of multilingual education in homes, classrooms and school domains. The analysis is presented under the following two subcategories: *stakeholders' use of the languages in their domains* and *stakeholders' concerns regarding trilingual education and.* The first subcategory also covers *teachers' practices of translanguaging* and *parents' use of additional resources.*

The stakeholders' use of the languages in their domains. This part of the literature review analysis various groups of stakeholders' language use in different domains. Firstly, before reviewing actual practices of languages in different domains, there is a need to explain the notion of domain because it is a multidimensional term and can be understood differently. Crystal (2008) defines domains as a social group of people who share a common set of behavioural rules such as domains of the family, church, workplace, etc. Similarly, Spolsky's (2007) generalization of the notion of domains also refers to a specific social community such as homes, public media, government and workplace that share the same linguistic regulation and location. Therefore, domains would refer to homes, classrooms, schools in the scope of this study. Now, after identifying the notion of the domain, in order to explore various groups of stakeholders' language practices under the frame of multilingual education, it is necessary to investigate their language practices in those domains which include: language use at school, language use at classroom and

language use at home domains.

Plenty of studies exist that investigated language policy from various perspectives. However, a limited number of studies were found regarding the actual practices of languages in multilingual education within school domains (Mensah, 2015; Nyaga & Anthonissen, 2012; Probyn et al. 2002; Shameem, 2002). According to Mensah (2015), public school administrators have no choice except for following the rules set by authorities about the languages that should be used at school levels. In other words, public schools seem to be required to use certain languages as mediums of instruction that were prescribed by higher educational authorities or educational policy initiatives. However, such prescribed linguistic requirements appear to be not practiced in reality (Nyaga & Anthonissen, 2012; Probyn et al., 2002; Shameem, 2002). Probyn et al. (2002) claim that there is a wide gap between the required language policy and the actual language practices at school levels. Similarly, Nyaga and Anthonissen's (2012) school observations revealed that certain school administrators misinterpreted the language policies and practiced it differently from what was required. Both studies of Probyn et al. (2002) and Nyaga and Anthonissen (2012) show that certain languages e.g. *local languages* were misused opting the use of a more prestigious one. In the same vein, Shameem (2002) found that actual language practices at the school level are quite different from what was assumed in the policy level. For instance, within the policy level, schools were required to teach in mother tongue at the primary level in Fiji, though, in practice English immersion was promoted by the administration. Overall, evidence suggests that public schools and administration are required to follow the language policies set by higher educational authorities and/or policy documents. However, the extent to which administrators explicitly apply the required languages within schools seems to be questionable. According to Probyn et al. (2002), Nyaga and Anthonissen (2012) and Shameem (2002), there is a tendency to neglect certain

languages in the frame of language policy by school administrators and educators. Possible explanations for that are the status of languages: prestigious or low status (Mensah, 2015; Probyn et al. 2002) and/or poor teaching resources in local languages (Nyaga & Anthonissen, 2012).

As for the languages used within classrooms, its practices likewise differed. Analysing the literature regarding language use within classrooms in multilingual education revealed that some teachers strictly followed monolingual approach or immersion in teaching (Bostwick, 2001; Cheng et al., 2010; Jeon, 2008), while others allowed the use of L1 or bilingual approach (Cook, 2001; Kang, 2012; Karathanos, 2009; Tarnopolsky & Goodman, 2014). Although different definitions of the monolingual and immersion approach exist, it would be referred to as an approach for teaching through the medium of the target language within the scope of this thesis (Jeon, 2008). There is a widespread assumption that L2 is more successfully acquired if students are immersed in the target language (Bostwick, 2001; Jeon, 2008). The study done by Cheng et al. (2010) confirms that the learners' target language proficiency within the immersion program was much better than those of non-immersion. Similarly, the study done by Shameem (2002) and Shameem (2004) also revealed that the monolingual approach in teaching was best to facilitate learning from teachers' perspective. On the other hand, other teachers encouraged the use of L1 when teaching through the medium of the target language (Cook, 2001; Kang, 2012; Karathanos, 2009; Tarnopolsky & Goodman, 2014). Cook (2001) and Kang (2012) point out that the use of L1 helps to develop the target language proficiency and increases the meta-cognitive process. Moreover, Cook (2001) claims that students' L1 should be treated as a resource so that teachers can meaningfully use it to better explain the subject. The empirical studies of Karathanos (2009) and Tarnopolsky and Goodman (2014) support that L1 use within classrooms positively impacts students' academic achievement.

An ethnographic study done by Tarnopolsky and Goodman (2014) found out that teachers and students were quite positive to use their L1 when studying through the medium of the target language. From their point of view, the use of L1 made learning "easier and faster, not damaging or slowing down the process of target language acquisition" (p. 394). Collectively, that evidence suggest that language use within classrooms varied, from applying the monolingual approach to the bilingual approach in teaching the content through the medium of the target language. Application of monolingual or bilingual approach seems to depend on teachers' attitudes towards the role L1 plays in the classroom: as a resource (Cook, 2001) or problem.

Another domain of language use under the frame of multilingual education relates to home domains. There is a necessity to investigate languages used at home because certain language practices at home may hinder or succeed in multilingual education, thus, impact learning (Branum-Martin et al., 2014). The parents' language use within homes can be divided into two subcategories: firstly, those that maintained their first language (L1) and promote the target language (Curdt-Christiansen, 2009; Riches & Curdt-Christiansen, 2010; Tuominen, 1999); secondly, those who shifted to target language (Lao, 2004; Curdt-Christiansen & Wang, 2018). Within the first subcategory, parents maintained their first language (L1) because of cultural values the L1 entails and promoted the target language because of its practical advantages to their children's future (Curdt-Christiansen, 2009; Riches & Curdt-Christiansen, 2010). For instance, Chinese families in Canada preserved their L1 as a linchpin for traditions and cultural values, whereas, French and English were learned at school level (Riches & Curdt-Christiansen, 2010). Similarly, the earlier study done by Tuominen (1999) found out that some parents purposefully used their native language with their children to preserve it as parents believed that native language connects their children with the home country, and the target language was acquired within schools.

On the contrary, the studies done by Lao (2004) and Curdt-Christiansen and Wang (2018) discovered that some parents shifted to the target language within the home domains and in communication with their children. Lao (2004) explains such practices as poor language proficiency of parents' native language and a lack of activities in native languages. On the other hand, Curdt-Christiansen and Wang's (2018) interpretations of such findings relate to the high status of the target language, English in this case, and the low status of the native language. Overall, language use within home domains varied, if some parents preserved their L1 and promoted the target language, other parents shifted to the target language because of a lack of exposure to the native language and high status of the target language.

Collectively, this section of the literature review provides the language used within different domains such as schools, classrooms, and homes. It was significant to identify the language used within different domains because it helps to answer the research question of how various groups of stakeholders practice tri/multilingual education in their domains. The literature analysis revealed that school administrators are required to use the languages set by policies, though misuses occurred. Similarly, teachers' practices of languages within tri/multilingual education differed from what was required by school administration and policies. As for the parents' language use within homes, some of them succeeded in preserving their L1 and supporting the target languages, while others shifted to the target language. Below, the teachers' practices of translanguaging are analysed as it pertains to the stakeholders' language use within different domains subcategory.

Teachers' practices of translanguaging. The literature analysis revealed two major practices within tri/multilingual education that teachers use in classroom domains such as codeswitching and translangauging. Those practices are explained below.

Firstly, one of the most common practices applied by teachers in tri/multilingual education appears to be translanguaging. Otheguy, García and Reid (2015) explain

translanguaging as the "deployment of a speaker's full linguistic repertoire" (p. 281). Another definition of translanguaging is provided by Lewis, Jones and Baker (2012) who state that translanguaging is a practice of two or more languages for learning and teaching purposes in one class. Garcia (2009) states that learners' language repertoire should be used as a resource, and argues that translanguaging is separate from codeswitching.

As for the studies related to teachers' practices of translanguaging, the researchers affirm that teachers were aware of the translanguaging strategy and its goals in teaching (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Hornberger & Link, 2012). Hornberger and Link (2012) declared that translanguaging appears when bilingual learners use different linguistic features to meaningfully communicate. Moreover, Hornberger and Link (2012) argue that teachers' translanguaging practices help them to identify how to use learners' language repertoires for successful educational experiences. As for Creese and Blackledge (2010), they highlighted the major reasons for teachers' translanguaging practices. It included classroom management, students' easy understandings of the learning processes, the inclusion of all students, encouraging participation, development of informal relationships between teacher and learner and eliciting ideas (Creese & Blackledge, 2010).

Codeswitching is another type of practice used by teachers in tri/multilingual educational environment, it refers to mixing two or more languages or its varieties in one speech (Milroy & Muysken, 1995). Although the literature clearly demonstrates a distinction between codeswitching and translanguaging practices for teaching purposes, some scholars investigated teachers' practices of codeswitching in multilingual education (Altinyelken et al., 2014; Bahous et al., 2011; Henn-Reinke, 2012; Oattes et al., 2018; Wang & Kirkpatrick, 2013).

As aforementioned, some scholars utilized the concept of codeswitching to describe teachers' practices within the classroom domains (Altinyelken et al., 2014; Bahous et al.,

2011; Henn-Reinke, 2012; Oattes et al., 2018; Wang & Kirkpatrick, 2013). The literature analysis uncovered a number of reasons for teachers' practices of codeswitching. Wang and Kirkpatrick (2013) reported that Hong Kong teachers mostly codeswitched from English to Cantonese because of learners' low level of English proficiency, to help them understand the learning materials. On the other hand, other teachers practiced codeswitching to help to facilitate learners' education progress (Altinyelken et al. 2014). According to Altinyelken et al. (2014), some teachers in Uganda purposefully codeswitched to English in performing certain tasks to prepare learners to transition to EMI in the upper secondary level, thus, adapting the bottom-up approach in teaching. Collectively, these studies indicate that teachers' practices of codeswitching and/or translanguaging take place in multilingual education implicitly and explicitly, but, the reasons why teachers' switched the languages appear to be the same, to facilitate learners' educational progress. The next section covers the parents' use of additional resources as it is the part of stakeholders' language use in different domains subcategory.

 Parents' use of additional resources. This section presents the literature review regarding parents' use of additional resources for children in providing tri/multilingual education. Parents' practices within tri/multilingual education are usually associated with their investment (Guryan, Hurst, & Kearney, 2008) and involvement (Hoover-Dempsey & Sandler, 1995) in children's education. However, this literature review will cover only those studies that focus on parents' use of private language tutoring for children as an additional resource because it seems to be one of the widely used practices in supporting children's education from parents' perspective

 The majority of the studies unanimously affirmed that parents provide their children with private language tutoring to enhance their children's linguistic skills (Bray, 1999; Nunan, 2003; Park, Byun, & Kim, 2011; Reichelt, 2006; Xuesong, 2006). The

earlier study done by Nunan (2003) found that English has affected the major education

dimensions such as university entry requirement, job progression, curriculum, and

research. That seems to be one of the common reasons why parents send their children to

private sectors to master English, so children could gain those facilities. In a similar vein,

Reichelt's (2006) analysis showcase that parents send their children to private English

tutoring in order to facilitate children's progress to "get ahead" and "earn certificates such

as those in the Cambridge certificate system" (p. 8). Overall, Xuesong (2006) determines

such parental practices as a strategy to provide a child with "extended language exposure,

enhance interest, and increase confidence in learning English" (p. 291).

Although such private language tutoring appears to be a widespread practice in

education, little research is undertaken in this direction. According to Bray (1999), private

tutoring is a "phenomenon that has escaped the attention of researchers and education

planners" (p. 7) and emphasizes to investigate its impact on students' academic progress.

Bray (1999) names private tutoring metaphorically as a "shadow education system"

because it provides supplementary tutoring of the main educational system as its shadow.

However, in the view of Park, Byun and Kim (2011), private tutoring is an educational

"service that can be customized to the specific needs of the child" (p. 6). In other words,

parents' use of additional resources such as private language tutoring seems to be today's

demand and response to the education system and development of English. Taken together,

these studies stress the necessity to further explore such parental practices to find out the

reasons behind and its educational outcomes in the Kazakhstani context.

Stakeholders' concerns regarding tri/multilingual education provision at

schools. This section of the literature review provides the major concerns that different

groups of stakeholders face in providing multilingual education. The concerns include the

regional inequalities of rural-urban schools and external factors that impact various groups of stakeholders in implementing multilingual education.

Firstly, analysis of the literature revealed that tri/multilingual education implementation within rural schools fell behind than those in urban schools (Altinyelken et al., 2014; Nunan, 2003; Oladejo, 2006; Wang, 2008). Some groups of stakeholders were concerned about the regional inequalities because of the poor access to effective English instruction (Altinyelken et al., 2014; Nunan, 2003; Wang, 2008). For instance, Altinyelken et al. (2014) said that parents' group of stakeholders were concerned with the provision of tri/multilingual education in rural schools because rural schools taught English as a subject, whereas, urban schools used English as a medium of instruction. Similarly, Wang (2008) found that rural teachers demonstrated their concerns towards the regional inequalities of rural schools saying that rural schools struggled with poor foreign language proficiency. In other words, various groups of stakeholders perceived the regional inequalities of rural-urban schools as their major concern in providing tri/multilingual education because of the poor quality of English.

Secondly, the teachers' group of stakeholders were concerned with the external factors that impacted the implementation of educational reform. According to Wang and Cheng (2009), the external factors refer to the influence from "outside the classroom such as sociocultural, political, or administrative, that teachers have little or no control over" (p. 139). In other words, the external factors included curriculum, large class sizes, teaching materials, ill-equipped classrooms, and support from other departments which are not controlled by each group of stakeholder. For instance, Altinyelken et al. (2014) claims that some teachers were unfamiliar with the teaching methodology used to teach the content through the medium of the foreign language. On the other hand, Wang (2008) and Skinnari and Nikula (2017) found that some schools failed to provide teachers with clear theoretical

guidance and support to provide multilingual education, thus, the absence of theoretical support caused teachers certain issues.

Another external factor that different groups of stakeholders were concerned with relates to the lack of resources. For instance, Jian (2013) stated that the majority of the teachers in his study were concerned with the lack of course books to provide tri/multilingual education. Similarly, the school administrators group of stakeholders also problematized the shortage of teaching materials in providing effective multilingual education that further hindered its implementation (Negron, 2015). Furthermore, Bahous et al. (2011) concluded that although some teachers are in favour of and support providing tri/multilingual education, due to the lack of resources the majority of the teachers failed to teach. All things considered, these studies demonstrate that different groups of stakeholders had various concerns regarding the provision of multilingual education. If most parents were concerned with the regional inequalities of the schools, teachers problematized the lack of theoretical guidance and administrators stressed the importance of teaching materials in providing multilingual education.

Taken together, the abovementioned studies demonstrate a diversity of stakeholders' concerns in providing tri/multilingual education. The literature analysis clearly shows that a number of factors affect various groups of stakeholders' practices of tri/multilingual education in their domains. Although plenty of studies exist in relation to different groups of stakeholders' perceptions and practices of tri/multilingual education in the international contexts, there is a shortage of studies done in Kazakhstan in the frame of trilingual education. Therefore, this study aims to fill in this gap and will be an asset and a foundation for future studies in the field of tri/multilingual education.

Trilingual Education in the Kazakhstani Context

The chapters above discussed a broader picture of multilingual education within the

international contexts and from the various perspectives, this chapter provides the studies related to trilingual education in the Kazakhstani context. The literature review regarding trilingual education in Kazakhstan revealed scarce research in this field. Some studies explored the implementation of trilingual education and language policy in the Kazakhstani context from different perspectives (Mehisto et al., 2014; Karabosava, 2018). Mehisto et al. (2014) conducted three case studies in the schools that provide trilingual education in three different regions. The scholars (2014) explored educators and government officials' perceptions of trilingual education. The findings revealed that although teachers, head-teachers, and government officials positively viewed trilingual education accepting its importance and advantages, they encountered some difficulties. These difficulties were related to the lack of learning materials, teacher developmental courses, the poor linguistic skills of both teachers and students, and the appropriate guidance in trilingual education implementation. The findings revealed that the study participants had limited knowledge of trilingual education implementation (Mehisto et al., 2014). A more recent study which was done in the frame of trilingual education in the Kazakhstani context explored teachers' conceptualization of CLIL pedagogy (Karabassova, 2018). Here, the scholar found that teachers were unaware of their role in facilitating students' linguistic proficiency. In other words, content teachers were inclined to teach explicitly the content matter neglecting teaching the target language (Karabassova, 2018).

Review of Nazarbayev University masters and doctoral dissertations revealed some qualitative studies that explored parents' and teachers' views and practices of trilingual education. For instance, Ayazbayeva (2017) explored parents' views on trilingual education, language ideology, and practices. In her research, she found that participating parents had a limited understanding of the educational policy, which might hinder its

implementation. Another doctoral thesis done by Iyldyz (2017) investigated teachers' beliefs and classroom practices of trilingual education in secondary schools in Kazakhstan. Here, the author (2017) found that participating teachers interpreted and enacted the policy through the prism of their beliefs to facilitate their students' knowledge. A few more papers were found in relation to multilingualism, education and language policy in the Kazakhstani context, but, they do not reflect trilingual education so far (Gaipov et al. 2013; Zharkynbekova et al. 2014; Smagulova, 2008). Overall, these studies demonstrate the complexity of the implementation of the policy, as to succeed in providing trilingual education, policy-makers should take into account all stakeholders' viewpoints, past studies in the multilingual education field, international experiences, and other relevant factors.

Overall, these studies served as a foundation for the current research. Though they investigated different aspects of trilingual education enactment and perceptions of different stakeholders, there are no studies that use the data triangulation method to explore the perceptions and practices of the various groups of stakeholders. Such triangulated studies are important because it may give a broader picture of the current situation and identifies the gaps in trilingual education implementation. Review of the existing literature in the Kazakhstani context discovered a gap, such as a lack of triangulated data from different perspectives such as those of parents, teachers and school administrators. Moreover, the abovementioned studies were mostly conducted in the urban areas of Kazakhstan. However, it was previously stated in the introduction chapter that around 76.3% of all schools in Kazakhstan are situated in rural areas (National report, 2017). Therefore, making use of these studies, and adapting them to some extent would facilitate my research which aims to explore the rural school stakeholders' perceptions and practices of trilingual education.

To sum up, the literature review demonstrated the complexity of trilingual education and its implementation. The literature analysis indicates that some similarities and differences exist in stakeholders' perceptions and practices. As abovementioned, the purpose of the current study was to determine how major stakeholders perceive and practice tri/multilingual education in their domains in the international and local contexts. Firstly, the literature review started by discussing the key concepts, secondly, it covered the concept of trilingual education. Then, it addressed the various groups of stakeholders' perceptions and practices of tri/multilingual education, respectively. Lastly, after these discussions, it was narrowed down to the explanation of trilingual education within the Kazakhstani context. The above literature analysis gave a foundation for developing research instruments for this study which aimed at exploring the rural school stakeholders' perceptions and practices of trilingual education. The next chapter discusses the methodological approach that the study applied.

Methodology

The purpose of this study is to explore various groups of stakeholders' perceptions and practices of trilingual education. To achieve this purpose, the study sought answers to the following research questions:

1. How do the stakeholders perceive trilingual education?

2. How do the stakeholders practice trilingual education?

3. How similar and/or different are the stakeholders' perceptions?

The previous chapter reviewed the literature that was relevant and answered the research questions. This chapter focuses on the methodology of the study. According to Bell (2003), any study requires an appropriate methodology to generate a "complete piece of research" (p. 115). The central phenomena of this study are the rural stakeholders' perceptions and practices of trilingual education. The qualitative approach was undertaken to explore these phenomena. This chapter presents the methodology that guided the researcher in exploring how these stakeholders perceived and practiced trilingual education, and whether their perceptions were similar or not. Below, I provide the rationale for employing a qualitative instrumental case study that guided me in answering the research questions mentioned above. The paper provides information on the research site, and how the research participants were selected by providing justification on the sample. It also justifies the applied research method, describes the research procedure and how the data was analysed. Finally, it discusses the ethical considerations of the study.

Research Design

This section provides a description of the research approach and design applied in the study. To explore rural school stakeholders' perceptions and practices of trilingual education the study applied the qualitative approach. The qualitative approach best deals with exploring an issue and developing a detailed understanding of the central

phenomenon (Creswell, 2014). Moreover, to unveil participants' voices, the qualitative

approach is more appropriate as it employs close interactions with participants rather than

the quantitative approach which deals with numbers and statistics (Denzin & Lincoln,

2005). The way participants interpret and attribute their experiences is the basic feature of

the qualitative approach (Merriam & Tisdell, 2009).

Within the qualitative approach, a case study design was used to examine the

central phenomenon. According to Merriam (1988), the qualitative case study is a holistic

description and analysis of a single phenomenon. However, Stake (1995) claims that the

case study addresses the importance of a particular case. Although these case study

explanations supplement each other, Creswell (2014) explicitly defines it as "an in-depth

exploration of a bounded system based on extensive data collection" (p. 493).

Additionally, Hamilton and Corbett-Whittier (2013) present key elements of the case study

that include a "bounded unit – a person, a group or an institution; employment of two or

more perspectives; location within (local, professional, regional) communities" (p. 11).

These key elements assist to triangulate the data and strengthen the authenticity and

reliability of the collected data (Hamilton & Corbett-Whittier, 2013). Thus, this study fully

corresponds to Hamilton and Corbett-Whittier's (2013) explanation of the case study, as

aforementioned the study was conducted within the rural community with three different

groups of stakeholders: parents, teachers and school administrators. Moreover, Laws

(2003) highlights that the triangulated data allows the researcher to observe the "same

thing from different perspectives and thus to be able to confirm or challenge the findings"

(p. 281). Similarly, triangulation by "data source" was pointed out as one of the types of

triangulation used to verify the findings (Meijer, Verloop, & Beijaard, 2002, p. 146).

Furthermore, this study applied an instrumental case study which deals with the

issue within the case and seeks to lighten up the particular issue (Creswell, 2014; Stake,

1995). In educational research, instrumental case study deals with aspects such as teaching, learning, policy implementation, and curriculum development (Hamilton & Corbett-Whittier, 2013). Therefore, to achieve the research purpose and answer the research questions the study employed the qualitative instrumental case study as according to Hamilton and Corbett-Whittier (2013) this design deals with investigating policy implementation from various perspectives and within certain communities.

Overall, the instrumental case study was applied to achieve the research purpose and answer the research questions. Hamilton and Corbett-Whittier (2013) claim that the case study design fully corresponds to explore the central phenomena from three different perspectives within rural areas that belong to one bounded unit.

Research Site. The above section justified the employed research methodology of the study. This paragraph provides the details of the research site where the study was conducted. The study took place in one of the districts of Almaty Oblast. The research site is located in a small village, around 100 km away from Almaty city and pertains to a particular district of Almaty Oblast. That is why the research site is considered as a rural school. The education within this research site is divided into two approaches: 1. Mainstream education; 2. Trilingual education. The school provides mainstream education starting from the 1st grade. After the completion of the 6th grade students are required to pass an examination. If students get high results in these examinations, then, students start studying the 7th grade within the trilingual education approach. If they fail, they continue studying in the mainstream part of the school. My study was conducted within the part of the school that provides trilingual education. Within this school, History of Kazakhstan and World History are taught in Kazakh; the subjects such as Physics, Chemistry, Biology, and Informatics are taught in English starting from the 7th grade. Therefore, the reasons for choosing this research site are: firstly, it provides trilingual education; secondly, the school

uses two different mediums of instructions; and thirdly, it is located in the rural area. To ensure participants' anonymity and confidentiality of the gathered data the site is named as a rural secondary school in Almaty Oblast.

Sample. The target population of the study was the parents, teachers, and administration of one rural secondary school that provides trilingual education in Almaty Oblast. The study had 10 participants, including 3 parents, 5 teachers (1 from each of subjects Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Informatics and History of Kazakhstan) and from the administration: a principal and a vice principal. Table 1 provides the details of the research participants. This number is justified by the previous researches. The findings of the studies done by Skinnari and Nikula (2017), Wang and Kirkpatrick (2013), and Wang (2008) implicitly showed data saturation from their sample size which is close to the sample size in my study. Based on these studies' data saturation (Marshall et al., 2013), the sample size of 10 participants was enough to collect rich data.

Table 1 Research Participants Profile

N	Interviewee	Occupation	Teaching MoI
1	**A1**	School principal	
2	**A2**	Vice principal	
3	**T1**	Biology teacher	English
4	**T2**	Chemistry teacher	English
5	**T3**	Physics teacher	English
6	**T4**	Informatics teacher	English
7	**T5**	History teacher	Kazakh
8	**P1**	Parent 1	
9	**P2**	Parent 2	
10	**P3**	Parent 3	

To select parents, a homogeneous sampling strategy was applied which involves selecting individuals with a similar characteristic (Creswell, 2014). This similar characteristic was to be 7th graders' parents. The reason for choosing the parents of 7th grade is that this grade has been practicing the trilingual education program for a year. Moreover, as the 7th graders passed the entry examination mentioned earlier, assumingly, parents were expected to have a clear vision of trilingual education. The parents' of 7th graders were sent recruitment letters (see Appendix A) via the social messenger as a whole school used such messengers to communicate with parents. The researcher allowed three days for the parents' group to respond. The researcher interviewed the first three parents who contacted the researcher first, as it was stated in the recruitment letter.

The teachers' sample was chosen using a maximal variation sampling strategy, which "purposefully seeks variation in sample selection" (Merriam & Tisdell, 2009, p. 259). The selection criteria included: different medium of instruction (English and Kazakh); different subjects (Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Informatics, and History of Kazakhstan); a different teaching experience (more than 2 years); and being 7th graders' teachers.; Firstly, to recruit participants, all the 7th graders' teachers' phone numbers were requested from the administration not mentioning any selection criteria. Then, the recruitment flyers were sent directly to all teachers that matched the selection criteria through the messenger (see Appendix B). None of the selection criteria were mentioned to the gatekeeper and the school administration to protect teachers' identification. The researcher allowed 3 days for participants to respond. Then, those teachers that matched the selection criteria and those who contacted the researcher first were selected to be interviewed, as was stated in the recruitment flyer. From the school administration, applying a purposeful sampling strategy the principal and vice principal were asked to be interviewed.

Data collection instrument. In the sections above, research design, research site, and participants were justified. This section presents the data collection instrument that was employed to collect the data and the way that data was collected. As mentioned above, this study applied the qualitative instrumental case study design with interviews being the main method. Thus, the data collection instrument for this study was one-on-one semi-structured interviews which refers to an in-depth interview where participants answer open-ended questions (Creswell, 2014). Edwards and Holland (2013) claim that semi-structured interviews usually follow a pattern of themes and/or topics, and these topics should be prepared in advance. Such interviews allow the researcher to obtain as much information as possible through verbal and non-verbal communication, too (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011). Therefore, the semi-structured interviews were based on the topics and questions that needed to be explored by the researcher (Creswell, 2014). Some of the studies from the literature review applied semi-structured interviews as their data collection instrument in exploring perceptions and practices of tri/multilingual education (Altinyelken et al., 2014; Curdt-Christiansen & Wang, 2018; Wang, 2008).

The interview consisted of 15 open-ended questions, that were purposefully developed for this study and based on the research questions and the literature review. The interview questions were comprised of three parts: the first part focused on eliciting some background information, such as experience, teaching subjects, number of children; the second section focused on how different groups of stakeholders understood and perceived trilingual education: negatively, positively or neutral; advantages or disadvantages that were under the *perceptions* theme. Thirdly, the rest of the questions were related to how these stakeholders used languages at home, classroom and school, those questions looked for stakeholders' *practices* of trilingual education (see Appendices C for the protocols).

Before going to the site, I conducted pilot testing of my interview questions in three languages (English, Russian, Kazakh) upon testers' choice. It was revealed that the interview questions had too much focus on background information, thereby, I shortened some of them.

Research Procedures

The process of thesis writing started long before the data collection period, by identifying the research problem and developing the research purpose. Then, the research questions were elaborated to achieve the established research purpose. Before conducting the study, I have passed the CITI training and got approval from the NUGSE Research Ethics Board. Then, I conducted a pilot testing of my interview questions in three languages (English, Russian, Kazakh) and made certain changes.

The data collection procedure started with some difficulties. Initially, the study intended to be conducted in a rural lyceum, and interview 10th graders' parents, teachers and the school administrators. However, due to unseen circumstances, the study was conducted in a rural mainstream school that had been piloting trilingual education from 2007. As the study intended to be conducted in another school, I did not have any gatekeepers in the second research site. Therefore, I directly approached the principal of the second mainstream school, provided him/her with an official letter from NUGSE which contained the purpose and procedures of the research, and got the permission to conduct the study. The second challenge that I encountered was the absence of a staff room to distribute my recruiting flyers. Consequently, I distributed my recruiting flyers through the social messenger directly to all participants, which was an appropriate way of protecting their identification.

The data collection procedure and recruitment process were started only after getting all these permissions. Firstly, a list of all teachers was obtained from the school

administration without mentioning any selection criteria. The list contained such

information as teachers' names, teaching subjects and phone numbers. Then, the

recruitment flyers were directly sent to those teachers who matched the selection criteria

through the social messenger "What'sApp" that was used at this school for communication

purposes. Secondly, to approach parents the class teachers were asked to send the

recruitment flyers to the parents' messenger groups. Thirdly, from the administrators, the

school principal and vice-principal who is responsible for trilingual education

implementation within the school were asked to be interviewed. After distributing the

recruitment flyers, I allowed 3 days for teachers and parents to respond. The recruitment

flyers contained information that those who contact the researcher first and match the

selection criteria would be interviewed. There were a few parents who contacted later on,

but, they were politely rejected.

After getting the responses from the participants who expressed willingness to

participate in the research I negotiated with each of them a venue outside the school to

keep their identification from the school administration; set the time for carrying out

interviews so that it would suit both, me and participants. Overall, I interviewed ten

participants, three parents, five teachers, and two school administrators. The semi-

structured, face-to-face interviews were conducted outside the school, except for two

participants who had private rooms.

Before I started each interview, I gave a participant the consent form to read and

explained them anonymity and confidentiality procedures; talked about voluntary nature

and their right to withdraw from the participation at any time. The interview started after

participants signed the consent form. The informed consent form was written in three

languages: Kazakh, English, and Russian languages and was given upon the participant's

choice (see Appendices D for the consent forms); The majority of participants preferred to

speak Kazakh, although they codeswitched a lot to Russian. The interviews were audio-taped with the participants' permission. During the interviews, extra prompts emerged, thus, few more questions were added to elicit further information. The interviews approximately lasted for 35 – 50 minutes. The data collection started on December 13, 2018, and ended on December 28, 2018. The next step after the data collection was to organize and analyse the raw data according to Creswell (2014) and interpret the findings. The findings were discussed according to the previous literature.

      Data analysis. The data analysis followed the six steps described in Creswell (2014). Those steps included: organization of raw data, coding the data, creating themes from codes, representation, and discussion of themes, interpreting the findings and making a conclusion (Creswell, 2014). Patton (2015) highlights the challenging part of organizing a massive amount of qualitative data into one scheme. Therefore, I organized the data by participants' pseudonyms, stored files in separate folders with different colours (Creswell, 2014), and made sure to date the data (Patton, 2015). As there were ten participants, all data was transcribed by hand. The sample of transcribed data is provided (Appendix E). Additionally, the field notes were typed. After the data was fully transcribed, I thoroughly read the transcriptions to get a general understanding of it and to take notes near each paragraph to better understand the data. I started labelling them using initial coding. After the first coding I had around a hundred codes, which then were reduced and combined with other codes. After doing such initial coding, broader themes and categories that cover the most important coding were formed (Creswell, 2014; Patton, 2015; Punch, 2005). The major categories that emerged from these coding include: *stakeholders' understanding of the concept of trilingual education, stakeholders' use of the languages, stakeholders' perceptions of the role of three languages, stakeholders' concerns regarding trilingual education*. These themes were further used to elaborate on the findings chapter.

Consequently, the findings and literature review chapters were used to develop the discussion part of the study.

Ethical Considerations

The nature of qualitative research involves close interaction with people, that is why any ethical issues need to be carefully safeguarded by the researcher (Creswell, 2014). The participants were notified throughout the study of the voluntary nature of the research. The data collection process started only after participants signed the consent form which was meticulously explained to ensure participants' anonymity, safety and respect of human rights (Creswell, 2014). The Consent Form was written in three languages (Kazakh, Russian, English) depending on participants' choice, and was available in two copies, for the researcher, and another for the participants. The interview was audiotaped with the permission of the participants.

Regarding the anonymity consideration, the study neither collected any unique identifiers about individuals as family names, addresses, the site address, nor participants' photos were taken. To protect participants' anonymity, the interviews took place outside the school in a convenient place for participants and their names were replaced with pseudonyms in all stages of the study. The description of the research site was generalized as a rural school in Almaty Oblast to protect the school's and individuals' identity (Creswell, 2014).

With respect to maintaining the confidentiality of the collected data, only the researcher had access to it. To strengthen the level of confidentiality any recognizable data was replaced by pseudonyms or generalized names. The gathered field notes and audio-taped recordings were safely stored within a locker in the researcher's room. To prevent unauthorized access, the transcribed data was securely kept within password protected

computer folders with no internet access. All collected data would be destroyed two years following successful graduation NU GSE, masters course.

This chapter presented the methodology chapter that was used to conduct the study. The study applied the qualitative approach with the instrumental case study being the research design. The semi-structured interviews were utilized to achieve the research purpose and answer the research questions. Overall, ten research participants were recruited using the purposeful sampling strategy. The study was conducted within the rural school in Almaty Oblast. The chapter started with an explanation of the research approach and research design. Then, the rationale for choosing the research site and sample were meticulously explained, respectively. After that, the research instruments and data analysis approach was discussed and justified by the literature. Finally, the ethical considerations were described. The next chapter that follows presents the findings for the study.

Findings

The purpose of this chapter is to present the findings of the study which explored

the rural school stakeholders' perceptions and practices of trilingual education.

Subsequently, to achieve this purpose, the research questions posed in the study were:

1. How do these stakeholders perceive trilingual education?

 2. How do these stakeholders practice trilingual education?

3. How similar or different are these stakeholders' perceptions?

For the achievement of the research purpose and respond to the research questions, the

qualitative case study with semi-structured interviews was employed. The findings chapter

is outlined as following: firstly, the findings on *stakeholders' perceptions of trilingual*

education are presented under the following three subcategories that include: *stakeholders'*

understanding of the concept of trilingual education, stakeholders' perceptions of the role

of three languages, and *stakeholders' views towards the age of introduction of trilingual*

education. Secondly*,* the finding on *similarities and/or differences of stakeholders'*

perceptions is represented which answer the third research question. Thirdly, the finding

on *stakeholders' practices of trilingual education* consists of two subcategories:

stakeholders' use of three languages in different domains and *stakeholders' concerns*

regarding trilingual education. The first subcategory includes *teachers' practices of*

translanguaging and *parents' use of additional resources*. Finally, the chapter provides the

list of the main findings and conclusion.

Stakeholders' Perceptions of Trilingual Education

This section presents the findings on stakeholders' perceptions of trilingual

education. It includes four subcategories: *stakeholders' understanding of the concept of*

trilingual education, stakeholders' perceptions of the role of three languages, and

stakeholders' views towards the age of introduction of trilingual education that are presented below, respectively.

Stakeholders' understanding of trilingual education. This section presents the findings regarding the stakeholders' understanding of trilingual education. The stakeholders' perception of the concept of trilingual education varied from understanding it as the teaching of English to teaching three languages and teaching in three languages (see Table 2).

The majority of all three groups of participants perceived trilingual education as the teaching the English language. Some representative comments include: "trilingual education is a necessity, English is needed everywhere" (Parent 1). "It [trilingual education] is the demand of globalization, everything requires the knowledge of English" (Teacher 5). Meanwhile, the concept of trilingual education as an acquisition of three languages (Kazakh, Russian, and English) was perceived as by a few participants. If the school administrator viewed it as "... paying attention to all three languages" (Admin 2), "it [*trilingual education*] is learning three languages at the same time" (Parent 3) was the way how one of the parents expressed his understanding of trilingual education. The concept of trilingual education as using three languages as mediums of instruction was perceived by one participant. "It is teaching science subjects in English, Histories [*history of Kazakhstan and World history*] in Kazakh and Russian languages" (Teacher 3) was the way how Physics teacher understood trilingual education.

Table 2 illustrates the way three groups of stakeholders understand trilingual education. As shown in table 2, the majority of three groups of stakeholders perceived it as teaching English, some of them consider it as teaching three languages. Only one participant's understanding it like teaching in three languages coincides with the concept explanation which is accepted by Kazakhstani policy documents.

Stakeholders' perceptions of the role of three languages. All three groups of stakeholders are very positive towards trilingual education and specifically with the roles that these languages play. Below, the findings that reflect the role of each language by the different groups of stakeholders are considered.

Regarding Kazakhs language, stakeholders perceived its role as a mother tongue, as a language of communication with the elderly, and as a necessity for developing patriotism, though there were some views such as Kazakh restricts access to the globalization. The majority of all three groups of stakeholders saw it as the native language which should be preserved: "Kazakh is our mother tongue; we must know it" (Teacher 3) was the way how teachers understood its role. On the other hand, the group of parents perceived the role of Kazakh as a communication tool with elderly people, a way of showing their patriotism and a good opportunity for finding a governmental job position. "We speak only Kazakh with our grandparents" (Parents 1), "it [*knowledge of Kazakh*] shows our patriotism, it is our heritage" (Parent 3) and "the knowledge of Kazakh language is required to get a good governmental job" (Parent 2) were the ways how the group of parents expressed the role of Kazakh in their domains.

Parents were more positive about the role of Kazakh than the school administrators and teachers, who considered the Kazakh language as restricting the access to the global arena. For instance, "By knowing only Kazakh, we cannot see the other world" (Admin 1) and "Kazakh is our mother tongue, but, we must speak other foreign languages to enter the globe" (Teacher 1) was how some of the teachers and administrators understood the role of Kazakh. Overall, the majority of all three groups of stakeholders perceived Kazakh as a mother tongue which should be maintained. But, the exact role of Kazakh language turned out to differ in each stakeholders' group. If the parents' group saw it mostly as a communication bridge with elderly people, teachers and administrators though considered

it as native/mother language that needs to be maintained, still hold the view that it as limiting access to the world.

As for the Russian language, the majority of all three groups of stakeholders perceived its role as the language for social media, socialization and interethnic communication though, there were some voices that were against studying this language. The majority who supported the need for Russian as the language for social media and socialization were the parents' group. They expressed this idea in different ways: "children start using Russian when they leave home" (Parent 1), "My daughter speaks in Russian with all her friends" (Parent 2) and "I noticed that my children use Instagram, WhatsApp, and Facebook mostly in Russian" (Parent 3). The school administrators and most teachers considered Russian as the language of interethnic communication. "It [*Russian language*] is used to speak with people of other nationalities in our society" (Admin 1) and "according to Elbasy [*the first president*], it is the language of interethnic communication" (Teacher 1) were the ways how some groups of stakeholders indicated their perceptions towards the role of Russian. However, there were some opinions that revealed negative attitudes towards Russian, connected with their perception of this language as something that is already in the past or that is not needed now because of limited resources which can be vividly seen in following quotes: "I agree with studying Kazakh and English, but not Russian because of Russian limits education. It is our past". (Teacher 2). "I don't use Russian because there aren't many resources in Russian" (Teacher 4). Taken together, the majority of participants of all three groups of stakeholders mostly perceived the role of Russian as the language of interethnic communication, social media, and socialization, though some teachers had negative attitudes towards it.

Regarding the English language, all groups of stakeholders perceived the role of English within trilingual education unanimously positive and important. The finding

revealed three major roles of English such as educational purposes (P1, P2, P3, A1, A2), better carrier opportunities (P1, A1, T2, T4, T5) and travelling (P1, P2, P3, T3). The vast majority of all three groups of stakeholders considered the role of English as immense for educational purposes. The parents' group stated its importance to obtaining "higher education" (P1, P2). The teachers perceived the role of English within trilingual education to be significant for searching for additional teaching materials. "You can find plenty of teaching materials in English" (Teacher 1), "Some information exists only in English" (Teacher 4) and "80% of all information on the internet is in English" (Teacher 2) were the teachers' perceptions towards the role of English in their domains. As for the administrators, they also considered the role of English to be important for educational purposes. "Obtaining higher education" (Admin 1) and "searching for additional teaching materials" (Admin 2) were the school administrators' perceptions towards the role of English.

The role of English for better career opportunities was considered as important also by nearly all groups of stakeholders. Some parents expressed it as following "to get a well-paid job, children must know English" (Parent 1). "By knowing English, one can get a promotion" was the way how the teacher of Chemistry considered the role of English for career-related opportunities. As for the administrators, they also indicated that the knowledge of English is crucial for a future career, expressing it as "who speaks English get better jobs in future" (Admin 1).

Traveling was another role for speaking English expressed nearly by all participants. Interestingly, all parents with one voice indicated that the role of English is important for "traveling" (P1, P2, P3) because "by speaking English abroad they [children] feel confident and learn the language better" (Parent 3). "My daughter can fluently use English when we travel abroad" (Parent 2) and "I was proud when my son spoke in

English to the guide in the museum, when we were in the USA" (Parent 1) were the ways how the parents expressed their views towards the role of English for travelling. Some teachers also considered English to be important for travelling, but for "conference related trips" (Teacher 3).

All three groups of stakeholders were quite positive towards the role of English within trilingual education providing their own perceptions. If the parents' group viewed its role as good for traveling and better career opportunities, the teachers' group saw it as access to additional teaching materials in English. The administrators had similar views of the role of English with both groups of stakeholders, they considered English to be useful for future career-related opportunities and teaching resources.

The stakeholders' views towards the age of introducing trilingual education. This paragraph demonstrates the findings regarding the stakeholders' views towards the starting age for introducing language components of Kazakhstani trilingual education. The data analysis revealed different views on this issue. While the majority of participants of all three groups of stakeholders considered the early introduction of trilingual education as significant, some considered that primary education should only be in mother-tongue.

Teaching three languages: Kazakh, Russian and English from the first grade as language components of trilingual education in Kazakhstani context was positively viewed by the majority of all three groups of stakeholders. This consensus among respondents can be seen in the following quotations: "children at young age are like sponges, they learn languages [*Russian and English*] very quickly" (Parent 1), "languages are learnt better at a young age" (Admin 1) and "it is beneficial to learn foreign languages from the first grade" (Teacher 3).

As said, there were those who considered that primary education should be only in mother-tongue, though, it was expressed by a few participants. The representative

quotations include: "Primary education must be in students' mother tongue" (Teacher 2),

"I don't agree with teaching foreign languages, be it Russian or English, from the first

grade" (Teacher 5) and "studying all three languages at once confuses my child" (Parent

3).

According to these respondents, some of the primary reasons for such attitudes include

students' language confusion and language anxiety. In general, most participants from all

three groups of stakeholders considered the early introduction of language components of

trilingual education the better and beneficial, though few were against it.

Stakeholders' Practices of Trilingual Education

This section discusses the findings on stakeholders' practices of trilingual

education. It includes the following two subcategories: *stakeholders' use of the languages*

in their domains and *stakeholders' concerns regarding trilingual education.* The first

subcategory also covers *teachers' practices of translanguaging* and *parents' use of*

additional resources. It is significant to explore those subcategories because they help to

answer the second research question.

Stakeholders' use of the languages in their domains. The findings on the

stakeholders' use of the languages in different domains revealed that all three languages

are practiced in school, classroom and home domains. But, if three languages were widely

supported at the school level, classroom and home domains revealed the preference for

using two languages with mostly negligence of Russian.

As said, all three languages are found to be equally used within the school domain.

It can be vividly seen from the school administrators' responses: "we promote all three

languages" (Admin 1) and "certain school activities are held in three languages" (Admin

2). The field notes also indicated that the majority of the in-school signs such as

announcements, school rules on the wall, and artefacts were written in three languages: Kazakh, Russian and English.

As for the classroom domains, the findings revealed different practices that teachers apply in classrooms with the majority of them giving freedom of choice of the languages to use in classrooms by their students, and others setting specific rules for their use. The majority of the teachers indicated that they do not set a specific rule for using certain languages within classrooms. "Students are free to use any of the three languages" (Teacher 1) and "they [*children*] are too young to master English, that is why I allow them to speak any language they prefer" (Teacher 4) were a few teachers' responses to the question about the language used within classrooms. However, there were those who set specific rules. A couple of teachers were against using three languages simultaneously because of difficulties in providing the translation of a word in three languages. "I ask students to use English and Kazakh" (Teacher 2) and "I prefer to use English and Kazakh, or English and Russian, using three languages is difficult" (Teacher 3) were the ways how teachers preferred to use the languages in the classroom domains.

In relation to the languages used at home domains, the parents' group were unanimous in using Kazakh and promoting English, though children used Russian for socialization and social media. All parents asserted to speak mostly Kazakh at home. "We live with our grandparents and only speak Kazakh" (Parent 1) was the way how one of the parents phrased it. Some of the parents claimed to forbid the use of Russian at home which is shown in the following quote "I ask my daughter to speak Kazakh, not Russian at home" (Parent 3) because they believed that Kazakh should speak the Kazakh language.

Overall, the findings on the stakeholders' language use in various domains revealed that all three languages were being practiced in three domains. However, the practices differed. If the school administrators promoted all three languages within school domains,

some teachers practiced all three languages at the classroom level, while others neglected the use of Russian. Similarly, the parents' group also tried to neglect the use of Russian at home, maintaining Kazakh and promoting English.

Teachers' practices of translanguaging. The teachers' practices of translanguaging is the section that relates to the findings on the stakeholders' use of the languages in their domains. All teachers responded that they practiced translanguaging when teaching, though they were not familiar with the concept of translanguaging. All science teachers specified that they purposefully utilize Russian and/or Kazakh to explain the content which is taught English. It can be observed form the following quotes "Yes! I use Russian and Kazakh when teaching" (Teacher 1) and "I allow to mixing languages" (Teacher 4). Meanwhile, the teacher of History reported that she purposefully uses Russian to explain Kazakh content. "I add some Russian elements such as videos and slideshows" phrased the approach that he/she applies in teaching History. From the interview talks with the teachers, it was observed that all teachers practiced translanguaging, purposefully using Kazakh and/or Russian languages to explain the English content. Moreover, all teachers had positive attitudes towards such practices of mixing the languages. As found above, the teachers' group purposefully mixed the languages when teaching: English with Kazakh and/or Russian to better explain the content, even though they were not acquainted with the concept of translanguaging.

Parents' using additional resources. Another finding that was revealed within the stakeholders' language use in different domain section is parents' use of additional resources. All interviewed parents unanimously expounded that they provided their children with additional resources to assist their educational progress. "My son goes to private English tutor" (Parent 1), "English supplementary classes are required to master those science subjects in English" (Parent 2), "private English lessons are a must-have"

(Parent 3) were the ways how parents' expressed their practices of trilingual education. From the interview with the parents, it seemed that the parents were obliged by class teachers or the school environment to provide their children with such private classes. It was observed from this statement, too "we must provide our child with paid English classes, otherwise, she might face difficulties in her study" (Parent 3). All parents were providing their children with English supplementary classes at the time of the interview. The reasons for such parental practices were quite different. Some reasons that were expressed by parents include: "language anxiety and confusion" (Parent 1) and "contribution to easing the education load" (Parent 2) and "to master English" (Parent 3). All interviewed parents used additional resources such as supplementary English classes to assist their children's trilingual education progress, which was practiced as a must-have activity among parents.

The stakeholders' concerns regarding trilingual education provision at the school. This paragraph provides the findings on the stakeholders' concerns regarding trilingual education that is being practiced at the school. All three groups of stakeholders mostly positive about trilingual education at the school, but expressed certain concerns. Those concerns mostly related to the school infrastructure, course books, and teaching staff. All three groups of stakeholders unanimously considered the school infrastructure such as the absence of scientific laboratories, lack of rooms and teachers' room, overcrowded classrooms, old building, which was initially built as a hospital, the major issues in providing trilingual education. Those issues can be vividly seen in the following quotations: "My son said that they don't have laboratories" (Parent 1), "there are only two schools in this area" (Admin1), "you saw, we don't have teacher' rooms" (Admin 2), "the school initially was built as a hospital, the building is too old" (Teacher 5) were some of the responses.

Another issue that addresses teachers' concerns relates to course book provision. A few teachers had concerns regarding course books that were used to teach science subjects. According to those teachers, the course books were chosen by authorities from the ministry, therefore, their voices were not taken into account. "We hadn't any opportunity to choose the course books ourselves" (Teacher 3) and "I've been to book exhibition this summer in Astana, where I saw science course books with additional students' books and teachers' books. The course books that we use now are normal, but not the best" (T 4). Those quotations present the teachers' major concerns regarding trilingual education within classroom domains. The vast majority of all participants problematized the poor school infrastructure as old buildings, lack of nearby schools, overcrowded school and a lack of laboratories as the major concerns in providing trilingual education.

Similarities and/or Differences in Stakeholders' Perceptions

This section of the findings chapter displays the answers to the third research question that seeks the answer to how similar and/or different the stakeholders' perceptions are. Similarities and/or differences in stakeholders' perceptions are represented as following: stakeholders' understandings of the concept of trilingual education, stakeholders' perceptions of the role of three languages, and stakeholders' views towards the age of introducing trilingual education.

The stakeholders' understanding of the concept of trilingual education varied from understanding it as just teaching of the English language to the teaching of three languages or teaching in three languages. As illustrated in Table 2, the majority of all three groups of participants perceived trilingual education as the teaching English as a foreign language, while one participant from each group considered trilingual education as the teaching of three languages. Only one teacher's understanding of the concept was applicable with its definition accepted by Kazakhstani policy documents.

Table 2 Stakeholders' understanding of the concept of trilingual education

N	Participants	Teaching in 3 languages	Teaching of 3 languages	Teaching of English language
1	Parent 1			+
2	Parent 2			+
3	Parent 3		+	
4	Admin 1			+
5	Admin 2		+	
6	Teacher 1			+
7	Teacher 2			+
8	Teacher 3	+		
9	Teacher 4		+	
10	Teacher 5			+

As for the stakeholders' views of the role of three languages, the findings revealed different perceptions, though had some similarities. All three groups of stakeholders unanimously perceived Kazakh as a mother-tongue that needs to be maintained. If the parents' group considered the Kazakh language as a characteristic of patriotism, a tool for communication with elderly people and getting an official job, the school administrators and some teachers regarded it as a restriction of access to the world..

Table 3 Stakeholders' perceptions of the role of three languages

Languages / Roles	P1	P2	P3	A1	A2	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5
Kazakh language										
Mother tongue	+	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+
Communication with elderly	+	+	+							
Patriotism		+					+			
Official jobs			+							
Restriction to world				+		+				
English										
Education purposes	+	+	+	+	+			+		
Better employment	+			+			+		+	+
Traveling	+	+	+					+		
Russian										
Social Media	+	+	+							
Interethnic communication				+	+	+		+		+
Lack of resources							+		+	

Lastly, the findings on the stakeholders' views towards the time of introducing the language components of trilingual education revealed different views. As shown in Table 4, the majority of all three groups of stakeholders considered the early introduction of the

language components of trilingual education as positive and beneficial for students. However, some of the participants from teachers and parents' groups negatively perceived the early instruction of language components claiming that primary education needs to be in mother-tongue, referring to the Kazakh language.

Table 4 Stakeholders' views towards the time of introducing trilingual education

N	Participants	Early introduction of language components	Primary education in mother-tongue
1	Parent 1	+	
2	Parent 2	+	
3	Parent 3		+
4	Admin 1	+	
5	Admin 2	+	
6	Teacher 1	+	
7	Teacher 2		+
8	Teacher 3	+	
9	Teacher 4	+	
10	Teacher 5		+

This section of the findings chapter presented the stakeholders' perceptions of trilingual education. The three group of stakeholders' perceptions were explored through the lens of their understandings of trilingual education, the role each language plays, and their views towards the time of introducing language components of trilingual education. Moreover, the answer to the third research question on similarities and/or differences in stakeholders' perception was displayed. The next section provides the findings related to the stakeholders' practices of trilingual education.

List of the main findings

1. The stakeholders' perceptions of the concept of trilingual education varied from understanding it as the teaching of English language to the teaching of three languages or teaching in three languages with the majority of all participants perceiving trilingual education as the teaching English as a foreign language.

2. All three groups of stakeholders were very positive towards trilingual education and specifically with the roles these languages play. The Kazakh language was perceived as a mother tongue and tool for communication with elderly people, while, Russian was considered as the language of socialization and social media and English as a language of higher education, career, and travel by the majority of all three groups of stakeholders.

3. The majority of three groups of stakeholders considered the early introduction of the language components of trilingual education as beneficial, though, some opposing views existed.

4. All three languages were practiced in all three domains, but, if three languages were widely supported at the school level, it was revealed the preference for using two languages with mostly negligence of Russian within classroom and home domains.

5. Teachers' practices of trilingual education can be seen from their practices of translanguaging in classroom domains, though they were not familiar with the concept of translanguaging. All teachers specified that they purposefully utilized Russian and/or Kazakh languages to explain the content which was in English and Kazakh.

6. Parents' practices of trilingual education can be observed from the provision of their children with additional resources. All parents unanimously stated that they

provide their children with additional resources such as private English language
tutoring to assist their educational progress.

7. The major issues in providing trilingual education were related to the school's poor
    infrastructure from all three groups of stakeholders' perspectives. The
    administrators were challenged by the lack of nearby schools; teachers underwent
    issues with course-books' provision, while parents were bothered with the lack of
    laboratories for science classes.

The purpose of this chapter was to present the main findings of the study. The
findings were divided into two main categories. Firstly, the findings sections covered the
stakeholders' perceptions of trilingual education category which were presented under the
following categories: *stakeholders' understanding of the concept of trilingual education,
stakeholders' perceptions of the role of three languages* and *stakeholders' views towards
the time for introducing trilingual education.* Secondly, it displayed the findings on the
stakeholders' practices of trilingual education category, which consisted of two
subcategories: *stakeholders' language use in different domains* and *stakeholders' concerns
regarding trilingual education.* The first subcategory of language uses comprised of
teachers' practices of translanguaging and *parents' use of additional resources.* Thirdly, it
represented the findings on the third research question *similarities and/or differences in
stakeholders' perceptions* of trilingual education. Finally, the list of main findings
composed of the seven major findings was presented.

Discussion

The previous chapter presented the main findings that were developed from the data analysis. This chapter discusses the possible explanations of the key findings by connecting and interpreting it with the previous literature. The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore different stakeholder groups' perceptions and practices of trilingual education. The research questions were: 1. How do these stakeholders perceive trilingual education? 2. How do these stakeholders practice trilingual education? 3. How similar or different are the stakeholders' perceptions?

The discussion chapter is organized in the same vein as the findings chapters reflecting the research questions. Firstly, it starts with the discussion of findings on stakeholders' perceptions of trilingual education. It is composed of three subcategories that include: *stakeholders' understanding of the concept of trilingual education, stakeholders' perceptions of the role of three languages,* and *stakeholders' views towards the introduction of trilingual education. Secondly,* it discusses the findings on *stakeholders' practices of trilingual education under the following* subcategories, including *stakeholders' use of three languages and stakeholders' concerns regarding trilingual education.* The first subcategory covers *teachers' practices of translanguaging* and *parents' use of additional resources* sections as it relates to stakeholders' language use. Thirdly, the findings on the third research question about *similarities and/or differences in stakeholders' perceptions* are discussed. Finally, it provides the answers to the research questions.

Stakeholders' Perceptions of Trilingual Education

This section presents the discussion of the main findings obtained from the data analysis. Within the first category of stakeholders' perceptions of trilingual education, three major subcategories emerged. Those subcategories include *stakeholders'*

understanding of the concept of trilingual education, stakeholders' perceptions of the role

of three languages, and stakeholders' views towards the introduction of trilingual

education.

Stakeholders' understanding of trilingual education. As the findings show, the

majority of all three groups of stakeholders understood trilingual education as a teaching of

the English language. Some of them perceived it as learning three languages, and, only one

respondent's answer corresponded with the definitions of trilingual education accepted in

Kazakhstan, which is teaching in three languages. Such discrepancies in stakeholders'

understandings were also revealed in the literature.

The prior studies done by Lao (2004) and Shannon and Milian (2002) found that

the majority of parents clearly understood the educational programme that their children

were enrolled in. It is similar to the current study, the majority of all three groups of

stakeholders were aware of *trilingual education.* However, their understandings differed.

Although parents were familiar with trilingual education to some extent, it does not mean

that they clearly understood its goals and principles (Lee,1999). In this study, trilingual

education was mostly misunderstood by parents as teaching English by parents. This

finding is supported by the previous study. In the same vein, Sheffer (2003) for example,

found that half of the respondents understood multilingual education as learning English.

Moreover, Sheffer (2003) in his study identified the major reasons for parents'

misunderstandings. It included a "serious and problematic lack of communication between

the school and the parents" (p. 334), low socioeconomic status and education of parents.

As for the educators, their understandings regarding trilingual education differed,

too. In the current study, the majority of teachers and administrators perceived it as

teaching English, while some of them considered it as a teaching of three languages. This

finding reveals a mismatch in educators' understandings with its understanding by the

policymakers in Kazakhstan. The similar mismatch is observed in the prior research literature. The earlier study done by Shin and Krashen (1996) found that less than a half of the teachers misunderstood the concept of bilingual education perceiving it as an English immersion programs. Moreover, some studies found a correlation between educators' understandings of bilingual education with their educational background and knowledge (Menken & Solorza, 2013; Menken & Solorza, 2015; Shin & Krashen, 1996). Menken and Solorza (2013) states that those educators who were knowledgeable in bilingual education valued it. Similarly, Shin and Krashen (1996) claims that those "supplementary training showed stronger support for bilingual education" (p. 53). Those studies show that there is a need to further investigate the Kazakhstani teachers and administrators' understandings of the concepts of trilingual education in correlation with their educational background, and if a mismatch occurs, take further steps.

Collectively, the current study and prior literature show a discrepancy in stakeholders' understandings of multilingual education. These results should be interpreted with caution because these interpretations seem to directly affect the vulnerable population, the students. Thus, s possible explanation of parents' misunderstanding of the concept of multilingual education in the current study can be explained by a lack of communication (Riches & Curdt-Christiansen, 2010) low socioeconomic status and/or education (Sheffer, 2003), whereas, educators misunderstanding could be explained by the lack of appropriate training (Shin & Krashen, 1996) related to trilingual education implementation. Hence, it could conceivably be assumed that parent-school communication and educators' training are the major sources of managing trilingual education. This finding has important implications for enhancing the current parent-school communication system and pre-service and in-service teacher training programs. Therefore, further research in these directions is required.

Stakeholders' perceptions of the role of three languages. All three groups of stakeholders were very positive towards trilingual education and specifically with the roles that these languages play. The Kazakh language was perceived as a mother tongue and tool for communication with elderly people, while, Russian was considered to be the language of socialization and social media and English as a language of higher education, career, and travel by the majority of all three groups of stakeholders.

Regarding the Kazakh language, the three groups of stakeholders unanimously perceived it as a mother tongue, as a language of communication with the elderly, and as a necessity for developing patriotism. This finding is in agreement with Shin (2000) and Riches and Curdt-Christiansen (2010) findings which showed that most stakeholders expressed the necessity for maintaining their primary language because of its association with their culture, history, and identity. It also correlates with the findings from GuatPoh et al. (2017) who found that maintaining the mother tongue as crucial for defining one's "ethnic identity, to better understand one's culture and heritage" (p. 529). Similarly, the stakeholders in this study perceived the role of Kazakh as an engine that connects one's identity, culture, historical roots and shows one's patriotism. Moreover, this study confirms that the mother tongue, the Kazakh language in this case, which is associated with the language of communication with elderly people, grandparents, finds its support in Braun (2012) and Cummins (1999) research stating that within multilingual families, communication with grandparents serves as a natural resource for maintaining a positive relationship to preserve mother tongue.

As for the Russian language, the majority of all three groups of stakeholders perceived its role as the language for social media, socialization, and interethnic communication. However, some groups of stakeholders were against its studying within schools. The debate over the role of Russian in the Kazakhstani society is ongoing since

the country's independence (Matuszkiewicz, 2010). However, the role of Russian in the

Kazakhstani society has been identified by the Law on Languages (1997) where Russian is

used in all spheres of management as an official language along with Kazakh. Moreover,

the current language policy evolved from the project "Trinity of Languages" delineates the

role of Russian as the language of interethnic communication (Nazarbayev, 2007).

The way how the different groups of stakeholders perceived the role of Russian is

quite different. The parents' group viewed the role of Russian as a tool for using social

media and socialize with friends. During the interviews, most parents claimed that their

children speak Russian with friends at school and outside. These findings correspond with

the earlier studies of Sabitova and Alishariyeva (2015), where Russian was considered as

the language for communication. According to Sabitova and Alishariyeva (2015), Russian

was viewed as lingua franca and for communication purposes and dominated in social

media, which is similar to this study. There are a number of possible explanations. Firstly,

there is a society-wide perception that speaking Russian seems more prestigious than

Kazakh (Matuszkiewicz, 2010), thus, the younger generation appears to use the high-status

language. The second possible explanation for such a role of Russian in society is an

implicit parental influence. In this study, most parents were Russian dominant, though they

switched to Kazakh due to children's education. During the interviews, parents affirmed

that they frequently codeswitched between Russian and Kazakh. Consequently, such

parental codeswitching may impact children's language use at home, school and outside. In

turn, parents tend to perceive the role of Russian as the language of socialization. As for

administrators and teachers, they perceived the role of Russian as the language of

interethnic communication which coincides with the major policy documents (Law on

Languages, 1997). However, Smagulova (2005) claims that no studies exist that explore

such interethnic communication strategies of Kazakhs with people of other nationalities in Kazakhstan.

Regarding the English language, all three groups of stakeholders perceived the role of English within trilingual education unanimously positive and important. The majority of the participants of all three groups of stakeholders believed that the role of English is immense for higher education and career-related opportunities. As mentioned in the literature review, such practical advantages regarding the role of English was found in the literature, too (Curdt-Christiansen & Wang, 2018; Lao, 2004; Ramos, 2007; Shin, 2000; Young & Tran, 1999). These studies demonstrate that research participants valued job opportunities, the positive self-image of being multilingual, communication skills, better cognitive development and better academic quality that multilingual education entailed. Curdt-Christiansen and Wang (2018) explain stakeholders' such attitude towards the role of English within society as English having superiority over other languages because of globalization and being one of the frequently used languages. The scholars (2018) name it as "instrumental value of English" which refers to the advantages of knowing English.

It seems possible that these results are due to the dominant role of English in our society and throughout the world. For example, all three groups of stakeholders are well aware that studying higher education abroad and even in Kazakhstan requires the knowledge of English. Subsequently, well-paid jobs also require English proficiency. Moreover, the group of teachers and administrators of this study rephrased policy documents' aims that there is a need to know at least three languages to be competitive in the world arena. These reasons tend to magnify the dominance of the role of English in our society.

The stakeholders' views towards the time of introducing trilingual education. The majority of participants of all three groups of stakeholders considered the early

introduction of the language components of trilingual education as beneficial, though, some opposing views existed. Those stakeholders, who were against the early foreign language introduction, based their arguments on their past experiences.

As was found in the previous studies, the majority of the parents viewed early foreign language introduction to be beneficial for educational, social and economic reasons (Chung, 2008, Griva & Chouvarda, 2012; Enever & Moon, 2009; Oladejo, 2006). The same applies to this study. The majority of all three groups of stakeholders' considered early foreign language introduction useful and advantageous. In this study, the parents' group were in favour of introducing foreign language components of trilingual education at the early ages because of its practical advantages such as travelling, better education, and future job. Similarly, Griva and Chouvarda (2012) found that most parents believed that "early language learning contributes to psychosocial, linguistic and educational progress of the children" (p. 2). Furthermore, Enever and Moon (2009) explained that some stakeholders from the parents' group believed that early foreign language learning entails social and economic benefits for children, which was similar to this study.

As for teachers and administrators of this study, most of them also positively considered the early foreign language introduction. Recent evidence suggests that teachers perceived the early foreign language introduction to be useful for students. In the survey conducted by Othman and Kiely (2016), it was found that the majority of teachers underlined the importance of early language learning and its benefits for further education, stating "children get better results" (p. 53). However, the previous studies were mostly concerned with the methodological aspect of foreign language teaching to young learners (Munoz, 2010; Nikolov & Djigunovic, 2011; Roothooft, 2017). In this study, the teachers and administrators who considered foreign language learning at a younger grade as

beneficial stated its practical advantages such as being multilingual and lucrative for education and career.

Regarding those who had opposing views towards the early introduction of foreign languages, they stated the difficulties that they faced and past practices. Firstly, one of the parents pointed out that they frequently encountered their children's language learning anxiety and confusion of languages, that is why they did not support the early foreign language learning. It contradicts to what was found in the literature, some parents preferred the early foreign language introduction as a component of multilingual education to avoid such learning anxiety among their children (Oladejo, 2006). Secondly, one of the teachers was also against the early foreign language learning. The teacher remembered his/her past teaching experience in the Soviet teaching system, where primary education was only in the mother tongue.

There are several possible explanations for such findings. As for parents, who preferred the early introduction of foreign language components of trilingual education, they might consider that by early introduction they better prepare their children to the current educational system, thus, be more competitive than others. With respect to the administrators and teachers, who supported the early introduction of trilingual education, they probably follow the lead of policymakers and officials as Spolsky (2007) said school representatives are required and checked over policy enactment. Although it might be true, further investigation is needed from teachers and school administrators' perspectives. The early learning of the language components may impact a successful integration into trilingual education when a student starts the 7th grade, a required grade by policies for beginning trilingual education in Kazakhstan (Road Map, 2015). Therefore, these findings have important implications for policymakers to explain rural stakeholders the benefits of early foreign language learning.

Stakeholders' Practices of Trilingual Education

The section provides a discussion of findings on stakeholders' practices of trilingual education. The main subcategories include *stakeholders' use of three languages* and *stakeholders' concerns regarding trilingual education.* The first subcategory contains *teachers' practices of translanguaging* and *parents' use of additional resources* because it reflects stakeholders' use of languages. It is crucial to cover those subcategories because they help to answer the research questions and achieve the purpose of the study.

Stakeholders' use of the languages in their domains. Three groups of stakeholders' language use vary in their domains. If the school administrators promote all three languages within the school domain, some teachers also used three languages at the classroom level, while others refused such practices. Meanwhile, the parents' group prefers to use Kazakh at home, promote English, and tend to forbid the use of Russian for home use. A strong relationship between various domains and language use has been reported in the previous literature (Ricento, 2009; Spolsky, 2007). Ricento (2009) states that individuals tend to purposefully use certain languages for different domains (e. g., schools, work, home, leisure) because of its status such as being prestigious or low-status languages.

As for this study, the findings regarding administrators' language use within school domains partially corresponds to what was found in the literature. According to Mensah (2015), school administrators are required to follow the rules set by policy initiatives. However, Nyaga and Anthonissen (2012), Probyn et al. (2002) and Shameem (2002) discovered that certain schools do not apply the languages that were prescribed by authorities. As for the practices of school administrators of this study, they seem to strictly follow the rules set by authorities, which is similar to Mensah's (2015) findings. As both of the administrators stated that they support all three languages and field notes also indicate

the presence of all three languages in a form of artefacts on the walls. A possible explanation for this is that school administrators are checked over the policy implementation by higher educational departments. Spolsky (2007) explains the administrators' such practices as being under the "control of the central government" (p. 9). In other words, schools and administrators might be regularly checked for the enactment of trilingual education within the school or they provide reports of activities related to trilingual education, therefore, obliged to use three languages. However, further research in exploring administrators' explicit practices of trilingual education within schools is needed because some studies question the extent administrators practice the required rules (Probyn et al., 2002; Shameem, 2002).

As for the language use within classroom domains, two different approaches that teachers use when teaching were disclosed: full immersion to the target language and bilingual approach where teachers used L1 to facilitate learning (Cheng et al., 2010; Jeon, 2008; Kang, 2012; Karathanos, 2009). The findings of this study fully correspond with the earlier studies that applied the bilingual approach in teaching the content through the medium of the target language. In other words, the teachers of this study stated that they purposefully used L1 to facilitate and encourage learning (Kang, 2012; Karathanos, 2009). Although the teachers of this study did not link the use of L1 when teaching through the medium of the target language with the increase of target language proficiency and "meta-cognitive process" (p. 32), they linked it with a positive impact on students' academic achievement (Tarnopolsky & Goodman, 2014). This finding confirms that L1 use when teaching through the medium of target language positively impacts the learning, encourages students, thus contributes to better academic achievement. There are several possible explanations for this result. Firstly, students may have poor language skills, thus teachers use L1 to explain the content in a more comprehensible way. Secondly, teachers

may feel anxious about their language skills, so they switch to L1 due to the poor vocabulary or speaking skills when teaching. Thirdly, teachers do not assess students' target language skills, they assess the content, therefore, the teachers may not explicitly focus on the target language proficiency. This result needs to be interpreted with caution because teachers' practices were revealed through the interviews, not through observations. Therefore, further study with more focus on the observation of teachers' practices is suggested. The next section below provides language use within home domains.

Another domain that needs an explanation for language use is – home domains. According to Branum-Martin et al. (2014), home language practices impact tri/multilingual education success or failure. As said in the literature review, language use at home has two subcategories: firstly, those who maintain their L1 and support the target language; secondly, those who shifted to the target language (Riches & Curdt-Christiansen, 2010; Tuominen, 1999 Lao, 2004). The findings of this study correspond with the first subcategory, where parents preserved their L1 and supported the target language. The parents' group of this study unanimously claimed that they use Kazak because they are Kazaks, use Kazakh to communicate with elderly people and it describes their identity and culture. Similar findings were discovered within Riches and Curdt-Christiansen (2010) and Tuominen's (1999) studies. The earlier study done by Tuominen (1999) found that some parents spoke predominantly their native language at home so children have exposure to it. A more recent study of Riches and Curdt-Christiansen (2010) disclosed that parents maintained Chinese (their L1) through providing their children with literacy resources and support as parents believed that L1 connects their children with culture and shows their identity. As for the support of the target language within homes, both studies indicated that mainly English was supported because of its "instrumental motivation" (Riches & Curdt-Christiansen, 2010, p. 549) such as pursuing higher education, better employment, and

travelling. Moreover, this study revealed that Russian was also used within homes, though, some parents tend to forbid its use at homes. On the other hand, Russian was used for social communication and social media domains as parents reported. The use of Russian for social communication and social media can be explained by the prestige of Russian over the Kazakh language. There is an ongoing debate about the status of Russian and Kazakh languages in society as one being more prestigious than the other. These results match those observed in earlier studies asserting the high status of Russian and low status of Kazakh (Brown, 2013; Dave, 1996; Smagulova, 2008). The earlier survey of Dave (1996) found that "the prestige score for Kazakh remains quite low than the one of Russian, ... for Kazakh schools as well" (p. 67). A more recent study of Smagulova (2008) has similar findings. Although the use of Russian within homes, social communication and social media seem to correlate with its prestige over the Kazakh language, these results should be interpreted with caution, because of the small sample size it cannot be generalized and claimed that Russian is used in those domains by the majority of stakeholders. Therefore, further investigation is required regarding the role and use of Russian in certain domains.

　　　　Teachers' practices of translanguaging. *T*he findings illustrate that all teachers practiced translanguaging when teaching science and history, though they were not familiar with the concept of translanguaging. They purposefully utilized Russian and/or Kazakh to explain the content which was in English and Kazakh. From the interviews, it was clear that the concept of translanguaging was not familiar for them, but, the teachers purposefully switched to the language which was convenient for the students. There were two views of such practices in the literature review. Firstly, some scholars reported that their participants applied codeswitching (Altinyelken et al. 2014; Wang & Kirkpatrick, 2013), while others used the term translanguaging (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Martínez,

Hikida, & Durán, 2015).

Overall, there are several possible explanations for such teachers' practices. Firstly, as the teachers reported themselves, students are not proficient in English, therefore, the teachers switched to Russian and/or Kazakh to facilitate their learning and understanding. The same practices were reported in the previous literature (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Hornberger & Link, 2012). In the current study, the teachers switched to students' native language or first language, to encourage and contribute students' learning. Creese and Blackledge (2010) state that teachers use of translanguaging strategy in teaching to help students to easily understand the learning process, to encourage participation and inclusion of all students regardless of their linguistic skills. Secondly, the teachers themselves might not be enough proficient in English, thus codeswitch themselves. Such issues regarding teachers' low level of language proficiency and its anxiety were stated by Irsaliyev et al. (2017b). However, these data must be interpreted with caution because the teachers were interviewed about their practices, not observed. It is one of the main limitations of this study. Therefore, further research is needed to find teachers' practices of trilingual education in classrooms using observation as one of the primary instruments.

As for the history teacher's translanguaging practices to Russian, it is the most interesting finding which corresponds with the previous literature. In this study, the teacher of the History of Kazakhstan purposefully used Russian language and teaching materials in Russian, although the history of Kazakhstan is required to be taught in Kazakh language (Road Map, 2015). The history teacher explained his/her purposeful switch to Russian by his/her willingness to prepare students for the next academic year. According to the history teacher, the school intends to use the Russian medium for teaching the World History in the next academic year. Altinyelken et al. (2014) in their study also found out that some teachers initiated such bottom-up approaches in teaching certain subjects in another

language, not waiting for the reform to be enacted. Although only one teacher initiated such bottom-up practices in this study, it is an important finding because it seems to show some teachers' awareness and readiness to new initiatives from the bottom-up. Therefore, further comparative research is needed to explore teachers' practices of trilingual education from the bottom-up approach in three different mediums of instruction, using observations as the main tool.

   Parents' use of additional resources. The parents' group unanimously expressed that they provided their children with additional resources such as private language tutoring to assist children's educational progress. As aforementioned, the majority of three groups of stakeholders associated trilingual education with the teaching of the English language. Consequently, in this study, English was the language that parents attempted to assist to facilitate learning progress at the school. These findings are consistent with those of Nunan (2003), Reichelt (2006) and Xuesong (2006), where parents send their children to private English tutoring to develop the linguistic capital of their children. The reason for such interest in acquiring English is the instrumental value of English (Curdt-Christiansen & Wang, 2018) which covers social and practical advantages of English such as being multilingual, travelling, better employment, and studying abroad (Curdt-Christiansen & Wang, 2018; Lao, 2004; Feng & Adamson, 2014; Ramos, 2007). Overall, previous empirical research and this study illustrate that most parents tend to use additional resources such as private language tutoring to facilitate their children's learning progress, to ease the educational overload, and/or better equip their children to be more competitive than others (Curdt-Christiansen & Wang, 2018; Lao, 2004; Feng & Adamson, 2014; Ramos, 2007).

   A number of possible explanations for such results can be developed. Firstly, some scholars have speculated that English being the global language has an enormous value in

the world (Crystal, 1997). The role of English is critical for higher education, travelling, and employment, thus, such perceptions regarding the role of English in society tend to impact the parents' practices in better equipping their children with appropriate knowledge. Secondly, the implementation of trilingual education may be the other reason for such parental practices. As said, the majority of all three groups of stakeholders perceived trilingual education as the teaching of the English language. Therefore, some parents as a response for such policy initiative try to provide their children with English language courses to facilitate their learning at school, to better understand the subject matter in English and/or to overcome children's foreign language anxiety. It is similar to Reichelt's (2006) analysis, where parents provided children with private language tutoring to be ahead of others. It is also true that the private English tutoring sector appears to be not investigated in Kazakhstan, as Bray (1999), it is the shadow of the Kazakhstani educational system. However, with small sample size, caution must be applied, as the findings might not be transferable to all parents from rural areas. A further study with more focus on such parental practices and the bigger sample size is therefore suggested.

The stakeholders' concerns regarding trilingual education provision at the school. All three groups of stakeholders mostly positive about trilingual education at the school, but expressed certain concerns. Those concerns mostly related to the school infrastructure, course books, and teaching staff. All three groups of stakeholders unanimously considered the school infrastructure such as the absence of scientific laboratories, lack of rooms and teachers' room, overcrowded classrooms, old building as the major issues in providing trilingual education.

One unanticipated finding was that all three groups of stakeholders did not consider rural-urban differences as a problem. Therefore, some findings of the current study do not support the previous research. Nunan (2003) and Oladejo (2006) found that

stakeholders were mostly concerned with the education quality within rural schools, claiming rural children fall behind of urban ones because of rural-urban school differences in providing facilities. Such stakeholders' concerns were explained by Altinyelken et al. (2014) and Wang (2008) who found that multilingual education poorly functioned in rural schools than in urban schools because of the improper facilities of the rural schools. It is difficult to explain such inconsistency of the findings, but it might be explained in the following ways. Although the research site of the current study is located in the rural area, it is a part of megapolis Almaty, approximately an hour drive from the city, thus, it might impact stakeholders.

On the other hand, the following findings support those observed in earlier studies. In this study, all three groups of stakeholders unanimously considered the school infrastructure such as the absence of scientific laboratories, lack of rooms and teachers' room, overcrowded classrooms, old building as the major issues in providing trilingual education. The studies done by Altinyelken et al. (2014) and Lao (2004) found that stakeholders were concerned with poor resources such as classrooms for providing multilingual education in rural areas. In other contexts, teachers faced difficulties with teaching materials and provision of course books needed to teach within multilingual education (Bahous et al., 2011; Jian, 2013; Negron, 2015). However, the findings of this study are not as much deplorable as in the above literature. Although the school building is old and was built as a hospital, from the interview it was observed that all three groups of stakeholders managed to teach there. As for the absence of the course books, it was solved by the parents' sponsorship. A possible explanation for these findings may be the lack of adequate funding and poor work of educational departments in providing schools with adequate infrastructure and facilities (Irsaliyev et al. 2017b). Thus, further research may be required to investigate departments' contribution to schools that provide trilingual

education.

Similarities and/or Differences in Stakeholders' Perceptions

This section of a discussion represents the answers to the third research question that seeks for similarities and/or differences in stakeholders' perceptions. In this study, the vast majority of all three groups of stakeholders understood trilingual education as teaching English. It corresponds with the studies done by Sheffer (2003), Lee (1999) and Shin and Krashen (1996), where respondents misunderstood the tri/multilingual education perceiving it mostly as an English immersion program. As for the stakeholders' views of/on the role of three languages, some similarities and differences occurred. The greater number of stakeholders unanimously perceived Kazakh as their mother-tongue that reflects their culture and history (GuatPoh et al. 2017; Riches & Curdt-Christiansen, 2010). All three groups of stakeholders had similar perceptions of the role of English. It was perceived as the beneficial language for education, better employment, and travelling (Curdt-Christiansen & Wang, 2018; Lao, 2004; Ramos, 2007; Shin, 2000; Young & Tran, 1999). On the other hand, the role of Russian was perceived differently by stakeholders. If the parents' group considered Russian as a language for communication and social media (Sabitova & Alishariyeva, 2015), the teachers and administrators viewed it as the language of interethnic communication (Nazarbayev, 2007). The stakeholders' responses regarding the time for introducing trilingual education differed. The majority of all three groups considered the early introduction as significant for education (Chung, 2008, Griva & Chouvarda, 2012; Enever & Moon, 2009), while, a few teachers and parents opted for mother-tongue based primary education (Oladejo, 2006). This triangulation of data sources shows that trilingual education was differently understood by three groups of stakeholders which might further impact the success and/or hindrances of its implementation, though

some similarities in their perceptions occurred. Therefore, further research is needed to explore the factors that affect stakeholders' perceptions of trilingual education.

Answers to the Research Questions

This section presents the answers to the research questions in order to explore whether the research purpose has been achieved and research questions answered. The discussion of the findings above is utilized to answer the research question.

RQ 1: How do the stakeholders perceive trilingual education. The answer to this research question is based on the following findings that were obtained from the data analysis: *stakeholders' understanding of the concept of trilingual education* (Findings 1), *stakeholders' perceptions of the role of three languages (Finding 2)* and *stakeholders' views towards the time of introducing trilingual education* (Finding 3). The majority of all participants positively perceived trilingual education, though a few respondents had negative views. The findings suggest that the greater number of all stakeholders perceived trilingual education as the teaching of the English language. The stakeholders' perceptions of trilingual education were impacted by the roles each language played: Kazakh was perceived as a mother-tongue, Russian as the language for communication and media, and English for education and employment. The majority of all three groups of stakeholders were satisfied with the current introduction of trilingual education and its language components. Overall, these findings propose that the researcher has answered the research question. The majority of three groups of stakeholders perceived trilingual education as teaching English and preferred the early introduction of language components of trilingual education.

RQ 2: How do the stakeholders practice trilingual education? The answer to this research question is based on the following findings: *stakeholders' use of the languages in their domains, teachers' practices of translanguaging, parents use of*

additional resources, and *stakeholders' concerns regarding trilingual education*. The findings show that all three languages were used in all domains, though, the use of Russian was neglected by some teachers and parents. It was mostly the school administrators who supported the use of three languages. Within classroom domains, the teachers practiced translanguaging to assist students and ease the education load. This finding answers to the second research question because teachers' practices of translanguaging are one of the widely used teaching practices in multilingual education (Garcia, 2009). Furthermore, all parents were providing their children with additional resources such as private language tutoring. The parents explained it as a desire to help, ease and support the education of their children. All participants shared certain concerns regarding trilingual education such as the school's poor infrastructure and course-book provision which impacts its practice at the school. Overall, the findings suggest that the school administrators promoted the use of three languages in the school, the teachers and parents practiced different strategies to facilitate students' education process within trilingual education.

RQ 3: How similar or different are the stakeholders' perceptions? The greater number of all participants had similar perceptions regarding trilingual education, it was perceived as the teaching of English. Similarly, English was unanimously perceived as the language of education, employment, and travel by all three groups of stakeholders. On the contrary, the role of Kazakh and Russian was considered differently. As for Kazakh, all three groups of stakeholders declared Kazakh to be their mother-tongue. Moreover, the parents regarded Kazakh important for official jobs and a tool for communication with elderly people, meanwhile, the teachers and administrators believed that Kazakh restricts access to the world. The role of Russian was differently understood by three groups of stakeholders, too. The parents' group perceived it as the language for media, whereas, the teachers and administrators accepted it as the language of interethnic communication. As

for the time of introducing trilingual education, the vast majority of stakeholders agreed with the current introduction of the language components of trilingual education. Such data triangulation shows that trilingual education differently perceived by three groups of stakeholders and such misunderstandings seem to impact their practices. For example, as the second research question answered, the use of Russian is being neglected by some stakeholders in certain domains.

The purpose of this chapter was to provide a discussion of the main findings. The discussion chapter started with an introduction section that covered research purpose and research questions. Then, the chapter presented two major categories: stakeholders' perceptions and practices of trilingual education, respectively. In order to achieve the research purpose and answer the research questions, it was significant to discuss and interpret those findings. Finally, the last section of the discussion chapter structurally answered the research questions. The next chapter Conclusion synthesizes the prior chapters, considers the further recommendations, and limitations of the study.

Conclusion

The previous chapters presented the introduction, literature review, methodology, findings and discussion chapters of the thesis. The variety of relevant literature on multilingual education from international and national contexts was analysed, covering key concepts and aspects related to various groups of stakeholders' perceptions and practices of multilingual education. The purpose of this chapter is to summarize all the obtained findings coinciding with the research purpose and research questions. Moreover, this chapter presents the limitations of the study and implications for the practices of trilingual education.

Various groups of stakeholders' misunderstanding of trilingual education and poor school condition within rural regions motivated the researcher to conduct this study because misunderstanding and poor facilities might impact stakeholders' practices. The purpose of this study was to explore various groups of stakeholders' perceptions and practices of trilingual education. To achieve this research purpose, the study was guided by three research questions: 1. How do these stakeholders perceive trilingual education? 2. How do these stakeholders practice trilingual education? 3. How similar or different are the stakeholders' perceptions? The qualitative approach with the case study design was applied in order to answer these research questions. The data collection instrument was semi-structured, one-on-one interviews. The overall sample included ten participants: parents, teachers and school administrators from one rural school in Almaty Oblast.

Overall, the study findings suggest that rural school stakeholders' perceptions of trilingual education are important because the number of rural schools outweigh the number of urban ones (Irsaliyev et al., 2017a). This study revealed that three groups of stakeholders' perceptions were dissimilar and their practices of trilingual education varied, too. The majority of all three groups of stakeholders considered trilingual education as

teaching English, some of them believed it to be the teaching of three languages, only one teacher's view corresponded with the accepted explanation of trilingual education in Kazakhstan, which is teaching in three languages. As for the practices of trilingual education, three languages were used to some extent by all participants. The administrators promoted the use of three languages within the school domain, meanwhile, some teachers used three languages in the classroom, and few teachers ignored the use of Russian. As for the parents' language use, it was also revealed that Russian was omitted by parents within home domains. Moreover, for the purposes of facilitating students' academic achievement, ease education overload and assist students, the teachers and parents used certain practices: the teachers practiced translanguaging, while parents provided their children with private language tutoring. Despite achieving the purpose of the study and answering the research questions, the study had some limitations presented below.

Limitations

While achieving the research purpose and answering the research questions, the study has a number of limitations. Those limitations mostly concern the methodological aspects of the study. The first limitation relates to small sample size. Ten participants were interviewed in the scope of this research: three – parents, five – teachers, two – school administrators. Although the study applied a case study design that does not aim at generalizing its findings to all rural schools, the sample size is still small compared to the whole research site population. It would be better to interview more parents of the school whose children study under the frame of trilingual education; and teachers that provide trilingual education in order to make more reliable its findings with the research site population. The second limitation relates to the data collection instrument. As the purpose of the study was to explore various stakeholders' perceptions and practices of trilingual education, it could have been more reliable to employ observation as an additional

instrument for data collection to investigate the stakeholders' practices in their domains. However, due to the limited allocated time for data collection and the small-scale nature of the research, this study utilized a single instrument – interviews. The interviews mostly focus on participants' memory, therefore, when talking about their practices the stakeholders could have reported wrong information. However, to avoid such discrepancies, the researcher applied probes and the member checked the respondents' answers. Collectively, those limitations of the study suggest that similar studies could be conducted with more research participants and using observations as an additional data collection tool.

Implications for Practices

This section of the conclusion chapter provides the implications for practices and further research. The findings of the study revealed that the majority of the three groups of stakeholders perceived trilingual education as the teaching of English. Such misunderstanding of the concept of trilingual education helps us to understand that there is a lack of collaboration among policymakers and rural school stakeholders. A possible solution for such issues is creating communication and information channels where the policymakers can explain trilingual education implementation processes and especially, rural school stakeholders can collaborate to discuss certain issues, share experiences, and speak about the expected outcomes of trilingual education. However, policymakers should take into account that such channels should not be carried out as a mandatory task for all stakeholders, as, otherwise it could get opposite results. Before establishing such educational platforms, it is advisable to conduct studies in exploring the most suitable mode where various stakeholders can exchange their ideas. After establishing such communication and information channels comparative studies could have been carried out

to investigate its effectiveness and impact on policy implementation, and if needed to make some changes.

Another implication for practices concerns the teachers and school administrators. As found in the study, the teachers misunderstood the concept of trilingual education that may further impact their teaching practices, therefore, it is advisable to establish in-service and pre-service teacher training. Although such teacher training courses exist in Kazakhstan, it mostly focuses on the content matter rather than the trilingual education implementing process. The findings revealed that the school administrators also misunderstood trilingual education, thus there is a need for establishing developmental courses for leadership in trilingual education. Such developmental courses would facilitate the stakeholders' understandings of trilingual education, teaching and leadership practices, and successful policy implementation. However, further qualitative and longitudinal research is required to find out what factors impact teachers and administrators' (mis)understandings of trilingual education.

References

Adamson, B., & Feng, A. (2009). A comparison of trilingual education policies for ethnic

    minorities in China. *A Journal of Comparative and International*

    Education, 39(3), 321-333. doi:10.1080/03057920802436258

Altinyelken, H. K., Moorcroft, S., & Draai, H. (2014). The dilemmas and complexities of

    implementing language-in- education policies: Perspectives from urban and rural

    contexts in Uganda. *International Journal of Educational Development, 36*, 90–99.

    doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2013.11.001

Ayazbayeva, N. (2017). Language policy, ideology and practice: parents' views on the

    trilingual policy (Master's thesis, Nazarbayev University). Retrieved from

    https://nur.nu.edu.kz

Bahous, R., Bacha, N. N., & Nabhani, M. (2011). Multilingual educational trends and

    practices in Lebanon: A case study. *International Review of Education, 57*(5-6),

    737-749. DOI 10.1007/sl 1159-01 1-9250-8

Bardel, C., & Falk, Y. (2007). The role of the second language in third language

    acquisition: the case of Germanic syntax. *Second Language Research, 23*(4), 459-

    484. doi.org/10.1177/0267658307080557

Basurto, I., Wise, D., & Unruh, R. (2006). California School Principals' Perceptions of the

    Effects of Proposition 227. *Educational Leadership and Administration 18*.

    Retrieved from www.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ795108.pdf

Bell, J. (2003). Doing your Research Project: A guide for first-time researchers in

    education, health and social science. (4th ed.). New York, NY: Open University

    Press.

belief. (2002). In A. Flew (Ed.), *A dictionary of philosophy, MacMillan* (3rd ed.).

Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan Publishers Ltd. Retrieved from

http://ezproxy.nu.edu.kz

Björklund, S. (2005). Toward Trilingual Education in Vaasa/Vasa, Finland. Trilingual

Education in Europe. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 171*, 23-

40. doi:10.1515/ijsl.2005.2005.171.23

Bostwick, M. (2001). English language immersion in Japanese schools. In D. Christian &

F. Genesee, (Edc.). Bilingual education (pp 125-138). Aleksandra: TESOL

Branum-Martin, L., Mehta, P. D., Carlson, C. D., Francis, D. J., & Goldenberg, C. (2014).

The nature of Spanish versus English language use at home. *Journal of Educational

Psychology*, *106*(1), 181. doi.org/10.1037/a0033931

Braun, A. (2012). Language maintenance in trilingual families – a focus on grandparents.

International Journal of Multilingualism, 9(4), 423-436. doi:

10.1080/14790718.2012.714384

Bray, T. M. (1999). *The shadow education system: Private tutoring and its implications for

planners*. UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning.

Brohy, C. (2005). Trilingual Education in Switzerland. *International journal of the

sociology of language, 171*, 133-148. Retrieved from

https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=6813578

Brown, K. D. (2013). Language policy and education: Space and place in multilingual

post-Soviet states. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *33*, 238-257.

doi.org/10.1017/S0267190513000093

Cenoz, J. (2003). The additive effect of bilingualism on third language acquisition: A

review. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 7*(1), 71-87.

doi.org/10.1177/13670069030070010501

Cenoz, J. (2008). Achievements and challenges in bilingual and multilingual education in the Basque Country. *Aila Review*, *21*(1), 13-30. doi.org/10.1075/aila.21.03cen

Cenoz, J. (2009). *Towards multilingual education: Basque educational research from an international perspective.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Cenoz, L., Hufeisen, B., & Jessner, U. (2001). Towards Trilingual Education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 4(*1), 1-10. doi: 10.1080/13670050108667714

Cheng, L., Li, M., Kirby, R., Qiang, H., & Woolley, L. (2010). English language immersion and students' academic achievement in English, Chinese and mathematics. *Evaluation & Research in Education, 23*(3), 151-169. doi:10.1080/09500790.2010.489150

Chung, Y. F. (2008). Parents' Attitudes toward the English Education Policy in Taiwan. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 9(4),* 423-435. Retrieved from link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF03025660

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). Research methods in education (7th ed.). Abington, Oxon: Routledge.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian modern language review*, *57*(3), 402-423.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The modern language journal*, *94*(1), 103-115.

Creswell, J. (2014). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research: International edition (4th ed.).* Boston: Pearson.

Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2009). Invisible and visible language planning: Ideological

 factors in the family language policy of Chinese immigrant families in Quebec.

 Language policy, 8(4), 351-375. doi.org/10.1007/s10993-009

Curdt-Christiansen, X.L., & Wang, W. (2018). Parents as agents of multilingual education:

 Family language planning in China. Language, *Culture and Curriculum, 31*(3), 1–

 18. doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2018.1504394

Cummins, J. (1999). The Ethics of Doublethink: Language Rights and the Bilingual

 Education Debate. TESOL Journal, 8(3), 13-17. Doi:10.1002/j.1949-

 3533.1999.tb00188.x

Dalton-Puffer, C., & Smit, U. (2013). Content and language integrated learning: A research

 agenda. *Language Teaching, 46*(4), 545-559. doi:10.1017/S0261444813000256

Dave, B. (1996). National Revival in Kazakhstan: Language Shift and Identity Change.

 P*ost-Soviet Affairs, 12*(1), 51-72. doi:10.1080/1060586X.1996.10641415

Dechert, H. W. (1995). Some critical remarks concerning Penfield's theory of second

 language acquisition. *The age factor in second language acquisition: A critical look

 at the critical period hypothesis*, 67-94.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Introduction: The discipline and practice of

 qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Handbook of

 qualitative research* (pp. 1-32). California: Sage Publications.

domain. (2008). In D. Crystal, *Language library: A dictionary of linguistics and

 phonetics* (6th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.nu.edu.kz:

Edwards, R., & Holland, J (2013). What is qualitative interviewing? Bloomsbury

 Academic. pp. 2–3. ISBN 9781849668095. Retrieved from

 http://eprints.ncrm.ac.uk/

Enever, J., & Moon, J. (2009). New global contexts for teaching primary ELT: Change and

challenge. In J. Enever, J. Moon, & U. Raman (Eds.), *Young learner English language policy and implementation: International perspectives* (pp. 5–21). Reading, UK: Garnet Education.

Feng, A., & Adamson, B. (Eds.). (2014). Trilingualism in education in China: Models and challenges (Vol. 12). Springer

Gaipov, D., Yaylaci, Y., Çiğ, K., & Guvercin, S. (2013). Formation of multilingual educational system in Kazakhstan: Kazakh-Turkish high schools. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 103*, 416-424. Retrieved from www.sciencedirect.com

García, O. (2009). Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century. In: A. Mohanty, M. Panda, R. Phillipson & T. Skutnabb-Kangas (eds). *Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the local* (pp. 128-145). New Delhi: Orient Blackswan.

Genesee, F., & Lambert, W. (1983). Trilingual Education for Majority-Language Children. *Child Development, 54*(1), 105-114. doi:10.2307/1129867

Griva, E., & Chouvarda, P. (2012). Developing Plurilingual Children: Parents' Beliefs and Attitudes towards English Language Learning and Multilingual Learning. *World Journal of English Language*, *2*(3). doi:10.5430/wjel.v2n3p1.

GuatPoh, A., Lum, C., Xuan-hui, P., Yuan, C., & Qi-ying, T. (2017). A pilot study of Singapore's Young Chinese Parents' Perceptions, attitudes, and behaviours towards bilingual education. *English Teaching, 14*(9), 523-538. doi:10.17265/1539-8072/2017.09.001

Guryan, J., Hurst, E., & Kearney, M. (2008). Parental education and parental time with children. *Journal of Economic perspectives*, *22*(3), 23-46. doi: 10.1257/jep.22.3.23

Hamilton, L., & Corbett-Whittier, C. (2013). *Using case study in education research.* London, UK. SAGE Publication Ltd.

Henn-Reinke, K. (2012). *Considering trilingual education.* Routledge.

Hochberg, J. (1956). Perception: toward the recovery of a definition. P*sychological review, 63*(6), 400-405. doi.org/10.1037/h0046193

Hochberg, J., & Hochberg, J. (2010). Perception. In W. E. Craighead, & C. B. Nemeroff (Eds.), The Corsini encyclopedia of psychology and behavioral science (4th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.nu.edu.kz

Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., & Sandler, H. M. (1995). Parental involvement in children's education: Why does it make a difference? *Teachers college record, 97*(2), 310-331.

Hornberger, N., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging in Today's Classrooms: A Biliteracy Lens. *Theory into Practice, 51*(4), 239-247. doi: 10.1080/00405841.2012.726051

Imenda, S. (2014). Is There a Conceptual Difference between Theoretical and Conceptual Frameworks? *Journal of Social Sciences*, 38(2), 185-189**.** doi.org/10.1080/09718923.2014.11893249

Irsaliyev, S., Kultumanova, A., Tulekov, E., Buldybaev, T., Nurmuhametova, Zh., Kussidenova, G., & Ismurzina, G. (2017a). National report on the state and development of educational system of the Republic of Kazakhstan. (for the years of Independence of Kazakhstan) Astana. JSC "IAC".

Irsaliyev, S., Karabassova, L., Mukhametzhanova, A., Adil, A., Bekova, M., & Nurlanov, Y. (2017b). *Teaching in three languages: International experience and recommendations for Kazakhstan*. Astana, JSC Information Analytic Center.

Iyldyz, L. (2017). Trilingual education policy in secondary schools in Kazakhstan: teachers' beliefs and classroom practices. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Nazarbayev University), Nur-Sultan.

Jeon, I. J. (2008). Korean EFL teachers' beliefs of English-only instruction. *English Teaching*, *63*(3), 205-229. Retrieved from kate.bada.cc.

Jian, H. (2013). Factors Influencing the Trilingual Education in Leshan Ebian Yi Autonomous County. *English Language Teaching, 6(6)*. doi:10.5539/elt.v6n6p148

Juffermans, K. (2013). Trilingual education in Luxembourg: A model for Brussels? [PDF file]. Retrieved from http://www.marnixplan.org/IMG/pdf/kasper_juffermans_mp_inaugural.pdf

Kang, H. S. (2012). English-only instruction at Korean universities: Help or hindrance to higher learning? *English Today*, *28*(1), 29-34. doi.org/10.1017/S0266078411000654

Karabassova, L. (2018). Teachers' conceptualization of content and language integrated learning (CLIL): evidence from a trilingual context. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1550048

Karathanos, K. (2009). Exploring US mainstream teachers' perspectives on use of the native language in instruction with English language learner students, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 12*(6), 615-633. doi: 10.1080/13670050802372760

Law on Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan (2007). Retrieved from https://online.zakon.kz/document/?doc_id=30118747#pos=7;-247

Law on Languages of the Republic of Kazakhstan. (1997). Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan effective from July 11, 1997, N 151-I. Retrieved from http://online.zakon.kz/Document/?doc_id=1008034#pos=12;-285

Lao, C. (2004). Parents' Attitudes Toward Chinese–English Bilingual Education and Chinese-Language Use. *Bilingual Research Journal: The Journal of the National*

Association for Bilingual Education, 28(1), 99-121. doi:

10.1080/15235882.2004.10162614

Laws, S. (2003) *Research for Development: A Practical Guide*. London: Sage.

Lee, S. K. (1999). The Linguistic Minority Parents' Perceptions of Bilingual Education.

Bilingual Research Journal, 23(2), 199-210, doi:

10.1080/15235882.1999.10668686

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Origins and development from

school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation: An*

International Journal on Theory and Practice, *18*, 641–654.

doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718488

Lenneberg, E.H. (1967). *Biological Foundations of Language. Wiley. ISBN 978-0-89874-*

700-3.

Liao, P. (2007). Teachers' beliefs about teaching English to Elementary School children.

English Teaching & Learning, 31(1), 43-76. doi:10.6330/ETL.2007.31.1.02

Magiste, E. (1984). Learning a third language. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural*

Development, 5(5), 415-421. doi: 10.1080/01434632.1984.9994170

Manan, S. A., Dumanig, F. P., & David, M. K. (2017). The English-medium fever in

Pakistan: Analyzing policy, perceptions and practices through additive

bi/multilingual education lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and*

Bilingualism, 20(6), 736-752. doi: 10.1080/13670050.2015.1080659

Marshall, B., Cardon, P., Poddar, A., & Fontenot, R. (2013). Does sample size matter in

qualitative research?: A review of qualitative interviews in is research. *Journal of*

Computer Information Systems, 54(1), 11-22. doi:

10.1080/08874417.2013.11645667

Martínez, R., Hikida, M., & Durán, L. (2015). Unpacking Ideologies of Linguistic Purism:

How Dual Language Teachers Make Sense of Everyday Translanguaging. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 9*(1), 26-42. doi: 10.1080/19313152.2014.977712

Matuszkiewicz, R. (2010). The language issue in Kazakhstan–institutionalizing new ethnic relations after independence. *Economic and environmental studies, 10*(2), 211-227. Retrieved from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org

Mehisto, P., Kambatyrova, A., & Nurseitova, K. (2014). Three in One? Trilingualism in Policy and Educational Practice. In D. Bridges (Ed.), *Educational reform and internationalisation: The case of school reform in Kazakhstan* (pp. 152-176). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Menken, K., & Solorza, C. (2013). Where have all the bilingual programs gone?!: Why prepared school leaders are essential for bilingual education. J*ournal of multilingual education research, 4*(1), 3. Retrieved from //fordham.bepress.com/jmer/vol4/iss1/3

Menken, K., & Solorza, C. (2015). Principals as linchpins in bilingual education: The need for prepared school leaders. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 18*(6), 676–697. doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2014.937390

Mensah, H. (2015). Language policy in a multilingual school: the case of Windhoek International School in Namibia. *International journal of humanities and cultural studies,* ISSN 2356-5926. 2. 290-406.

Mensah, H. A., & Anthonissen, C. (2016). Language policy in a multilingual school: the case of Windhoek International School in Namibia. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies (IJHCS) ISSN 2356-5926*, *2*(1), 390-406.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education.

  Revised and Expanded from" Case Study Research in Education.". Jossey-Bass

  Publishers, 350 Sansome St, San Francisco, CA 94104.

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and*

  implementation. San Francisco, USA, Jossey-Bass

Meijer, P. C., Verloop, N., & Beijaard, D. (2002). Multi-method triangulation in a

  qualitative study on teachers' practical knowledge: An attempt to increase internal

  validity. *Quality and quantity*, *36*(2), 145-167. doi.org/10.1023/A:1014984232147

Milroy, L., & Muysken, P. (1995). One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary

  perspectives on code-switching. New York, USA: Cambridge University Press.

MoC (Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Kazakhstan). (2011). State Programme for

  Development and Functioning of Languages in the Republic of Kazakhstan for

  2011-2020 (2011). Retrieved from http://strategy2050.kz/en/page/gosprog5/

MoES (Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan). (2010). State

  Program of Education Development in the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2011-2020.

  Astana. Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

MoES (Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan). (2015). Road

  Map of Trilingual Education Development for 2015-2020. Retrieved from

  http://nao.kz/loader/fromorg/2

MoES (Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan). (2016). State

  Program of Education and Science Development in the Republic of Kazakhstan for

  2016-2019. Astana. Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of

  Kazakhstan.

Moon, J. (2000). *Children learning English*. Oxford: Macmillan Heinemann.

Muñoz, C. (2010). On how age affects foreign language learning. *Advances in research on language acquisition and teaching*, 39-49. Retrieved from www.enl.auth.gr

Nazarbayev, N. A. (2007). New Kazakhstan in a new world: Address by the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan N. Nazarbayev to the People of Kazakhstan. Retrieved from http://www.akorda.kz

Nazarbayev, N. A. (2012). Address by the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Leader of the Nation, N. A. Nazarbayev "Strategy Kazakhstan-2050": New political course of the established state. Retrieved from http://strategy2050.kz/en/page/message_text/

Nazarbayev, N. A. (2015). The Nation's Plan "100 concrete steps set out by President Nursultan Nazarbayev to implement the five institutional reforms". (20 May 2015). Retrieved from http://www.kazembassy.org.uk/en/pages/page/82

Negron, D. (2015). Bilingual education: Selected principal's experiences with programs at their schools (Dissertation). Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/2142/87993

Nikolov, M., & Djigunović, J. M. (2011). All shades of every colour: An overview of early teaching and learning of foreign languages. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *31*, 95-119. doi:10.1017/S0267190511000183

Nunan, D. (2003). The impact of English as a global language on educational policies and practices in the Asia-Pacific Region. *TESOL quarterly, 37*(4), 589-613. doi.org/10.2307/3588214

Nyaga, S., & Anthonissen, C. (2012). Teaching in linguistically diverse classrooms: difficulties in the implementation of the language-in-education policy in multilingual Kenyan primary school classrooms, *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 42*(6), 863-879. doi: 10.1080/03057925.2012.707457

Oattes, H., Oostdam, R., Graaff, R., & Wilschut, A. (2018). The challenge of balancing

content and language: Perceptions of Dutch bilingual education history teachers.

Teaching and Teacher Education 70, 165-174. doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.11.022

Oladejo, J. (2006). Parents' Attitudes Towards Bilingual Education Policy in Taiwan.

*Bilingual Research Journal: The Journal of the National Association for Bilingual

Education, 30*(1), 147-170. doi: 10.1080/15235882.2006.10162870

Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing

named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review, 6*(3),

281-307.

Othman, J., & Kiely, R. (2016). Preservice teachers' beliefs and practices in teaching

English to young learners. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *6*(1), 50-59.

doi:10.17509/ijal.v6i1.2661.

Padron, Y., & Waxman, H.C. (2016). Investigating principals' knowledge and perceptions

of second language programs for English language learners. *International Journal

of Educational Leadership and Management, 4*(2), 127-146. doi:

10.17583/ijelm.2016.1706

Park, H., Byun, S. Y., & Kim, K. K. (2011). Parental involvement and students' cognitive

outcomes in Korea: Focusing on private tutoring. *Sociology of Education*, *84*(1), 3-

22. doi.org/10.1177/0038040710392719

Park, S. M., & Sarkar, M. (2007). Parents' attitudes toward heritage language maintenance

for their children and their efforts to help their children maintain the heritage

language: A case study of Korean-Canadian immigrants. *Language, Culture and

Curriculum, 20*(3), 223-235, doi: 10.2167/lcc337.0

Pastor, A. M. (2009). Policy and Practice in Madrid Multilingual Schools. *Theory into

Practice, 48*(4), 258-266, doi: 10.1080/00405840903192649

Patton, M.Q. (2015) *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Thousand

    Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Pavlenko, A. (2006). Russian as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 26,*

    78-99. doi:10.1017/S0267190506000055

Pawan, F., & Ortloff, J. H. (2011). Sustaining collaboration: English-as-a-second-

    language, and content-area teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(2), 463-

    471.

Perception. (1993). In K. McLeish (Ed.), *Bloomsbury guide to human thought*. London,

    UK: Bloomsbury. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.nu.edu.kz

Perception. (2001). In A. P. Iannone, *Dictionary of world philosophy*. London, UK:

    Routledge. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.nu.edu.kz

Perception. (2011). In B. Sandywell, Dictionary of visual discourse: a dialectical lexicon of

    terms. Surrey, UK: Ashgate Publishing. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.nu.edu.kz

Probyn, M., Murray, S., Botha, L., Botya, P., & Westphal, V. (2002). Minding the gaps-an

    investigation into language policy and practice in four Eastern Cape districts: Many

    languages in education: issues of implementation. *Perspectives in education, 20*(1),

    29-46. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net

Punch, K. (2005). Introduction to social research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches

    (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications

Ramos, F. (2007). What Do Parents Think of Two-Way Bilingual Education? An Analysis

    of Responses. *Journal of Latinos and education, 6*(2), 139–150.

    doi:/abs/10.1080/15348430701304807

Reichelt, M. (2006). English in a multilingual Spain. *English Today*, *22*(3), 3-9.

    doi.org/10.1017/S0266078406003026

Ricento, T. (Ed.). (2009). *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method*. John

   Wiley & Sons.

Riches, C., & Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2010). A Tale of Two Montréal Communities:

   Parents' Perspectives on Their Children's Language and Literacy Development in a

   Multilingual Context. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 66*(4), 525–555.

   doi:10.3138/cmlr.66.4.525

Roothooft, H. (2017). Primary teachers' beliefs about teaching English to young

   learners. PULSO. *Revista de Educación, 40*, 211-225.

Rothman, J. (2008). Why All Counter-Evidence to the Critical Period Hypothesis in

   Second Language Acquisition Is not Equal or Problematic. *Language and*

   Linguistics Compass, 2. 1063-1088. doi:10.1111/j.1749-818X.2008.00098.x

Sabitova, Z., & Alishariyeva, A. (2015). The Russian language in Kazakhstan: status and

   functions. *Russian Journal of Communication, 7*(2), 213-217.

   doi:10.1080/19409419.2015.1044877

Sanz, C. (2000). Bilingual education enhances third language acquisition: Evidence from

   Catalonia. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 21*(1), 23-44. Retrieved from

   https://www.cambridge.org

Shameem, N. (2002). Classroom Language Use in a Multilingual Community: The Indo-

   Fijians in Fiji. *Journal of Intercultural Studies, 23*(3), 267-284. doi:

   10.1080/07256860216388

Shameem, N. (2004). Language Attitudes in Multilingual Primary Schools in Fiji.

   Language, Culture and Curriculum, 17(2), 154-172. doi:

   10.1080/07908310408666690

Shannon, S. M., & Milian, M. (2002). Parents Choose Dual Language Programs in

   Colorado: A Survey. *Bilingual Research Journal, 26*(3), 681-696.

doi:10.1080/15235882.2002.10162584

Sheffer, C. S. (2003). Parents' Lack of Understanding of Their Children's Bilingual

Education Program. *Bilingual Research Journal, 27*(2), 333-341. doi:

10.1080/15235882.2003.10162809

Shin, F. H., & Krashen, S. (1996). Teacher Attitudes Toward the Principles of Bilingual

Education and Toward Students' Participation in Bilingual Programs: Same or

Different? *Bilingual Research Journal: The Journal of the National Association for*

Bilingual Education, 20(1), 45-53. doi: 10.1080/15235882.1996.10668619

Shin, F.H. (2000). Parent Attitudes Toward the Principles of Bilingual Education and their

Children's Participation in Bilingual Programs. *Journal of Intercultural Studies,*

21(1). 93-99. doi: 10.1080/07256860050000812

Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. London:

Blackwell.

Singleton, D. (2005). The Critical Period Hypothesis: A coat of many colours.

In*ternational*

review of applied linguistics in language teaching, 43(4), 269-285.

doi.org/10.1515/iral.2005.43.4.269

Skinnari, K., & Nikula, T. (2017). Teachers' perceptions on the changing role of language

in the curriculum. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics, 5(2),* 223-244.

doi:10.1515/eujal-2017-0005

Smagulova, J. (2005). On the likelihood of language conflict in Kazakhstan. In H.

Coleman (Ed.), National development, education and language in Central Asia and

beyond (pp. 38–44). Tashkent: British Council.

Smagulova, J. (2008). Language Policies of Kazakhization and Their Influence on

Language Attitudes and Use. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and*

Bilingualism, 11(3), 440-475. doi:10.1080/13670050802148798

Spolsky, B. (2007). Towards a theory of language policy. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics (WPEL), 22*(1), 1. Retrieved from repository.upenn.edu/wpel/vol22/iss1/1/

Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research.* Sage Publications

Sui-Chu, E. H., & Willms, J. D. (1996). Effects of parental involvement on eighth-grade achievement. *Sociology of education*, *69*(2). 126-141. doi:10.2307/2112802

Sutton, M., & Levinson, B. (2001). *Policy as practice toward a comparative sociocultural analysis of educational policy.* Stamford, CT: Ablex Publishing.

Tarnopolsky, O. B., & Goodman, B. O. (2014). The ecology of language in classrooms at a university in eastern Ukraine. *Language and Education, 28*(4), 383-396. doi: 10.1080/09500782.2014.890215

Tuominen, A. (1999). Who decides the home language? A look at multilingual families. *International journal of the sociology of language, 140*(1), 59-76. doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.1999.140.59

Wang, H. (2008). Language policy implementation: A look at teachers' perceptions. *The Asian EFL Journal, 30,* 1-25. Retrieved from https://www.asian-efl-journal.com

Wang, H., & Cheng, L. (2009). Factors Affecting Teachers' Curriculum Implementation. *Linguistics Journal, 4*(2), 135–166. Retrieved from https://search.ebscohost.com

Wang, L., & Kirkpatrick, A. (2013) Trilingual education in Hong Kong primary schools: a case study. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 16*(1), 100-116. doi: 10.1080/13670050.2012.689479

Xhaferi, B., & Xhaferi, G. (2012). Teachers' perceptions of multilingual education and

    teaching in a multilingual classroom - the case of the Republic of Macedonia.

    Jezikislovie, 13(2). 679-696. Retrieved from https://hrcak.srce.hr

Xuesong, G. (2006). Strategies used by Chinese parents to support English language

    learning: Voices of 'elite'university students. *RELC Journal, 37*(3), 285-298. doi

    10.1177/0033688206071302

Yakavets, N. (2014). Reforming society through education for gifted children: the case of

    Kazakhstan. *Research Papers in Education, 29*(5), 513-533. doi:

    10.1080/02671522.2013.825311

Young, R. L., & Tran, M. T. (1999) Vietnamese Parent Attitudes Toward Bilingual

    Education. *Bilingual Research Journal: The Journal of the National Association

    for Bilingual Education, 23*(2), 225-233, DOI: 10.1080/15235882.1999.10668688

Ytsma, J. (2001). Towards a Typology of Trilingual Primary Education. *International

    Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 4*(1), 11-22. doi:

    10.1080/13670050108667715

Yurdakul, B. (2015). Perceptions of Elementary School Teachers Concerning the Concept

    of Curriculum. Educational Sciences: *Theory and Practice, 15*(1), 125-139.

    Retrieved from http://www.estp.com.tr

Zhang, D., & Slaughter-Defoe, D. T. (2009). Language attitudes and heritage language

    maintenance among Chinese immigrant families in the USA. *Language, Culture

    and Curriculum, 22*(2), 77-93. doi: 10.1080/07908310902935940

Zharkynbekova, S., Aimoldina, A., Akynova, D., Abaidilda, A., & Kuzar, Z. (2014). The

    Role of Multilingual Education in the Process of Kazakhstani Identity Formation.

    Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 143, 217-221.

Appendix A

Parents' recruitment flyer in two languages

RURAL SCHOOL STAKEHOLDERS' PERCEPTIONS AND PRACTICES OF TRILINGUAL EDUCATION: SAME OR DIFFERENT?

Dear Parents,

- ✓ Would you like to make your child's study at school more fruitful?
- ✓ Would you like your voices to be heard?

If you answered Yes, then you are the person that I am looking for. You as a parent is one of the important people who can influence the development of language policy.

My name is Shakhrizat Agaidarova, I am carrying out a research related to trilingual education. The purpose of this research is to explore different stakeholders' perceptions and practices of trilingual education in a rural school in Almaty Oblast.

I would be very grateful if you have some time to participate in my study and share your experience. Your voice is important. You will be asked questions related to trilingual language and its practices at home. Please, note that all the information that you will provide will be confidential and participation will be anonymous.

You will have an indirect benefit from participating in this study as raising awareness of trilingual education and its implementation, thus reconsidering the importance of parental involvement in your child's education. If you do agree to participate, please contact me directly on xxx xxx by December 12 2018. Due to the limited time, only first contacted three parents will be interviewed.

If you have further questions, don't hesitate to contact me.

Contact Information

Researcher: Shakhrizat Agaidarova
Phone number: +x
Email: shakhrizat.agaidarova@nu.edu.kz

АУДАНДЫҚ МЕКТЕП СТЭЙКХОЛДЕРЛАРЫНЫҢ ҮШ ТІЛДІ БІЛІМ БЕРУГЕ ҚАТЫСТЫ ТҮСІНІГІ МЕН ҚОЛДАНЫСЫ

Құрметті ата-аналар,

- ✓ Балаңыздың оқуын мектепте жемісті болуын қалайсыз ба?
- ✓ Өз ойыңызбен бөліскіңіз келеді ме?

Егер сіз Иә деп жауап берсеңіз, Сіз бізге керек ата-анасыз. Ата-ана ретінде сіз тіл саясатының дамуына әсер ете алатын маңызды адамдардың бірі болып табыласыз.

Менің есімім Шахризат Агайдарова, мен қазіргі уақытта үш тілді оқытуға қатысты зерттеу жұмысын жүргізіп жатырмын. Зерттеу жұмысының мақсаты - аудандық мектеп стэйкхолдерларының үш тілді білім беруге қатысты түсініктері мен тәжірибелерін зерттеу.

Менің зерттеу жұмысыма қатысуларыңызды және тәжірибемен бөлісулеріңізді сұраймын. Ата-ана ретінде Сіздің дауысыңыз өте маңызды. Сіз ұсынатын барлық ақпарат құпия болып табылады және қатысушының аты-жөні көрсетілмейтіндігін ескертеміз. Егер сіз қатысуға келіссеңіз 12ші Желтоқсанға дейін хабарласыңыз. Уақыт тығыздығына байланысты, алғашқы хабарласқан үш ата-анадан сұхбат алынады.

Байланыс номері
Зерттеуші: Шахризат Агайдарова
Телефон нөмірі: xx
Электрондық пошта: shakhrizat.agaidarova@nu.edu.kz

Appendix B

Teachers' recruitment flyer in two languages

RURAL SCHOOL STAKEHOLDERS' PERCEPTIONS AND PRACTICES OF TRILINGUAL EDUCATION: SAME OR DIFFERENT?

Dear teachers,

- ✓ Are you a teacher with experience of more than two years?
- ✓ Do you teach your subject either in English or Kazakh?
- ✓ Are you eager to share your experience for the purposes of research?

If you answered "yes" to these questions, then you are the person that I am looking for. You are important because you can contribute to the policy implementation. I would really appreciate if you take part and share your experience. If you do agree to participate, please contact on xxx by December 12, 2018. Please, note that all information that you will provide will be confidential and participation will be anonymous.

The purpose of the research I am conducting is to explore different stakeholders' perceptions and practices of trilingual education in one rural school in Almaty oblast. Your voice as teachers are important as you are the major implementers of the trilingual education. Please, note that due to the time limit first contacted five teachers will be interviewed.

Contact Information
Researcher: Shakhrizat Agaidarova
Phone number: + xxx
Email: shakhrizat.agaidarova@nu.edu.kz

АУДАНДЫҚ МЕКТЕП СТЭЙКХОЛДЕРЛАРЫНЫҢ ҮШ ТІЛДЕ БІЛІМ БЕРУГЕ ҚАТЫСТЫ ТҮСІНІГІ МЕН ҚОЛДАНЫСЫ

Құрметті әріптестер,

- ✓ Сіз білім беру саласындағы зерттеулерге өз үлесіңізді қосқыңыз келе ме?
- ✓ Сіздің еңбек тәжірибеңіз екі жылдан асқан ба?
- ✓ Сіз өзіңіздің сабағыңызды ағылшын не қазақ тілдерінде бересіз бе?

Егер де сіз осы сұрақтарға "иә" деп жауап берсеңіз, онда "Сіз" біз іздеген мұғалімсіз. Сіздің дауысыңыз маңызды, себебі сіз тіл саясатын іске асыруға үлес қосып және ілгері дамытуға өз септігіңізді тигізесіз. Сіз беретін барлық ақпарат құпия болып табылады және қатысушының аты-жөні көрсетілмейтіндігін ескертемін.

Менің аты-жөнім Ағайдарова Шахризат, қазіргі уақытта үш тілді білім беруге

қатысты зерттеу жұмысын жүргізіп жатырмын. Егер осы зерттеуге қатысқыңыз

келсе, мына номерге ххх 12ші Желтоқсанға дейін хабарласуыңызды сұраймын.

Уақыт шектеулі болғандықтан, алғашқы бес мұғалімнен сұхбат алынады.

Байланыс ақпараты
Зерттеуші: Шахризат Агайдарова
Телефон нөмірі: ххх
Электрондық пошта: shakhrizat.agaidarova@nu.edu.kz

Appendices C

Interview protocols for three groups of stakeholders in two languages

Time:
Interviewer: Shakhrizat Agaidarova
Position of interviewee: **A parent**

Good day! My name is Shakhrizat, I am a Master student at Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education. I am conducting a research study on stakeholders' perceptions and practices of trilingual education. Thank you for your agreeing to participate in the research. Before we start the interview I would kindly request you to sign the Consent form devised to meet our university requirements. Essentially, this document states that: (1) all information will be held confidential, (2) your participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time if you feel uncomfortable, and (3) we do not intend to inflict any harm. For your information, only me as a researcher on the project will have access to the tapes which will be eventually destroyed after they are transcribed. To facilitate our note-taking, I would like to audio tape our conversations today only based on your permission. Finally, I greatly appreciate your contribution in the present study which attempts to understand your perceptions and practices. Your participation will take approximately 30-45 minutes. Can we start the interview?

Interview questions

1. How many children do you have?
2. What language do you usually speak in?
3. Have you heard about Trilingual education? What do you think it is? How do you understand it?
4. Regarding your child, when did he/she start studying in trilingual education? How do you think starting at that age (time) was successful for children or not? Why?
5. Do you think that trilingual education is beneficial for your child? If yes, then how? Probes: Better education opportunities in general; Better content knowledge; Awareness of different Linguistic & Cultural values; Aspiration to further study; Academic achievement in general;
6. How is the knowledge of Kazakh (Russian, English) beneficial for your child? Probes: Increase job opportunity in future; Develop English/Russian/Kazakh literacy skills; Positive self-image of being multilingual; Effective communication

skills in three languages What about maintaining primary language and culture?

Notes:

7. Can you think of your child's success stories in language learning? If any?

   Can you think of any issues children face studying in TE?

   Probes: Your examples; Any difference of TE between urban-rural areas; Language learning anxiety in children; Resources: lack of learning material, books, classroom size; Resources provided in rural VS urban school; How do you deal with such issues?

8. What language is usually spoken at home with your child?

   Probes: Do you try to preserve your ethnic language; Shifted to dominant language; languages at home; How do you perceive mixing languages?

9. Does your child prefer to speak a particular language at home? Or do you encourage

   him/her? Which language? Why do you think he prefers to speak that language(s)?

10. Does anybody help him/her at home with education? Probes: Monitor out of school activities; Assist home task; Limit TV time; Attend school meeting and volunteer; Reading at home (past & now);

11. What resources do you have to develop your child's English at home? (Kazakh, Russian?) Probes: Books; Providing with Internet access;

12. Do you provide your child any additional support to language learning?

    Probes: Providing private lessons or tutoring; Online learning classes;

    Supplementary classes with their teachers;

13. What language does your child watch TV in? Probes: Communicate with friends; Read books; Play computer games; Use social media.

14. Is there anything you would like to add that was not mentioned here? Suggestions?
    Notes:

Interview Protocol

Rural school stakeholders' perceptions and practices of trilingual education:

same or different?

Time:
Interviewer: Shakhrizat Agaidarova
Position of interviewee: **A teacher**

Good day! My name is Shakhrizat, I am a Master student at Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education. I am conducting a research study on stakeholders' perceptions and practices of trilingual education. Thank you for your agreeing to participate in the research. Before we start the interview I would kindly request you to sign the Consent form devised to meet our university requirements. Essentially, this document states that: (1) all information will be held confidential, (2) your participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time if you feel uncomfortable, and (3) we do not intend to inflict any harm. For your information, only me as a researcher on the project will have access to the tapes which will be eventually destroyed after they are transcribed. To facilitate our note-taking, I would like to audio tape our conversations today only based on your permission. Finally, I greatly appreciate your contribution in the present study which attempts to understand your perceptions and practices. Your participation will take approximately 30-45 minutes. Can we start the interview?

Interview questions

1. What subject do you teach? What is your teaching experience? (In this MoI)
2. What language do you usually speak?
3. What do you think of it? How do you understand it?
4. What is the value of trilingual education for students?
   Probes: Better academic achievement; Better content knowledge; Language skills
5. How is it beneficial to speak three languages? Probes: Language development; fluency;
6. Have you taken any developmental courses on TE?
7. Do you receive any support from other? If any, how does it help you?
   Probes: Any support you received from other schools; educational departments; РайОО, ГорОО; parents, akimat.

8. How long does it take you to prepare for the lessons?

Probes: Time consuming or not? Does it take longer to prepare materials, are you satisfied?

9. Can you think of your students' success stories in language learning? If any?

Probes: Are they successful in certain languages? How?

10. Can you think of any issues you face providing trilingual education?

Probes: Your examples; Any difference in Rural Vs Urban areas; Resources: books, other teaching materials, ICT; Do you have appropriate methodology; How do you deal with issues, if any you have?

11. What language do you usually speak in your class?

Probes: Use your L1 when teaching your subject; or prohibit code-switching; Correct any linguistics by giving feedback;

12. How do you think what impacts to students' L2/L3 proficiency?

Probes: L1 & L2 proficiency impact L3;

13. Have you observed the impact of students' language proficiency level on their content knowledge at your lesson? Probes: When teaching and they respond or not; e.g. Students don't want to answer because of their low level of language proficiency;

14. Do/Did you collaborate with language teachers when preparing a lesson?

Probes: If any? How beneficial is this? Notes:

15. Do you usually encourage students to speak a particular language? If any?

E.g. One-language-at-a-time; Set rules?

16. Is there anything you would like to add that was not mentioned here? Suggestions?

Interview Protocol

Rural school stakeholders' perceptions and practices of trilingual education:
same or different?

Time:

Interviewer: Shakhrizat Agaidarova

Position of interviewee: **An administrator**

Good day! My name is Shakhrizat, I am a Master student at Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education. I am conducting a research study on stakeholders' perceptions and practices of trilingual education. Thank you for your agreeing to participate in the research. Before we start the interview I would kindly request you to sign the Consent form devised to meet our university requirements. Essentially, this document states that: (1) all information will be held confidential, (2) your participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time if you feel uncomfortable, and (3) we do not intend to inflict any harm. For your information, only me as a researcher on the project will have access to the tapes which will be eventually destroyed after they are transcribed. To facilitate our note-taking, I would like to audio tape our conversations today only based on your permission. Finally, I greatly appreciate your contribution in the present study which attempts to understand your perceptions and practices. Your participation will take approximately 30-45 minutes. Can we start the interview?

Interview questions

1. Can you tell about your experience in this position?

2. What language do you usually speak in?

3. What do you think of it? How do you understand TE?

4. Have you obtained any developmental courses related TE? If any?

   Probes: What kind of? Were they helpful?

5. How is it beneficial speaking Kazakh (Russian, English)?

6. Do you receive any support from others? If any, how does help you?

   Probes: Any support you received from other schools, educational departments,

   РайОО, ГорОО; parents, akimat;

7. Can you think of your students'/teachers' success stories in language learning? If any?

8. Can you think of any issues you/school face providing trilingual education?

   Probes: Any difference in Rural vs Urban areas; Teachers fail teaching due to language proficiency; Too much codeswitch when teaching; Lack of resources; How do you deal with such issues?

9. What kind of activities are held within the school? in what languages are they held? Who organizes/develops activities related to trilingual education? What type of activities? Who is responsible?

10. Do you think parental involvement and support is important in trilingual education?

    probes: School-parents collaborating advantages; Parent-child collaborating advantages

11. What language is mostly used at your school?

    Probes: Allow or prohibit code-switching at school level; Purposeful translanguaging;

12. Do your teachers collaborate among each other? If any?

    Probes: Have you observed it? Do you encourage that? A content teacher collaborates with the language teacher? How beneficial is that? e.g. History teacher collaborates with Kazakh or Russian language teacher.

    What language is mostly used at school meetings?

    Probes: Strictly follow Kazakh only policy, or mix?

13. How would you like to develop teachers' understanding and practices of trilingual education? Probes: Provide developmental courses; Purposefully choose new teachers with multilingual background;

14. Is there anything you would like to add related to TE? Suggestions?

Интервью хаттамасы

Ауылдық мектеп стэйкхолдерлардың үш тілді білім беруге қатысты түсінігі мен қолданысы: бірдей не әртүрлі?

Уақыты:

Жүргізуші: Шахризат Агайдарова

Респондент позициясы: **Ата ана**

Қайырлы күн! Менің есімім Шахризат, мен Назарбаев Университетінің Жоғары Білім Беру мектебінің магистрантымен. Аудандық стэйкхолдерларының үш тілде білім беруге қатысты түсінігі мен қолданысына қатысты зерттеу жұмысын жүргізіп жатырмын. Зерттеуге қатысуға келісім бергеніңіз үшін рахмет. Интервьюді бастамас бұрын, біздің университет талаптарына сәйкес келісу формасына қол қоюыңызды өтінемін. Негізінен, бұл құжатта: (1) барлық ақпарат конфиденциалды болатыны, (2) сіздің қатысуыңыз ерікті болып табылатыны және кез келген уақытта тоқтатуға болатыны және (3) біз ешқандай зиян келтірмейтіндігіміз туралы жазылған. Атап өтетін тағы бір мәселе, зерттеуші ретінде осы таспаны тек қана мен қолданамын, және де бұл таспа траскрипцияланғаннан кейін өшірілетін болады. Сізден осы сұхбатты таспаға жазуға рұқсат сұраймын. Сіздің қатысуыңыз шамамен 30-45 минутты алады. Әңгімелесуді бастауға болады ма?

Интервью сұрақтары

1. Сіздің қанша балаңыз бар?

2. Сіз әдетте қандай тілде сөйлесесіз?

3. Үш тілді білім беру туралы естіп па едіңіз?

4. Сіз бұл білім беру туралы не ойлайсыз? Қалай түсінесіз? Маңыздылығы?

5. Енді, Сіздің балаңызға келсек, ол үш тілде білім алуды қай уақытта бастады?

   Қосымша: Сіз қалай ойлайсыз, осы жастан бастап үш тілде оқу балаңыз үшін сәтті болды ма? әлде жоқ па? Неліктен? Ескерту:

6. Үш тілді оқыту балаңыз үшін пайдалы деп ойлайсыз ба? Егер келіссеңіз, онда қалай пайдалы?

   Қосымша: жалпы білім алуды жақсартты; мазмұнды жақсы түсінді; Әртүрлі тілдерді және олардың мәдениетін білді; білімге деген құштарлығын арттыру; сабағы жақсарды

7. Балаңыздың тіл үйренудегі сәтті оқиғалары туралы айтып бере аласыз ба? Бар болса?

> Қосымша: Балаңыз кейбір тілдерді оқуда табысты болды ма? Қалай? Ол қандай тілді жақсырақ меңгерген?

8. Үш тілде білім алудағы балаңыздың қандай да бір қиыншылықтары барма?

> Қосымша: Қалалық-аудандық мектептер арасындағы айырмашылық бар деп ойлайсыз ба; Балалардағы тіл үйренуге деген алаңдаушылық; Ресурстар: оқу материалдарының, кітаптардың жетіспеушілігі, сыныптың өлшемдерінің үлкендігі; Аудандық VS қалалық мектебіндегі ресурстар әртүрлі;

9. Балаңыздың қай тілді жетік білгенін қалайсыз? Неліктен?

10. Әдетте үйде балаңызбен қандай тілде сөйлесесіздер?

> Қосымша: Ана тілін сақтауға тырысасыздар ма? Доминантты тілге көштіңіздер ме? Үйде тілдерді араластырып сөйлейсіздер ме? Тілдерді араластырып сөйлеуге қалай қарайсыз?

11. Балаңыз үйде белгілі бір тілді сөйлегенді қалайды ма?

> Қосымша: Қай тілді? Неліктен осы тілде сөйлеуді ұнатады деп ойлайсыз? Немесе, Сіз бір тілде сөйлегенін қалайсыз ба? Мысалы, орыс тілін дамытуы үшін, оған осы тілде көбірек сөйлеуін сұрайсыз ба?

12. Сабақ оқуға қандай да бір көмек көрсетесіздер ме?

> Қосымша: үй жұмысын бақылау; Үй тапсырмасына көмектесу; ТВ уақытын шектеу; Мектепке жиі барып тұру, волонтер болу; кітап оқу (өткен және қазір), сабағын оқуға кедергі етпеу;

13. Үй жағдайында, балаңыздың тілін дамыту үшін қандай да бір ресурстармен қамтамсыз етесіз бе? Қосымша: қазақ, орыс, ағылшын тілдерінде кітаптар;

14. Балаңызға тілдерді үйренуге қосымша қолдау немесе жағдай көрсетесіз бе?

> Қосымша: жеке сабақтар, репетитор; Онлайн оқыту сабақтары; Мұғалімдерден қосымша сабақтар сұрау;

15. Сіздің балаңыз үйде теледидарды қай тілде көреді? Қосымша: Достарымен қай тілде араласады; Кітапты қай тілде оқиды; Компьютерлік ойындарды қай тілде ойнайды; Әлеуметтік медианы қай тілде пайдаланады: What's up, Facebook, Instagram...

16. Сіздің сұрақтарыңыз барма, не қосқыңыз келетін ойларыңыз бар ма?

Интервью хаттамасы

Ауылдық мектеп стэйкхолдерларының үш тілде білім беруге қатысты түсінігі мен

қолданысы: бірдей не әртүрлі?

Уақыты:

Жүргізуші: Шахризат Агайдарова

Респондент позициясы: **Мұғалім**

Қайырлы күн! Менің есімім Шахризат, мен Назарбаев Университетінің Жоғары Білім Беру мектебінің магистрантымен. Аудандық стэйкхолдерларының үш тілде білім беруге қатысты түсінігі мен қолданысына қатысты зерттеу жұмысын жүргізіп жатырмын. Зерттеуге қатысуға келісім бергеніңіз үшін рахмет. Интервьюді бастамас бұрын, біздің университет талаптарына сәйкес келісу формасына қол қоюыңызды өтінемін. Негізінен, бұл құжатта: (1) барлық ақпарат конфиденциалды болатыны, (2) сіздің қатысуыңыз ерікті болып табылатыны және кез келген уақытта тоқтатуға болатыны және (3) біз ешқандай зиян келтірмейтіндігіміз туралы жазылған. Атап өтетін тағы бір мәселе, зерттеуші ретінде осы таспаны тек қана мен қолданамын, және де бұл таспа траскрипцияланғаннан кейін өшірілетін болады. Сізден осы сұхбатты таспаға жазуға рұқсат сұраймын. Осы зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға рұқсат бергеніңізге Сізге алғысым шексіз. Сіздің қатысуыңыз шамамен 30-45 минутты алады. Әңгімелесуді бастауға болады ма?

Интервью сұрақтары

1. Қай пәннің мұғалімісіз? Оқыту тәжірибеңіз қандай?
2. Үш тілді білім беруді қалай түсінесіз?
3. Үш тілді білім беру туралы не ойлайсыз?
4. Осы үш тілді білім берудің оқушыларға қандай маңызы бар деп ойлайсыз?

    Қосымша: білімі жақсарады ма? Мазмұнды жақсы игереді ме? Үш тілде сөйлеуі жақсарады ма?

5. Үш тілді білім беруді дамытуға арналған курстарды өттіңіз бе?
6. Мұғалім ретінде үш тілді білім беруге қатысты көмек аласыз ба?

    Қосымша: кітапхана керекті мағлұмат бере ме? Басқа мектептерден қолдау көрсете ма? РайОО, ГорОО; ОблОО, ата-аналар, әкімдіктер, акимат.

7. Жаңа сабақты дайындауға қанша уақыт кетеді?

Қосымша: Сабаққа дайындалу ұзақ уақыт кетеді ме жоқ па? Материалдарды дайындау ұзақ уақытты қажет етеді ме, сіз қанағаттанасыз ба?

8. Оқушыларыңыздың тіл үйренудегі жемісті болған кездері айта аласыз ба? Қандай?

Қосымша: тіл меңгерудегі жетістіктері, басқа да олимпиадалар

9. Үш тілді білім беруге қатысты қандайда бір өзекті мәселелер барма?

Қосымша: Ауылдық VS қалалық аудандарда ҮББде айырмашылық барма?

Кабинеттер? Ресурстар: кітаптар, интернет, басқа оқу-әдістемелік материалдар жеткілікті ма? Осы мәселелерді қалай шешуге тырысасыздар?

10. Сіз сабақ барысында әдетте қай тілде сөйлейсіз?

Қосымша: Т1-ді тақырыпты түсіндіру кезінде қолданасыз ба? Тілдерді араластырып сөйлейсіз бе? Оқушыларға тілдерді араластырып сөйлеуге тыйым саласыз ба?

11. Сіздің ойыңызша оқушылардың Т2 / Т3 еркін сөйлеулеріне не әсер етеді?

Қосымша: Қазақ тілімен орыс тілін жақсы меңгерген бала Ағылшын тілін еркін сөйлейді ма?

12. Сіз сабақ дайындау барысында қазақ, орыс, ағылшын пән мұғалімдерімен ақылдасқан

кездеріңіз болды ма? Қосымша: Не себепті араласасыз? Бұл қаншалықты пайдалы болды? Не себепті араласпайсыз?

13. Сіз жаңа тақырыпты өткеннен кейін оны қалай бекітесіз? Мысалы: оқушылар қорытындылай ма, әлде сізде қорытындылайсыз ба? Қосымша: Сіз жаңа тақырыпты бекіту үшін қай тілді қолданасыз? Оқушыларға тілдерді араластырып сөйлеуге қаншалықты рұқсат бересіз?

14. Сабақта қолданатын тілдерге қатысты тағы бір сұрақ. Оқушыларға тек бір тілде

сөйлеуге шақырасыз ба? Мысалы: Тек қазақша, ағылшынша. Ереже қоясыз ба? Оқушылардың бір тілде сөйлеулеріне қандай да бір жағдай жасайсыз ба? Егер оқушы,

15. Сіздің сұрақтарыңыз не қосқыңыз келетін ойларыңыз бар ма?

Интервью хаттамасы

Аудандық мектеп стэйкхолдерларының үш тілді білім беруге қатысты түсінігі мен қолданысы: бірдей не әртүрлі?

Уақыты:

Жүргізуші: Шахризат Агайдарова

Респондент позициясы: **Әкімшілік**

Қайырлы күн! Менің есімім Шахризат, мен Назарбаев Университетінің Жоғары Білім Беру мектебінің магистрантымен. Аудандық стэйкхолдерларының үш тілді білім беруге қатысты түсінігі мен қолданысына қатысты зерттеу жұмысын жүргізіп жатырмын. Зерттеуге қатысуға келісім бергеніңіз үшін рахмет. Интервьюді бастамас бұрын, біздің университет талаптарына сәйкес келісу формасына қол қоюыңызды өтінемін. Негізінен, бұл құжатта: (1) барлық ақпарат конфиденциалды болатыны, (2) сіздің қатысуыңыз ерікті болып табылатыны және кез келген уақытта тоқтатуға болатыны және (3) біз ешқандай зиян келтірмейтіндігіміз туралы жазылған. Атап өтетін тағы бір мәселе, зерттеуші ретінде осы таспаны тек қана мен қолданамын, және де бұл таспа траскрипцияланғаннан кейін өшірілетін болады. Сізден осы сұхбатты таспаға жазуға рұқсат сұраймын. Осы зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға рұқсат бергеніңізге Сізге алғысым шексіз. Сіздің қатысуыңыз шамамен 30-45 минутты алады. Әңгімелесуді бастауға болады ма?

Интервью сұрақтары

1. Осы лауазымдағы тәжірибеңіз туралы айта аласыз ба?
2. Сіз әдетте қандай тілде сөйлесесіз?
3. Үш тілді білім беру туралы не ойлайсыз? Қалай түсінесіз?
4. Осы үш тілді білім беруге қатысты қандай да бір дамыту курстарын өттіңіз бе?
5. Мектеп әкімшілігі ретінде үш тілді білім беруге қатысты көмек/ демеу аласыз ба?

    Қосымша: кітапхана керекті мағлұмат бере ме? Басқа мектептер қолдау көрсете ма? РайОО, ГорОО; ата-аналар, әкімдіктер, акимат.

6. Үш тілде білім беруді дамытатын/ қолдайтын іс-шараларды ұйымдастырасыз ба?

    Қосымша: кім ұйымдастырады? Кім жауапты, кім қандай рөл атқарады?

7. Оқушылардың/ мұғалімдердің тіл үйренудегі табысты оқиғалары/ жетістіктері туралы

    айта аласыз ба? Егер бар болса? Қосымша: Өзіңіздің жетістіктеріңіз, бар болса?

8. Үш тілді білім беруге қатысты қандайда бір өзекті мәселелер/проблемалар туралы не ойлайсыз? Сіздерде қандай мәселелер кездеседі?

Қосымша: Аудандық VS қалалық Үш тілді білім беруде айырмашылық барма?

Мұғалімдердің тілдерді білуі туралы не айтасыз? Сабаққа қатысқанда мұғалімдер тілдерді араластырып сөйлегенге қалай қарайсыз? Сабақ беруге арналған ресурстар жеткілікті деп ойлайсыз ба?

9. Сіздің ойыңызша, Үш тілді білім беру кезінде ата-аналардың қатысуы немесе қолдауы

    a. маңызды ма? Қосымша: Ата-ана мен мектептің тығыз қатынаста болуы баланың сабақты меңгеруіне әсер ете ме? Орынбасар ретінде Сіздерге Ата-ана келіп балалары жайлы мәліметтер алады ма? Немесе сынып жетекшілерінен ала алады ма?

10. Сіздің мектепте Қай тіл көбінесе қолданылады? Қосымша: Тілдерді араластырып сөйлегенге қалай қарайсыз? Мектеп деңгейінде тілдерді араластырып сөйлеуге рұқсат беру немесе тыйым салу кездеріңіз болды ма?

11. Мектеп ішілік, сынып ішілік/ ата-аналар жиналыстар көбінесе қандай тілде өткізіледі?

    Қосымша: Тек қана бір тіл саясатын ұстану керек пе? Араластыруға болады ма?

12. Сіздің мұғалімдер бір-бірімен жұмыс істейді ме? Мысалға, тіл мұғалімдері пәндік мұғалімдермен? Қосымша: Осындай пән аралық қарым қатынасты қолдайсыз ба? Неліктен? Бұл қаншалықты пайдалы деп ойлайсыз?

13. Мұғалімдер арасында үш тілді оқытуды туралы түсінігін және тәжірибесін қалай дамытуға болады? Қосымша: Уақытылы Даму курстарын қамтамасыз ету; Көптілді білетін және осы мамандықты бітірген жаңа мұғалімдерді таңдауға қалай қарайсыз?

14. Үш тілде білім беруді мұғалімдер арасында насихаттау үшін тағы не қажет деп ойлайсыз? Қосымша: Керекті ресурстармен/ материалдармен/ қамтамасыз ету және көбейту; Сіздің авторитетіңізді пайдалану; Мотивация;

15. Осы тақырыптарға байланысты қосқыңыз келетін ойларыңыз немесе ұсыныс және сұрақтарыңыз бар ма?

Appendices D

Informed Consent forms for three groups of stakeholders in three languages

INFORMED CONSENT FORM (for parents)

RURAL SCHOOL STAKEHOLDERS' PERCEPTIONS AND PRACTICES OF

TRILINGUAL EDUCATION: SAME OR DIFFERENT?

DESCRIPTION: You are invited to participate in a research study exploring how secondary school parents, teachers and administrators perceive trilingual education and how they practice it in their domains, in particular how languages are used at home, classrooms and school. Your voice is important because you are as a parent, one of the key implementers of language policy. You are invited to take part in a semi-structured interviews. You will be asked about your perceptions of trilingual education, and language use at home. You are also being asked for your permission to audiotape this interview for research purposes only. No recordings will be disclosed to the school administration or third parties. Your name will be replaced by pseudonyms to ensure your anonymity and none unique identifiers will be asked. Although the findings of this study might be published, no information that can identify you will be included.

TIME INVOLVEMENT: Your participation will take approximately 30-45 minutes.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: The risks associated with this study are minimal and may include only potential emotional discomfort from being interviewed. To minimize risks, questions will be formulated in a polite way and no sensitive questions will be asked. There will be no direct immediate benefits to you from participating in this study. However, indirect benefits will include a better awareness of trilingual education policy implementation, its goals and objectives. You will have an opportunity for self-reflection and consider the importance of parental involvement, support and motivation for your child. Your decision whether or not to participate in this study will neither affect your status nor the studies and grades of your child.

PARTICIPANTS' RIGHTS: If you have read this form and have decided to participate in this project, please understand your **participation is voluntary** and you have the **right to withdraw your consent or discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled**. **The alternative is not to participate**. You have the right to refuse to answer particular questions. The results of this research study may be presented at scientific or professional meetings or published in scientific journals.

CONTACT INFORMATION:
Questions: If you have any questions, concerns or complaints about this research, its procedures, risks and benefits, contact the Master's Thesis Supervisor for this student work, Sulushash Kerimkulova, sulushash.kerimkuloval@nu.edu.kz;

Independent Contact: If you are not satisfied with how this study is being conducted, or if you have any concerns, complaints, or general questions about the research or your rights as a participant, please contact the NUGSE Research Committee to at gse_researchcommittee@nu.edu.kz
Please sign this consent from if you agree to participate in this study.

- I have carefully read the information provided;
- I have been given full information regarding the purpose and procedures of the study;
- I understand how the data collected will be used, and that any confidential information will be seen only by the researchers and will not be revealed to anyone else;
- I understand that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time without giving a reason;
- With full knowledge of all foregoing, I agree, of my own free will, to participate in this study.

Signature: _____   Date: _____

The extra copy of this signed and dated consent form is for you to keep.

INFORMED CONSENT FORM (for teachers)

RURAL SCHOOL STAKEHOLDERS' PERCEPTIONS AND PRACTICES OF

TRILINGUAL EDUCATION: SAME OR DIFFERENT?

DESCRIPTION: You are invited to participate in a research study exploring how secondary school parents, teachers and administrators perceive trilingual education and practice it in their domains. Your voice is important because you are as a teacher, one of the key implementers of language policy. You are invited to take part in a semi-structured interviews. You will be asked to provide some educational background information (e.g., education, teaching experience) and perceptions of trilingual education and its practices in the classroom. You are also being asked for your permission to audiotape this interview for research purposes only. No recordings will be disclosed to the school administration or the third parties. Your name will be replaced by pseudonyms to ensure your anonymity and none unique identifiers will be asked. Although the findings of this study might be published, no information that can identify you will be included.

TIME INVOLVEMENT: Your participation will take approximately 30-45 minutes.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: The risks associated with this study are minimal and may include only potential emotional discomfort from being interviewed. To minimize risks, questions will be formulated in a polite way and no sensitive questions will be asked. There will be no direct immediate benefits to you from participating in this study. However, indirect benefits will include a better awareness of trilingual education policy implementation. You will have a possibility for self-reflection of your perceptions and practices of the policy. Your decision whether or not to participate in this study will not affect your employment or working conditions.

PARTICIPANTS' RIGHTS: If you have read this form and have decided to participate in this project, please understand your **participation is voluntary** and you have the **right to withdraw your consent or discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled**. **The alternative is not to participate**. You have the right to refuse to answer particular questions. The results of this research study may be presented at scientific or professional meetings or published in scientific journals.

CONTACT INFORMATION:
Questions: If you have any questions, concerns or complaints about this research, its procedures, risks and benefits, contact the Master's Thesis Supervisor for this student work, Sulushash Kerimkulova, sulushash.kerimkuloval@nu.edu.kz;

Independent Contact: If you are not satisfied with how this study is being conducted, or if you have any concerns, complaints, or general questions about the research or your rights as a participant, please contact the NUGSE Research Committee to at
gse_researchcommittee@nu.edu.kz
Please sign this consent from if you agree to participate in this study.

- I have carefully read the information provided;
- I have been given full information regarding the purpose and procedures of the study;
- I understand how the data collected will be used, and that any confidential information will be seen only by the researchers and will not be revealed to anyone else;
- I understand that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time without giving a reason;
- With full knowledge of all foregoing, I agree, of my own free will, to participate in this study.

Signature: _____ Date: _____
The extra copy of this signed and dated consent form is for you to keep.

INFORMED CONSENT FORM (for principal)

RURAL SCHOOL STAKEHOLDERS' PERCEPTIONS AND PRACTICES OF

TRILINGUAL EDUCATION: SAME OR DIFFERENT?

DESCRIPTION: You are invited to participate in a research study exploring how secondary school parents, teachers and a principal perceive trilingual education and practice it in their domains. Your voice is important because you are as a principal, one of the key executive implementers of language policy. You are invited to take part in a semi-structured interviews. You will be asked to provide some educational background information (e.g., education, leadership experience, language use), perceptions of trilingual education, and its practices at school. You are also being asked for your permission to audiotape this interview for research purposes only. No recordings will be disclosed to third parties. The school name and location will be replaced with general names. Your name will be replaced by pseudonyms to ensure your anonymity and none unique identifiers will be asked. Although the findings of this study might be published, no information that can identify you will be included.

TIME INVOLVEMENT: Your participation will take approximately 30-45 minutes.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: The risks associated with this study are minimal and may include only potential emotional discomfort from being interviewed. To minimize risks, questions will be formulated in a polite way and no sensitive questions will be asked. There will be no direct immediate benefits to you from participating in this study. However, indirect benefits will include a better awareness of trilingual education policy implementation at the school, and taking steps in strengthening its implementation. Your decision whether or not to participate in this study will not affect your status.

PARTICIPANTS' RIGHTS: If you have read this form and have decided to participate in this project, please understand your **participation is voluntary** and you have the **right to withdraw your consent or discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled**. **The alternative is not to participate**. You have the right to refuse to answer particular questions. The results of this research study may be presented at scientific or professional meetings or published in scientific journals.

CONTACT INFORMATION:
Questions: If you have any questions, concerns or complaints about this research, its procedures, risks and benefits, contact the Master's Thesis Supervisor for this student work, Sulushash Kerimkulova, sulushash.kerimkuloval@nu.edu.kz;

Independent Contact: If you are not satisfied with how this study is being conducted, or if you have any concerns, complaints, or general questions about the research or your rights as a participant, please contact the NUGSE Research Committee to at gse_researchcommittee@nu.edu.kz
Please sign this consent from if you agree to participate in this study.

- I have carefully read the information provided;
- I have been given full information regarding the purpose and procedures of the study;
- I understand how the data collected will be used, and that any confidential information will be seen only by the researchers and will not be revealed to anyone else;
- I understand that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time without giving a reason;
- With full knowledge of all foregoing, I agree, of my own free will, to participate in this study.

Signature: _____   Date: _____
The extra copy of this signed and dated consent form is for you to keep.

ФОРМА ИНФОРМАЦИОННОГО СОГЛАСИЯ (для родителей)

ВОСПРИЯТИЕ ТРЁХЪЯЗЫЧНОГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ И ЕГО ПРИМЕНЕНИЕ

ГЛАЗАМИ РАЗЛИЧНЫХ СТЕЙКХОЛДЕРОВ СЕЛЬСКОЙ ШКОЛЫ:

СХОДСТВА И РАЗЛИЧИЯ?

ОПИСАНИЕ: Приглашаем Вас принять участие в исследовании, целью которого является изучение восприятия трёхъязычного образования родителями, учителями и директором школы и применение этой языковой практики в своих областях. Ваш голос важен, потому что вы являетесь одним из ключевых исполнителей этой языковой политики. Вас приглашают принять участие в полу-структурированном интервью. Вас спросят о ваших мнениях о трёхъязычном образовании, использовании языков в домашних условиях и внешкольных мероприятиях. Просим Вашего разрешение на аудиозапись этого интервью для исследовательских целей. Эти данные не будут раскрыты администрации школы или третьим лицам. Ваше имя будет заменено псевдонимом, и вопросы касательно ваших уникальных идентификаторов не будут заданы. Результаты данного исследования могут быть опубликованы в научных журналах, но информация, идентифицирующая Вас не будет включена.

ВРЕМЯ УЧАСТИЯ: Участие займёт около 30- 45 минут.

РИСКИ И ПРЕИМУЩЕСТВА: Риски, связанные с этим исследованием, минимальны и могут включать только потенциальный эмоциональный дискомфорт от собеседования. Чтобы свести к минимуму риски, вопросы будут аккуратно сформулированы, и никакие чувствительные вопросы не будут заданы. Исследование не несёт непосредственной выгоды от участия для участников. Однако косвенные выгоды будут включать более глубокое понимание трёхъязычного образования, целей и задач программы. Ваше решение об участии в этом исследовании, не повлияет ни на ваш статус, ни на учёбу и оценки вашего ребёнка.

ПРАВА УЧАСТНИКОВ: Если Вы прочитали данную форму и решили принять участие в данном исследовании, Вы должны понимать, что Ваше участие является добровольным и что у Вас есть право отозвать своё согласие или прекратить участие в любое время. В качестве альтернативы можно не участвовать в исследовании. Также Вы имеете право не отвечать на какие-либо вопросы.

КОНТАКТНАЯ ИНФОРМАЦИЯ: Вопросы: Если у Вас есть вопросы, замечания или жалобы по поводу данного исследования, процедуры его проведения, рисков и преимуществ, Вы можете связаться с исследователем, используя следующие данные: Сулушаш Керимкулова   sulushash.kerimkuloval@nu.edu.kz;

Независимые контакты: Если Вы не удовлетворены проведением данного исследования, если у Вас возникли какие-либо проблемы, жалобы или вопросы, Вы можете связаться с Комитетом Исследований Высшей Школы Образования Назарбаев Университета по телефону +7 7172 70 93 59 или отправить письмо на электронный адрес gse_researchcommittee@nu.edu.kz

Пожалуйста, подпишите данную форму, если Вы согласны участвовать в исследовании.

• Я внимательно изучил представленную информацию;

• Мне предоставили полную информацию о целях и процедуре исследования;

• Я понимаю, как будут использованы собранные данные, и что доступ к любой конфиденциальной информации будет иметь только исследователи и руководитель;

• Я понимаю, что вправе в любой момент отказаться от участия в данном исследовании без объяснения причин;

• С полным осознанием всего вышеизложенного я согласен принять участие в исследовании по собственной воле.

Подпись: _____ Дата: _____

Дополнительная копия этой подписанной и датированной формы согласия предназначена для вас.

ФОРМА ИНФОРМАЦИОННОГО СОГЛАСИЯ (для учителей)

ВОСПРИЯТИЕ ТРЁХЪЯЗЫЧНОГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ И ЕГО ПРИМЕНЕНИЕ

ГЛАЗАМИ РАЗЛИЧНЫХ СТЕЙКХОЛДЕРОВ СЕЛЬСКОЙ ШКОЛЫ:

СХОДСТВА И РАЗЛИЧИЯ?

ОПИСАНИЕ: Приглашаем Вас принять участие в исследовании, целью которого является изучение восприятия трёхъязычного образования родителями, учителями и директором школы и применение этой языковой практики в своих областях. Ваш голос важен, потому что вы являетесь одним из ключевых исполнителей этой языковой политики. Вас приглашают принять участие в полу-структурированном интервью. Вопросы будут касательно вашего образования, преподавательском опыте, мнения о трёхъязычном образовании и его практике в классе. Просим Вашего разрешение на аудиозапись этого интервью для исследовательских целей. Эти данные не будут раскрыты администрации школы или третьим лицам. Ваше имя будет заменено псевдонимом для обеспечения анонимности и вопросы касательно ваших уникальных идентификаторов не будут заданы. Результаты данного исследования могут быть опубликованы в научных журналах, но информация, идентифицирующая Вас не будет включена.

ВРЕМЯ УЧАСТИЯ: Участие займёт около 30- 45 минут.

РИСКИ И ПРЕИМУЩЕСТВА: Риски, связанные с этим исследованием, минимальны и могут включать только потенциальный эмоциональный дискомфорт от собеседования. Чтобы свести к минимуму риски, вопросы будут аккуратно сформулированы, и никакие чувствительные вопросы не будут заданы. Исследование не несёт непосредственной выгоды от участия для участников. Однако косвенные выгоды будут включать более глубокое понимание трёхъязычного образования, целей и задач программы. Ваше решение об участии в исследовании не повлияет на ваш статус или на условия работы.

ПРАВА УЧАСТНИКОВ: Если Вы прочитали данную форму и решили принять участие в данном исследовании, Вы должны понимать, что Ваше участие является добровольным и что у Вас есть право отозвать свое согласие или прекратить участие в любое время. В качестве альтернативы можно не участвовать в исследовании. Также Вы имеете право не отвечать на какие-либо вопросы.

КОНТАКТНАЯ ИНФОРМАЦИЯ: Вопросы: Если у Вас есть вопросы, замечания или жалобы по поводу данного исследования, процедуры его проведения, рисков и преимуществ, Вы можете связаться с исследователем, используя следующие данные: Сулушаш Керимкулова   sulushash.kerimkuloval@nu.edu.kz;

Независимые контакты: Если Вы не удовлетворены проведением данного исследования, если у Вас возникли какие-либо проблемы, жалобы или вопросы, Вы можете связаться с Комитетом Исследований Высшей Школы Образования Назарбаев Университета по телефону +7 7172 70 93 59 или отправить письмо на электронный адрес gse_researchcommittee@nu.edu.kz

Пожалуйста, подпишите данную форму, если Вы согласны участвовать в исследовании.

• Я внимательно изучил представленную информацию;

• Мне предоставили полную информацию о целях и процедуре исследования;

• Я понимаю, как будут использованы собранные данные, и что доступ к любой конфиденциальной информации будет иметь только исследователи и руководитель;

• Я понимаю, что вправе в любой момент отказаться от участия в данном исследовании без объяснения причин;

• С полным осознанием всего вышеизложенного я согласен принять участие в исследовании по собственной воле.

Подпись: _____ Дата: _____

Дополнительная копия этой подписанной и датированной формы согласия предназначена для вас.

ФОРМА ИНФОРМАЦИОННОГО СОГЛАСИЯ (для директора)
ВОСПРИЯТИЕ ТРЁХЪЯЗЫЧНОГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ И ЕГО ПРИМЕНЕНИЕ

ГЛАЗАМИ РАЗЛИЧНЫХ СТЕЙКХОЛДЕРОВ СЕЛЬСКОЙ ШКОЛЫ:

СХОДСТВА И РАЗЛИЧИЯ?

ОПИСАНИЕ: Приглашаем Вас принять участие в исследовании, целью которого является изучение восприятия трёхъязычного образования родителями, учителями и директором школы и применение этой языковой практики в своих областях. Ваш голос важен, потому что вы являетесь одним из ключевых исполнителей этой языковой политики. Вас приглашают принять участие в полу-структурированном интервью. Вопросы будут касательно вашего образования, опыте работы, использование языков, мнения о трёхъязычном образовании и его практике в школе. Просим Вашего разрешение на аудиозапись этого интервью для исследовательских целей. Эти данные не будут раскрыты третьим лицам. Ваше имя будет заменено псевдонимом для обеспечения анонимности, и вопросы касательно ваших уникальных идентификаторов не будут заданы. Результаты данного исследования могут быть опубликованы в научных журналах, но информация, идентифицирующая Вас не будет включена.

ВРЕМЯ УЧАСТИЯ: Участие займёт около 30- 45 минут.

РИСКИ И ПРЕИМУЩЕСТВА: Риски, связанные с этим исследованием, минимальны и могут включать только потенциальный эмоциональный дискомфорт от собеседования. Чтобы свести к минимуму риски, вопросы будут аккуратно сформулированы, и никакие чувствительные вопросы не будут заданы. Исследование не несёт непосредственной выгоды от участия для участников. Однако косвенные выгоды будут включать более глубокое понимание трёхъязычного образования, целей и задач программы. Результаты этого исследования станут преимуществом для более эффективной реализации политики в вашей школе. Ваше решение об участии в исследовании не повлияет на ваш статус.

ПРАВА УЧАСТНИКОВ: Если Вы прочитали данную форму и решили принять участие в данном исследовании, Вы должны понимать, что Ваше участие является добровольным и что у Вас есть право отозвать своё согласие или прекратить участие в любое время. В качестве альтернативы можно не участвовать в исследовании. Также Вы имеете право не отвечать на какие-либо вопросы.

КОНТАКТНАЯ ИНФОРМАЦИЯ: Вопросы: Если у Вас есть вопросы, замечания или жалобы по поводу данного исследования, процедуры его проведения, рисков и преимуществ, Вы можете связаться с исследователем, используя следующие данные: Сулушаш Керимкулова   sulushash.kerimkuloval@nu.edu.kz;

Независимые контакты: Если Вы не удовлетворены проведением данного исследования, если у Вас возникли какие-либо проблемы, жалобы или вопросы, Вы можете связаться с Комитетом Исследований Высшей Школы Образования Назарбаев Университета по телефону +7 7172 70 93 59 или отправить письмо на электронный адрес gse_researchcommittee@nu.edu.kz

Пожалуйста, подпишите данную форму, если Вы согласны участвовать в исследовании.

• Я внимательно изучил представленную информацию;

• Мне предоставили полную информацию о целях и процедуре исследования;

• Я понимаю, как будут использованы собранные данные, и что доступ к любой конфиденциальной информации будет иметь только исследователи и руководитель;

• Я понимаю, что вправе в любой момент отказаться от участия в данном исследовании без объяснения причин;

• С полным осознанием всего вышеизложенного я согласен принять участие в исследовании по собственной воле.

Подпись: _____ Дата: _____

Дополнительная копия этой подписанной и датированной формы согласия предназначена для вас.

ЗЕРТТЕУ ЖҰМЫСЫ КЕЛІСІМІНІҢ АҚПАРАТТЫҚ ФОРМАСЫ (ата-анаға арналған)

АУДАНДЫҚ МЕКТЕП СТЭЙКХОЛДЕРЛАРЫНЫҢ ҮШ ТІЛДЕ БІЛІМ БЕРУГЕ ҚАТЫСТЫ ТҮСІНІГІ МЕН ҚОЛДАНЫСЫ: БІРДЕЙ НЕ ӘРТҮРЛІ?

СИПАТТАМА: Сізді ата-аналар, мұғалімдер және мектеп директоры үш тілді білім беруді қалай түсінетінін және өз орталарында қалай қолданатынын анықтауды көздейтін зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға шақырамыз. Сіздің қатысуыңыз ата-ана ретінде маңызды себебі сіз осы тіл саясатының негізгі орындаушысысыз. Сізге бетпе-бет сұхбатқа қатысу ұсынылып, ашық сұрақтар қойылады. Бұл сұрақтар үш тілде білім беруге, үйде және мектептен тыс жерлерде қолданылатын тілдерге байланысты болады. Зерттеу мақсатында жауаптар сұхбат алушының рұқсатымен таспаға жазылады. Мектеп әкімшілігіне немесе үшінші тараптарға сіздің жауабыңыз берілмейді. Сіздің жауабыңызды қорғау мақсатында есіміңіз псевдониммен ауыстырылып, жеке мәліметтер сұралмайды. Бұл зерттеу жұмысының қорытындысы ғылыми журналдарға жарияланса да, сіздің есіміңіз көрсетілмейді.

ӨТКІЗІЛЕТІН УАҚЫТЫ: Сіздің қатысуыңыз шамамен 30-45 минут уақытыңызды алады.

ЗЕРТТЕУ ЖҰМЫСЫНА ҚАТЫСУДЫҢ ҚАУІПТЕРІ МЕН АРТЫҚШЫЛЫҚТАРЫ: Осы зерттеуге байланысты қауіптер минималды және тек интервью барысында туындайтын қобалжу болуы мүмкін. Қатысушыларға зерттеуге қатысудан тікелей артықшылықтар болмауы мүмкін. Алайда қатысушылар үш тілде білім беру саясатының жүзеге асырылуы, осы бағдарламаның мақсаты мен міндеттері жайлы өз білімдерін арта түседі. Бұл жобада қатысып немесе қатыспауыңыз сіздің мәртебеңізге немесе балаңыздың сабағы мен бағасына әсер етпейді.

ҚАТЫСУШЫ ҚҰҚЫҚТАРЫ: Егер Сіз берілген формамен танысып, зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға шешім қабылдасаңыз, Сіздің қатысуыңыз ерікті түрде екенін хабарлаймыз. Сонымен қатар, қалаған уақытта зерттеу жұмысына қатысу туралы келісіміңізді кері қайтаруға немесе тоқтатуға құқығыңыз бар. Зерттеу жұмысына мүлдем қатыспауыңызға да толық құқығыңыз бар. Сондай-ақ, қандай да бір сұрақтарға жауап бермеуіңізге де әбден болады. Бұл зерттеу жұмысының нәтижелері академиялық немесе кәсіби конференцияларда жарияланып немесе баспаға ұсынылуы мүмкін.

БАЙЛАНЫС АҚПАРАТЫ: Сұрақтарыңыз: Егер жүргізіліп отырған зерттеу жұмысының процесі, қаупі мен артықшылықтары туралы сұрағыңыз немесе шағымыңыз болса, келесі байланыс құралдары арқылы жетекшімен хабарласуыңызға болады. Сулушаш Керимкулова sulushash.kerimkuloval@nu.edu.kz;

ДЕРБЕС БАЙЛАНЫС АҚПАРАТТАРЫ: Егер берілген зерттеу жұмысының жүргізілуімен қанағаттанбасаңыз немесе сұрақтарыңыз бен шағымдарыңыз болса, Назарбаев Университеті Жоғары Білім беру мектебінің Зерттеу Комитетімен көрсетілген байланыс құралдары арқылы хабарласуыңызға болады: +7 7172 70 93 59, электрондық пошта gse_researchcommittee@nu.edu.kz.

Зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға келісіміңізді берсеңіз, берілген формаға қол қоюыңызды сұраймыз.

• Мен берілген формамен мұқият таныстым;

• Маған зерттеу жұмысының мақсаты мен оның процедурасы жайында толық ақпарат берілді;

• Жинақталған ақпарат пен құпия мәліметтерге тек зерттеушілердің және жетекшінің өзіне қолжетімді және қалай қолданылатынын толық түсінемін;

• Мен кез келген уақытта ешқандай түсініктемесіз зерттеу жұмысына қатысудан бас тартуыма болатынын түсінемін;

• Мен жоғарыда аталып өткен ақпаратты саналы түрде қабылдап, осы зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға өз келісімімді беремін.

Қолы: _____ Күні: _____

Қол қойылған келісім формасының бір көшірмесі өзіңізде қалады.

ЗЕРТТЕУ ЖҰМЫСЫ КЕЛІСІМІНІҢ АҚПАРАТТЫҚ ФОРМАСЫ (мұғалімге арналған)

АУДАНДЫҚ МЕКТЕП СТЭЙКХОЛДЕРЛАРЫНЫҢ ҮШ ТІЛДЕ БІЛІМ БЕРУГЕ

ҚАТЫСТЫ ТҮСІНІГІ МЕН ҚОЛДАНЫСЫ: БІРДЕЙ НЕ ӘРТҮРЛІ?

СИПАТТАМА: Сізді ата-аналар, мұғалімдер және мектеп директоры үш тілде білім беруді қалай түсінетінін және өз орталарында тілдерді қалай қолданатынын анықтауды көздейтін зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға шақырамыз. Сіздің қатысуыңыз мұғалім ретінде маңызды себебі сіз осы тіл саясатының негізгі орындаушысысыз. Сізге бетпе-бет сұхбатқа қатысу ұсынылып, ашық сұрақтар қойылады. Бұл сұрақтар үш тілде білім беруге, және сыныпта қолданылатын тілдерге байланысты болады. Зерттеу мақсатында жауаптар сұхбат алушының рұқсатымен таспаға жазылады. Мектеп әкімшілігіне немесе үшінші тараптарға сіздің жауабыңыз берілмейді. Сіздің жауабыңызды қорғау мақсатында есіміңіз псевдониммен ауыстырылып, жеке мәліметтер сұралмайды. Бұл зерттеу жұмысының қорытындысы ғылыми журналдарға жарияланса да, сіздің есіміңіз көрсетілмейді.

ӨТКІЗІЛЕТІН УАҚЫТЫ: Сіздің қатысуыңыз шамамен 30-45 минут уақытыңызды алады.

ЗЕРТТЕУ ЖҰМЫСЫНА ҚАТЫСУДЫҢ ҚАУІПТЕРІ МЕН АРТЫҚШЫЛЫҚТАРЫ: Осы зерттеуге байланысты қауіптер минималды және тек интервью барысында туындайтын қобалжу болуы мүмкін. Қатысушыларға зерттеуге қатысудан тікелей артықшылықтар болмауы мүмкін. Алайда қатысушылар үш тілде білім беру саясатының жүзеге асырылуы, осы бағдарламаның мақсаты мен міндеттері жайлы өз білімдерін арта түседі. Сіздің зерттеуге қатысу немесе қатыспау туралы шешіміңіз жұмысқа немесе жұмыс жағдайына әсер етпейді.

ҚАТЫСУШЫ ҚҰҚЫҚТАРЫ: Егер Сіз берілген формамен танысып, зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға шешім қабылдасаңыз, Сіздің қатысуыңыз ерікті түрде екенін хабарлаймыз. Сонымен қатар, қалаған уақытта зерттеу жұмысына қатысу туралы келісіміңізді кері қайтаруға немесе тоқтатуға құқығыңыз бар. Зерттеу жұмысына мүлдем қатыспауыңызға да толық құқығыңыз бар. Сондай-ақ, қандай да бір сұрақтарға жауап бермеуіңізге де әбден болады. Бұл зерттеу жұмысының нәтижелері академиялық немесе кәсіби конференцияларда жарияланып немесе баспаға ұсынылуы мүмкін.

БАЙЛАНЫС АҚПАРАТЫ: Сұрақтарыңыз: Егер жүргізіліп отырған зерттеу жұмысының процесі, қаупі мен артықшылықтары туралы сұрағыңыз немесе шағымыңыз болса, келесі байланыс құралдары арқылы жетекшімен хабарласуыңызға болады. Сулушаш Керимкулова sulushash.kerimkulova1@nu.edu.kz;

ДЕРБЕС БАЙЛАНЫС АҚПАРАТТАРЫ: Егер берілген зерттеу жұмысының жүргізілуімен қанағаттанбасаңыз немесе сұрақтарыңыз бен шағымдарыңыз болса, Назарбаев Университеті Жоғары Білім беру мектебінің Зерттеу Комитетімен көрсетілген байланыс құралдары арқылы хабарласуыңызға болады: +7 7172 70 93 59, электрондық пошта gse_researchcommittee@nu.edu.kz.

Зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға келісіміңізді берсеңіз, берілген формаға қол қоюыңызды сұраймыз.

• Мен берілген формамен мұқият таныстым;

• Маған зерттеу жұмысының мақсаты мен оның процедурасы жайында толық ақпарат берілді;

• Жинақталған ақпарат пен құпия мәліметтерге тек зерттеушілердің және жетекшінің өзіне қолжетімді және қалай қолданылатынын толық түсінемін;

• Мен кез келген уақытта ешқандай түсініктемесіз зерттеу жұмысына қатысудан бас тартуыма болатынын түсінемін;

• Мен жоғарыда аталып өткен ақпаратты саналы түрде қабылдап, осы зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға өз келісімімді беремін.

Қолы: _____ Күні: _____

Қол қойылған келісім формасының бір көшірмесі өзіңізде қалады.

ЗЕРТТЕУ ЖҰМЫСЫ КЕЛІСІМІНІҢ АҚПАРАТТЫҚ ФОРМАСЫ (директорға арналған)
АУДАНДЫҚ МЕКТЕП СТЭЙКХОЛДЕРЛАРЫНЫҢ ҮШ ТІЛДЕ БІЛІМ БЕРУГЕ
ҚАТЫСТЫ ТҮСІНІГІ МЕН ҚОЛДАНЫСЫ:БІРДЕЙ НЕ ӘРТҮРЛІ?

СИПАТТАМА: Сізді ата-аналар, мұғалімдер және мектеп директоры үш тілде білім беруді қалай түсінетінін және өз орталарында тілдерді қалай қолданатынын анықтауды көздейтін зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға шақырамыз. Сіздің қатысуыңыз директор ретінде өте маңызды себебі сіз осы тіл саясатының негізгі орындаушысысыз. Сізге бетпе-бет сұхбатқа қатысу ұсынылып, ашық сұрақтар қойылады. Бұл сұрақтар үш тілде білім беруге және мектепте қолданылатын тілдерге байланысты болады. Зерттеу мақсатында жауаптар сұхбат алушының рұқсатымен таспаға жазылады. Сіздің жауабыңыз үшінші тараптарға берілмейді. Мектеп атауы мен орналасқан жері жалпылама атаулармен ауыстырылады. Сіздің жауабыңызды қорғау мақсатында есіміңіз псевдониммен ауыстырылып, жеке мәліметтер сұралмайды. Бұл зерттеу жұмысының қорытындысы ғылыми журналдарға жарияланса да, сіздің есіміңіз көрсетілмейді.
ӨТКІЗІЛЕТІН УАҚЫТЫ: Сіздің қатысуыңыз шамамен 30-45 минут уақытыңызды алады.
ЗЕРТТЕУ ЖҰМЫСЫНА ҚАТЫСУДЫҢ ҚАУІПТЕРІ МЕН АРТЫҚШЫЛЫҚТАРЫ: Осы зерттеуге байланысты қауіптер минималды және тек интервью барысында туындайтын қобалжу болуы мүмкін. Қатысушыларға зерттеуге қатысудан тікелей артықшылықтар болмауы мүмкін. Дегенмен, жанама артықшылықтар мектепте үштілді білім беру саясатын іске асыру туралы хабардар болуды және оны жүзеге асыруды дамытуға бағытталған қадамдарды қамтиды. Осы зерттеуге қатысу немесе қатыспау туралы шешім сіздің мәртебеңізге әсер етпейді.
ҚАТЫСУШЫ ҚҰҚЫҚТАРЫ: Егер Сіз берілген формамен танысып, зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға шешім қабылдасаңыз, Сіздің қатысуыңыз ерікті түрде екенін хабарлаймыз. Сонымен қатар, қалаған уақытта зерттеу жұмысына қатысу туралы келісіміңізді кері қайтаруға немесе тоқтатуға құқығыңыз бар. Зерттеу жұмысына мүлдем қатыспауыңызға да толық құқығыңыз бар. Сондай-ақ, қандай да бір сұрақтарға жауап бермеуіңізге де әбден болады. Бұл зерттеу жұмысының нәтижелері академиялық немесе кәсіби конференцияларда жарияланып немесе баспаға ұсынылуы мүмкін.
БАЙЛАНЫС АҚПАРАТЫ: Сұрақтарыңыз: Егер жүргізіліп отырған зерттеу жұмысының процесі, қаупі мен артықшылықтары туралы сұрағыңыз немесе шағымыңыз болса, келесі байланыс құралдары арқылы жетекшімен хабарласуыңызға болады. Сулушаш Керимкулова sulushash.kerimkuloval@nu.edu.kz;

ДЕРБЕС БАЙЛАНЫС АҚПАРАТТАРЫ: Егер берілген зерттеу жұмысының жүргізілуімен қанағаттанбасаңыз немесе сұрақтарыңыз бен шағымдарыңыз болса, Назарбаев Университеті Жоғары Білім беру мектебінің Зерттеу Комитетімен көрсетілген байланыс құралдары арқылы хабарласуыңызға болады: +7 7172 70 93 59, электрондық пошта gse_researchcommittee@nu.edu.kz.
Зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға келісіміңізді берсеңіз, берілген формаға қол қоюыңызды сұраймыз.
• Мен берілген формамен мұқият таныстым;
• Маған зерттеу жұмысының мақсаты мен оның процедурасы жайында толық ақпарат берілді;
• Жинақталған ақпарат пен құпия мәліметтерге тек зерттеушілердің және жетекшінің өзіне қолжетімді және қалай қолданылатынын толық түсінемін;
• Мен кез келген уақытта ешқандай түсініктемесіз зерттеу жұмысына қатысудан бас тартуыма болатынын түсінемін;
• Мен жоғарыда аталып өткен ақпаратты саналы түрде қабылдап, осы зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға өз келісімімді беремін.
Қолы: _____ Күні: _____
Қол қойылған келісім формасының бір көшірмесі өзіңізде қалады.

Appendix E

Interview transcripts in English

Interview transcripts with a parent	Codes
The consent form is being explained Researcher: Please, tell me about your family, how many children do you have? Parent: I have three children, two of them go to this school, one goes to kindergarten. R: What do you think of trilingual education? P: Well, I like ii and totally support it because after the school we have planned that our daughter will study higher education abroad. This is our plan for the future. I have asked some of our friends and looked through the internet, my daughter started <u>learning English intensively with this trilingual education. They started studying languages from very early age</u>. And we have also been preparing them to this. We increased her level of English by going to private tutors. This new education system allows children to search for information themselves. And this skill will be very helpful when children go to abroad they will be ready to such grading, for example. R: And how do you understand trilingual education? P: As I said, <u>Children should know English, it is something must have in these days.</u> It opens doors for children for further education. I as parent support it very much. R: what languages do you prefer to use at home? P: We speak mostly Kazakh, because we live with our grandparents. But, what I have noticed is that when children leave the home they start to switching to Russian language. They speak Russian with their friends, neighbours, and at school.	Intensive English learning (understanding) Understanding of TE