

**Medium of instruction and national identity**

Alexandra Nam

Submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

In

Multilingual Education

Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education

June, 2018

Word count: 18,762

©Copyright by Alexandra Nam 2018

## AUTHOR AGREEMENT

By signing and submitting this license, I Alexandra Nam (the author or copyright owner) grant to Nazarbayev University (NU) the non-exclusive right to reproduce, convert (as defined below), and/or distribute my submission (including the abstract) worldwide in print and electronic format and in any medium, including but not limited to audio or video.

I agree that NU may, without changing the content, convert the submission to any medium or format for the purpose of preservation.

I also agree that NU may keep more than one copy of this submission for purposes of security, back-up and preservation.

I confirm that the submission is my original work, and that I have the right to grant the rights contained in this license. I also confirm that my submission does not, to the best of my knowledge, infringe upon anyone's copyright.

If the submission contains material for which I do not hold copyright, I confirm that I have obtained the unrestricted permission of the copyright owner to grant NU the rights required by this license, and that such third-party owned material is clearly identified and acknowledged within the text or content of the submission.

IF THE SUBMISSION IS BASED UPON WORK THAT HAS BEEN SPONSORED OR SUPPORTED BY AN AGENCY OR ORGANIZATION OTHER THAN NU, I CONFIRM THAT I HAVE FULFILLED ANY RIGHT OF REVIEW OR OTHER OBLIGATIONS REQUIRED BY SUCH CONTRACT OR AGREEMENT.

NU will clearly identify my name(s) as the author(s) or owner(s) of the submission, and will not make any alteration, other than as allowed by this license, to your submission.

I hereby accept the terms of the above Author Agreement.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Author's signature:

01.06.18

Date:

**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:

01.06.2018

**Ethical Approval**

**NUGSE RESEARCH APPROVAL DECISION LETTER**

Dear Alexandra,


The NUGSE Research Committee reviewed the project titled "Medium of instruction and national identity" 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. Make sure to address all of the information requested on the request for modification form(s). Please be advised that in some circumstances, changes to the protocol may disqualify the project from approval.

Sincerely,  
NUGSE Research Committee

CITI Training Certificate



Completion Date 15-Sep-2017  
Expiration Date 14-Sep-2020  
Record ID 24627805

This is to certify that:


**Alexandra Nam**

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/?we359fcfd-0f9c-4513-952d-793c29b40156-24627805](http://www.citiprogram.org/verify/?we359fcfd-0f9c-4513-952d-793c29b40156-24627805)

**Abstract**

## Medium of instruction and national identity

Kazakhstan is a young country still in the early stages of nation-building, with civic and ethnic nationalism and Kazakh and Russian languages being the major issues in constructing the national identity (Aitymbetov et al., 2015). Although the state overtly strives to develop civic identity, it fails to overcome the resistance of ethnic nationalism (Burkhanov & Sharipova, 2015). As language is an essential element of national identity (Smith, 1991) and education is one of the main tools for its construction (Gellner, 2006), medium of instruction (MOI) in education is a defining factor in national identity. In the context of trilingual education and English medium of instruction (EMI), different MOI might produce different outcomes for national identity. Employing a mixed-methods research design, the study aims to investigate the relationship between MOI, and the strength and content of national identity. The study surveyed and interviewed ethnically Kazakh university students (n = 89 and 14 respectively) from three different MOI undergraduate programs: Kazakh, Russian and English. The findings revealed that the content of national identity for Kazakh-educated participants included a stronger ethnic component and the participants had a significantly stronger sense of national identity than the students educated in either Russian or English. Russian- and English-educated participants' national identities, on the contrary, were more civic-based, but weaker than those of Kazakh-educated students. Quantitative analysis also identified significant positive correlations between the strength of national identity and both the number of years in Kazakh MOI and perceived Kazakh proficiency. Negative correlations were found between the strength of national identity and perceived Russian language proficiency as well as with English proficiency (both perceived and based on IELTS scores). The findings

of the study might be used to explore possible outcomes for national identity of trilingual education and EMI in Kazakhstani educational institutions.

**Аңдатпа**

## Оқыту тілі және ұлттық сәйкестік

Қазақстан өз ұлттық құрылысының азаматтық және этникалық ұлтшылдық пен қазақ және орыс тілдері ұлттық ерекшелікті қалыптастырудағы басты мәселелердің бірі болып табылатын ерте кезеңіндегі жас мемлекет (Айтимбетов және басқалар, 2015). Мемлекет азаматтық сәйкестікті дамытуға тырысқанымен, этникалық ұлтшылдықтың қарсылығын еңсере алмайды (Бурханов және Шарипова, 2015). Тіл ұлттық сәйкестіктің маңызды элементі (Смит, 1991), ал білім беру оны құрудың негізгі құралдарының бірі болса (Геллнер, 2006), білім берудегі оқыту тілі ұлттық сәйкестіктің айқындаушы факторы болып табылады. Үш тілдік білім беру және ағылшын тілінде оқыту тұрғысынан алғанда, басқа оқыту тілі ұлттық сәйкестілікті қалауда өзге нәтижелерге әкеліп соқтыруы мүмкін. Аралас әдісті зерттеу тәсілін қолдану арқасында, осы жұмыс оқыту тілі мен ұлттық сәйкестіктің күші мен мазмұнының арасындағы қарым-қатынасты зерттеуге бағытталған. Зерттеуге орыс, қазақ және ағылшын тілдерінде оқитын үш қазақ студенттері қатысып, сауалнама мен сұхбаттан өтті (сауалнама 89 және сұхбат 14 студент). Зерттеулер нәтижесінде қазақ тілде білім алатын студенттер үшін ұлттық сәйкестік мазмұны ұлттың құрамдас бөлігі болғаны және орыс немесе ағылшын тілдерінде білім алған оқушыларға қарағанда қазақша оқитын қатысушылардың ұлттық сәйкестік сезіміне кәбірек ие екендігін көрсетті. Орыс және ағылшын тілдерінде оқитын қатысушылардың ұлттық сәйкестіктері, керісінше, азаматтыққа негізделген, бірақ қазақша оқитын оқушыларға қарағанда әлсіздеу. Сондай-ақ, сандық талдау ұлттық сәйкестіктің күштілігі мен қазақ тілінде білім алған жылдар саны және қазақ тілі меңгеру деңгейі арасындағы оң корреляция анықталды. Ұлттық сәйкестік күштілігі мен орыс тілін меңгеру деңгейі, сондай-ақ ағылшын тілін меңгеру деңгейі арасында (IELTS



балдары бойынша) теріс корреляция анықталды. Зерттеудің нәтижелері Қазақстандық білім беру мекемелерінде үштілді оқыту мен ағылшын тілінде білім берудің ұлттық сәйкестік үшін ықтимал нәтижелерді зерттеу үшін пайдаланылуы мүмкін.

## Абстракт

### Язык обучения и национальная идентичность

Казахстан - молодая страна, все еще находящаяся на ранних стадиях государственного строительства, где гражданский и этнический национализм наряду с казахским и русским языком являются основными проблемами в построении национальной идентичности (Айтымбетов и др., 2015). Хотя государство открыто стремится к развитию гражданской идентичности, оно не может преодолеть сопротивление этнического национализма (Бурханов и Шарипова, 2015). Поскольку язык является важным элементом национальной идентичности (Смит, 1991), а образование является одним из основных инструментов его строительства (Геллнер, 2006), язык обучения в образовании является определяющим фактором национальной идентичности. В контексте трехязычного образования и английского языка обучения различные языки обучения могут по-разному влиять на национальную идентичность. Используя смешанный метод, исследование направлено на изучение взаимосвязи между языком обучения и силой и содержанием национальной идентичности. В ходе исследования анкетирование и интервью охватили студентов казахской с тремя различными языками обучения: казахским, русским и английским национальности (89 и 14 соответственно). Полученные результаты показали, что содержание национальной идентичности для студентов из программ с казахским языком обучения включало более сильную этническую составляющую, и участники имели значительно более сильное чувство национальной идентичности, чем студенты, обучавшиеся на русском или английском языках. Напротив, национальная идентичность студентов обучающихся на русском и английском языках была более гражданской, но слабее, чем у студентов из программ с казахским языком обучения. Количественный анализ также

выявил прямые корреляции между силой национальной идентичности и количеством лет обучения на казахском языке и предполагаемым уровнем казахского языка, который участники определяли самостоятельно. Обратные корреляции были найдены между силой национальной идентичности и предполагаемым уровнем владения русским языком, а также с владением английским языком (как предполагаемым, так и основанным на показателях IELTS).

Результаты исследования могут быть использованы для изучения возможного влияния трехязычного образования и обучения на английском языке в казахстанских учебных заведениях на национальную идентичность учащихся.

**Table of Contents**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| List of Tables .....   | xiv |
| Chapter 1. Introduction.....                                   | 1   |
| Nation-building Process in Kazakhstan .....                    | 1   |
| Problem Statement.....   | 2   |
| Statement of Purpose and Research Questions .....              | 3   |
| Rationale and Significance of the Study .....                  | 3   |
| Structure of the Thesis .....                                  | 4   |
| Chapter 2. Literature Review.....                              | 6   |
| National Identity .....  | 6   |
| Constructivism and primordialism .....                         | 7   |
| Civic and ethnic conceptualizations of national identity ..... | 8   |
| National identity in Kazakhstan .....                          | 9   |
| National Identity and Language.....                            | 12  |
| National Identity, Education and Medium of Instruction .....   | 14  |
| Identity and education .....                                   | 15  |
| National identity and education.....                           | 16  |
| National identity and medium of instruction.....               | 17  |
| Theoretical framework .....                                    | 18  |
| Conclusion .....   | 19  |
| Chapter 3. Methodology .....                                   | 20  |
| Research Design .....  | 20  |
| Research Site and Sample.....                                  | 22  |
| Data Collection Instruments .....                              | 24  |
| Questionnaire .....  | 25  |
| Interviews .....   | 26  |
| Data Collection Procedures.....                                | 27  |
| Data Analysis .....  | 29  |
| Ethical Considerations .....                                   | 31  |
| Limitations .....  | 33  |
| Conclusion .....   | 34  |
| Chapter 4. Results.....  | 36  |
| Quantitative Data Report .....                                 | 36  |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Inferential analysis on national identity and medium of instruction.....          | 37 |
| National identity and the number of years educated through a language. ....       | 38 |
| Identity and language proficiency.....  | 39 |
| Summary of quantitative results.....  | 41 |
| Qualitative Results .....   | 42 |
| Kazakh-educated respondents' ethnic conceptualizations of national identity.....  | 43 |
| Russian-educated respondents' civic conceptualizations of national identity ..... | 45 |
| English-educated respondents' civic conceptualizations of national identity.....  | 48 |
| Students' experiences in different mediums of instruction.....                    | 52 |
| Summary of qualitative results.....   | 53 |
| Conclusion .....  | 54 |
| Chapter 5. Discussion.....  | 56 |
| Medium of Instruction and National Identity .....                                 | 56 |
| Medium of Instruction and Strength of National Identity .....                     | 58 |
| Medium of Instruction and Content of National Identity .....                      | 60 |
| Conclusion .....  | 62 |
| Chapter 6. Conclusion .....   | 64 |
| Limitations .....   | 64 |
| Implications .....  | 65 |
| Future Research .....   | 66 |
| References .....  | 68 |
| Appendices .....  | 75 |
| Appendix A.....   | 75 |
| Appendix B.....   | 77 |
| Appendix C.....   | 79 |
| Appendix D.....   | 80 |
| Appendix E.....   | 90 |

**List of Tables**

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table 1: Characteristics of participants involved in the quantitative part.....   | 23 |
| Table 2: Characteristics of participants involved in the qualitative part.....  | 24 |
| Table 3: A one-way between-groups ANOVA for national identity by medium of instruction.....   | 37 |
| Table 4: Spearman's rho rank-order correlation coefficient for national identity and the number of years educated through a language..... | 38 |
| Table 5: Spearman's rho rank-order correlation coefficient for national identity and language proficiencies.....                          | 39 |
| Table 6: Spearman's rho rank-order correlation coefficient for students' IELTS scores and their strength of national identity.....        | 40 |
| Table 7: Qualitative themes by medium of instruction.....   | 42 |

## **Chapter 1. Introduction**

Kazakhstan is a young country in its early stage of nation-building. “The language issue is central in the process of nation building and identity in the post-Soviet area” (Aitymbetov, Toktarov, & Ormakhanova, 2015, p.10) and since the main sites for enforcing language policies are educational institutions, this study considers medium of instruction (MOI) at educational institutions to be strongly connected to students' national identities.

### **Nation-building Process in Kazakhstan**

During the last 5 centuries the indigenous population has undergone several identity transformations. Kazakh identity first came into shape with the separation of Kazakh Khanate from Uzbek Khanate in the fifteenth century. However, during the soviet time, when Kazakhstan became a part of the Soviet Union, Kazakh identity was challenged with Soviet affiliation (Goble, 2015; Gerhard, 1991; Glenn, 1999). Nowadays after gaining its independence in 1991, language issue and ethnic and civic dichotomies of nationalism are considered main characteristics of nation-building process in Kazakhstan (Burkhanov & Sharipova, 2015; Laruelle, 2015; Aitymbetov, Toktarov, & Ormakhanova, 2015)

The case of Kazakhstan is notably distinctive with regards to the country's ethnic diversity and noticeable shifts in the proportional representation of major ethnic groups. The population of the country includes more than 130 ethnicities with Kazakhs and Russians being the largest. Right after the collapse of the Soviet Union, Kazakhstan was the only post-soviet country where titular population represented a minority in its own country and was outnumbered by the representatives of other ethnic groups (Goskomstat, 1991). According to the population census, in 1989 the proportion of Kazakhs constituted 27,1%, whereas the proportion of Russians in Kazakhstan comprised 50,8%. However, during the last three decades, due to extensive migration of Russians, Germans and other

slavs and higher birth rate of Kazakhs compared to Russians (Agency of Statistics of the Republic of Kazakhstan, as cited in Mehisto, 2015), Kazakhs have restored their numeric dominance in the country. In 2015 Kazakhs constituted 65,52%, with Russians 21,47%, Uzbek 3,04% and other ethnic groups comprising 9,97% (Naselenie Kazakhstana, 2017).

The aforementioned demographic background of the country as well as the dominance of the Russian language within the Soviet Union left Kazakhstan with the Kazakh language spoken mostly only in home domain, with the public spheres being mainly Russian-dominant (Smagulova, 2008). Nowadays, Kazakhstan is restoring its titular language. According to the “Law on Languages in the Republic of Kazakhstan” issued in 1997, the Kazakh language has gained the status of the national language. However, the Russian language is still noticeably present as a language of instruction, especially in the urban areas (Fierman, 2006). Moreover, as “Kazakhstan 2050 Strategy” (-, 2012) states, Kazakhstan has set the goal to achieve trilingualism in the society by adding the English language to the Kazakh and Russian languages (Nazarbayev, 2011).

### **Problem Statement**

As Kazakhstan is one of the post-soviet Central Asian countries with “multilayer and mixed identities” (Omelicheva, 2015, p. vii), the process of nation building in Kazakhstan is complex in its nature. The country’s population is noticeably heterogeneous not only in terms of race, ethnicity, religion, but also with regards to language (Marquardt, 2015). As national identity in post-colonial countries are frequently linked to language policies and the major sites for enforcing these language policies are educational institutions (Landau & Kellner-Heinkele, 2001; Tollefson & Tsui, 2010), national identity is interconnected with medium of instruction (MOI) in educational institutions.

Yet, since trilingual system is still not implemented, most of the educational institutions provide education mainly in Kazakh or Russian and occasionally in English or



other minority languages (Statisticheskii Ezhegodnik Kazakhstana, as cited in Landau & Kellner-Heinkele, 2001). Acknowledging the power of education in terms of shaping national identity and being aware that “Language, whether indigenous or foreign, is a marker of identity” (Olaoye, 2013, p. 41), MOI in Kazakhstani educational institutions might to some extent influence the strength of national identity. Thus, it is logical to suppose that the outcomes of Kazakh MOI, Russian MOI and English MOI programs in terms of national identity could vary. The present study will focus on tertiary education and will explore national identity of students from different MOI programs. The findings of the research will contribute to receiving a deeper insight in identity construction with regards to the language in education.

### **Statement of Purpose and Research Questions**

The purpose of the present mixed-methods study is to investigate the link between identity and MOI in Kazakhstani educational institutions. As there is “variation in the intensity or nature of group identification across members” (Hale, 2004, p. 461), the study will look at both the strength and the content of national identity with the following research questions posed:

- 1) Is there any relationship between MOI and the strength of students’ national identity?
- 2) What are the perceptions of students from different MOI programs of the content of Kazakhstani national identity?

### **Rationale and Significance of the Study**

The rationale to study the relationship between MOI and national identity rests upon the desire to contribute to the research which might allow to predict the potential outcome of the implementation of trilingual education policy in secondary education and English medium of instruction (EMI) in higher education in constructing identity of the

younger generation in Kazakhstan. The study will look at how each language (Kazakh, English and Russian) separate from each other relates to both the strength and content of national identity.

The findings might be useful in understanding the trajectories in identity formation in Kazakhstani education. Moreover, this study also aims to fill the gap in the literature specifically with regards to the relations between MOI and national identity. The link between language and identity has been repeatedly discussed by the researchers (Norton, 2000, Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004). However, little research was devoted to language and national identity in education, especially in Kazakhstan.

### **Structure of the Thesis**

The thesis consists of 6 chapters: introduction, literature review, methodology, results, discussion and conclusion. Literature review will look at the concept of national identity and its relation to language and language in education. Looking at identity as fluid, situated, negotiated and changeable across space and time (Gee, 2000; Norton, 2000, Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004), the study will be based on Gellner's (2006) theory of education being a significant instrument in constructing national identity through establishing common high culture, societal reproduction and language unification. The content of national identity will be looked at through the prism of the dichotomy of civic and ethnic nationalism (Brubaker, 1996; Smith, 1991). Methodology of the study will justify the choice of mixed-methods embedded design, survey and interview as the main tools for the data collection as well as sample, sites and data analysis procedures. The results chapter will report both qualitative and quantitative results with the findings being discussed, compared and contrasted with the existing literature on the topic in the discussion chapter. Finally the conclusion chapter will include summary of the findings,

limitations, implications and recommendations for the future research with the concluding comments on achieving the research purpose and answering the research questions.

## **Chapter 2. Literature Review**

The purpose of the chapter is to review the main theories and empirical research in relation to education, language and national identity with more focus on Kazakhstan. The chapter will look at national identity and its relation to language as well as education and MOI. The part on national identity will discuss constructivist and primordial approaches, civic and ethnic conceptualizations of national identity and discourses on national identity in Kazakhstan. The literature on Kazakhstani national identity will be reviewed to reflect the ethnic and civic dichotomies of the national identity in Kazakhstan. The chapter will also cover the relationship between language and national identity as well as the relationship between national identity, education and MOI. The part devoted to national identity, education and MOI will first dwell on the concept of identity itself and recent approaches to studying it as well as theoretic rationale for studying it, especially in the context of multilingual education. Finally, the chapter will discuss how language and national identity are related to each other and what role education and MOI play in constructing students' national identities. Theoretical framework of the study will be introduced at the end of the literature review chapter.

### **National Identity**

When referring to the concept of national identity many researchers frequently cite Anderson (1991), Smith (1991), Gellner (2006) and Brubaker (1994). Both Smith (1991) and Anderson (1991) link their conceptualizations of national identity to the concept of a nation. Anderson's (1991) constructivist perspective on the origin of the nations, supported by Gellner (2006), takes over Smith's (1991) primordial view, although both perspectives might be seen as somewhat similar (Hale, 2004). Brubaker (1994) and Smith (1991), in their turn, distinguish between ethnic and civic characteristic of the nations, which are similar to Connor's (1993) distinctions between nationalism and patriotism with the former

having a stronger appeal and strength of emotional attachment to the individuals. Civic and ethnic components were used in the current study for analytical purposes to respond to the second research question on the content of national identity.

Smith's (1991) definition of national identity suggests that the notion "involves some sense of political community, however tenuous. A political community in turn implies at least some common institutions and a single code or rights and duties for all the members of the community. It also suggests a definite social space, a fairly well demarcated and bounded territory, with which the members identify and to which they feel they belong." (p. 9). Smith (1991) also proposes a list of five essential elements of national identity: "1. an historical territory, or homeland; 2. common myths and historical memories; 3. a common, mass public culture; 4. common legal rights and duties for all members; 5. a common economy with territorial mobility for members." (p.14). In this way, nation is "a named human population sharing an historic territory, common myths and historical memories, a mass public culture, a common economy and common legal rights and duties for all members" (p. 15). According to Anderson (1991) national identity is a sense of belonging to a nation, which in its turn can be defined as an *imagined political community*. The term *imagined* here is explained in the following way: "members of even the smallest nations will never know most of their fellow members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion" (p. 6-7). In this way, both scholars link national identity to the concept of nation, the origin of which is usually viewed from two different perspectives.

**Constructivism and primordialism.** Constructivist (Anderson, 1991; Gellner, 2006) and primordial (Smith, 1991) approaches to viewing nations and national identity are two major competing theories within national identity studies. Smith's (1991) primordial approach sees a nation as a continuity of ethnic community, or *ethnie* as the

scholar calls it. In other words, the nation is formed on the basis of ethnic community, which in its turn is characterized by “the durability of ethnic ties, the longevity of their cultures and the persistence of collective identities and even communities over several centuries” (Smith, 1991, p. 33). Anderson (1991), on the other hand, portrays a nation as a unity once it is created by means of print. This idea is also shared by Gellner (2006) who also sees national identity as a social construct with education considered to be the main tool for social reproduction and developing a sense of unity and belonging. The current study is looking at national identity from a more constructivist perspective and sees identity as something fluid, changeable in response to environmental changes and constructed by the group itself. However, it does not deny the significance of the ethnic category. Instead, the concept of ethnicity is also viewed from the constructivist lens with ethnic identity being “constructed (i.e., that beliefs about primordiality are formed) during some identifiable period in history” (Hale, 2004, p. 461).

**Civic and ethnic conceptualizations of national identity.** Both Brubaker (1994) and Smith (1991) distinguish between ethnic and civic nationalism. Brubaker (1994) conceptualized civic and ethnic national identities based on the examples of France and Germany respectively. According to the scholar, French civic national identity places more value on the territory of the country and is more inclusive. German ethnic national identity, on the other hand, is more based on blood and descent and is less inclusive. Similarly to Brubaker (1994), Smith (1991) divides models of national identities into Western and non-Western. The former conceptualizes national identity in more civic terms, whereas the latter represent a more ethnic conceptualization of national identity. Therefore, non-Western models, compared to Western models, put the value of the core ethnicity in the center of national identity, thus, making national identity less flexible with regards to migration and, therefore, less inclusive. The scholar also defined both civic and ethnic

elements of national identity. Thus, the elements of civic national identity include “historic territory, legal-political community, legal-political equality of members, and common civic culture and ideology” (Smith, 1991, p. 11). Ethnic elements, in turn, incorporate “genealogy and presumed descent ties, popular mobilization, vernacular languages, customs and traditions” (Smith, 1991, p. 12). Current study employed civic and ethnic conceptualizations of national identity and analyzed the content of Kazakhstani national identity with reference to the presence of civic and ethnic elements.

Connor’s (1993) distinction between nationalism and patriotism also seems to reflect the dichotomy of ethnic and civic sentiments, with the former having a greater influence on the individuals. According to the scholars, “an emotional attachment to one's state or country and its political institutions” (p. 374) should not be confused with nationalism and, instead, should be referred to as patriotism. The correct interpretation of nationalism, in its turn, should be “an emotional attachment to one's people - one's ethnonational group” (p. 374). Nationalism is frequently used by the ruling elites as a tool for manipulation since, as the scholar argues, being rooted in blood, common descent and familial kinship, nationalism compared to patriotism possesses a stronger emotional power for the individuals.

**National identity in Kazakhstan.** Kazakhstan possesses a complex “hybrid state identity” (Laruelle, 2015, p. 1). As any national identity it possesses multiple levels and dimensions (Omeliicheva, 2015a). With regards to national identity in Kazakhstan, Kazakhstani civic national identity is frequently compared with Kazakh ethnic national identity (Laruelle, 2015; Rees and Williams, 2017). The first is defined as the identity of “a multiethnic nation at the crossroads of Eurasian continent, [...] a transnational country integrated into world trends” (Laruelle, 2015, p. 2), whereas the latter is viewed as the identity of “the political entity of the Kazakh nation and its historical accomplishment”

(Laruelle, 2015, p. 2). Kazakhstanness in this case is viewed as close to the Soviet national identity (Laruelle, 2015, p. 28), with the researchers (Aitymbetov, Toktarov, & Ormakhanova, 2015; Brubaker, 1996; Burkhanov & Sharipova, 2015; Dave, 2007; Laruelle, 2015) coming to the consensus that Kazakhstani national identity is ethnicity-centered national identity with the emphasis on Kazakh language, Kazakh culture and Kazakh traditions.

Brubaker's (1996) view of post-soviet states as nationalizing states is also reflected in Bravna's (2007) work on post-soviet Kazakhstan. Brubaker (1996) refers to almost all post-Soviet states as to be nationalizing "in domains such as language policy, education, mass media programming, constitutional symbolism, national iconography, migration policy, public sector employment, and citizenship legislation" (p. 106). Kazakhstan is not an exception. Although Brubaker (1996) compares Kazakhstani case with Ukraine in terms of the language situation, a large proportion of Russians in the ethnic compositions of the countries, mild nationalizing policies and the countries' image of interethnic harmony, the scholar, nevertheless argues that both Kazakhstan and Ukraine are still nationalizing in their policies. Promoting Kazakh language in Kazakhstan both in education and mass media, according to Brubaker (1996), is a nationalizing policy. Another example is the requirement for the Kazakh language skills in taking positions in the government. Aitymbetov, Toktarov, and Ormakhanova (2015) also view the conflict between Kazakh and Kazakhstani identities as the conflict between Kazakh and Russian languages in the country with the discourse of Kazakh ethnic identity circulating in the Kazakh media and Kazakhstani civic identity in the media in Russian:

As it is known, those in positions for Kazakh identity, struggling for Kazakh language present not only in the Constitution, but in the real daily life would be the official language, spoken by all peoples living in Kazakhstan. While the



carriers of Kazakhstani identity advocate the positions of Russian language in certain ways. (p. 6)

Bravna (2007) also adopts Brubaker's (1996) view on Kazakhstan as a nationalizing state with "derussification" of Kazakh ethnic national identity as an important step in achieving the states nationalist goal. The reference to the civiness in this context is viewed as symbolic, which is characterized by only "mimicking of a 'civic' discourse" (p. 136).

Researchers investigating national identity in Kazakhstan (Burkhanov & Sharipova, 2015; Laruelle, 2015) also view Kazakhstani national identity as a civic identity that prioritizes Kazakh ethnicity. Burkhanov and Sharipova (2015) argue that Kazakhstani national identity takes the model of the Soviet identity as an example and could be considered as a "neo-Soviet national identity approach" (p. 28). The notion of "Soviet people" (p. 22) is replaced by Kazakhstanis with the Russians position of the "older brother" (p.26) taken by the Kazakhs in Kazakhstan. The equality and rights of the ethnicities living in Kazakhstan is embodied in the nominal body of Assembly of the People of Kazakhstan (APK). However, although the idea of a civic nation is promoted in the Kazakhstani media, the scholars provide the data from empirical research conducted by Kazakhstani Institute of Strategic Research in 2010 to conclude that although the notion of Kazakhstani national identity is gradually emerging, in reality Kazakhstani case is still close to the nationalizing stance discussed by Brubaker (1996). Laruelle (2015) also sees little prospect for Kazakhstanness in the future. The paradigm of Kazakhstanness is discussed together with the two other paradigms of Kazakhness and Transnationalism. Kazakhness is promoted by the return of oralmans, establishment the Kazakh language as the national language of the country, substitution of Russian names of streets and cities by Kazakh ones. Kazakhstanness in turn is associated with Eurasianism and APK. Finally,

transnationalism goes in parallel with Bolashak, the hosting of the World EXPO 2017 and Nazarbayevism, in particular Nazarbayev University, Nazarbayev Intellectual Schools and Astana day. All three paradigms are appealing to certain audiences: Kazakness to the indigenous population of the country, Kazakhstanness to ethnic minorities within the country as well as post-Soviet countries, and transnationalism to internationalized audience. Thus, considering the decrease in the Slavic population in Kazakhstan, the scholar suggests that the paradigm of Kazakhstanness might gradually vanish from the state identity.

To sum up, the similar conclusions of all the abovementioned articles go in line with Smith's (1991) models of national identities and Brubaker's (1996) image of post-soviet nationalizing states. Kazakhstani model is non-Western model that implies a strong emphasis on the vernacular ethnicity of the country. Soviet identity can be also explained by belonging to the same model as the model involves both Eastern European and Asian countries.

### **National Identity and Language**

The relationship between language and national identity was discussed by both the Enlightenment and Romantics views. In research theoretical works, this link has been considered as a fundamental not only in the abovementioned sociological studies (Anderson, 1991; Brubaker, 1994; Gellner, 2006; Smith, 1991) but also by the researchers in multilingual education (Baker, 2011; Tollefson & Tsui, 2010). Empirical quantitative research both in the international context and in Kazakhstan gives further evidences of the interconnectedness of language proficiency and national identity.

Despite different perspectives on the relationship between language and national identity, language was viewed as a significant component of national belonging by both the Enlightenment and Romantics (Joseph, 2016, p. 21). Jacobin (as cited in Joseph 2016),

who represents the former perspective, states that “creating a shared language is the necessary and sufficient condition for producing a nation out of the sometimes distantly related peoples who live in a contiguous landscape” (p. 21). In contrast to Jacobin, who reflects the constructivist approach to the origin of a nation, Seriot (as cited in Joseph, 2016), a representative of the Romantic view, seems to be based on the primordial approach and has a slightly different perspective on the relationship between language and the nation. According to the scholar, a shared language is more of a product of a soul of the nation rather than the condition for creating a nation.

Recent quantitative research investigating the link between language and national identity (Brown & Sachdev, 2009; Golan-Cook & Olshtain, 2011) also confirms the relationship between native and state languages and both ethnic and national identities. The survey involving 152 immigrant university students with post-soviet background who currently lived in Israel looked at students’ perceived language proficiency, language use and identity (Golan-Cook & Olshtain, 2011). The findings showed that students’ identity influenced students’ attitudes towards the languages representing their ethnicity and nationality. In other words, students with stronger national identities expressed more positive attitudes towards the country’s language and less positive attitudes towards their mother tongue. The students that were ready to embrace their new national identities also showed more frequency in using Hebrew. The relationship between students’ perceived language command and identity as well as language command and language use was insignificant, which was explained by students’ strong command in both languages, Hebrew and Russian. The relationship between language and identity was also identified in the context of Japanese residents in the United Kingdom (Brown & Sachdev, 2009). The analysis of survey data from 95 participants showed negative correlations between Japanese language identity and British identity. In other words, the stronger a person

identified with Japanese language, the weaker his British identification was and vice versa. The results also revealed that the longer the participants stayed in the United Kingdom, the higher they scored on use of the English language, English language command as well as British and English language identities.

Empirical Kazakhstani studies (Rees & Williams, 2017; Sharipova, Burkhanov & Alpeissova, 2017) are also in consistent with the research. The studies closely link both the strength (Rees & Williams, 2017) and the content (Sharipova, Burkhanov & Alpeissova, 2017) of Kazakhstani national identity to the Kazakh language. The analysis of the 460 door-to-door interviews to see how Kazakhstani national identity related to the following categories: demographic information, language use, identity, attitudes towards language and political engagement (Rees and Williams, 2017). The findings showed that, although no correlation was identified between Kazakhstani national identity and ethnicity or political engagement, Kazakhstani national identity was slightly correlated to the preference of the Kazakh language. Similarly, the analysis of the data from 1600 Kazakhstanis also found that people with good command of the Kazakh language were supportive of ethnic nationalism (Sharipova, Burkhanov & Alpeissova, 2017). Moreover, 85% of the respondents considered knowledge of the Kazakh language important for the citizens of the country.

### **National Identity, Education and Medium of Instruction**

National identity is constructed through education and educational policies. Since language is a significant element of national identity, both national identity and MOI in education are interconnected and interdependent. Education is the main site where the state's language policies to are implemented. Therefore, MOI can be considered a powerful tool in the process of constructing national identity.

**Identity and education.** As language is a social practice, recent research on identity in the context of multilingual education views identity as a salient category in education and language learning (Gee, 2000; Norton, 2000; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004). In this sense, language learning and identity are intertwined and interconnected.

The concept of identity is commonly viewed as a sense of belonging to a larger group and is complex in its nature. According to Norton (2013), identity implies “how a person understands his or her relationship to the world, how that relationship is constructed across time and space, and how the person understands possibilities for the future” (p. 45). The major change in the perspective on identity is connected to the shift from psychological to collective approach, with the latter taken over in identity research (Niezen, 2012). In contrast to psychological approach, which viewed identity as a “fixed” category, collective approach sees identity as something that can be claimed and protected from others. In the research in multilingual education, the notion of identity is currently seen as socially constructed, fluid, multidimensional, situated, negotiated, dynamic, changing through space and time and linked to the categories of imagined communities, symbolic resources and power (Gee, 2000; Norton, 2000; Norton, 2013; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004).

As have been mentioned above, identity is a multidimensional concept. Thus, as within social identity the division into ethnic identity, cultural identity and national identity occur (Yuan & Fang, 2016), the research either focuses on these divisions separately or studies the way the identities co-exist. Citrin and Sears (2009) look in particular at ethnic and national identities and note that in homogenous context national and ethnic identities are not in danger of clashing. This goes in line with Bauman’s (as cited in Preece, 2016) statement that “those who feel that they belong have no need to worry about their identities. Identity only becomes an issue when a person’s sense of belonging is disrupted”

(p.2). The issue, however, might be possible in multiethnic and multicultural countries, such as Kazakhstan.

**National identity and education.** As have been mentioned above, the current study is looking at identity from a constructivist lens and sees identity as something fluid, changeable in response to environmental changes and constructed by the group itself (Anderson 1991, Gellner, 2006). Education, in this sense, is considered to be a major tool in the process of national identity construction (Gellner, 2006).

The link between national identity and education is explicitly mentioned by Smith (1991). In particular, the scholar argues that education and mass media are directly responsible for establishing one of the core elements of national identity, common culture. Similar to Smith (1991), Gellner (2006) argues that “centralized method” (p. 29) that occurs through education, is one of the two major ways of social reproduction:

The employability, dignity, security and self-respect of individuals, typically, and for the majority of men now hinges on their *education*; and the limits of the culture within which they are educated are also the limits of the world within which they can, morally and professionally, breathe. A man’s education is by far his most precious investment, and in effect confers his identity on him (p. 35).

Thus, so-called “high culture” (p. 34) that unites the individuals functioning within the same society is transmitted through educational institutions managed by the state.

A recent study conducted by Stein (2011) confirms Gellnerian theory of identity and high culture being transferred through educational system. The findings from the lesson observation and survey data from 178 school students in four Almaty schools revealed that the curriculum and the necessity to meet the standards for it, was shaping the national identities of 9-11<sup>th</sup> grades school students. Although the survey answers differed

to some extent with regards to the medium of instruction, Kazakh, Russian or Uyghur, students' answers mainly reflected the views of the Kazakh ethnicity and high culture. As for the some differences in the answers, Stein (2011) suggested they might be explained by other external influences such as community or ethnicity. Thus, the abovementioned consensus of the Kazakhstani identity with the focus on the Kazakh ethnicity as the leading ethnicity in the country is reflected in the findings of the study (Stein, 2011). This is also in line with Norton's (2013) argument that "identity is influenced by practices common to institutions such as homes, schools and workplaces" (p. 2).

**National identity and medium of instruction.** Quantitative studies investigating language and identity in multi-lingual and multi-racial contexts report the relationship between the language of instruction and identity. In particular, MOI is reported to be connected to the strength of ethnic and national identities (David & Tien, 2009, Der-Karabetian & Balian, 1992; Kemppainen, Hilton & Rannut, 2015)

MOI was also reported to be related to the strength of national identity (David & Tien, 2009). The study was conducted in multiethnic Malaysia, where similar to Kazakhstan, after the independence national language Malay started to be promoted and was actively implemented in the education. The study looked at the strength of national identity among two different groups: (a) a sample of 30-year-olds who were educated through national language Malay, and (b) a sample of those, who were over 45 and thus received their education in mostly in English. The survey of 186 ethnically Malay, Chinese and Indian participants in total showed that those who were educated in the national language had both a stronger command of the language and a stronger national identity.

MOI is also considered to be significant when ethnic and national identities are concerned (Der-Karabetian & Balian, 1992; Kemppainen, Hilton & Rannut, 2015). The analysis of the survey which investigated ethnic, national and global identities of 70

Turkish-Armenians found the relationship between MOI and national and ethnic identities (Der-Karabetian & Balian, 1992). The data showed that younger participants and those educated through Turkish MOI at schools scored higher on national identity. On the contrary, older participants and those who received their education in Armenian schools had a stronger ethnic identity. The study also reported negative correlations between national and ethnic identities, with global identity correlating negatively with ethnic identity and positively with national identity. A similar result was found by another study in Estonia. The survey involved 186 students of Russian and Estonian background in Estonia investigated the relationship between ethnic identity and 6 possible predictive factors: students' school language, grades, residence, parents' citizenship, ethnicity and language proficiency (Kemppainen, Hilton & Rannut, 2015). The data revealed that although all the factors except for the students' residence were related to ethnic identity, the strongest relationship was reported with students' school language. Most of the students who identified themselves as Russians were receiving their education in Russian. On the contrary, those most Russian speakers who identified themselves as Estonians were receiving their education through Estonian.

**Theoretical framework.** The current study is looking at the relationship between MOI and national identity through the constructivist lens of Gellnerian theory of social reproduction and language unification. In this sense, MOI incorporating both education and language in itself is viewed as powerful tool to shape and influence the construction of national identity, which in this study will involve both the strength and the content of the notion. The part representing the content of the national identity, in its turn, will be viewed through the prism of the presence of civic and ethnic elements of national identity. The civic ones include "historic territory, legal-political community, legal-political equality of members, and common civic culture and ideology" (Smith, 1991, p. 11), with the ethnic



comprised of “genealogy and presumed descent ties, popular mobilization, vernacular languages, customs and traditions” (Smith, 1991, p. 12).

### **Conclusion**

Literature review chapter looked at the main topics connected with the current study. As the review showed, the concept of identity is fluid and changeable across time and space (Norton, 2000), that is being constructed (Gellner, 2006) through and negotiated (Gee, 2000; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004) in education. National identity in its turn is constructed by the government and shaped with language policies in education (Gellner, 2006; Tollefson, 2010). Being closely linked to both education and language, MOI and identity appear to be interconnected (David & Tien, 2009, Der-Karabetian & Balian, 1992; Kempainen, Hilton & Rannut, 2015). In the current study, the relationship between MOI and national identity will be investigated through the constructivist lens of Gellnerian theory of social reproduction and language unification. When exploring the way MOI and national identity relate to each other the theoretical framework for the study will also incorporate the Smith’s (1991) elements of civic and ethnic national identity. Since, the relationship between MOI and national identity is a new research area and have not been studied in Kazakhstan yet, the study focusing purely on national identity and MOI and looking at both the strength and the content of national identity will attempt to fill the gap in the literature on the topic in Kazakhstani context as well as contribute to the studies in the language and strength and content of national identity. The next chapter will describe the methodology employed in the study and how instruments were developed to answer the research questions.

### **Chapter 3. Methodology**

Whereas the preceding chapter discussed the literature covering the topic, the current chapter aims to describe and justify the selected methodology for the study. The rationale for choosing the methodology rested on the suitability for both the research purpose and research questions. The purpose of the study, investigating the relationship between students' MOI and their national identity, posed the following two research questions: (a) Is there a relationship between students' MOI and their strength of their national identity? (b) What are the perceptions of Kazakhstani national identity of students' educated through different MOI? The first two sections of the chapter will present and give rationale for choosing research method and design as well as research site and sample for the study. The consequent sections will discuss data collection and data analysis procedure. Finally, ethical consideration and limitations of the study will be described last.

#### **Research Design**

Drawing upon the research purpose and research questions, the present research chose to employ a mixed-method with an embedded research design. The present mixed-method study aimed to investigate the link between identity and MOI in Kazakhstani universities. The rationale for selecting mixed methods rested upon the characteristics of the research questions that required both qualitative and quantitative approaches.

Embedded design was chosen as it allowed to address two different research questions separately and use qualitative data to augment quantitative data (Creswell, 2014).

The study employed mixed methods as it was suitable for both research questions. The questions complement each other and investigate different sides of the relation between the language of instruction and identity. The first research question aimed at relating students' MOI and the strength of their national identity. The question was quantitative in nature as similar to quantitative questions it intended to "relate attributes or

characteristics of individuals or organizations” (Creswell, 2014, p. 127). It was also like other quantitative research questions a specific and narrow question asked “to obtain measurable and observable data on variables” (Creswell, 2014, p. 28). The variables in this case were students’ MOI and the strength of their national identity. The second research question, in turn, was a qualitative question as it aimed to investigate students’ perceptions of the content of national identity, or as Creswell (2014) says, “*a central phenomenon*” (p. 127). The question was built more on participants’ perspectives, rather than on the direction suggested by the literature. Therefore, the question could benefit most from qualitative data as it was “stated so that you can best learn from participants” (Creswell, 2014, p. 31).

To summarize, mixed methods research was considered of a benefit as it allowed to collect, analyze and mix “both quantitative and qualitative methods in a single study” (Creswell, 2014, p. 565). Moreover, the benefit of employing both methods for the same study contributes to “a better understanding of the research problem and question than either method by itself” (Creswell, 2014, p. 565). The approach adds to triangulation of the study, “seeking convergence and corroboration of results from different methods and designs studying the same phenomena” (Biesta, 2012, p. 147). Enhancing validity of the findings together with clarification of the findings, exploring possible contradictions, the benefit of two methods informing each other and increasing the scope of research, or the five rationales for using mixed methods described by Biesta (2012) were considered as other significant advantages of the selected method.

Drawing on research questions, embedded design was considered to be the most suitable for the study. Using embedded research design “the two data sets are analyzed separately, and they address different research questions” (Creswell, 2014, p. 575). Similarly, the research questions in the current study were aimed to investigate two

different aspects of national identity, strength and content, and required the data to be analyzed separately. Furthermore, embedded research design is more focused on quantitative data, but it allows qualitative data to augment or support the quantitative data (Creswell, 2014). Likewise, the study's second research question investigating the content of national identity among Kazakhstani students was designed to provide more information about Kazakhstani national identity, which could contribute to understanding the quantitative findings on the strength of national identity. Another characteristic of the embedded research design also appeared to be beneficial for the study. The research design allowed the data to be collected simultaneously and was beneficial within the timeframe of the thesis research as it was less time-consuming than sequential data collection.

### **Research Site and Sample**

The research sites included four universities offering programs in Kazakh, Russian or English. The sites were identified relying on nonprobability convenience sampling strategy based on geographical proximity of the universities and availability in terms of gaining permission to enter the sites. In other words, this sampling strategy was employed as it allowed "easy access" (Cohen et al., 2011, p.156) to the universities in terms of location and willingness to participate.

Nonprobability convenience sampling was also used to recruit the participants for the survey. This sampling strategy was selected as it allowed to recruit "participants because they are willing and available to be studied" (Creswell, 2014, p. 164). The sample for the research included 89 ethnically Kazakh students aged 20-25 educated through either through Kazakh, Russian or English: 29 students for each language of instruction (see Table 1). The rationale for recruiting ethnically Kazakh students was eliminating the variable of ethnicity that could interfere with the results and investigate the topic with the focus on the dominant group in Kazakhstan.

Table 1

*Characteristics of Participants Involved in the Quantitative Part*

| MOI         | Gender | n  | %   |
|-------------|--------|----|-----|
| Kazakh MOI  | Male   | 11 | 38  |
|             | Female | 18 | 32  |
|             | Total  | 29 | 100 |
| Russian MOI | Male   | 10 | 34  |
|             | Female | 19 | 66  |
|             | Total  | 29 | 100 |
| English MOI | Male   | 11 | 38  |
|             | Female | 18 | 62  |
|             | Total  | 29 | 100 |

The participants for the interview were recruited from the students that expressed their interest to participate in the interviews. To identify the participants for the interview among the volunteers purposeful maximal variation sampling strategy was used. The rationale for applying purposeful sampling was the necessity to have “information-rich” (Patton, 1990, p. 169) participants. Moreover, purposeful sampling deliberately selected participants to reveal more about the central phenomenon (Creswell, 2014). To present multiple perspectives, the study applied maximal variation sampling, which selected the “individuals that differ on some characteristic or trait” (Creswell, 2014, p. 230). The students sampled differed on the basis of the language through which they are instructed at their university. When selecting the participants within the same medium of instruction stratified sampling strategy was employed: (a) to have both males and females in the sample, preference was given to males, (b) to have variety in students’ majors, students with the majors different from other participants were given preference, (c) to select the students with more lengthy experience of education in the selected languages of instruction, those who received their education in school through the same language of instruction and those who were in their final years in the university were given preference.

Initially, the study aimed to recruit 4 participants for each medium of instruction, since as suggested by Onwuegbuzie and Leech (2007), the number of the participants for one subgroup should be not less than three individuals, as it should be small enough to easily “extract thick, rich data” (p. 242) and large enough to have saturated data. However, due to high interest among Kazakh- and English-educated students, the number of the participants from those two MOI programs increased up to 5 participants (see Table 2). This change in the planned sample of the participants enhanced the data, but still was manageable for the researcher to analyze.

Table 2

*Characteristics of Participants involved in the Qualitative Part*

| Code | Gender | Medium of instruction at the university | Year in the university | Medium of instruction at school | Place of origin |
|------|--------|---|------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| Kz1  | Male   | Kazakh                                  | 1 year                 | Kazakh                          | Almaty          |
| Kz2  | Female | Kazakh                                  | 1 year                 | Kazakh                          | Atyrau          |
| Kz3  | Female | Kazakh                                  | 4 year                 | Kazakh                          | Aktau           |
| Kz4  | Female | Kazakh                                  | 4 year                 | Kazakh                          | Karaganda       |
| Kz5  | Female | Kazakh                                  | 4 year                 | Kazakh                          | Astana          |
| Ru1  | Male   | Russian                                 | 1 year                 | Russian                         | Astana          |
| Ru2  | Female | Russian                                 | 3 year                 | Russian                         | Atyrau          |
| Ru3  | Female | Russian                                 | 4 year                 | Russian                         | Pavlodar        |
| Ru4  | Female | Russian                                 | 2 year                 | Kazakh                          | Atyrau          |
| En1  | Female | English                                 | 4 year                 | Kazakh/trilingual               | Pavlodar        |
| En2  | Female | English                                 | 4 year                 | Kazakh/trilingual               | Shymkent        |
| En3  | Female | English                                 | 3 year                 | Russian/trilingual              | Semey           |
| En4  | Female | English                                 | 4 year                 | English/Russian                 | Almaty          |
| En5  | Male   | English                                 | 3 year                 | Kazakh/Kazakh-English           | Shymkent        |

**Data Collection Instruments**

The instruments were chosen to look at identity from two different perspectives: the strength and the content. The strength of national identity was measured by means of a survey. Interviews looked at the content of national identity. Both instrument were first piloted and, after the necessary corrections were made, were used for data collection.

**Questionnaire.** A short close-ended 13-item questionnaire was used to collect quantitative data on participants' strength of belonging to Kazakhstan. Questionnaire was considered beneficial for the study as it allowed to gather "structured, often numerical data, being able to be administered without the presence of the researcher, and often being comparatively straightforward to analyze" (Wilson and McLean; as cited in Cohen, 2011, p.377). The completion of the questionnaire required approximately 10 minutes. The advantage of using a short questionnaire is avoiding the issues with validity that rise when the questionnaires are lengthy and respondents out of boredom start to tick boxes without taking time to think (Tymms, 2012). Furthermore, close-ended questions are easy and quick to answer and allow the data to be easily transferred into the software for analysis (Newby, 2010).

The questionnaire included six background information items and seven items to measure the strength of national identity. The background information items were multiple-choice questions aimed to collect the information about the students' MOI both at school and university, number of years educated through this MOI, students' perceived language proficiencies of Kazakh, Russian and English and certified language proficiency of English. This information was later used to investigate possible correlations between these variables and students' strength of national identity to see how language and identity are interconnected. The questionnaire on national identity was adapted from Der-Karabetian and Ruiz (1993), who used the items alongside with the items on global and ethnic identities in their study on bicultural and global-human identities of Mexican-American young people. The rationale for using the items on national identity from Der-Karabetian and Ruiz (1993) and adapting them for Kazakhstani context was that the questionnaire was already tested by the study and the items on national identity were also used in several other studies (Der-Karabetian, 1980; Der-Karabetian & Balian, 1992; Zak,

1973). The questionnaire consisted of 7 items with each item devised as a 5-point Likert scale question. Likert scale questions were considered appropriate for measuring the strength of national identity as employing Likert scale is beneficial when measuring “perceptions, emotions and feelings” (Curtis, Murphy & Shields, 2013, p. 108). The options “Strongly agree”, “Agree”, “Not sure”, “Disagree” and “Strongly disagree” were provided as possible answers. Lower points indicated weaker strength of national identity and higher points implied stronger one. Some of the examples of the items used in the questionnaire are as follows: “Being a Kazakhstani plays an important part in my life” and “My destiny is closely connected to the destiny of Kazakhstan. To ensure participants’ understanding of the questionnaire (see Appendix A), the questionnaire was offered in any of the following languages: Kazakh, Russian and English.

**Interviews.** The interviews looked specifically on the content of national identity and explored what “Kazakhstaniness” was from the perspectives of students from different MOI programs. As qualitative interviews involve asking “participants general open-ended questions” (Creswell, 2014, p. 239), they allowed to obtain specific type of information the study concentrates on. Open-ended semi-structured interviews took place to collect qualitative data on students’ perceptions of “Kazakhstaniness”.

The interviews were conducted one-on-one and lasted approximately 30 minutes each. The rationale for selecting one-on-one interviews rested upon the need to obtain participants’ answers that were not influenced by other individuals. Compared to focus group interviews, applying individual interviews helped avoid dominant participants’ influences on the individuals (Creswell, 2014).

To explore students’ perceptions and understanding of Kazakhstani national identity in a greater depth and yet to ensure that the participants provide answers to the research questions, semi-structured interviews were used. This type of interviews was



selected as it provided some flexibility to ask additional questions based on the interviewees' answers (p. 321). The interviews had "a list of questions or fairly specific topics to be covered" (Bryman, 2012, p. 321), which did not follow the exact order. Some flexibility in asking interview questions allows gaining richer and clearer data. At the same time the presence of the core structure still ensures obtaining the data that answers the research question (Newby, 2010). To look at the interview protocol see Appendix B.

### **Data Collection Procedures**

After obtaining approval of GSE research committee to conduct the study, I sought permission to enter the sites. I first delivered the letters for data collection to each of the universities and explained the nature of the research, specifying the length of the study and providing the detailed description of participation required from the university. The study required permission to recruit the participants through the site. Having gained the permission to enter the site, I looked for a gatekeeper. Hammersley & Atkinson (1995) define a gatekeeper as "actors with control over key sources and avenues of opportunity" (p. 27). In other words, gatekeepers assisted me with identifying potential participants for the study and identifying the way of distributing the information about participants' recruitment among them. Participants' recruitment was mainly administered electronically by sending the potential participants advertisements about participants' recruitment form thesis research. When the electronic addresses of the potential participants were not available, I prepared poster advertisement and with the permission of the universities placed the posters inside the university buildings. Thus, participants recruitment was administered both through distributions of the advertisements via email as well as through the poster advertisements in the university halls. For examples of the advertisements for participants' recruitment see Appendix C. Each individual was asked to participate in a short survey about national identity was asked whether they were willing to further

participate in one thirty-minute audio-taped one-on-one interview, which consisted of broad open-ended questions about Kazakhstani national identity.

Before data collection occurred, I ensure that the participants understood their rights to decide to either participate in the study or not. Informed-consent forms were used to give individuals the “opportunity to ‘say or express yes’ to participation in research” (Bourke & Loveridge, 2014, p. 152). The forms described data collection procedures specifying the time required for participation as well as risks and benefits for the participants.

The survey was administered through Qualtrics survey software. The rationale for using Qualtrics survey software was that web-based electronic data collection allows collecting data easily and quick (Creswell, 2014, p. 174). Moreover, using electronic data collection contributed to economic benefits and allowed fast data collection and covering a wide scale of participants (Tymms, 2012). Each participant was sent a link with a close-ended questionnaire. Cross-sectional survey that involved the participants of different characteristics was used (Curtis, Murphy & Shields, 2013). The survey covered students representing Kazakh, Russian and English MOI programs.

14 participants further participated in 30-minute audiotaped individual interviews that consisted of broad open-ended questions. All the participants agreed to be audiotaped on my ASUS phone recorder. The interviews were conducted in the convenient for the participants’ day and time and in a comfortable place chosen by the participants. To ensure rich data the language for the interviews was chosen by the participants themselves. The participants had a choice of being interviewed by the interviewer in either Russian or English or having an interview in Kazakh but conducted with the help of a translator. Thus, although most of the participants chose to be interviewed in Russian and two of the participants expressed the wish to incorporate answers in English, two interviews were

conducted in Kazakh, as the participants felt more comfortable expressing themselves in Kazakh.

### **Data Analysis**

After the data collection, the data from the survey underwent quantitative analysis and the recordings were transcribed and subjected to qualitative data analysis. Although the analysis was conducted separately for each of the dataset, the findings were merged and discussed together in the discussion chapter.

The data from the survey were analyzed quantitatively employing IBM SPSS Statistics Version 21. The rationale for selecting IBM SPSS Statistics was that the researcher was trained to use it and it was available for use at the university. Moreover, IBM SPSS software package is easy to use and is the most widely used in educational research (Muijs, 2011). Before entering the data into SPSS I reduced participants' responses by excluding the responses that were either incomplete or not representing the sample in terms of ethnicity or MOI. The data from 89 respondents were entered into SPSS manually.

The analysis of the data employed both descriptive and inferential statistics: Cronbach's alpha test, one-way between-groups ANOVA and Spearman's rho rank-order correlation coefficient. Descriptive statistics was used to obtain the information on the characteristics of the participants such as gender and MOI presented in Table 1.

Before the actual data analysis, Cronbach's alpha was used to estimate the internal consistency of the scores for national identity questionnaire. According to Muijs (2011), internal consistency reliability should be checked for instruments that include several items. Cronbach's alpha allowed examining the seven subscales of national identity separately and estimating whether or not the subscales measured the same variable of national identity. The test reported that internal consistency of the scores for the

questionnaire was high enough to consider the data reliable. When the measure is not less than 0.7 the data can be considered internally consistent (Muijs, 2011). Cronbach's alpha for 7 national identity items comprised 0.87 and, therefore, the reliability was considered acceptable.

After test showed that the data was reliable, the data on national identity gathered by all seven items were computed into one variable. Later, using one-way between-groups ANOVA the results for the strength of national identity were compared across the three groups: (a) students educated through Kazakh, (b) students educated through Russian, and (c) students educated through English. The results were also compared across the number of years students' were educated in certain MOI programs, perceived knowledge of Kazakh, Russian and English languages and students' certified proficiency of the English language. As the variables of national identity and number of years educated in a certain MOI program, students' perceived language proficiencies of Kazakh, Russian and English and certified language proficiency of English are ordinal variables, as suggested by Muijs (2011) Spearman's rho rank-order correlation coefficient was used to explore the correlations between these variables and the continuous variable of national identity.

Similarly, transcribed data from the interviews were analyzed qualitatively with some comparison across the three groups. First, as suggested by Cohen et al. (2011) the audiotaped interviews were transcribed with the record of hesitations and pauses. Interviews were organized by groups reflecting students' MOI. The approach was considered beneficial as grouping allows "themes, patterns and similarities to be seen at a glance" (Cohen, 2011, p. 551). Thus, participants' were assigned individual codes, e.g. Kz1, Ru3, En5, which allowed identifying MOI programs the respondents belonged to.

The preliminary exploratory analysis involved reading the interviews multiple times to achieve better understanding of participants' overall responses (Creswell, 2014).

During the next stage of analysis, the data was coded by hand using highlighter pens of different colors for the codes and quotes from the participants. The data was coded following inductive approach and “narrowing the data into a few themes” (Creswell; as cited in Creswell, 2014, p. 267). With each new interview newly-found codes were added to the previously coded interviews. As a result, 129 initial codes were the produced by open coding or simply giving “a new label that the researcher attaches to a piece of text to describe and categorize that piece of text” (Strauss & Corbin; as cited in Cohen, 2011, p. 561). Then, the codes identified were listed in a separate document. To avoid repetition similar codes were merged together and later united into categories. Then, the common themes from the data for each MOI were identified. The distinction was made between the themes that were reflected in data from all participants, the themes that were common among most of the participants and the themes that were mentioned by few participants.

The analysis also involved both deductive and inductive approaches to data (Creswell, 2014). Smith’s (1991) ethnic and civic characteristics of national identity, Smith’s (1991) national identity constituents were used for analytical purposes. Thus, the following major elements were considered for comparing the themes in the three groups for similarities and differences: “Historic territory, legal-political community, legal-political equality of members, and common civic culture and ideology” (Smith, 1991, p. 11) and “Genealogy and presumed descent ties, popular mobilization, vernacular languages, customs and traditions” (Smith, 1991, p.10). The first set of elements reflected civic conception of national identity, whereas the latter set reflected ethnic conception.

### **Ethical Considerations**

Before data collection the study was approved by GSE ethics committee. I completed the online CITI Training course and obtained the certificate. Gaining the

permission to enter the research sites, signing consent forms and ensuring anonymity and confidentiality of the participants were the main steps taken to consider ethical issues.

I ensured obtaining permission to enter the universities as sites. During the study, the level of disturbance to the university was as low as possible. My presence remained passive and the data collection procedures did not interfere with the universities daily routine. Moreover, the research did not require a substantial amount of participants' time.

Before data collection commenced, I ensured that the participants had signed informed consent forms (see Appendix D). The participants were given full information regarding the study's purpose and a thorough description of all data collection procedures.

Students' privacy, anonymity and confidentiality were ensured through disguising students' identities, storing data in secured places and granting the participants the right to either refuse or discontinue participating in the research. All the information gathered from the survey was kept anonymous and the information from the interviews confidential.

Participants' anonymity was ensured in the following way. The participants' names were not on the survey. Each participant was given a code. The files with the data were secured by password and stored separately from the files with participants' identities. Participants' confidentiality was ensured in the similar manner. As recommended by Cohen et al.

(2011), the study concealed individuals' real names and employed codes to refer to the individuals while reporting qualitative results. Personal data of the participants were kept completely confidential and was not shared with other participants or universities' staff.

"Off the record" (Creswell, 2014, p. 253) information was not disclosed. After the

completion of the research, all audiotaped material will be deleted and field-notes

destroyed. In written materials or discussions no reference that could link the participants to the research was made.

Within ethical issues several aspects were taken into account to ensure that the risk for the participants was minimal. Representatives from high-risk populations were not engaged in the study. The participation was voluntary and the right to refuse to participate in the research or withdraw from the study at any stage was respected. Questionnaire completion required from the participants very little time investment. The interviews were held in comfortable and familiar for the participants' environments. Yet, while answering some of the interview questions touching upon such sensitive topics as language and identity, the participants might have felt some personal discomfort. In this case, the participants were free to refuse to answer some questions or to withdraw their commentaries. The participants were informed of being tape-recorded during the interview, but had the right to refuse to be audiotaped and the notes could be taken manually.

As for the benefits, survey participants were able to develop a better awareness of the strength of their national identity. Moreover, the students who later participated in the interviews were able to articulate their personal beliefs and share their opinions about national identity in Kazakhstan as well as obtain a deeper insight in the way they perceive it. The participants were also able to gain satisfaction from the fact that by participating in the research they made a contribution into research in education. The findings of the research might be useful in understanding whether there is a relationship between the MOI and the strength of students' national identity. This knowledge might contribute to the understanding of how the transformation to trilingual education or integrating the English language in education might affect the identities of younger generation.

### **Limitations**

As for limitations and assumptions, the study was aware that limitations of sampling size, convenience sampling strategy and value-laden nature of the study with personal reflexivity and subjective assumptions might affect reliability of the findings.

The study was limited in terms of the sample of the participants. The number of participants in the quantitative part for each MOI was 29 individuals. The sample also represented only the universities from Astana. The gender distribution was not equal among of the respondents for both survey and the interviews. As data collection and analysis in qualitative research is time-consuming and the collection of two datasets is “labor intensive for a single researcher” (Creswell, 2014, p. 575), current study also involved relevantly small sampling for the qualitative part. The sample for participants in the interviews included noticeably more females than males. Thus, the patterns identified during the interview analysis were more likely to reflect the patterns of one particular female population.

The choice for convenience sampling strategy also might have influenced the finding of the research, as the participants cannot be confidently stated to be “representative of the population” (Creswell, 2014, p. 163). Therefore, this sampling strategy is believed to be less methodologically rigorous compared to probability sampling strategies (Curtis, Murphy & Shields, 2013).

Finally, the qualitative part of the research is value-laden. The researcher’s bias might have influenced some interpretations in the study. For the present study the researcher’s assumption was that MOI affected students’ perceptions of Kazakhstani national identity.

## **Conclusion**

The methodology of the study was devised in accordance with the research purpose to investigate the relationship between MOI and national identity. The mixed methods research design was chosen to answer the two research questions of the study. The quantitative part looked at the relationship between MOI and the strength of national identity. The qualitative part was aimed to investigate the perceptions of different MOI



students of the content of Kazakhstani national identity. The data collected from the survey of 89 ethnically Kazakh bachelor degree students in Astana and 14 semistructured interviews from the students who also took the survey were analyzed with the results presented in the following chapter.

## **Chapter 4. Results**

The current chapter will present the results obtained from the analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data. The analysis of the collected data on national identity surveys was primarily aimed to answer the first research question of the study: “Is there a relationship between identity and medium of instruction?” The interview data was analyzed to answer the second research question: “What are the perceptions of the content of national identity of students’ educated through different languages of instruction: Kazakh, Russian and English?”

Thus, the first part of the chapter will report the results gained from comparing the data on national identity survey from three groups of respondents differentiated by their language of instruction at university. 87 responses were collected from students educated in Kazakh, Russian and English, 29 students per each group. The results on the strength of students’ national identity will be presented first. Then I will proceed with the results gained from additional analysis of the data on national identity in relation to students’ the number of years educated through a language and students’ language proficiencies.

The second part of the chapter will report the results obtained from the interviews of 14 students in total that represented three groups, each with a different language of instruction: (a) five students with Kazakh medium of instruction, (b) four students with Russian medium of instruction, and (c) four students with English medium of instruction. The comparative analysis showed several differences among the data produced from the respondents of the three groups. The results will be organized around the languages of instruction.

### **Quantitative Data Report**

The first part of quantitative analysis will employ one-way between subjects ANOVA with the focus on MOI and national identity. Later Spearman’s rho rank-order

correlation coefficient analysis will be applied to correlate national identity with the number of years educated through a certain language and students' proficiency in languages.

**Inferential analysis on national identity and medium of instruction.** A one-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of medium of instruction in university on students' strength of national identity in Kazakh-medium, Russian-medium and English-medium classrooms. There was a significant effect of medium of instruction on students' strength of national identity at the  $p < .05$  level for the three groups with different languages of instruction [ $F(2,86) = 5.628, p = 0.005$ ] (see Table 3).

Table 3

*A One-Way Between-Groups ANOVA for National Identity by Medium of Instruction.*

|                | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F     | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|------|
| Between Groups | 6.515          | 2  | 3.258       | 5.628 | .005 |
| Within Groups  | 48.622         | 84 | .576        |       |      |
| Total          | 55.137         | 86 |             |       |      |

Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey post hoc test indicated that the mean score of the strength of national identity for Kazakh medium of instruction ( $M = 4.17, SD = 0.79$ ) was significantly different compared to both Russian ( $M = 3.53, SD = 0.78$ ) and English ( $M = 3.67, SD = 0.71$ ) languages of instruction. However, English medium ( $M = 3.67, SD = 0.71$ ) and Russian medium ( $M = 3.53, SD = 0.78$ ) did not significantly differ from each other in terms of the strength of national identity. Taken together these results suggest that medium of instruction does have an effect on the strength of students' national identity. Specifically, the results suggest that respondents educated through the Kazakh language have stronger national identity compared to their peers educated in either Russian or English languages. However, it should be noted that although the strength of national

identity among Russian- and English-educated respondents do not differ significantly, the students educated through Russian have weaker strength of national identity than their peers educated through the English language.

**National identity and the number of years educated through a language.** As the data available allowed conducting the analysis on the strength of national identity in relation to the number of years studied through a certain language, Spearman's rho rank-order correlation coefficient analysis were conducted to see whether there was a significant correlation between the abovementioned variables. The analysis estimated a weak correlation for the number of years educated through the Kazakh language and the strength of national identity,  $r = 0.32$ ,  $n = 87$ ,  $p = .00$  (see Table 4).

Table 4

*Spearman's Rho Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient for National Identity and the Number of Years Educated through a Language.*

|  | National identity                       |                                       |  |  |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|
|  | Three languages of instruction (n = 89) | Kazakh medium of instruction (n = 29) | Russian medium of instruction (n = 29) | English medium of instruction (n = 29) |
| 1. Number of years educated in Kazakh  | .32**                                   | .03                                   | -.05                                   | .27                                    |
| 2. Number of years educated in Russian | -.15                                    | .07                                   | .18                                    | -.00                                   |
| 3. Number of years educated in English | .02                                     | -.12                                  | 0.4                                    | -.19                                   |

\*. Correlation is significant at the .05 level

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the .01 level

The number of years studied in Kazakh correlated positively with the strength of national identity. Thus, the results suggest that the longer the respondents were educated through

Kazakh the stronger their national identity was. Correlations between the numbers of years educated in a language and the strength of national identity were not found when the same analysis was conducted for the data from the respondents from the three languages of instruction separately. Thus, the results suggest that the link between number of years of education in Kazakh and the strength of national identity did not strongly related to any of the MOI in particular.

**Identity and language proficiency.** The data from the questionnaires also allowed conducting Spearman's rho rank-order correlation coefficient analysis to see whether there is a connection between students' perceived language proficiencies in Kazakh, Russian and English, and the strength of their national identity. Negative correlations were found between: (a) Russian language proficiency and national identity,  $r = -.41$ ,  $n = 29$ ,  $p = .00$ , and (b) English language proficiency and national identity,  $r = -.28$ ,  $n = 29$ ,  $p = .01$  (see Table 5). The results suggest the better the respondents spoke Russian or English the weaker their national identity.

Table 5

*Spearman's Rho Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient for National Identity and Language Proficiencies.*

|                                  | Three languages of instruction (n = 87) | National identity                     |  |  |
|----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|
|                                  |   | Kazakh medium of instruction (n = 29) | Russian medium of instruction (n = 29) | English medium of instruction (n = 29) |
| 1. Perceived Kazakh proficiency  | .18                                     | -.32                                  | .28                                    | .39*                                   |
| 2. Perceived Russian proficiency | -.41**                                  | -.37*                                 | .20                                    | -.46*                                  |
| 3. Perceived English proficiency | -.28**                                  | -.32                                  | -.00                                   | -.48**                                 |

\*. Correlation is significant at the .05 level

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the .01 level

Interestingly, when the same analysis was conducted for the three languages of instruction separately, significant correlations were found only among the respondents from Kazakh and English languages of instruction. As could be seen from Table 5, Spearman's rho rank-order correlation coefficient analysis involving the data only from Kazakh-educated respondents showed that the strength of national identity had a weak negative correlation with perceived proficiency in Russian ( $r = -.37, n = 29, p = .05$ ). Thus, the results suggest that the better Kazakh-educated students thought they know Russian, the weaker their strength of national identity was.

While the analysis of the data from Russian-educated participants revealed no significant correlations, the data from English-educated participants showed correlations between the strength of national identity and students' perceived proficiency in all three languages (see Table 8). The strength of national identity had a weak positive correlation with perceived Kazakh language proficiency ( $r = .39, n = 29, p = .04$ ) and a weak negative correlation with perceived Russian ( $r = -.46, n = 29, p = .01$ ) and English language proficiency ( $r = -.48, n = 29, p = .01$ ). Thus, the results suggest that the better English-educated participants thought they know Kazakh, the stronger their national identity was. At the same time, the better they think they know Russian or English, the weaker their national identity was.

Finally, Spearman's rho rank-order correlation coefficient analysis was conducted between the variable of students' IELTS scores and their national identity. The analysis revealed negative correlation between the scores and students' national identities,  $r = -.36, n = 44, p = .02$  (see Table 6).

Table 6

*Spearman's Rho Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient for students' IELTS Scores and their Strength of National Identity.*

|             | Three languages of instruction (n = 44) | National identity                    |                                       | English medium of instruction (n = 28) |
|-------------|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
|             |   | Kazakh medium of instruction (n = 7) | Russian medium of instruction (n = 9) |  |
| IELTS score | -.36*                                   | -.06                                 | .08                                   | -.54**                                 |

\*. Correlation is significant at the .05 level

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the .01 level

The results suggest that the higher the students' scores on IELTS the weaker their national identity was. Similar outcome was identified for the English language of instruction when Spearman's rho rank-order correlation coefficient analysis was conducted for Kazakh, Russian and English groups separately. As can be seen from Table 6, a moderate correlation was found between the strength of national identity and students' IELTS scores ( $r = -.54, n = 28, p = .00$ ). However, no correlations were found for Kazakh and Russian languages of instruction ( $r = -.06, n = 7, p = .91$ ;  $r = .08, n = 9, p = .85$ )

**Summary of quantitative results.** In conclusion, inferential analysis including one-way between-groups ANOVA and Spearman's rho rank-order correlation coefficient produced the following results:

1. Statistically significant differences were found between the groups with different mediums of instruction with regards to their strength of national identity. Kazakh-educated students scored higher on national identity than their Russian-educated peers. A weaker but still statistically significant difference was also found between the groups of Kazakh-educated students and English-educated students. Kazakh-educated students scored higher again.
2. A positive correlation was found between the number of years educated in Kazakh and students' national identity. The longer the students were educated in the Kazakh language the stronger their national identity was.

3. Both positive and negative correlations were also found between students' language proficiencies and the strengths of their national identity. The students who spoke Kazakh better had a stronger sense of national identity, whereas those who possessed higher proficiency of either Russian or English had weaker sense of national identity. This goes in line with the result that IELTS scores negatively correlated with national identity.

### Qualitative Results

The analysis on the content of national identity revealed that although all students seemed to attach both ethnic and civic components to the “Kazakhstani” national identity model, the analysis determined the differences with regards to the prominence of each component, civic and ethnic, in the studied groups (see Table 7). Thus, ethnic component was clearly more visible in the answers from the respondents educated through the Kazakh language. On the contrary, both the respondents from the groups with Russian and English languages of instruction focused their answers around the civic understanding of the “Kazakhstani” national identity model. Students' perceptions of patriotism also reflected the two different perceptions of “Kazakhstani” national identity model. Kazakh educated students connected patriotism to ethnic values, whereas their peers from Russian and English medium programs, on the contrary, linked it more to civic values.

Table 7

#### *Qualitative Themes by Medium of Instruction*

| Kazakh MOI (Strong ethnic component of national identity)     | Russian MOI (Strong civic component of national identity) | English MOI (Strong civic component of national identity) |
|---|---|---|
| Long ownership of the territory, motherland, presumed descent | Staying within the country                                | Understanding attitude to leaving the country             |
| Knowledge of the Kazakh language is important                 | Knowledge of the Kazakh language is not important         | Understanding attitude to not knowing Kazakh              |



---

|                                       |   |  |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Respecting customs and traditions     | Less supportive of customs and traditions             |  |
|                                       | Economy, development, bringing benefit to the country | Economy, development, bringing benefit |
|                                       | Tolerance/no discrimination                           | Tolerance/Equality                     |
| Patriotism connected to ethnic values | Patriotism connected to civic values                  | Patriotism connected to civic values   |

---

### **Kazakh-educated respondents' ethnic conceptualizations of national identity.**

The analysis of the data from Kazakh-educated respondents showed that although the interviewed students mention that Kazakhstan is a multiethnic country, the discourse of ethnic nationalism was clearly visible in the data. Thus, all of the participants from this group acknowledged that the term “Kazakhstani” can include individuals of ethnicities other than Kazakhs. However, at the same time all of the respondents explicitly mention the notions that refer to the ethnic component of national identity: (a) language, (b) customs and traditions of the titular ethnicity, and (c) presumed descent ties and long ownership of the territory. The conceptualization of patriotism for the respondents from Kazakh medium programs also reflected the values of ethnic nationalism.

All the five respondents that represent Kazakh language of instruction primarily referred to the knowledge of the Kazakh language as either one of the main characteristics or a significant component of being a Kazakhstani. For instance, Kz1 said that in his understanding a Kazakhstani is someone who speaks Kazakh:

I: How do you understand the term “Kazakhstani”?

Kz1: A Kazakhstani is a person who knows his native language, who understands that he lives in Kazakhstan, that he is a citizen of Kazakhstan. It is

the same like in Russia. If you're a citizen of Russia you know Russian. It is your native language, it is your motherland. The same is with Kazakhs.

As can be seen from the quote, knowing native language is stated first and later emphasized when describing the characteristics of a Kazakhstani person.

All of the five participants also frequently referred to respecting, knowing and following Kazakh traditions when describing a Kazakhstani person. As an example, when describing an ideal Kazakhstani Kz2 said:

I personally consider my parents to be good examples of Kazakhstanis for me. Since childhood they taught me to follow and respect our customs and traditions. Out of all 17 million people I think of my parents as examples. In my opinion they are true Kazakhstanis.

Here, Kz2 chooses the examples of a good Kazakhstani based on the characteristic of following and respecting customs and traditions.

The data also reflected attributing presumed descent and long ownership of the territory to the characteristics of national identity. Thus, four out of five participants referred to the creation of Kazakh Khanate as one of the most important points in history for Kazakhstanis. The quote below vividly illustrates the concept of presumed descent for the participant Kz5. When asked what her understanding of the term Kazakhstani was, the student responded with the following: "Freedom-loving people who created their Khanate and are eventually independent now". Kz5 sees here Kazakhstanis as the continuation of the people who lived in the Khanate. People of the Khanate are viewed here as ancestors that Kazakhstanis have presumed descent ties with.

The concept of patriotism also contained an emphasis on ethnic values. For three out of four participants mentioning patriotism, the theme was found with reference mainly to knowing the language, customs and traditions. As an example, Kz3 linked patriotism to

knowing customs and traditions: “Patriotism is cool. When you love your nation, you know its culture, customs and traditions”. Kz1 linked it to speaking the Kazakh language: “At school and at the university we were taught to respect our language, to try to speak it more [...] and develop this in this direction, to love our country, in the spirit of patriotism”.

To conclude, Kazakh-educated respondents had more ethnic understanding of Kazakhstani national identity model with more emphasis on vernacular language, customs and traditions and presumed descent ties. Similarly, the conceptualization of patriotism of the respondents from Kazakh medium programs was also aligned with ethnic nationalism.

**Russian-educated respondents’ civic conceptualizations of national identity.** In comparison to the Kazakh-educated respondents, the participants from the Russian-educated group seemed to have a stronger civic component in their interpretation of what being a Kazakhstani means. Although all of the four respondents acknowledged the presence of ethnic Kazakh characteristics such as hospitality and values of family and traditions, while describing a Kazakhstani person they mainly referred to such civic components of national identity as economic development and tolerance. In contrast to the group of Kazakh-educated respondents, the participants with Russian medium of instructions did not consider the knowledge of the Kazakh language as a prerequisite for being a true Kazakhstani and sometimes expressed somewhat negative attitudes to certain Kazakh customs and traditions. Patriotism also was perceived in civic terms.

Economic development of Kazakhstan is the most frequently mentioned theme for the Russian-educated respondents. All the four participants attached great significance to contributing to the country’s economy and bringing economic benefit to the country’s development. One of the examples taken from the data is shown below:

I: What makes a person a true Kazakhstani?

Ru1: A true Kazakhstani? I believe it is striving to make the country better. It is the convergence of interests of the person and the country, if he considers himself a Kazakhstani... For example, if you are an oligarch, you build mansions in Kazakhstan instead buying them in Paris. If you have a vacation, you spend it in Kazakhstan. Of course you can go for example to Paris, France or other countries, but it is better that the money that you spend on your vacation also stay in Kazakhstan. What makes you a Kazakhstani is the consumption of products made in Kazakhstan.

Here, Ru1 attributes bringing benefit to the country with the stress on contributing to the country's economic development as the main characteristic of being a true Kazakhstani. Economy, development and contribution has not emerged as a theme for the data from Kazakh-educated participants, as only one out of five respondents referred to it during the interview.

In three cases out of four, failing to bring benefit to the country was connected to abandoning the country in search of a better life. The theme of staying within the country was another major theme found among all the four participants. In line with the emphasis on the significance of staying within the country, leaving the country was criticized to various degrees. As an example, Ru3 said: "If you go to another country to bring new knowledge and new experience, then it is good. If people leave the country forever, it is anti-patriotism". Ru1 expressed even stronger negative attitude to leaving the country.

I think that if you live abroad, then your fate should be connected to the country you live in. You didn't move there for no reason. Maybe you liked the culture of the other country and you decided to move there. Then live there, why should you go back? "Why did you go there then?" I have a question. I see it a bit similar to betrayal.

Ru3 looks at leaving the country through the lens of bringing benefit to the country. Both Ru3 and Ru1 do not approve the act of leaving the country. Although the theme of staying within the country was one of the major themes for students from Russian medium programs, it was of little significance for participants from Kazakh medium programs. Only one out of five Kazakh-educated students referred to it.

The second theme at least once mentioned by each of the four participants is tolerance that also refers to the civic component of the national identity, equality of legal members. Interestingly, the idea of tolerance in three cases out of four was expressed with some negative language. To present some of the examples, Ru3 says: “Another characteristic of a Kazakhstani is respecting other ethnicities, not being a Nazi”. Ru4 said: “A Kazakhstani doesn’t discriminate against other ethnicities”. Ru2 also said: “There are no skinheads or something like that here. Everything is more or less tolerant”. In contrast, although one of the five Kazakh-educated respondents also talked about tolerance, the theme for discrimination was not present in the data from Kazakh MOI.

With regards to language, as opposed to Kazakh-educated respondents, all the four participants educated through Russian believed that the Kazakh language is not an indispensable characteristic of being a Kazakhstani. When being asked whether it is important for a Kazakhstani to speak Kazakh, all the respondents replied that it is not very important. For instance, Ru2 said: “Speaking Kazakh is not very important. I don’t speak much Kazakh, but feel myself fully Kazakhstani”. Ru4 also said: “Language does not affect people’s feelings towards motherland, towards the country.” It is important to mention that three of the participants, except for Ru4, had either no or poor command of the Kazakh language.

Three out of four Russian-educated respondents were to a certain extent less supportive of traditions and customs. Thus, Ru1 said: “We are a secular state, imposing

certain traditions is something I don't like". Ru2 said: "Kazakhstanis sometimes honor traditions too much". When asked to name negative traits of Kazakhstanis, Ru4 also says: "Traditional views, for example, that women should cook and stay at home". This may be used to explain why compared to the respondents from Kazakh medium programs, Russian-educated participants do not view knowing customs and traditions as the main characteristic for the Kazakhstani national identity model.

Finally, similarly to the civic conceptualization of Kazakhstani national identity model, all the four Russian-educated students attached civic values to the concept of patriotism. The quote taken from the interview with Ru3 is a good example of this pattern: "Loyalty to our country, patriotism is living for the benefit of the country, doing good deeds, acting out of kindness, helping voluntary". Ru3 clearly perceives patriotism in civic terms and attributes no significance to ethnic national values.

To conclude, the respondents from Russian medium programs perceived Kazakhstani national identity model with a stronger civic rather than ethnic component. The students placed more emphasis on economic development and tolerance and also viewed patriotism in more civic terms. Compared to the data from Kazakh-educated respondents, the students educated in Russian were less supportive of customs and traditions and did not consider speaking the Kazakh language as being an important attribute for being a Kazakhstani.

#### **English-educated respondents' civic conceptualizations of national identity.**

English-educated participants similar to Russian-educated ones had a more civic understanding of the term Kazakhstani. The major themes among these students were equality of members of the country, tolerance and bringing benefit to the country's development. The analysis also revealed more understanding attitudes to leaving the

country and not speaking the titular language. The participants also were aware of the expressions of ethnic and civic types of patriotism and favored the latter.

Equality of the members of the country, tolerance and absence of discrimination are the themes traced in the answers of all the five English-educated participants. As an example, when being asked the first interview question En1 strongly emphasized the notion of equality, unity and absence of discrimination:

I: How do you understand the term “Kazakhstani”?

En1: Kazakhstani... well, I think the term Kazakhstani is different from Kazakh. You-you are like everyone else. In my understanding, it means that you are equal with everyone else. We are multicultural country, 130 ethnicities. And it is not like “you are Russian” or “you are Ukrainian” and so on, “you are a Kazakhstani. That’s it”.[...] Like “I am American. That’s all”. [...] There are no barriers. We are one nation, just one nation. Yes, we are one country, that’s it. We are all united and there shouldn’t be all these arguments. I think that it is a good thing. There will be less discrimination.

Here, En1 sees equality of members, one of the civic characteristics of national identity, as the main attribute of Kazakhstani national identity model. She even compares Kazakhstani with American, the model of civic nationalism. Similar to Russian respondents, En1 also expresses the idea of tolerance and no discrimination.

All the five English-educated respondents also stressed the importance of contributing to the country’s development. Changing the country for the better, developing economy, contributing to the science are some of the topics mentioned by these participants. Thus, when asked to describe the role model for a Kazakhstani, En3 said:

It is the person who moves ahead, does not remain static, is trying to develop, change... There are very few people like that, people who want to introduce,

implement something new... like some sort of start-up or to establish the country's name on the global arena. For example, develop a program, go, show, say "I am from Kazakhstan. I did this". Or repair the roads. Change something, do something.

Similar to the responses of Russian-educated students, En3 also views bringing benefit as the main characteristic of her role model for a Kazakhstani. However, En3 does not limit bringing the benefit only for the country, but also sees value in bringing benefit to the world and helping Kazakhstan establishing in the world arena.

The theme of leaving the country was also found in the data from four of the five participants. Interestingly, the discourse here was a bit different from the one found among Russian-educated participants. The respondents saw the negative aspect of abandoning the country, but at the same time were not overly negative about it. For instance, En1 said: "It is OK to live in another country. I don't think that everyone will leave the country. First of all, I have to satisfy myself. Egoistical a little bit". En5, in his turn, said: "If they become good people and will bring benefit anywhere else, they do not have to return to Kazakhstan". Although stating different reasons for their opinions, both En1 and En5 have similar attitudes to leaving the country. Thus, English-educated respondents show more flexibility and more relaxed attitudes towards not living within the territory of the country, compared to Russian-educated students.

The attitude towards the importance of speaking Kazakh language among the respondents also appeared to be different from both Russian- and Kazakh-educated participants. Four out of five respondents from English-medium programs thought that understanding Kazakh is enough and speaking the language is not as significant for Kazakhstanis. For instance, En2 said: "I think respect towards the Kazakh language and trying to know something in Kazakh, this is what is important. It is more important than



knowing the language well and not knowing the language well". Thus, it seems that the position of the participants from English medium programs is somewhere in the middle between the stances of Kazakh- and Russian-educated students.

With regards to patriotism, the respondents from English medium programs distinguished between ethnic and civic patriotism and were more supportive of the latter one. Four out of five participants talk about two sides of patriotism which they have positive and negative attitudes to. En4's quote is a good example for this theme:

Well, I actually have a twofold attitude to patriotism. I mean, I always perceived this as something negative. Well, because ... well, there were people who said "You should speak Kazakh, you should behave this way, you should do this because you are a Kazakh". And it's very annoying and you are left with perceiving the word "patriotism" with a negative connotation. But at the same time, I understand that patriotism should be positive and that we should understand that this is our country and I have this understanding now ... I do not have the desire to leave the country, I have a desire to do something for the benefit of our own country. I now have a more mature understanding and attitude towards what, well ... what patriotism is.

Here En4 perceives ethnic nationalism and patriotism that emphasizes the importance of the titular language negatively, but sees value in civic nationalism and patriotism that emphasizes bringing benefit to the country.

To conclude, the analysis of the data from English-educated participants revealed also more civic understanding of Kazakhstani national identity. However, the themes had certain differences from the ones found in the data from Russian-educated students. Students from English medium programs had the attitude towards speaking the titular language that was somewhere in the middle between the attitudes of Kazakh- and Russian-

educated students. They also were more understanding of people who leave Kazakhstan. The respondents also favored civic patriotism over ethnic one.

**Students' experiences in different mediums of instruction.** The data also revealed students' personal experiences of different MOI. The common theme was language conflict possibly between those with civic and ethnic national identities. Several students currently receiving education through Russian or English mentioned negative feelings linked to their experience of Kazakh MOI programs in the past and then emphasized their positive experiences of Russian and English languages of instruction.

Two participants from Russian MOI programs have talked about their negative experiences with Kazakh medium of instruction. As an example, a girl who was educated in Kazakh at school in her home town Atyrau, describes her first semester in Astana as follows:

Ru4: when I entered the university, I chose a Kazakh group, I studied for a whole semester in Kazakh, but I could not find a common language with my classmates, and my grades were not very good either, I moved to the Russian group and everything went on well. I started to understand everything and now... I found a common language with my classmates

I: You could not find a common language with your classmates?

Ru4: Yes. Well, the teachers were the same and the material was the same. I think it was because of classmates. With the guys from the Russian group it's somehow easier.

En1, the girl from Pavlodar who is currently receiving her education in English, also talked about her classmates in Kazakh MOI program at her university before she applied to be transferred in English MOI group:

En1: In the first-second year, I spent a lot of time at NU. I have a lot of friends there. ... And I did not notice there any regional divisions. In our university east, west, south is strongly felt. Because all people are different. For example, in my group, they split up. The West is very straightforward. Both south and west, for example, they do not understand us because we start talking in Russian. "Why do you need the Russian language, if there is Kazakh language?"

Similar to what En1 said, En3 and En4 also viewed both Nazarbayev Intellectual Schools and Nazarbayev University as educational institutions that have tolerance and fewer tensions. Thus, all the three Russian-dominant students from English MOI programs reported positive experiences of the atmosphere in Nazarbayev Intellectual Schools and Nazarbayev University, where the language of instruction is trilingual and English respectively.

**Summary of qualitative results.** Qualitative results revealed that although all the respondents attached both ethnic and civic components to Kazakhstani national identity model, students with different medium of instruction stressed more either civic or ethnic component of the identity. Thus, a stronger ethnic component in the content of identity was more present among the students receiving their education in Kazakh. The students emphasized presumed descent ties and long ownership of the territory as well as knowledge of the titular language, customs and traditions. On the contrary, students from Russian and English medium programs had a stronger civic component present in their perceptions of national identity. The students attached greater significance to bringing benefit to the country and legal equality of members. The language element in national identity showed the main difference between the three MOIs. For Kazakh-educated students' knowledge of the titular language was one of the main criteria for being a

Kazakhstani. The opposite opinion was found in the data produced by Russian-educated students. The students thought that Kazakh language was not a fundamental criterion for being a Kazakhstani and that a person could be a Kazakhstani without knowing or speaking the language. English-educated participants stance was somewhere in the middle between the two. The latter viewed respecting and trying to learn the language as more important than actually knowing the language.

### **Conclusion**

Both quantitative and qualitative analyses showed differences in both strength and content of national identity between the same groups. Kazakh medium of instruction was different in strength and content of national identity compared to both Russian and English mediums of instruction. National identity of Kazakh-educated students was significantly stronger compared to the Russian and English MOI. Kazakh-educated participants also differed from the latter two groups in their perceptions of the content of Kazakhstani national identity. In their perceptions the students had a stronger ethnic component of the identity that was mainly linked with presumed descent ties and long ownership of the country as well as the knowledge of the titular language, customs and traditions. Russian- and English- educated students, on the contrary, perceived the content of Kazakhstani national identity as having a stronger civic component with the emphasis on economic development and equality of the members. Both quantitative and qualitative part also showed differences between groups with regards to the language.

Quantitative analysis found a weak positive correlation between the number of years students were educated in Kazakh and their strength of national identity. In other words, the longer the students were educated in the Kazakh language, the stronger their national identity was. Furthermore, the correlations were found between the strength of national identity and students' perceived Kazakh, Russian and English language

proficiencies and students' English proficiency based on students' IELTS scores. As the analysis showed perceived Kazakh proficiency positively correlated with the strength of national identity for the sample of English-educated participants. In other words, the higher the students assessed their knowledge of the Kazakh language the stronger national identity they possessed. Similarly, negative connotations were found between the strength of students' national identity and their perceived Russian and English language proficiencies both in the total sample and in the sample of Kazakh-educated participants only. In other words, the higher the students assessed their command of Russian or English, the weaker their national identity was. The same result was found for the IELTS scores and national identity. Students of higher scores possessed weaker national identity.

Finally, qualitative analysis revealed the differences in students' attitudes towards the significance of knowing the titular language for Kazakhstani national identity. Two opposing views were found between Kazakh- and Russian-educated participants. The former attached more significance to the language, whereas the latter considered knowing the language not as important. English-educated students, in turn, took a mediating position seeing respect towards the language as more important than actual language proficiency.

## **Chapter 5. Discussion**

The previous chapter presented the results of both quantitative and qualitative analysis guided by two research questions. Quantitative analysis of the survey data aimed to investigate the relationship between MOI and the strength of national identity showed that Kazakh-educated students had significantly stronger national identities compared to their peers from Russian and English MOI programs. Similar division between the results of Kazakh MOI, and Russian and English MOI were also found during the analysis of the qualitative data from the interviews that aimed at investigating students' perceptions of the content of Kazakhstani national identity. The students from Kazakh MOI programs possessed more ethnic conceptualizations of Kazakhstani national identity. Russian- and English-educated students, on the other hand, perceived Kazakhstani national identity in more civic terms. Students' experiences of different MOI programs were also reported in the qualitative part. With regards to social relationships, Kazakh MOI programs were linked to negative emotions, whereas both Russian and English MOI programs were described positively. Finally, the quantitative analysis also reported that the strength of national identity positively correlated with the number of years students were educated in Kazakh and self-reported proficiency in the Kazakh language. Negative correlations were found between the strength of national identity and students' self-reported Russian proficiency and English proficiency both self-reported and based on IELTS scores. In this chapter the results of the study will be explained and interpreted in relation to the literature. Existing research on the topic will be used to compare and contrast the findings.

### **Medium of Instruction and National Identity**

As quantitative and qualitative analysis showed, there is the relationship between MOI and national identity. National identity was found to be different in both the strength and the content of national identity. Kazakh-educated students possess stronger and more

ethnic conceptualizations of Kazakhstani national identity, whereas both Russian- and English-educated students possess weaker and more civic conceptualizations of Kazakhstani national identity. The difference between ethnic and civic national identities in terms of the strength of attachment to the nation is in line with Smith's (1991) description of the individuals' attachments to the ethnicity-based national identity and Connor's (1993) argument that ethnonational bond is more powerful in its influence and emotional attachment when compared to civic values.

Smith's (1991) ethnicity-based national identity implies a strong attachment to the nation as it sees the nation as long-enduring ethnicity-based community, characterized by "the durability of ethnic ties, the longevity of their cultures and the persistence of collective identities and even communities over several centuries" (Smith, 1991, p. 33). Thus, as argued by Smith (1991), nations based on ethnic groups had strong attachments to their ethnic national groups long before the creation of the state itself. Moreover, rooted in blood and ethnic bond, ethnicity-centered national identity considers an individual to be born in the particular ethnic national group that does not allow the chance for choosing or changing national identity. Civic national identity, on the other hand, portrays national identity to be more flexible in terms of choosing and changing individuals' belonging to a state (Smith, 1991).

Similarly, ethnicity is often considered to evoke strong emotion, passion and attachment in individuals (Connor, 1993; Finlayson, 1998; Horowitz, 1985; Shils, 1957; as cited in Hale 2004). According to Connor (1993), ethnonational "bond is subconscious and emotional rather than conscious and rational in its inspiration" (p. 384) and is more powerful compared to the impact of civic values, as ethnonational sentiment does not appeal to the *reason*, but instead "appeals to the emotions (appeals not to the mind but to the blood)" (p. 384).

In other words, consistent with the literature, Kazakh-educated students look at Kazakhstani national identity with Smith's (1991) ethnicity-based model of national identity, which in its turn implies a stronger attachment to the nation compared to the civic conceptualization of national identity. Although the finding does not imply a cause-effect relationship, as an implication for educational policy makers might want to consider the possibility that the shift to trilingual education and implementing EMI in higher education could result in the changes in the strength and content of students' national identity.

### **Medium of Instruction and Strength of National Identity**

The results of quantitative findings showed that Kazakh-educated students scored higher on national identity than their Russian- and English-educated peers. The stronger national identity of the Kazakh-educated students is consistent with the results of quantitative research that reports that those who are educated in the national language (David & Tien, 2009) and who express preference for the Kazakh language (Rees & Williams, 2017) have a stronger national identity. Similar to Malay people educated in Malay, Kazakhs educated in Kazakh had a stronger national identity compared to those who received their education in the language other than national language. Similar to Rees and Williams (2017) results, who reported the relationship between the participants' strength of identification with Kazakhstani national identity and their preference for the Kazakh language, the students who preferred Kazakh MOI for their bachelor studies had stronger Kazakhstani national identity compared to their peers who chose Russian or English MOI.

English-educated students scoring lower on the strength of national identity than Kazakh-educated could also be explained with the literature. This finding might be explained by the impact of students' local-global hybrid identities on their decision to enroll in EMI university programs (Henry & Goddard, 2015). In other words, English-



educated students in the current study might have had weaker national identity compared to their Kazakh-educated peers as they might have possessed hybrid local-global identities with the global component possibly weakening their attachment to the country's territory.

A positive correlation was also found between the number of years the participants were educated in Kazakh and the strength of their national identity. In other words, the longer the participants stayed in Kazakh MOI school or university programs, the stronger their attachment to the country was. It is also consistent with Brown and Sachdev's (2009) finding that the longer the Japanese stayed in the United Kingdom, the higher they scored on use of the English language, English language command as well as British and English language identities. The finding reflects the fluidity and changing of identity across time (Norton, 2000). It also gives some evidence for Gellner's (2006) argument that education is constructing national identity. However, it is important to note, that identities are negotiated (Gee, 2000; Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004) and not only constructed one-sidedly. It could be possible that there was also the influence from the students' identities to opt for the certain language as a MOI as identity influenced students' attitudes towards the languages representing their ethnicity and nationality (Brown & Sachdev, 2009; Golan-Cook & Olshtain, 2011). Moreover, although the findings showed that there is a relationship between MOI and both the content and the strength of national identity, the causality was not investigated. Therefore, it cannot be claimed that students' ethnic and civic conceptualizations of national identity were constructed within school as they could have been constructed either prior to receiving education or outside educational institutions. Yet, the findings still should be considered significant as they contribute to the understanding of the link between MOI and national identity.

The finding might be also considered as supportive for Norton's theory about investment, symbolic resources and imagined communities. In line with the theory, the

more the students invested in gaining symbolic resources such as linguistic resource of the Kazakh language the stronger their affiliation with imagined community of Kazakhstanis might have become. Investing in the Kazakh language could also have meant investing into the community with ethnic national sentiments (Brubaker, 1994; Sharipova, Burkhanov & Alpeissova, 2017; Smith, 1991), which in turn could be linked to stronger irrational emotional connection to the country (Connor, 1993)

### **Medium of Instruction and Content of National Identity**

Qualitative data analysis showed that students from different MOI programs perceived the content of national identity differently. Although all the three groups perceived national identity as civic ethnicity centered national identity, Kazakh-educated respondents attributed a stronger ethnic component to Kazakhstani national identity, while both Russian- and English-educated students understood the identity in more civic terms. The finding ties well with the previous research on national identity in Kazakhstan (Aitymbetov, Toktarov, & Ormakhanova, 2015; Burkhanov & Sharipova, 2015; Laruelle, 2015; Stein, 2011).

Thus, the finding confirms Burkhanov's and Sharipova's (2015) conclusion that Kazakhstani-civic national identity model is being contested and resisted by ethnic national identity. The finding also reflects the results about medium of instruction and national identity in four schools in Almaty (Stein, 2011). In Stein's (2011) study the students also viewed Kazakhstani national identity model as Kazakh-ethnicity centered civic model, but still differences in students' answers on national identity were noticed among Kazakh, Russian and Uzbek MOIs. As the current study shows, these differences might have reflected different proportion of presence of the civic and ethnic components in students' conceptualizations of Kazakhstani national identity. The strength of each component in its turn could be influenced by the three paradigms existing in the discourses on state identity

in Kazakhstan: (a) Kazakhness, (b) Kazakhstanness, and (c) transnationalism (Laruelle, 2015). In this sense, Kazakh-educated participants might have been influenced by the discourse of Kazakh national identity as the audience for this discursive paradigm is Kazakhs (Laruelle, 2015) and a significant number of Kazakhs are educated in Kazakh MOI programs (Minister of Education Kulekeev; as cited in Fierman, 2006). Similarly, the strong civic component in Kazakhstani national identity model might have been influenced by the civic discourse of Kazakhstanness, which according to Laruelle (2015) is aimed at ethnic minorities, who in their turn tend to receive their education in Russian MOI programs. Finally, transnationalism might have affected national identities of the participants from English MOI programs, as three out of five interviewed students educated in English came from Nazarbayev Intellectual Schools, which together with Nazarbayevism is a part of transnationalism paradigm.

The interview data showed that Kazakh-educated participants' ethnic views on the importance of knowledge of the Kazakh language were contrasted with the civic views of their peers from Russian MOI programs. As opposed to Kazakh-educated participants, students from Russian MOI programs did not consider the knowledge of the Kazakh to be important for being a Kazakhstani. This is consistent with Kazakh ethnic identity being closely tight to the Kazakh language, whereas Kazakhstani civic national identity in a certain way is connected to the Russian language (Aitymbetov, Toktarov, & Ormakhanova).

The finding could also be explained by Norton's (2000) theory about investment, symbolic resources and imagined community. The decision to invest into a certain language when choosing to enroll into a particular MOI program might have possibly been influenced by the students' different imagined national communities. Viewing a Kazakhstani person as a person who values titular language, traditions and presumed

descent ties, the students opt for Kazakh MOI programs. On the contrary, seeing a Kazakhstani person as a person who brings benefit to the country and is tolerant towards other members of the state, the students opt for Russian and English medium programs. Moreover, the finding that Kazakh-educated students perceived Kazakhstani national identity in more ethnic terms might be reflecting the correlation between students' strong ethnic identities and their MOIs (Der-Karabetian & Balian, 1992; Kemppainen, Hilton & Rannut, 2015). The students educated in Kazakh might have had strong ethnic identity which influenced their perceptions of national identity.

The finding on the content of national identity was also linked to the theme of students experiences of different MOI programs emerged in the data. Students with poor command of Kazakh felt themselves better around the students from Russian and English MOI programs. This finding could be explained with the literature on civic and ethnic national identities (Smith, 1991; Brubaker, 1994). A more civic conceptualizations of national identity that have been noticed among both Russian- and English-educated students are more inclusive and are characterized by fewer tensions and more emphasis on tolerance and equality. A more ethnic conceptualizations of national identity, on the other hand, is less inclusive and more prone to tensions. As an implication for the educators and policy makers, constructing a more civic Kazakhstani national identity might enhance social cohesion both in the classroom and in the society.

### **Conclusion**

The discussion chapter found that the findings of the study were consistent with the previous research. Similar to the literature in national identity in Kazakhstan, the findings showed that civic and ethnic conceptualizations of national identities and the strength of national identification were related to language (Aitymbetov, Toktarov, & Ormakhanova, 2015; Burkhanov & Sharipova, 2015; David & Tien, 2009; Rees & Williams, 2017;

Sharipova, Burkhanov & Alpeissova, 2017). The findings on the strength and the content of national identity were also in line with the research saying that ethnic national identity is more emotional and has stronger attachment to the country compared to civic national identity (Connor, 1993; Smith, 1991). The strongest link was shown between Kazakh MOI and the strength of national identity. The longer students spent in Kazakh MOI programs, the stronger their national identity was. The findings support Gellner's (2006) argument about education playing a significant role for national identity construction with different MOI programs producing different outcomes in terms of national identity. However, it is important to note that the findings could be also reflecting the opposing discourses circulating in Kazakh and Russian speaking environment (Aitymbetov, Toktarov, & Ormakhanova, 2015; Laruelle, 2015) not necessarily inside educational institutions.

## **Chapter 6. Conclusion**

By answering two research questions, the study has achieved its purpose to investigate the relationship between MOI and national identity. The first research question was aimed to find out whether there is a relationship between MOI and the strength of national identity. Quantitative data analysis showed that indeed there was a link between the two. The students who were enrolled in Kazakh MOI programs had significantly stronger national identity than those educated in Russian or in English. The answer to the second question also showed the differences between Kazakh MOI and both Russian and English MOI. The second research question was aimed to explore perceptions of students' from different MOI programs of the content of Kazakhstani national identity. Qualitative data analysis revealed that students educated through the Kazakh language had a more ethnic conceptualization of Kazakhstani national identity, whereas their peers from Russian and English MOI programs had a more civic conceptualization of the identity. Thus, the study has achieved its research purpose to investigate the relationship between MOI and national identity. The findings showed that MOI and national identity are related and the students from programs with instruction in the titular Kazakh language had stronger national identity with more ethnic conceptualization of the identity, whereas their peers from programs with the instruction in non-titular Russian and English languages had weaker national identity with more civic conceptualization of the identity.

### **Limitations**

It is important to note that generalizability of the findings is limited due to the small uneven with regards to gender and limited in regional representation sample, value-laden nature of the qualitative part of the study and limitations of convenience sampling strategy. The sample size for both survey and interviews was small and limited in the regional representation collecting data only in Astana. Uneven representation of male and female

participants could also be reflecting mainly female population. Moreover, the study looked only at correlations and did not establish causality. Thus, no conclusions could be made on the cause and effect relationship between MOI and national identity. Furthermore, the value-laden nature of the qualitative study and non-guaranteed representativeness of the sample should be also taken into account. The study employed convenience sampling strategy, which could also attract certain population to volunteer to participate in the study, thus undermining representativeness of the sample. Although, the analysis of the qualitative data was based on certain existing categories reflecting the elements of national identity, researcher's assumption that MOI influences students' national identities could have involved some bias in the qualitative part of the study. However, despite the abovementioned limitations that are important to take into account, the findings of the study have certain implications both for the educators and policymakers as well as recommendations for future research.

### **Implications**

Both the practitioners and the students should be aware that the content of Kazakhstani national identity might be perceived differently by students from different MOI programs and might involve certain tensions, especially on the basis of language. Moreover, the classroom practices should employ critical pedagogies to ensure that the power of discourse and ideologies concentrated in the educators' hands were not violating students' rights, when fostering and affirming particular forms of identities and disregarding other forms. The teachers from Kazakh MOI programs should be aware of the challenges students with low Kazakh proficiency might face not only linguistically, but socially, and be prepared to act in a supportive manner or be proactive.

Educational policymakers, in their turn, might want to consult the research on national identity and MOI to be aware of the possible identity outcomes of trilingual MOI

in secondary education and EMI in higher education planned to be implemented in the near future. The current small scale research might suggest that English MOI programs and trilingual or multilingual programs foster more civic national identities associated with less tension and more tolerance, which is especially beneficial in Kazakhstani context with the population not only divided ethnically and linguistically, but also possessing two opposing conceptualizations of national identity. Thus, English MOI classrooms might be more comfortable places for the interaction of different ethnicities, students possessing different conceptualizations of the national identity and Kazakh- and Russian-dominant students. English in education might play a mediating role between Kazakh and Russian languages. As a possible downside, civic national identity is considered to be less emotional and more rational, with not as strong as affiliation and attachment to the country as of the ethnic national identity. However, the recommendations for both educators and policymakers should be based on a large scale research.

### **Future Research**

Current study confirms that identity is not fixed, but instead is fluid and changeable. MOI in this sense might be one of the factors influencing students' identities, especially ethnic and national ones. Language proficiency might be playing a role in the relationship between MOI and students' identities.

More research on the relationship between MOI and ethnic and national identities might bring more insights for identity and language learning research. Furthermore, by investigating teaching practices and students' experiences, future research might pose the question whether MOI indeed is influencing students' identities by certain discourses and language ideologies circulating in the classrooms or teachers' behavior affirming or refuting students' identities. Students' desire and motivation behind their choices for opting for certain MOI programs could also contribute to the understanding the complex



relationship between MOI and students' identities. Norton's (2000) work on identity, investment and imagined communities might of use here. Teacher identities and MOI might also be of interest to the researchers. The topic of elitism in EMI could be another are to investigate deeper.

For Kazakhstani context, investigating identity in trilingual education might be of particular interest. Language ideologies and language issues in the interaction between Kazakh- and Russian- dominant students might also bring insights on the group social cohesion. The research might be of benefit to both educators and policymakers.

### References

- Aitymbetov, N., Toktarov, E. & Ormakhanova, E. (2015). Nation-Building in Kazakhstan: Kazakh and Kazakhstani Identities Controversy, *Bilig*, 74, 1-20
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Verso. London.
- Biesta, G. (2012). Mixed methods. In: J. Arthur, M. Warning, R. Coe & L.V. Hedges (Ed.). *Research methods and methodologies in education*. (pp. 147-152). London, Great Britain: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Bourke, R. & Loveridge, J. (2014). Exploring informed consent and dissent through children's participation in educational research, *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 37(2), 151-165, doi: 10.1080/1743727X.2013.817551
- Brown, I. & Sachdev, I. (2009). Bilingual behaviour, attitudes, identity and vitality: some data from Japanese speakers in London, UK, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 30(4), 327-343, DOI: 10.1080/01434630902780715
- Brubaker, R. (1994). *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. London, England: Harvard University Press.
- Brubaker, R. (1996). *Nationalism reframed: Nationhood and the national question in the new Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods*. (4<sup>th</sup>ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burkhanov, A. & Sharipova, D. (2014). Kazakhstan's civic-national identity: Ambiguous policies and points of resistance. In: M. Y. Omelicheva (Ed.), *Nationalism and*

- identity construction in Central Asia*. (pp.21-35). London, Great Britain: Lexington Books.
- Citrin, J. & Sears, D. O. (2009). In: R. Abdelal, Y.M. Herrera, A.I. Johnston & R. McDermott (Ed.), *Measuring identity. A guide for social scientists*. (pp.145-174). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Connor, W. (1993). Beyond reason: The nature of the ethnonational bond, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 16(3), 0141-9870/93/1603-373
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education*. London: Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. International edition (4<sup>th</sup>ed.). Boston: Pearson
- Curtis, W., Murphy, M., & Shields, S. (2013). *Research and Education*. New York, NY: Routledge
- Dave, B. (2007). *Kazakhstan: Ethnicity, language and power*. New York: Routledge.
- David, M. K., & Tien, W. 2009. Conceptualisation of Nationalism through Language—an Analysis of Malaysian Situation, *Language in India*, 9 (1), 303–16.
- Der-Karabetian, A., & Ruiz, Y., (1993). Affective bicultural and global-human identity scales for Mexican-American adolescents. *Psychological Reports*, 80, 1027-1039.
- Der-Karabetian, A. & Balian, N. (1992). Ingroup, Outgroup, and Global-Human Identities of Turkish-Armenians, *Journal of Social Psychology*, 132(4), 497-504.
- Fierman, W. (2006). Language and education in post-Soviet Kazakhstan: Kazakh medium instruction in urban schools. *The Russian Review*, 65, 98-116.

Gee, J. P. (2000). Chapter 3: Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. *Review of research in education*, 25(1), 99-125.

<https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X025001099>

Gellner, E. (2006). *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing

Gerhard, S. (1991). *Nationalism and Policy toward the Nationalities in the Soviet Union: From Totalitarian Dictatorship to Post-Stalinist Society*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Glenn, J. (1999). *The Soviet Legacy in Central Asia*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Goble, P. (2015). Three post-Soviet cases. In: M. Ayoob, & M. Ismayilov (Ed.), *Identity and Politics in Central Asia and the Caucasus*. (pp. 69-81) New York: Routledge.

Golan-Cook, P. & Olshtain, E. (2011). A model of identity and language orientations: the case of immigrant students from the Former Soviet Union in Israel, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 32(4), 361-376, DOI: 10.1080/01434632.2011.579128

Goskomstat, (1991). Natsionalnyi sostav naseleniya SSSR po dannym vsesoyuznoi perepisi naseleniya 1989. Ethnic composition of the USSR population from the 1989 population census data. Retrieved from [demoscope.ru/weekly/ssp/sng\\_nac\\_89.php](http://demoscope.ru/weekly/ssp/sng_nac_89.php) on 1.10.2017.

Hale, H. (2004). Explaining ethnicity, *Comparative Political Studies*, 37(4), 458-485. DOI: 10.1177/0010414003262906

Henry, A & Goddard, A. (2015). Bicultural or Hybrid? The Second Language Identities of Students on an English-Mediated University Program in Sweden, *Journal of*

*Language, Identity & Education*, 14(4), 255-274, DOI:

10.1080/15348458.2015.1070596

Joseph, J. E. (2016). Historical perspective on language and identity. In: S. Preece (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and Identity*. (pp.19-33). Kent: GreenGate Publishing Services.

Kemppainen, R., Hilton, S. & Rannut, Ü. (2015). Ethnic Identification and School Language of Russian-speaking Students in Estonia, *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 14(5), 336-353, DOI: 10.1080/15348458.2015.1090275

Laruelle, M. (2014). The three discursive paradigms of state identity in Kazakhstan. In: M. Y. Omelicheva (Ed.), *Nationalism and identity construction in Central Asia*. (pp.1-20). London, Great Britain: Lexington Books.

Landau, J. M. & Kellner-Heinkele, B. (2001). *Politics of Language in the Ex-Soviet Muslim States*. The USA: The University of Michigan Press.

Marquardt, K. L. (2015). Language and sovereignty: A comparative analysis of language policy in Tatarstan and Kazakhstan 1991-2010. In: M. Ayoob, & M. Ismayilov (Ed.), *Identity and Politics in Central Asia and the Caucasus*. (pp. 44-68) New York: Routledge.

Mehisto, P. (2015). 7 Kazakhstan: From twenty trilingual schools to thousands, *Building Bilingual Education Systems*, retrieved from books.google.com on 1.10.2017, 109-130

Muijs, D. (2011). *Doing quantitative research in education with SPSS*. London, SAGE Publications Ltd. ISBN: 9781849203241

“Naselenie Kazakhstana na 2016 god”. The population of Kazakhstan in 2016. (2017).

Retrieved from <http://mfina.ru/naselenie-kazaxstana-na-2016-god> on 2.10.2017.

Nazarbayev, N. (2011). ‘On the State Program of Functioning and Development of Languages in the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2011-2020’. Decree of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan No.110.

Newby, P. (2010). *Research Methods for Education*. London: Pearson.

Niezen, R. (2012). Identities. In: G. Ritzer (Ed.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Globalization*. Vol. 3,I-No (pp.985-988). Singapore: Markono Print Media Pte Ltd.

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Malaysia: Pearson Education Limited.

Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Olaoye, A. A. (2013). The Role of Language in National Re-Branding: A Sociolinguistic Perspective, *Journal on English Language Teaching*, 3(3), 41-47

Omelicheva, M.Y. (2014). *Nationalism and Identity Construction in Central Asia*. London: Lexington Books.

Onwuegbuzie, J.A. & Leech, L.N. (2007). A Call for Qualitative Power Analyses. *Quality and Quantity*, 41, 105-121. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11135-005-1098-1>

Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Pavlenko, A. & Blackledge, A. (2004). *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts*. Great Britain: Cromwell Press Ltd.

- Preece, S. (2016). *The Routledge handbook of language and Identity*. Kent: GreenGate Publishing Services.
- Rees, K.M. & Williams, N.W. (2017) Explaining Kazakhstani identity: supraethnic identity, ethnicity, language, and citizenship, *Nationalities Papers*, 45(5), 815-839, DOI: 10.1080/00905992.2017.1288204
- Sharipova, D., Burkhanov, A. & Alpeissova, A. (2017) The determinants of civic and ethnic nationalisms in Kazakhstan: Evidence from the grass-roots level, *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 23 (2), 203-226, DOI: 10.1080/13537113.2017.1311143
- Smagulova, J. (2008). Language Policies of Kazakhization and Their Influence on Language Attitudes and Use, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 11(3-4), 440-475
- Smith, A. D. (1991). *National Identity*. Reno, Nevada: University of Nevada Press.
- Stein, M. (2011). Connecting to the Khans: Shaping national identity of the next generation through education in Kazakhstan. *Current Issues in Education*, 14(2). Retrieved on October 27, from <http://cie.asu.edu/ojs/index.php/cieatasu/article/view/551>
- Tollefson, J. & Tsui, A. (2010). *Medium of instruction policies: Which Agenda? Whose Agenda?* New York: Routledge.
- Tymms, P. (2012). Questionnaires. In: J. Arthur, M. Warning, R. Coe & L.V. Hedges (Ed.). *Research methods and methodologies in education*. (pp. 231-240). London, Great Britain: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Yuan, Y. & Fang, L. (2016). Cultivating college students' national culture identity based on English education, *English Language Teaching*, 9(5), 192-196.

Zak, I. (1973). Dimensions of Jewish-American identity. *Psychological Reports*, 33, 891-900.





|   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| future of humankind in Kazakhstan.  |   |   |   |   |   |
| 12. One of my most important duty as a Kazakhstani is loyalty to Kazakhstan.  | • | • | • | • | • |
| 13. If a stranger were to meet me and mistake me for a non-Kazakhstani, I would correct his/her mistake, and tell him or her that I am a Kazakhstani. | • | • | • | • | • |
| 14. If I were to be born all over again, I would wish to be born a Kazakhstani.   | • | • | • | • | • |

**Appendix B****Interview Protocol****Background information**

1. What is the language of instruction in your university?
2. What year are you in? How long have you been educated through this language?
3. What was the language of instruction in your school?
4. What region in Kazakhstan are you from?

**Questions on the content of Kazakhstani national identity**

5. What is your understanding of the term Kazakhstani?

Probes:

- What are some of the essential characteristics of a Kazakhstani person?
  - What is the most important feature that represents a Kazakhstani person?
  - How would you describe a true Kazakhstani?
6. What features of a Kazakhstani person you perceive as positive?
  7. What features of a Kazakhstani person you perceive as negative?
  8. What values are typical for a Kazakhstani person?
  9. What does a Kazakhstani person take pride in?
  10. What is important for Kazakhstanis in terms of their past?
  11. What holidays are important for a Kazakhstani person?
  12. Who would you consider a model of a true Kazakhstani person for you? Why?
  13. In your opinion how important are the following for being a true Kazakhstani?
    - To have been born in Kazakhstan
    - To have Kazakhstani citizenship
    - To have lived in Kazakhstan for most of one's life
    - To be able to speak Kazakh

- To be a Muslim
- To respect Kazakhstan's political institutions and laws
- To feel Kazakhstani
- To have ancestry from Kazakhstan

## Appendix C

## Advertisement for recruiting participants



**Dear 3 and 4 year students  
majoring in humanities**

**we are happy to announce  
the *recruitment for participants in  
the research in  
language of instruction and identity***



**The purpose of the research** is to investigate the link between *identity and language of instruction* in Kazakhstani universities and to explore the perceptions of Kazakh medium-, Russian medium- and English medium-educated students of „Kazakhstanness“.

**The participation** will involve the completion of one short close-ended questionnaire. The *survey* will be administered online and will take about **15 minutes** of your time. Some of you might be also invited to participate in one-on-one *interviews*.

**If you are interested in participating in this research, please send an email to [alexandra.nam@nu.edu.kz](mailto:alexandra.nam@nu.edu.kz) with the following information:**

1. Your gender, major, year of study
2. your language of instruction in the university
3. the number of years you are being educated through this language, including university and school experience
4. whether you are interested to participate in both survey and the interview or only in the survey.



  
NAZARBAYEV  
UNIVERSITY

 **NUGSE**  
RESEARCH IN EDUCATION

If you have any questions regarding the research, please contact Alexandra Nam via email or phone:  
[alexandra.nam@nu.edu.kz](mailto:alexandra.nam@nu.edu.kz), 87076590058

**Appendix D****INFORMED CONSENT FORM #1**

## Survey participation

Identity and language of instruction: A mixed-method study of Kazakh-, Russian- and English-educated students in Kazakhstan.

**DESCRIPTION:** You are invited to participate in a research study on identities of students educated through different languages of instruction. You will be asked to participate in a short online survey. Your participation will involve completing an anonymous questionnaire about your identity. All the information gathered from the survey will be kept anonymous. Your name will not be on the survey. You will be coded with a number. The files with the data will be secured by password and stored separately from the files with your identity. In written materials or discussions no reference that could link the participants to the research will be made.

**TIME INVOLVEMENT:** Your participation will take approximately 15 minutes.

**RISKS AND BENEFITS:** The risk associated with this study is minimal. You might have some individual discomfort when questions are being asked about language and identity. There are no direct benefits for you. Yet, by participating in the study you might develop a better awareness of the strength of your national and global identities. Moreover, you will also be able to gain satisfaction from the fact that by participating in the research you made a contribution into research in education. The findings of the research will be useful in understanding whether there is a relationship between the language of instruction and the strength of students' national and global identities. This knowledge will contribute to the understanding of how the transformation to trilingual education or integrating the English language in education might affect the identities of younger generation. Your decision whether or not to participate in this study will not affect your grades in university.

**SUBJECT'S RIGHTS:** If you have read this form and have decided to participate in this study, 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. You have the right to refuse to answer particular questions. Your individual privacy will be maintained in all published and written data resulting from the study.

**CONTACT INFORMATION:**

**Questions:** If you have any questions, concerns or complaints about this research, its procedures, risks and benefits, you should ask the Master's thesis Supervisor, Xose Rosales, [xose.rosales@nu.edu.kz](mailto:xose.rosales@nu.edu.kz), +77172706439.

**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 speak to someone independent of the research team at +7 7172 709359. You can also write an email to the NUGSE Research Committee at [gse\\_researchcommittee@nu.edu.kz](mailto:gse_researchcommittee@nu.edu.kz)

Please sign this consent form 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.**

**According to the law of the Republic of Kazakhstan an individual under the age of 18 is considered a child. Any participant falling into that category should be given the Parental Consent Form and have it signed by at least one of his/her parent(s) or guardian(s).**

**INFORMED CONSENT FORM #2**

## Interview participation

Identity and language of instruction: A mixed-method study of Kazakh-, Russian- and English-educated students in Kazakhstan.

**DESCRIPTION:** You are invited to participate in a research study on identities of students educated through different languages of instruction. You will be asked to participate in one one-on-one audio taped interview. In case you refuse to be audiotaped, the notes will be taken manually. All the information gathered from the interviews will be kept confidential. The files with the data will be secured by password and stored separately from the files with your identity. The study will conceal individuals' real names and will employ pseudonyms to refer to the individuals while reporting the findings. Personal data of the participants will be kept completely confidential and will not be shared with other participants or universities' staff. After the completion of the research, all audiotaped material will be deleted and field-notes destroyed.

**TIME INVOLVEMENT:** Your participation will take approximately 60 minutes.

**RISKS AND BENEFITS:** The risk associated with this study is minimal. You might have some individual discomfort when questions are being asked about language and identity. There are no direct benefits for you. Yet, by participating in the interview you will be able to articulate your personal beliefs and share your opinions about national identity in Kazakhstan as well as obtain a deeper insight in the way you perceive „Kazakhstanness“. You will also be able to gain satisfaction from the fact that by participating in the research you made a contribution into research in education. The findings of the research will be useful in understanding whether there is a relationship between the language of instruction and the strength of students' national and global identities. This knowledge will contribute to the understanding of how the transformation to trilingual education or integrating the English language in education might affect the identities of younger generation. Your decision whether or not to participate in this study will not affect your grades in university.

**SUBJECT'S RIGHTS:** If you have read this form and have decided to participate in this study, 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. You have the right to refuse to answer particular questions. Your individual privacy will be maintained in all published and written data resulting from the study.

**CONTACT INFORMATION:**

**Questions:** If you have any questions, concerns or complaints about this research, its procedures, risks and benefits, you should ask the Master's thesis Supervisor, Xose Rosales, [xose.rosales@nu.edu.kz](mailto:xose.rosales@nu.edu.kz), +77172706439.

**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 speak to someone independent of the research team at +7 7172 709359. You can also write an email to the NUGSE Research Committee at [gse\\_researchcommittee@nu.edu.kz](mailto:gse_researchcommittee@nu.edu.kz)

Please sign this consent form 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.**

**According to the law of the Republic of Kazakhstan an individual under the age of 18 is considered a child. Any participant falling into that category should be given the Parental Consent Form and have it signed by at least one of his/her parent(s) or guardian(s).**

**ЗЕРТТЕУ ЖҰМЫСЫ КЕЛІСІМІНІҢ АҚПАРАТТЫҚ ФОРМАСЫ #1**

Сауалнамаға қатысуға арналған форма

Тұлғалық сезім мен білім беру тілі: Қазақ, орыс, ағылшын тілінде оқитын студенттер жайлы аралас зерттеу

**СИПАТТАМА:** Сіз әр түрлі тілде оқитын студенттердің өзіндік тұлға сезімін анықтауға бағытталған зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға шақырылып отырсыз. Сізге анонимді түрде өзигдік тұлғаңыз туралы қысқа онлайн сауалнамаға қатысу ұсынылады. Зерттеу аяқталғаннан кейін сіз туралы мәліметтерді қамтитын ақпараттар біржолата жойылады. Сауалнамада сіздің атыңыз көрсетілінбейді, атыңыздың орнына белгілі бір номерлер қолданылады. Сіз туралы жеке деректерді қамтитын құжаттар құпия сөзбен қорғалынып, жеке сақталынады. Осы зерттеуге сіздің қатысуыңызды көрсетуі мүмкін жазбаша материалдарда немесе пікірталастарда ешқандай сілтемелер көрсетілмейді.

**ӨТКІЗІЛЕТІН УАҚЫТЫ:** Сіздің сауалнамаға қатысуыңыз шамамен 15 минут уақытыңызды алады.

**ЗЕРТТЕУ ЖҰМЫСЫНА ҚАТЫСУДЫҢ ҚАУІПТЕРІ МЕН АРТЫҚШЫЛЫҚТАРЫ:**

Зерттеу жұмысына қатысудың қауіптері өте аз. Сізде кейбір жеке ыңғайсыздықтар болуы мүмкін. Зерттеуге қатысу сізге тікелей пайда бермеуі мүмкін. Дегенмен, зерттеуге қатысу арқылы сіз өзіңізді қаншалықты мемлекеттік және жаһандық тұлға ретінде сезінетіңіз жайлы ой қалыптастыра аласыз. Сұхбатқа қатысу арқылы, сіз өзіңіздің жеке сенімдеріңізді білдіріп, Қазақстан туралы өз пікірлеріңізбен бөлісе аласыз. Зерттеу нәтижелері білім беру тілі мен студенттердің елдік немесе жаһандық тәуелділігінің арасындағы ара-қатынасты анықтауға көмектеспек. Бұл ақпарат ағылшын тілінің енгізілуі жас студенттердің өзіндік сезіміне қалай әсер ететінгін білуге көмектеседі. Зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға келісім беруіңіз немесе бас тартуыңыз *Сіздің жоғарғы оқу орнындағы бағаларыңызға* еш әсерін тигізбейді.

**ҚАТЫСУШЫ ҚҰҚЫҚТАРЫ:** Егер Сіз берілген формамен танысып, зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға шешім қабылдасаңыз, Сіздің қатысуыңыз **ерікті** түрде екенін хабарлаймыз. Сонымен қатар, **қалаған уақытта айыппұл төлемей және сіздің әлеуметтік жеңілдіктеріңізге еш кесірін тигізбей 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 мақсаттарда баспаға ұсынылуы немесе шығарылуы мүмкін.

**БАЙЛАНЫС АҚПАРАТЫ:**

**Сұрақтарыңыз:** Егер жүргізіліп отырған зерттеу жұмысының процесі, қауіпі мен артықшылықтары туралы сұрағыңыз немесе шағымыңыз болса, келесі байланыс құралдары арқылы зерттеушімен хабарласуыңызға болады: Шосе Розалес, [xose.rosales@nu.edu.kz](mailto:xose.rosales@nu.edu.kz), +77172706439

**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](mailto: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 зерттеушінің өзіне қолжетімді және мәлім болатынын 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: \_\_\_\_\_

**ЗЕРТТЕУ ЖҰМЫСЫ КЕЛІСІМІНІҢ АҚПАРАТТЫҚ ФОРМАСЫ #2**

Сұхбатқа қатысуға арналған форма

Тұлғалық сезім мен білім беру тілі: Қазақ, орыс, ағылшын тілінде оқитын студенттер жайлы аралас зерттеу

**СИПАТТАМА:** Сіз әр түрлі тілде оқитын студенттердің өзіндік тұлға сезімін анықтауға бағытталған зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға шақырылып отырсыз. Сізге анонимді түрде сұхбат сұрақтарына жауап беруді сұраймыз. Қасылықтарыңыз болмаса, сұхбат дыбыстық жазбаға жазылынып алынады. Сұхбат барысында алынған ақпараттар қатаң құпия түрде сақталынады. Зерттеу аяқталғаннан кейін сіз туралы мәліметтерді қамтитын ақпараттар біржолата жойылады. Сұхбатта сіздің атыңыз көрсетілілмейді, атыңыздың орнына белгілі бір номерлер қолданылады. Сіз туралы жеке деректерді қамтитын құжаттар құпия сөзбен қорғалынып, жеке сақталынады. Осы зерттеуге сіздің қатысуыңызды көрсетуі мүмкін жазбаша материалдарда немесе пікірталастарда ешқандай сілтемелер көрсетілмейді.

**ӨТКІЗІЛЕТІН УАҚЫТЫ:** Сіздің сұхбат беруіңіз шамамен 60 минут уақытыңызды алады.

**ЗЕРТТЕУ ЖҰМЫСЫНА ҚАТЫСУДЫҢ ҚАУІПТЕРІ МЕН АРТЫҚШЫЛЫҚТАРЫ:**

Зерттеу жұмысына қатысудың қауіптері өте аз. Сізде кейбір жеке ыңғайсыздықтар болуы мүмкін. Зерттеуге қатысу сізге тікелей пайда бермеуі мүмкін. Дегенмен, сұхбатқа қатысу арқылы, сіз өзіңіздің жеке сенімдеріңізді білдіріп, Қазақстан туралы өз пікірлеріңізбен бөлісе отырып, «Қазақстандық болу» туралы терең түсіністік қалыптастыра аласыз. Зерттеу нәтижелері білім беру тілі мен студенттердің елдік немесе жаһандық тәуелділігінің арасындағы ара-қатынасты анықтауға көмектеспек. Бұл ақпарат ағылшын тілінің енгізілуі жас студенттердің өзіндік сезіміне қалай әсер ететінін білуге көмектеседі. Зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға келісім беруіңіз немесе бас тартуыңыз *Сіздің жоғарғы оқу орнындағы бағаларыңызға* еш әсерін тигізбейді.

**ҚАТЫСУШЫ ҚҰҚЫҚТАРЫ:** Егер Сіз берілген формамен танысып, зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға шешім қабылдасаңыз, Сіздің қатысуыңыз **ерікті** түрде екенін хабарлаймыз. Сонымен қатар, **қалаған уақытта айыппұл төлемей және сіздің әлеуметтік жеңілдіктеріңізге еш кесірін тигізбей 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 мақсаттарда баспаға ұсынылуы немесе шығарылуы мүмкін.

**БАЙЛАНЫС АҚПАРАТЫ:**

**Сұрақтарыңыз:** Егер жүргізіліп отырған зерттеу жұмысының процесі, қауіп мен артықшылықтары туралы сұрағыңыз немесе шағымыңыз болса, келесі байланыс құралдары арқылы зерттеушімен хабарласуыңызға болады: Шосе Розалес, [xose.rosales@nu.edu.kz](mailto:xose.rosales@nu.edu.kz), +77172706439

**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](mailto: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 зерттеушінің өзіне қолжетімді және мәлім болатынын 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: \_\_\_\_\_

**ФОРМА ИНФОРМАЦИОННОГО СОГЛАСИЯ #1**

## Участие в опросе

Идентичность и язык обучения: исследование студентов обучающихся на казахском, русском и английском языках.

**ОПИСАНИЕ:** Вы приглашены принять участие в исследовании по идентичности студентов с разными языками обучения. Вам будет предложено принять участие в недолгом опросе онлайн. Вас попросят заполнить анкету о вашей идентичности. Вся информация, собранная в данном опросе, является анонимной. Ваше имя не будет указано в анкетах; будет использован только идентификационный номер. Документы с данными будут защищены паролем и будут храниться отдельно от документов с Вашими личными данными. Никакие ссылки не будут указаны в письменных материалах или обсуждениях, которые могли бы указать на Ваше участие в данном исследовании.

**ВРЕМЯ УЧАСТИЯ:** Ваше участие займёт около 15 минут.

**РИСКИ И ПРЕИМУЩЕСТВА:** Риски, связанные с исследованием минимальны. У Вас может возникнуть личный дискомфорт, когда Вас будут спрашивать о языке и идентичности. Возможно, вы не получите никакой прямой выгоды от участия в данном исследовании. Однако, участие в исследовании может помочь Вам лучше осознать насколько сильно вы ощущаете свою принадлежность к государству и принадлежность к мировому сообществу. Кроме того, Вы сможете получить удовлетворение от того, что приняв участие в исследовании, Вы сделали свой вклад в исследовании в сфере образования. Результаты исследования будут полезны в понимании того, существует ли связь между языком обучения и тем, насколько сильно студенты ощущают свою принадлежность к государству и принадлежность к мировому сообществу. Эти знания внесут вклад в понимание того как переход к трёхязычному образованию и внедрение английского языка в образование может повлиять на идентичность молодого поколения. Ваше решение о согласии либо отказе в участии никаким образом не повлияет на ваши оценки/баллы в университете.

**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 без штрафных санкций и без потери социального пакета, который Вам предоставляли.** В качестве альтернативы можно не участвовать в исследовании. Также Вы имеете право не отвечать на какие-либо вопросы. Результаты данного исследования могут быть представлены или опубликованы в научных или профессиональных целях.

**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 руководителем магистерской диссертации, Шосе Розалес, используя следующие данные: [xose.rosales@nu.edu.kz](mailto:xose.rosales@nu.edu.kz), +77172706439.

**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](mailto: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 исследователь;
- 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: \_\_\_\_\_

**ФОРМА ИНФОРМАЦИОННОГО СОГЛАСИЯ #2**

## Участие в интервью

Идентичность и язык обучения: исследование студентов обучающихся на казахском, русском и английском языках.

**ОПИСАНИЕ:** Вы приглашены принять участие в исследовании по идентичности студентов с разными языками обучения. Вам будет предложено принять участие в индивидуальном интервью. Во время интервью будет вестись аудио запись. В случае если Вы откажетесь быть записанным на аудио, записи будут вестись вручную. Вся информация, собранная в данном опросе, является конфиденциальной. Документы с данными будут защищены паролем и будут храниться отдельно от документов с Вашими личными данными. Исследование скроет Ваше имя и будет использовать псевдонимы в письменных текстах. Ваша личная информация будет строго конфиденциальной и не будет разглашаться или передаваться другим участникам или администрации университета. По окончании исследования все аудио записи и записи, сделанные вручную, будут удалены.

**ВРЕМЯ УЧАСТИЯ:** Ваше участие займёт около 60 минут.

**РИСКИ И ПРЕИМУЩЕСТВА:** Риски, связанные с исследованием минимальны. У Вас может возникнуть личный дискомфорт, когда Вас будут спрашивать о языке и идентичности. Возможно, вы не получите никакой прямой выгоды от участия в интервью. Однако, Вы сможете выразить Ваши личные убеждения и поделиться Вашим мнением касательно государственной принадлежности и получить более глубокое понимание о том как вы осознаете «Казахстанность». Кроме того, Вы сможете получить удовлетворение от того, что приняв участие в исследовании, Вы сделали свой вклад в исследовании в сфере образования. Результаты исследования будут полезны в понимании того, существует ли связь между языком обучения и тем, насколько сильно студенты ощущают свою принадлежность к государству и принадлежность к мировому сообществу. Эти знания внесут вклад в понимание того как переход к трёхязычному образованию и внедрение английского языка в образование может повлиять на идентичность молодого поколения. Ваше решение о согласии либо отказе в участии никаким образом не повлияет на ваши оценки/баллы в университете.

**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 без штрафных санкций и без потери социального пакета, который Вам предоставляли.** В качестве альтернативы можно не участвовать в исследовании. Также Вы имеете право не отвечать на какие-либо вопросы. Результаты данного исследования могут быть представлены или опубликованы в научных или профессиональных целях.

**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 руководителем магистерской диссертации, Шосе Розалес, используя следующие данные: [xose.rosales@nu.edu.kz](mailto:xose.rosales@nu.edu.kz), +77172706439

**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](mailto: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 исследователь;

- 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: \_\_\_\_\_

**Appendix E****Data Sample****An extract from an interview transcript****December 26, 2018**

I: You study in Russian now, and did you study in school in Russian too?

Ru1: Yes, I studied in Russian in school. The first one or two grades I studied in Kazakh, but this shouldn't be taken into account, because in the kindergarten I was in Russian group, spoke Russian and these two years that I spent in the first grades in Kazakh group, they were like a kind of trauma. I mean, something was demanded from me, something wanted, and I did not understand what and because of this there was a conflict, I cried, did not want to go to school. Then in the third grade they transferred me to the Russian group. Well, and life has improved from then on. I began to study well.

I: Are you local?

Ru1: Yes, I lived here all my life.

I: How do you understand the term Kazakhstani?

Ru1: I can start with the history. Well, the collapse of the Russian Empire occurred. There were different people, they were classified into foreigners, indigenous people and non-Russians ... in the empire ... Then Soviet power came and all peoples became equal. And there were different peoples ... Russians, Kazakhs, Uzbeks, Kirghiz, Chechens, Tatars, Mordovians, but all were part of one big family. And we all together formed a single Soviet ethnos, a superethnos. But as a result of the restoration of capitalism in 1991, you can call it the bourgeois counter-revolution, it was the will of fate that we now live in different countries ... we wanted it or did not want it, but it happened so. And we seem to have returned to the capitalist way of life. And in the capitalist way, well, as a result, there is an intense nation-building, genesis of a nation, that is, it is easier for the bourgeoisie to rule the people when they speak the same language, they have one culture and so on. Well, in history, this is clearly traced. With the development of capitalism, nations are being formed. The French, the British, the Germans, the Americans are also a formed nation. And so it turns out we live in a bourgeois state and we need ... our bourgeoisie needs to form one nation from all people, a Kazakhstani, that is, the collective name of a citizen of the republic.