

**Exploring University Teachers and Students' Beliefs and Practices about
Translanguaging in Kazakh Language Learning Classes**

Symbat Mukhamediyeva

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Multilingual Education

Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education

May, 2021

Word Count: 23579

Author Agreement

Author Agreement

By signing and submitting this license, I SYMBAT MUKHAMEDIYEVA (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


28.05.2021

Date

Declaration

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: 28.05.2021

Ethics Approval



53 Kabanbay Batyr Ave.
010000 Astana,
Republic of Kazakhstan
October 2020

Dear **Symbat Mukhamediyeva**

This letter now confirms that your research project entitled: **Exploring university teachers' and students' beliefs and practices about translanguaging in Kazakh language learning classes** has been approved by the Graduate School of Education Ethics Committee of Nazarbayev University.

You may proceed with contacting your preferred research site and commencing your participant recruitment strategy.

Yours sincerely

Syed Abdul Manan

On behalf of Zumrad Kataeva
Chair of the GSE Ethics Committee
Assistant Professor
Graduate School of Education
Nazarbayev University

Block C3, Room 5006
Office: +7 (7172) 70 9371
Mobile: +7 777 1929961
email: zumrad.kataeva@nu.edu.kz

CITI Training Certificate

Completion Date 21-Aug-2020
Expiration Date 21-Aug-2023
Record ID 37829869

This is to certify that:

Symbat Mukhamediyeva

Has completed the following Citi Program course:

Students conducting no more than minimal risk research
(Curriculum Group)

Students - Class projects
(Course Learner Group)

1 - Basic Course
(Stage)

Not valid for renewal of certification
through CME.

Under requirements set by:

Nazarbayev University

CITI
Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative

Verify at www.citiprogram.org/verify/?w7a00699f-11a1-47ae-a1a9-1c57597404b3-37829869

Acknowledgements

There were millions of times I felt extremely grateful throughout these two years of studying at NUGSE. Grateful to people, opportunities, and circumstances. First, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor Syed Abdul Manan who always respected our passion for knowledge and was always there to share his amazing experience and expertise. Thank you, professor, for having the best answers to all the questions and concerns I had. Second, I want to thank the team of NUGSE MA professors. I feel so lucky to be a student of such great people. I also want to thank my dearest MA peers, I am so happy to have shared these two years with you all. Let us be the agents of change in the field of education. I believe in you!

Saltanat, Sofya, and Zarina, my bestest besties, thank you for making me laugh whenever I felt down and stopped believing in myself. I am very lucky to have such smart, wise, and fun best friends.

No words can describe how thankful I am to my family. Мамуль, папуль, самое огромное и необъятное спасибо я выражаю Вам! За то, что всегда верили в меня, молились за меня и не переставая спрашивали, все ли у меня хорошо. My sisters, Sabina and Nazym, thank you for being my role models. I am grateful to have my nephew Aisultan and niece Yasmine as the greatest source of inspiration. I always think that I might be a role model for them, and these thoughts always make me strive higher. Моя семья - мой двигатель прогресса. Я вас очень люблю!

I owe a very special thanks to my beloved husband, Damir. He was there for me 24/7 and did everything to make me feel comfortable, secure, and confident. Thank you for your support, understanding, and for always showing how proud you are of me. You are my greatest power.

Abstract

Exploring University Teachers and Students' Beliefs and Practices about Translanguaging in Kazakh Language Learning Classes

Since the growth of multilingualism, a growing amount of research has been conducted on translanguaging, and teachers' use of it as a pedagogical tool that enhances students' performance (Canagarajah, 2011; Cummins & Early, 2011; García & Wei, 2014; Joseph & Ramani, 2012). However, there is little research on students' perceptions and practices of translanguaging in postcolonial multilingual contexts. Therefore, this qualitative study has explored university teachers' and Russian speaking students' beliefs and practices of translanguaging in classes where Kazakh is taught as a subject and has posed the following research questions: 1) What are university teachers and students' beliefs towards translanguaging in classes where Kazakh is taught as a subject? 2) What are university teachers and students' practices of translanguaging in classes where Kazakh is taught as a subject? This study also draws on Macaro's (2014) framework that defines three positions (virtual, maximal, and optimal) of teachers' beliefs towards language mixing in the language classrooms. The data were collected online with the help of semi-structured interviews. The participants of the study were English-medium university undergraduate students attending core intermediate and upper-intermediate Kazakh classes and their teachers. The data were analysed by adopting the six steps as suggested by Clarke and Braun (2013) for conducting thematic analyses. The findings reported the presence of monolingual practices in the language classroom and the participants' beliefs that a monolingual environment is more efficient for successful language acquisition. However, the results also demonstrated the students' challenges with using solely the target language and the need for more fluid and flexible language practices to facilitate Kazakh language proficiency development. This study suggests directions for further research and

pedagogical implications, such as the employment of sustainable translanguaging pedagogy and the enhanced flexibility of course content within the classroom.

Аңдатпа

Оқытушылар мен Университет Студенттерінің Қазақ Тілі Сабағында Транслингвизмге Сенімдері мен Тәжірибелерін Зерттеу

Көптілділіктің таралуы аясында транслингвизм және оны мұғалімдердің оқушылардың оқу жетістіктерін жақсарту үшін оқыту құралы ретінде қолдануы туралы үлкен зерттеулер жүргізілді (Гарсиа & Уэй, 2014; Джосеф & Рамани, 2012; Камминс & Эрли, 2011; Канагараджа, 2011). Алайда, студенттердің транслингвизмді қабылдауы мен тәжірибесі постколониялық көптілділік жағдайында жеткілікті зерттелмеген. Демек, бұл зерттеу жұмысы орыс тілді студенттер мен олардың оқытушыларының қазақ тілі сабағында транслингвизмнің сенімдері мен практикасын сапалы зерттеу болып табылады. Бұл сапалық зерттеу келесі сұрақтардан негізделген: 1) Мұғалімдер мен студенттердің қазақ тілі сабағында транслингвизмге деген сенімдері қандай? 2) Қазақ тілі сабағында оқушылар мен мұғалімдер арасында транслингвизмнің тәжірибесі қандай? Бұл зерттеу Макароның (2014) теорияға негізделген, ол мұғалімдердің сабақта басқа тілдерді қолдануға қатысты сенімдері туралы үш позицияны (виртуалды, максималды, оптималды) анықтады. Жартылай құрылымды сұхбаттар негізгі зерттеу құралы ретінде қолданылды. Барлығы зерттеуге студенттерге сөйлемейтін студенттерге арналған қазақ тілі курстарына қатысқан алты студент, сондай-ақ осы курстардың екі оқытушысы қатысты. Зерттеу нәтижелері көрсеткендей, зерттеуге қатысушылардың көпшілігі тілді біртүрлі ортада оқудың тиімді екеніне сенімді болды. Осылайша, қазақ тілін зерттеу көбіне орыс және ағылшын тілдерін қатыстырмай, тек қазақ тілінде сөйлесу ережесіне негізделді. Осыған қарамастан, зерттеуге қатысқан студенттердің көпшілігі тек қазақ тілінде сөйлеу ережесі бойынша сабақта қиындықтар туды деп мәлімдеді. Олар сондай-ақ тілдің икемді тәжірибелеріне

қатысуға ниет білдірді, өйткені сабақ құрылымына орыс немесе ағылшын тілдерін икемді тарту қазақ тілін білу деңгейін көтеруге көмектесе алады. Алынған мәліметтер негізінде транслингвизмді педагогикалық құрал ретінде пайдалану және білім беру мазмұнының икемділігін арттыру сияқты ықтимал зерттеулер мен педагогикалық ұсыныстар жасалды.

Аннотация

Исследование Убеждений и Практик Учителей и Студентов Университета о Транслингвизме на Уроках Казахского Языка

Вслед за распространением полиязычия, большое количество исследований было проведено о транслингвизме и его использовании преподавателями как педагогического инструмента, улучшающего успеваемость учащихся (Гарсиа & Уэй, 2014; Джосеф & Рамани, 2012; Камминс & Эрли, 2011; Канагараджа, 2011). Тем не менее, восприятие и практика транслингвизма учениками не были достаточно исследованы в постколониальном полиязычном контексте. Следовательно, данная работа представляет собой качественное исследование об убеждениях и практике транслингвизма русскоязычными студентами и их учителями на уроках казахского языка. Исследование основано на следующих вопросах: 1) Каковы убеждения учителей и студентов о транслингвизме на уроках казахского языка? 2) Какова практика транслингвизма у студентов и учителей на уроках казахского языка? Данное исследование базируется на теории, разработанной Макаро (2014), в которой он выделил три позиции (виртуальная, максимальная, оптимальная) об убеждениях учителей касательно использования других языков в образовательном процессе. Полуструктурированные интервью были использованы в качестве главного инструмента исследования. Всего в исследовании приняли участие шесть студентов бакалавриата, которые посещали курсы казахского языка для неказахоговорящих студентов, а также два преподавателя данных курсов. Результаты исследования показали, что большинство участников исследования были убеждены в том, что более эффективным является изучение языка в монологичной среде. Таким образом, изучение казахского языка в большей степени основывалось на правиле говорить только на казахском языке, не вовлекая русский и английский языки. Несмотря на

это, большинство студентов, которые участвовали в исследовании, утверждали, что испытывали сложности на уроках из-за правила говорить только на казахском языке. Они также выразили желание быть вовлеченными в более гибкие языковые практики, так как более гибкое вовлечение русского или английского языков в структуру урока могло бы помочь повысить уровень владения казахским языком. Исходя из полученных данных, были разработаны возможные исследовательские и педагогические рекомендации, такие как использование транслингвизма как педагогического инструмента и улучшение гибкости учебного контента.

Table of Contents

Author Agreement	i
Declaration.....	ii
Ethics Approval	iii
CITI Training Certificate.....	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Abstract.....	vi
List of Tables	xv
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Statement of Problem	3
Purpose of the Study.....	5
Research Questions.....	5
Significance of the Study.....	6
Outline of the Study.....	6
Chapter 2: Literature Review	8
An overview of the Language Policy Developments in Soviet and Post-Soviet Kazakhstan.....	8
Monolingual Bias and “Two Solitudes” Assumption.....	13
The Multilingual Turn	15
Translanguaging	17
Translanguaging and “Shala Kazakh”	20
Translanguaging as a Flexible Pedagogical Tool	21
Theoretical framework for this study	23
Conclusion.....	25
Chapter 3: Methodology.....	26

Research Design	26
Research Site	27
Sampling	28
Data Collection Instrument.....	29
Data Collection Procedures	31
Data Analysis Procedures	32
Ethical Considerations	34
Conclusion.....	35
Chapter 4: Findings	36
Biographical Information of Respondents.....	36
Research Question 1: What are Teachers' and Students' Beliefs towards	
Translanguaging in Classes, where Kazakh is Taught as a Subject?	38
Puristic Assumptions towards People's Language Mixing Practices.....	38
Monolingual Classroom Environment as the Key to Success.....	41
Translanguaging as an Advantageous Tool.....	45
Research Question 2: What are University Teachers' and Students' Practices of	
Translanguaging in Classes, where Kazakh is Taught as a Subject?	50
The Kazakh-Only Rule as the Main Classroom Practice	51
Language Mixing Practices	53
The Effect of Classroom Language Practices on Students.....	55
Conclusion.....	59
Chapter 5: Discussion.....	61
Prevalent Monolingualism-oriented Beliefs	61
Kazakh as the Only Classroom Language	66
Occasional use of Translanguaging	67

Tension between Beliefs and Practices	70
Chapter 6: Conclusion	74
Main Conclusions of the Study	74
Limitations and Further Implications	77
Recommendations	78
References	80
Appendix A	94
Appendix B.....	100
Appendix C.....	112

List of Tables

Table 1 37

Table 2 38

Chapter 1: Introduction

Kazakhstan is a culturally and linguistically diverse country with a rich historical background. It was colonized by the Soviet Union and, due to that, the Kazakh language and culture underwent many challenges. The Soviet oppressive Russification policy can be considered a major one (Dave, 1996; Sharygin & Guillot, 2013). As a consequence, the Kazakh language had no opportunity to develop, both on societal and academic levels, for more than 40 years. For instance, the percentage of Kazakh students in schools with Kazakh-medium of instruction (KMI) decreased from 75% in 1958 to only 34% in 1991, with the vast majority of them concentrated in the rural areas of the country (Smagulova, 2008). Due to the low Kazakh proficiency and overall Kazakh language usage among its citizens, one of the goals of the country in the post-independence period was to revitalize and restore the Kazakh language, enhance its prestige, and make policies for people to promote its learning all over the country. Outlining such a goal was an extremely important step towards preserving the language, given the history of the country, which suggests that many families have not been able to adopt Kazakh as a home language during the Soviet time (Smagulova, 2016).

Hence, the government developed a policy of “Kazakhization” which aimed at establishing Kazakh-medium schools and making Kazakh a mandatory subject in all educational institutions, including those with Russian as a medium of instruction (RMI). As a result, the policy helped to strengthen the Kazakh identity and increase the number of students studying at KMI schools (Smagulova, 2008). In addition, the “English-Medium fever” tendency (Manan, et al., 2015) made Kazakhstani educational stakeholders consider the need to make the educational system of the country more globalized by introducing English as a language of instruction. Considering the importance of maintaining the country’s bi/multilingual background and the worldwide educational EMI trends, the

former president of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev (2007), introduced a project called “the Trinity of Languages” which promoted the usage of Kazakh, Russian and English in order to develop multilingualism and to integrate the country into the global economy (Belova, 2017; RK MoCS, 2011; RK MoES, 2015). According to the project, the younger generation had to undergo the “Kazakh re-acquisition” process and/or develop its proficiency, learn English along with maintaining the Russian language spoken in the country (Smagulova, 2016, p.102). This made Kazakhstan the first country in Central Asia to introduce the multilingual medium of instruction policy.

Multilingual education oftentimes features code-switching and translanguaging practices. Translanguaging can be defined as “a systematic, strategic, affiliative and a sense-making hybrid language use” which appears to be of great help as a pedagogical tool for multilingual educators and learners (García, 2009, p. 6; Gutiérrez, et al., 2001). However, there arises the problem of refusal from the educational stakeholders, which might occur due to the prevailing monolingual assumptions and linguistic purism in education. The continued dominance of the Russian language along with the suppression of Kazakh resulted in the spread of monolingual ideologies among the citizens of the country. In educational settings, it is believed that multilingual people should keep languages in their repertoire separately and avoid language mixing. These ideologies can be traced among both teachers and students. Nevertheless, despite the assumption that languages should not be mixed in the educational environment and overall, the multilingual turn movement suggests changing monolingual language teaching ideologies (May, 2014). Here, the multilingual turn is the movement that advocates the shift from monolingual bias towards multilingual awareness and viewing other languages as a resource. Therefore, considering the recent trends in multilingual teaching approaches, as well as Kazakhstani trilingual education policy and the newly formed Kazakh identities, it

is important to study translanguaging in the Kazakh language learning classes held at a multilingual educational institution.

Statement of Problem

Although ample research evidence around the world demonstrates that fluidity of languages and translanguaging can be a useful pedagogical tool in language teaching and learning and in the easy transfer of course contents; however, teachers in Kazakhstan do not seem to have yet understood the importance and effectiveness of employing translanguaging as a pedagogical tool. Even though the monolingual approach in language education has been criticized (Cook, 2001), one common practice of language learning schools or classes is to follow a monolingual policy, which does not allow any space for translanguaging and the usage of the first language (L1). Generally, students and teachers expect themselves to be balanced bi/multilinguals, being “two (or more) monolinguals in one” (Grosjean, 1982, p. 3). Consequently, due to such a monolingual bias (May, 2014), translanguaging is perceived negatively as a hindrance in the process of language acquisition.

The monolingual approaches, as stated above, can also be applied to the Kazakhstani context. Translanguaging is considered a useful tool for developing a greater understanding of the content studied, and for promoting the target language (TL) proficiency through the dominant language (García & Wei, 2014). However, teachers tend to think that in order to efficiently develop proficiency in a particular language, students’ first languages should not interfere with the learning process (Leonet, et al. 2017). Especially in language learning settings, both teachers and/or students themselves oftentimes underestimate the importance and role of the student’s mother tongue(s). For instance, due to the Kazakhstani multilingual policy, some people are concerned with the possibility of raising a generation of “semilinguals” instead of “multilinguals” (Djilkisheva,

2016). Even though the country is aware of the unique Kazakhstani multilingual situation, the post-Soviet identities of Kazakh people considered the Russian language as the barrier that obstructs promotion and restoration of the state language (Fierman, 2006).

The problem being addressed here is that teachers and students tend to compartmentalize languages, and consider Russian and Kazakh as what scholars describe as “two solitudes assumption” (Cummins, 2007), whereas translanguaging is believed to threaten Kazakh proficiency development. My personal schooling experiences show that the derogatory term of “Shala-Kazakh”, which means “Half Kazakh”, is oftentimes used to humiliate those Kazakhs who are not proficient in the Kazakh language. Being a Russian-dominant ethnic Kazakh, I often came across people’s negative attitude towards my low Kazakh language proficiency level. My schooling experience started at a KMI school in 2004, however, I was transferred to RMI school because I was bullied by my other classmates for my poor proficiency in Kazakh. Though I tried to learn and speak Kazakh in the following years, I was condemned and/or penalized for my “russified” pronunciation and occasional codeswitching, especially during my Bachelor’s studies. Such a purist “Kazakh-only” view of educators did not help to enhance my Kazakh language proficiency, it only made me feel insecure of the way I speak the language.

Therefore, Russian-dominant students often feel that they have to do their best to “put aside” their first language(s) during their Kazakh lessons. Such problems might occur at different levels of education. The roots of such issues might lie in the teachers’ lack of awareness, and insufficient development of translanguaging in the context of Kazakhstan as there is relatively little literature about the term and its practices. Hence, due to the ideological, cultural, and methodological debates mentioned above, it is important to conduct a study on university students and teachers’ beliefs and practices of translanguaging in classes where Kazakh is taught as a subject. Such a study can be crucial

in voicing views of the protagonists of the Kazakh language learning and restoration process.

The Kazakh language is taught at all educational levels in Kazakhstan. In the context of the study, the research site has the Kazakh language classes that are core for all the Bachelor's students. Russian-dominant students, whose Kazakh proficiency level is upper-intermediate or below, have to take two academic Kazakh classes that are meant to enhance their language skills. Taking into consideration the factors described earlier and the researcher's personal experience, the exploration of such a unique context can help acquire rich and diverse data that can be instructive in unraveling the views and practices of Russian-dominant multilingual students and their teachers on translanguaging.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to explore university teachers' and students' beliefs, prior experience, and current practices of translanguaging in Kazakh language learning classes. In particular, this study seeks to explore the presence of biased or non-biased views on language mixing when learning Kazakh, the teachers' usage of translanguaging as a pedagogical tool, and the students' prior or current involvement in the dynamic use of dominant languages from their repertoire in academic Kazakh language classrooms.

Research Questions

The study aims to answer the following research questions:

1. What are teachers and students' beliefs towards translanguaging in classes where Kazakh is taught as a subject?
2. What are teachers and students' practices of translanguaging in classes where Kazakh is taught as a subject?

Significance of the Study

This research study could be significant in a number of ways. The significance of this study is based on the belief that it can be of potential help to educators and emergent multilingual students since it embraces a concept, which is relatively new for the Kazakhstani context. The study can have an impact not only on the way the above-mentioned stakeholders reflect on the beliefs they have about the use of language, but also on the overall language learning and teaching processes. Since the presence of monolingual beliefs of teachers and students can be easily traced in theoretical underpinnings of translanguaging, the findings of the study can help raise awareness of monolingual assumptions present in education and moderate and minimize the derogation of being called “Shala Kazakh”. The study might promote the understanding of the fluidity of language use and the disadvantages of a rigid monolingual teaching environment. This work can also raise awareness and possibly inform policymakers about multilingual practices in the “language as subject” curriculum since it will present the voices of the “protagonists” of the learning process – students and teachers. Besides, since there is a lack of literature on students’ attitudes towards translanguaging, especially in the context of our country, this research could significantly contribute to the body of literature on this topic.

Outline of the Study

The first chapter provides the background information of the study, outlines the research problem, and introduces the research purpose, research questions, and the significance of the study. The second chapter reviews the literature that is most relevant to the present study. It starts with the historical overview of the Kazakhstani language policy development. It further reviews the notion of monolingual bias and the multilingual turn movement. Furthermore, the chapter explores the translanguaging concept, its presence in the context of Kazakhstan, and flexibility as a pedagogical tool. Finally, the literature

review chapter discusses the theoretical framework. The methodology chapter presents the research design, site, and sampling, as well as the data collection tools, procedure, and analysis. The ethical considerations are also thoroughly explained in the chapter. The fourth chapter focuses on the major findings. It is followed by the discussion chapter that focuses on discussing the findings in relation to the literature presented in the second chapter. The last chapter presents the main conclusions drawn from the study, limitations, implications for further research, and recommendations.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

This chapter reviews the relevant literature and provides information about previous studies on the concepts that are closely related to the theory of translanguaging. Moreover, it presents a theoretical framework that can be utilized for studying university teachers and students' beliefs and practices about translanguaging. Firstly, the chapter introduces the historical review of language policy development in Soviet and Post-Soviet Kazakhstan. Secondly, the notions of monolingual bias and languages in solitude assumptions are discussed. Further, the chapter elaborates on the multilingual turn movement which has led to a shift from the monolingual approach to translanguaging. Thirdly, the chapter discusses the translanguaging concept, its relation to the Kazakhstani context, and flexibility as a pedagogical tool. Finally, the chapter will present the theoretical framework of the study.

An overview of the Language Policy Developments in Soviet and Post-Soviet Kazakhstan

Kazakhstan is a multiethnic and multilingual country, with a rich historical background. Under Soviet colonization, the linguistic situation in Kazakhstan underwent drastic changes, from the support of the Kazakh language to a forced language shift and resultant tendencies towards language loss. In order to understand the country's current sociolinguistic profile, it is important to provide an overview of the development of the Kazakhstani language policy during colonization and the post-Soviet era.

The history of Kazakh language policy is indeed very complex. The shift in language preference from Kazakh to Russian occurred mostly due to the language policies that were operational during the Tsarist and Soviet times. Being colonized by the Russian Empire in the 18th century, the Kazakh people attending schools had to switch from traditional religious education to the one offered in Russian-Kazakh bilingual schools. In

1870, there were 162 bilingual schools that were based on a transitional approach, which meant that students started to study in their native language and then shifted to Russian as a medium of instruction. Despite the switch, the Kazakh language remained taught as a school subject (Smagulova, 2016). When the Russian Empire collapsed in 1917, Kazakhstan became a part of the newly formed Soviet Republic without having an opportunity to separate from the former and establish an independent country. At that time, the Soviet Republic had more than 100 million citizens speaking more than 150 languages (Dickens, 1988). Such a complex political, cultural and linguistic situation surprisingly did not result in the implementation of a prejudicial language policy towards indigenous languages. The Communist Party (CPSU), the ruling political party of the Russian State and the Soviet Union, emphasized the importance of indigenous languages in increasing the Soviet literacy rate (Dickens, 1988). Thus, in 1919, according to the decree *On the Eradication of Illiteracy Among the Population of the Russian Federation*, all people between the ages of 8 and 50 had to learn to read and write in the language they preferred (Russian or their native language) (McLeish, 1972). This policy was aimed at being “national in form, but socialist in content” (Gorenburg, 2006, p. 1). This suggests that the government wanted to strengthen the indigenous ethnicities’ ability to read and write in their language, whilst promoting the socialist ideas of the state.

Such indigenization lasted until the 1930s when the Communist Party started promoting the Russian language as the language uniting all the Soviet people. This policy is referred to as the *Russification* policy. As Fierman (2006) stated, “Russian was assigned a central role in fostering rapprochement (*сближение*) of the many nationalities inhabiting the USSR”. It is also worth noting that “according to official Soviet ideology, linguistic and other differences would progressively weaken and eventually lead to their merger (*слияние*)” (p. 98).

According to Pavlenko (2013), up until the late 1980s, there were “consistent and long-lasting attempts to forcibly make Russians out of non-Russians” (p. 264). Starting from 1938, the Russian language was an obligatory subject in schools with a language of instruction other than Russian. From 1955, Kazakh was no longer taught as a subject in schools (Smagulova, 2016). Consequently, Russian supplanted other languages from the different domains of the Soviet people’s lives. As a result of the policy, language shift did occur among Kazakh people, making the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic (KazSSR) the most russified Soviet republic after the Russian Soviet Socialist Republic. The Kazakh language became less spoken as a native language and enjoyed less prestige among the citizens of the Kazakh Soviet Republic. Many Kazakh families had to adopt Russian as the language of childrearing because speaking Russian and being educated in Russian was by then a status marker (Fierman, 2005; Reagan, 2019). Moreover, Russian speaking people had more opportunities in professional and academic fields (Gorenburg, 2006; Smagulova, 2008). As Smagulova argues, it was important to learn and be highly proficient in Russian (2016, p. 94). In addition, in the late 1950s and early 1960s, the “Virgin Lands Campaign” resulted in an influx of Russians and other Russian speaking ethnicities into the territory of Kazakhstan, intensifying the spread of the Russian language in North Kazakhstan. The campaign aimed at increasing agricultural production by expanding croplands, mainly in North and Central Kazakhstan (Kraemer, et al., 2015). This region remains one of the Russian speaking regions in contemporary Kazakhstan.

The language policy developed in the Soviet Era caused significant changes in the lives of Kazakh Soviet people. Kazakh people not only became aliens in their lands but also lost the prestige of their language. As Smagulova (2016) notes, most urban Kazakhs, who were raised between the 1960s and 1980s, were either Russian monolinguals or

passive bilinguals, which in this case means having a lack of exposure to the Kazakh language.

Nevertheless, the last years of the Soviet Union's existence were remarkable due to the policy documents assigning Kazakh a higher status, especially in the field of education. To elaborate, by the mid-1980s, the leader of the USSR, Mikhail Gorbachev, started making changes in the Kazakh SSR's language policy (Fierman, 2006; Smagulova, 2008). In 1987, he introduced a decree which promised to make schooling in the Kazakh language more available for Kazakh people. This was the first document in a few decades that was aimed at raising the status of the Kazakh language. The second document was a law that guaranteed the right for the Kazakh language, along with Russian, to be the medium of instruction, not only in schools, but also at all educational levels. Moreover, Kazakh also became an obligatory subject in all educational institutions at different levels. The implementation of these decrees showed the change in the CPSU's language policy and planning development (Fierman, 2006).

After the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, Kazakhstan gained independence. The new government began to enhance the usage of the Kazakh language in education, mass media, and civil services. Aiming to strengthen and upgrade the Kazakh language, policymakers started the *Kazakhization* policy whereby Kazakh was proclaimed as the sole state language of the country. As the Chair of the Language Committee of the Ministry of Culture stated, "a state language is a face of any country, it is a symbol just like its flag, coat of arms, and anthem" (Smagulova, 2008, p. 449). Moreover, according to Kazakhstan's Law on Languages, acquiring Kazakh, the state language, is a duty of every Kazakhstani citizen, since it is one of the most crucial factors of the "consolidation of the people of Kazakhstan" (Law on Languages, 1997). With regards to Russian, the Constitution of Kazakhstan assigned it the official status, which means it can be officially

used along with the Kazakh language. Moreover, Russian is claimed to be the language of interethnic communication. Therefore, in spite of a bitter history with the Russian language, the policies still aim to maintain Russian so that its usage is not denied or restricted at all.

Currently, Kazakhstan is following two directions: nationalization and globalization (Montgomery, 2013). Nationalization in this case refers to the maintenance of Kazakh and Russian, whereas globalization refers to the adoption of global languages such as English to develop the human capital of the country, and integrate well with the needs of the present globalized world. Therefore, the former president of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, offered to start a new project called “the Trinity of Languages” with Kazakh as the state language, Russian as the language of interethnic communication, and English as the language of integration into the global economy (Karabassova, 2020, p. 42).

Although the country’s language policies seem to be positive and of current global interests, Kazakh people are afraid that the pursuit of global needs can lead to the recurrence of the Soviet LPP events. The trilingual policy seems to emphasize English and Russian more, which might lead to the development of “elite closure” (Karabassova, 2020; Smagulova, 2020). Here, elite closure refers to a specific strategy which is aimed at implementing policies that provide advancement to elites and limits the possibilities of non-elite people (Myers-Scotton, 2009). Nevertheless, the government continues to work on strengthening the prestige of Kazakh and increasing the number of its speakers. For instance, the recent State Program on Language Policy Realization in Kazakhstan for 2020-2025 outlined the aim to strengthen the role of Kazakh as the language of intercultural communication (MoES, 2019).

Monolingual Bias and “Two Solitudes” Assumption

In present years, languages spoken by bi/multilingual people are expected to be used separately from one another, as different, solely existing languages in society, and especially in academic practices. Cummins (2007, 2008) described such an attitude as the “two solitudes” assumption (p. 65). In a classroom environment, such a notion usually expects teachers to “avoid hybridizing or border crossing between languages” and expect them to “preferably keep languages apart” (Manan & Tul-Kubra, 2020, p. 2). This attitude of languages being in “solitude” is a result of the “monolingual bias” notion which was developed due to the structuralist language ideologies. The ideologies themselves evolved in the times of colonialism and modernism (Escobar & Dillard-Paltrineri, 2015; Vogel & García, 2017).

As Cenoz and Gorter (2011) notes, the monolingual bias can be represented as the stance of the “default for human communication”. Moreover, it views the notion of “nativeness” as the highest and the most prestigious form of language competence (Akbar, 2013, p. 1). In other words, in the field of second language acquisition (SLA), “acquiring a second or additional language means being able to use it in the same way as its monolingual native speaker” (Kachru, 1994, p. 797). Indeed, educators and learners tended to measure success in a target language (TL) by comparing and contrasting the language learner’s performance with the native speaker’s language use. For instance, in English as Foreign Language (EFL) or English as a Second Language (ESL) classes, the “English-only policy” is oftentimes seen as a representation of possible success in language learning. When entering the ‘target language only’ classes, people expect their teachers to be native speakers or have a native-like proficiency. Also, they expect the classroom materials to be designed by the native speakers (Conteh, 2018; Manan & Tul-Kubra, 2020; Manan, et al., 2020; Otwinowska, 2017). Thus, for the advocates of the monolingual approach in

language education, the usage of other languages in the classroom harms students' native-like proficiency development by blocking the exposure to the target language and developing laziness when speaking it (Gardner-Chloros, 2009; Doiz & Lasagabaster, 2017). Moreover, teachers with monolingual ideology never view other languages from students' repertoire as a resource (Auerbach, 1993; Cook, 2001).

Similar assumptions were outlined by Phillipson (1992). He presented five major fallacies that are oftentimes promoted as tenets in the field of language teaching. These five fallacies are:

1. The monolingual fallacy, which assumes that language is best taught through monolingual practices.
2. The native speaker fallacy, which supposes that the ideal language teacher is the native speaker of the target language.
3. The early start fallacy that posits the better outcome when the language is taught from early childhood.
4. The maximum exposure fallacy, which supposes higher efficiency when the language is taught more intensively.
5. The subtractive fallacy that views the usage of other languages as a threat to the standard varieties (Phillipson, 1992; Phillipson, 2018, p. 4).

Despite the spread of the monolingual assumptions, in the early 1980s they started to be challenged by new views which stood for the support of the linguistic diversity in SLA and education overall. Bley-Vroman (1983) presented his concern towards the "comparative fallacy", where the aim towards flawless native speaking is a doubtful practice, because "the learner's system is worthy of study in its own right" (p. 4), "on the basis of [its] own 'internal logic'" (p. 15) (as cited in Schwartz, 1997). A similar critique was voiced by Cook (1992) who stated that by comparing emergent bilinguals with native

speakers, people set undesirable purist monolingual standards. Indeed, such problems were seen as a threat to the notions of equity, since they resulted in ethnic hegemony and strengthened social stratification. In addition, the idealization of nativeness results in language learners' feelings of being incomplete and illiterate (Escobar & Dillard-Paltrineri, 2015).

Cummins (2007) views such monolingual assumptions as crucial problems due to the lack of empirical evidence and people's awareness of multilingual minds' significance. Thus, he concluded that it is of vital importance to shift away from the monolingual bias. The employment of multilingual strategies in the classroom can be beneficial in several ways (Cummins, 2007; Cummins, et al, 2005; Manyak, 2004). First, multilingual speaking can help enhance plurilingual competencies of marginalized students by developing their literacy skills in different languages. Moreover, Cummins (2007) stated that allowing students to express their thoughts in two or more languages can "promote identity investment among both majority and minority students", for instance, through multimedia projects (p. 238). Therefore, there needs to be a change in language teaching paradigms that will view other languages as useful tools for promoting not only emergent bi/multilingual students' proficiency in TL but also their identities and competencies.

The Multilingual Turn

In recent decades, monolingual ideologies received much criticism on how they limit and underestimate people's abilities to perform a not native-like multilingual speech. Nevertheless, due to the trends towards globalization and tolerance that reign in much of today's world, linguists all over the world understand the need to move away from the 'languages in solitude' approach. Such a change can be defined as the multilingual turn, which is a crucial movement in the field of education since it criticizes the monolingual approach that was previously dominated in the field of SLA.

The notion was employed by May (2014), where he voiced the importance of shifting away from the monolingual bias and traditional language teaching. Manan and Tul-Kubra (2020) highlight that the multilingual turn movement advocates the “fostering of multilingual awareness”, moving away from the “deeply-entrenched” monolingual assumptions that have been reigning in the field of linguistics and language education for decades (p. 3). The Global English Language Teaching framework (GELT) presents a similar approach, where GELT is being opposed to a more traditional field of English Language Teaching (ELT). There, GELT is an approach that views other languages globally as helpful resources, whilst ELT sees other languages as a problem that hinders the development of language proficiency (Manan & Tul-Kubra, 2020; Rose & Galloway, 2019). Nevertheless, despite the importance of the multilingual turn, the fields of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and language teaching does not reflect the turn’s tenets in their methodological and theoretical approaches (Manan & Tul-Kubra, 2020).

This movement is crucial for several reasons. Conteh and Meier (2014) claim that the 21st century can be seen as an era of post-nationalism, where the questions of multiculturalism and linguistic diversity are being highlighted. This means that globalization and the spread of cultural and linguistic varieties need to be seen as a complement to the demands of today’s world. Indeed, if we refer back to Bley-Vroman’s words (1983), individuals create their patterns of language learning and language use when developing their linguistic repertoire. Thus, it is of crucial importance not to disturb such a process.

The multilingual turn consists of a variety of ideas. For instance, Trentman (2018) has listed its major interconnected tenets: a denial of the view that multilingual people have the mind of multiple monolinguals, the fluidity of languages, and an awareness of individuals’ unique linguistic repertoire. First, the belief in viewing languages as separate

independent entities is a relic of the past. Thus, the multilingual turn offers or even dictates the need to put aside the aim to simulate the linguistic manners of a native speaker. Instead, the linguistic resources of a multilingual individual can serve a facilitating role to “perform and negotiate social functions” (Trentman, 2019, p. 119). Although this trend negates the separate view of languages, it does view them as “an integrated, cross-lingual, patterned and dynamic system” (Meier, 2017, p. 143).

Second, when talking about the fluidity of language varieties, one needs to remember that the boundaries between languages are most likely to be imagined (Trentman, 2018). In other words, boundaries do not exist and the practices of mixing languages in multilingual discourses are conventional. In addition, “mixed language is the norm, and enforcing a monolingual “target language only” environment is potentially upholding the nation-state and missing opportunities for learning” (Trentman, 2018, para 3). Hence, by allowing students to code-switch or translanguage, educators help students to complement their multilingual repertoire, which further enhances their competence in the way that suits the students the most (May, 2014). The next principle of the multilingual turn involves the awareness of the speaker’s multilingualism. This tenet supports a theory that a person’s linguistic repertoire and different linguistic elements it contains can operate as a resource. One of the most notable examples of a notion that evolved as a result of the multilingual turn is translanguaging, features of which reflect the principles described above.

Translanguaging

When the field of linguistics underwent the multilingual turn and started moving towards the pluralist discourses, which stand for accepting linguistic and cultural diversity (de Jong, 2011), the term “translanguaging” was developed. García (2009) defined the term as “multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of

their bilingual worlds” (p. 42). In other words, it can be described as a fluid usage of multilingual people’s linguistic repertoire (Cenoz, 2017). The concept of translanguaging is used in a wide variety of fields, such as bilingual education, translation studies, content and language integrated learning (CLIL), everyday social communication studies, and TESOL (Tian, et al., 2020). It is also viewed as a promising multifaceted term that might help dismantle monolingual biases and move away from the native-speakerism paradigm.

Therefore, this concept in bilingual and TESOL education serves as one of the tools that builds bridges between students’ linguocultural backgrounds and learning processes, and enhances the performance of students. Translanguaging was initially introduced by Cen Williams in Welsh educational settings in 1994, then the term was translated to English by Colin Baker. Williams’ translanguaging practices were about letting his students mix languages by teaching in one language and allowing the students to respond in another (Goodman & Tastanbek, 2020).

What makes translanguaging a special concept is the fact that it evolved in response to the crucial demand to empower linguistically marginalized students, so that linguistic human rights are not violated and complex discursive practices take place (García, 2009; García & Kleifgen, 2010). In other words, translanguaging practices within the classroom may emphasize diversity, create spaces for social justice and cultural equity. Hence, translanguaging values the bi/multilinguals and their language practices, without considering the languages from their linguistic repertoire as separate units. Moreover, according to García (2009), nowadays translanguaging can be seen as “multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of bilingual worlds” (p. 112). That is to say, it also offers a prism through which the language practices can be regarded as “valuable, generative, and powerful” (Poza, 2017, p. 102). Indeed, as García pointed out, this strategic and flexible tool helps to release language learners from such matters as

language separation and language prestige, which usually have an impact on the way minoritized language learners perform in monolingual classrooms (2009). Thus, in addition to the idea of equity, it is said that languages that are present in a multilingual mind can have a positive impact on the development of not only a student's target language but also on their whole multilingual system (Cummins, 2017). Therefore, translanguaging can be understood as a tool that represents the dynamic nature of bilingualism and contributes to the prosperity of equity in today's diverse world.

Some scholars state that the notion should be seen not as a separate object itself, but as an "emerging perspective" or a lens that can provide educational stakeholders useful insights for understanding and examining language and language in education (Tian, et al., 2020; Vogel & Garcia, 2017; Wei, 2014, 2018). Thus, Vogel and García (2017) outlined three main characteristics of the translanguaging lens:

1. It acknowledges the fact that multilingual speakers are the ones who choose their linguistic repertoire's features for interactions.
2. It views multilingualism as a "perspective which privileges speakers' own dynamic linguistic and semiotic practices above the named languages of nations and states".
3. However, it still admits "socially constructed language categories" and previously mentioned ideologies (p. 4).

Although translanguaging is perceived as a helpful tool, there are contexts where people see the practices of this notion as a threat. This is usually the case when the bi/multilingualism feature involves more powerful and prestigious languages, which minority language speakers accept and use. This might lead to a situation where the indigenous language is undervalued and is associated with underdevelopment, poverty, etc. (de Mejía, 2004; Hèlot, 2006). Indeed, colonization and strict political regimes do make the 'weaker languages' seen as symbols of shame and underdevelopment. After

overcoming the hardships of certain political regimes, it takes a lot of effort to make a shift in favor of the minoritized language. When the positive shift does happen, it is important to maintain the indigenous language spoken, since it can still be seen as vulnerable. Therefore, in such contexts, translanguaging can be frowned upon. The following section will present how language mixing practices are viewed in the Kazakhstani context.

Translanguaging and “Shala Kazakh”

The idea of translanguaging in the context of Kazakhstan and the Kazakh language has a more negative perspective, which may largely be due to the past of the Kazakh language. The Kazakh language was severely oppressed by the Soviet Russification policy which did not allow the Kazakh language any space for proper academic and societal development. Between 1960 to 1980, generations of Russian-dominant ethnic Kazakhs were raised, since many Kazakh families adopted Russian as a language of child-rearing because the Russian language was viewed as the language of prospects and prestige (Smagulova, 2016). Even though they tried to speak their ethnic language, the dominance of Russian and lack of factors for the Kazakh language development resulted in the interference of Russian in their speech. Such language mixing was then called “Shala Kazakh” which is a derogatory term, referring to the practices of Russian-Kazakh code-switching (Akanova, 2017).

The years of pre-independence and independence of Kazakhstan, policies of “Kazakhization” and attempts to revitalize the language in order to enhance its use by the Kazakhstani population strengthened the identities of Kazakhs, as well as enhanced their awareness of the critical state of their language. The symbiosis of these aspects resulted in the idea that speaking Kazakh purely can help to revitalize the language and reinforce nation-building (Foster, 2017). Thus, speaking “Shala-Kazakh” is perceived negatively. “Russified” Kazakhs are contemptuously called “mangurts”, the term that refers to those

who gave up their language, culture, and/or traditions; and in most cases, these derogatory terms are used by proficient Kazakhs, especially by the older generation. Such an attitude makes Russian speaking Kazakhs insecure about the usage of their ethnic language, and in some cases, they reject speaking Kazakh at all (Ubiria, 2010).

Translanguaging as a Flexible Pedagogical Tool

Considering the key concepts as described above, translanguaging is a multifaceted term that can be observed, used and studied both inside, and outside the educational environment (Lewis, et al., 2012). It can be a spontaneous or planned tool that teacher educators can employ in their teaching. Spontaneous translanguaging practices happen “without planning or design as the bi-/multilingual speakers spontaneously translanguage to scaffold learning in the ongoing dynamic interaction” (Lin, 2020, p. 6). Since this study concentrates on the translanguaging practices in language learning classes, it is important to view translanguaging as a flexible pedagogical tool. As Joseph and Ramani (2012) state, translanguaging helps to “move fluently between languages in their search for knowledge” (p. 30). It gives the educational practitioners the power to “transform the power relations ... enhance the experience, and develop identity” (Wei, 2018, p. 15). When employing translanguaging as a pedagogical tool, teachers and students make use of their linguistic repertoire in academic settings by acknowledging the multilingual nature of their minds and viewing it as a resource that can further contribute to the efficiency of their performance (Semiante & Tian, 2020). Therefore, it is recommended for teachers to view students’ linguistic repertoire as a valuable affordance which can help students feel more comfortable and inspired to study (Darvin & Norton, 2015). Taking into account these words, we can see that translanguaging can be a useful tool for developing a greater understanding of the content studied and promoting the target language repertoire through

the dominating languages (Canagarajah, 2011; Cenoz & Gorter, 2017; García & Wei, 2014; Galante, 2020; Joseph & Ramani, 2012; Menken & Sanchez, 2019).

There are several concepts which aim at moving from the monolingual bias and its consequences to a more inclusive movement in the language-in-education sphere (Manan & Tul-Kubra, 2020). One of them is the translanguaging stance, which can be considered a feature that educators adapt and develop when applying the translanguaging pedagogy. Translanguaging stance is a philosophical base or orientation that teachers rely on when constructing the translanguaging practices in educational settings. It is “a necessary mindset or framework for educating bilingual students that informs everything from the way we view students and their dynamic bilingual performances and cultural practices to the way we plan instruction and assessment” (García, et al., 2016, p. 50). In other words, translanguaging stance is a set of beliefs, ideologies, and philosophies that educators develop towards the translanguaging notion (Deroo, et al., 2020; Lucas & Villegas, 2013). Though the stance is usually attributed to translanguaging pedagogy, Menken & Sanchez (2019) claim that it can evolve from the overall translanguaging strategies themselves.

Another important term to consider is drawn by Cummins (2017), where he refers to the flexible transitions of languages in classrooms as cross-lingual practices, which can be a great help for students to improve and enhance their linguistic repertoire and literacy skills since languages are believed to interact and transfer in a dynamic way. The cross-lingual transfer seems to complement the idea and/or share the aim of translanguaging in education as if being an additional branch to it. Hence, by practicing efficient transmissions from one language to another in the educational process, bi- multilingual learners have an opportunity to experience and develop the dynamics of their language repertoire, making it more flexible.

In theory, efficiently understood, interpreted, and used translanguaging pedagogical practices in writing, reading or speaking can serve as a scaffolding tool for both teachers and students. Moreover, according to the purposes of translanguaging, which were presented by García, Johnson, and Seltzer (2017), it encourages students to stay engaged even when dealing with challenging tasks, supports their identities, and makes them aware of their uniqueness. Altogether, the combination of these factors boosts students' way of knowing and "advances social justice" (Vogel & García, 2017, p. 11).

Theoretical framework for this study

Since this study considers both beliefs and practices, it is important to define these terms. The term 'belief' is usually understood as the "proposition individuals consider to be true and which are often tacit, have a strong evaluative and affective component, provide a basis for action and are resistant to change" (Borg, 2011, p. 370-371). Moreover, beliefs are usually formed from individuals' experiences (Li, 2012). They can influence the way people perceive and respond to new knowledge (Driel, et al., 2007). With this in mind, Pajares (1992) described beliefs as filters that help individuals to understand and interpret new information. In the field of education, beliefs oftentimes shape the aims that educators might have towards the subject matter by helping to make decisions in their teaching (Grossman, et al., 1989). Thus, beliefs and practices are oftentimes intertwined, with the former influencing the latter. This connection is especially evident among teachers. As pointed out by Kubanyiova (2014), teaching practices that are carried out by teacher educators are often related to teachers' beliefs that have been shaped throughout their pedagogical experience. Nevertheless, beliefs and practices do not always match, thus, the connection between them is believed to be complex (Basturkmen, 2012).

In order to best answer the research questions, this study has adopted the theoretical framework proposed by Macaro (2014), which defined three positions that teacher

educators can hold towards code-switching that is considered to be a part of translanguaging practices (Tastanbek, 2019). The virtual, maximal, and optimal positions concentrate on the degree of tolerance and acceptance of hybrid language mixing practices in language teaching classrooms. Even though Macaro's framework focuses on teachers' beliefs, students can hold these positions as well.

The first type is called the virtual position, where the classroom language practices are solely monolingual so that the classroom environment becomes similar to the target country. Students' first languages are excluded since they might disturb the feeling of "nativeness" in the class. Moreover, no pedagogical value is viewed in their use (Macaro, 2001). Thus, translanguaging practices are not welcomed in classes that support the virtual position, since translanguaging is believed to hinder the development of exposure towards the target language.

The maximal position, the second type, also sees no value in students' first languages. Yet, there can be occasional resorting to students' L1, because "perfect teaching and learning conditions do not exist" (Macaro, 2001, p. 535). Since the monolingual discourses were supreme in language teaching for a long time, it resulted in the widespread feeling of guilt about translanguaging practices among both language learners and language teachers. Therefore, even rare language mixing arouses the feeling of guilt among those who use or allow the use of translanguaging in educational settings (Butzkamm & Caldwell, 2009; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Martin, 2005; Shin, 2005). In other words, those who resort to translanguaging feel that such practices are "regrettable but necessary" (Macaro, 2005, p. 68).

The third type is called optimal position. Educators holding the optimal position make use of other languages as a pedagogical tool, viewing them as valuable resources. They think that the process of acquiring the target language can be enhanced with the help

of the learners' L1. In the same vein, Doiz and Lasagabaster (2017), in their work on teachers' beliefs about translanguaging practices, comment that students' linguistic repertoire "paves the way for translanguaging, and teachers who support the optimal position will be willing to embrace translanguaging" (p. 6). Hence, the optimal position acknowledges the multilingual linguistic repertoire of students and supports the usage of other languages without any regrets (Wang, 2019). Those who stand for the optimal position claim that language mixing offers a safe and creative language learning experience (Arthur & Martin, 2006; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Martin, 2005).

Conclusion

The literature review chapter has broadened the understanding of the Kazakhstani context and the concepts that are closely related to the translanguaging theory. To be more precise, it reviewed the development of the Kazakhstani language policy, the monolingual assumptions that were dominating in the language-in-education field, and the multilingual turn movement that aimed at shifting away from the languages in solitude assumption. The chapter carefully looked at the translanguaging notion, both in and out of the educational context, as well as the prejudices regarding language mixing in the context of Kazakhstan. Finally, the theoretical framework on beliefs towards the translanguaging practices was presented. Most importantly, the reviewed literature forms the foundation of this study that can help in effectively answering the research questions.

Chapter 3: Methodology

The previous chapter reviewed the literature that was relevant to the field of language education, the translanguaging theory, and the Kazakhstani context overall. The Methodology section aims at elaborating the measures that need to be taken for collecting the necessary data to answer the following research questions:

1. What are university teachers and students' beliefs towards translanguaging in classes where Kazakh is taught as a subject?
2. What are university teachers and students' practices of translanguaging in classes where Kazakh is taught as a subject?

For this purpose, the research design is described in detail first. Then, the research site and sampling procedures are explained. The following sections discuss the data collection instruments, then explain data collection and analysis procedures. Finally, the chapter concludes with the issues of ethical considerations.

Research Design

This section describes the research approach and design that was used in this study. In order to investigate beliefs and practices that university teachers and students might have towards translanguaging, the qualitative research approach has been chosen as the most appropriate. The qualitative research approach collects nonnumerical data (e.g. words) and helps to explore and interpret the studied phenomenon (Creswell, 2014). In other words, this approach uses participants' words and narrations that cannot be used and analyzed in quantitative research, which collects numerical data. In addition, it also helps to better understand the researched context from the participants' perspectives and gain useful insights from it (Bui, 2014; Creswell, 2014). In the case of this study, the central phenomenon is the notion of translanguaging, which is researched in the context of a Kazakhstani multilingual university. As Holliday (2015) states, the basic aim of the

qualitative approach is to dig into the bottom of the aspects of social behavior. Moreover, it usually deals with specific social settings, such as school or hospitals, that “are treated as cultures of activity and pose basic ethnographic questions to do with power structures, tacit behavioural rules and modes of organization” (p. 32).

To gather more rigorous information, interviews were deemed more appropriate research tools for this research design. By asking general open-ended questions, interview-based research is considered effective in obtaining rich and detailed personal information directly from the research participants (Creswell, 2014). Such questions were used to help the interviewees share their Kazakh language learning beliefs and experiences with the researcher controlling the process of obtaining information.

Research Site

The study was conducted at an educational institution in Nur-Sultan, the capital city of Kazakhstan. The university has English as its medium of instruction, and the university faculty consists of mostly international professors. Most of the university students are Kazakhstani citizens and are multilingual. Moreover, the university not only acknowledges the linguistic diversity but also emphasizes the importance of the Kazakh language, e.g. by having Kazakh included in all the newsletters and offering core Kazakh courses for all undergraduate and graduate students. For instance, the Bachelor’s students have required Kazakh language courses that they need to take to fulfil the university requirements regarding successful completion of their program. To be enrolled in the above-mentioned courses, students have to take a special proficiency test. If the test results show intermediate level or below, they have to take the first academic course, and then register for the second academic Kazakh course, which is designed for students with upper-intermediate proficiency level, before they graduate. Graduates of schools with Kazakh-medium schools and those whose test result has shown C1 (advanced) level do not have to

take the above-mentioned courses. Instead, they have to register for two advanced courses, e.g. Kazakh for Civil services. In this way, the selection of this research site is justified as it potentially promises a rich data that can be obtained due to the requirement of such courses for every student.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the university studies solely online. Therefore, the recruitment and data collection process took place online, using special corporate platforms, social media, and Zoom.

Sampling

The target population for this study was students at an EMI university who attended Kazakh language learning classes and Kazakh language instructors. The sampling strategy for recruiting the student participants was purposeful, maximal variation sampling, which according to Creswell (2014, p. 229) refers to “the researcher samples cases or individuals that differ on some characteristic or trait”, and which can help to identify various research perspectives on the problem. Following this principle, it was decided that the students’ first language should not be Kazakh. All of them had to have the experience of taking Kazakh language learning courses at their university and be bachelor students. Such a choice was made because university students are most likely to have a longer experience of learning Kazakh.

Participants needed to come from different regions of Kazakhstan, for instance, East, Central or North, and West or South Kazakhstan. This was likely to ensure that students may have different attitudes towards the state language and that their initial proficiency level might differ. Furthermore, it was important to have student interviewees attending classes with different levels of Kazakh proficiency since their beliefs and experiences of translanguaging could show to the researcher their varied perspectives on the researched topic. Overall, there were six student participants: three participants who

attended the course for intermediate level students, and three participants who attended the course for students with upper-intermediate level. Moreover, two teachers were also recruited as participants of the research. For them, the sampling strategy was purposeful homogeneous. This means that teachers had to 1) work as Kazakh language instructors for bachelor students at the multilingual university and 2) have no less than three years of Kazakh language teaching experience. Since little research has been conducted on students' beliefs on translanguaging in the Kazakhstani context, therefore, the study focuses mostly on the views of the students.

For the recruitment of the participants, the researcher first requested from the gatekeepers the list of teachers who teach these courses. Afterwards, the potential teacher participants were sent an invitation message with the relevant information about the study via Gmail. Student participants were recruited with the help of VK, a social network that is highly popular among the students at the university. The researcher posted the announcement on a private page for the students of the above-mentioned university. The participants were told about the voluntary nature of the participation in the research and about the fact that they can withdraw from the study at any time. After that, the selected participants received a document with a consent form that informed them about the purpose of the study, risks, benefits, and their rights, as well as assurance about the confidentiality and anonymity of the research.

Data Collection Instrument

For this study, the interview format has been chosen as the data collection tool, since it is consistent with the qualitative research approach. To be more precise, the data collection was based on semi-structured one-on-one online interviews which contained open-ended questions and probes for clarification based on the stated research problem and research questions. As Cohen, et al. (2007) states, "the interview is a flexible tool for data

collection, enabling multi-sensory channels to be used: verbal, non-verbal, spoken and heard” (p. 349). Semi-structured interview is believed to be the most widespread interview type in social sciences (Brinkmann, 2013). This instrument is seen as a compromise between previously arranged questions by the interviewer, and the interviewees’ openness to develop a particular issue. In addition, topics in semi-structured interviews are usually selected before the start of the research in relation to the literature and practice (Corbin & Strauss, 2015; Dornyei, 2007).

The semi-structured interviews can be defined as the type which have “the purpose of obtaining descriptions of the life world of the interviewee in order to interpret the meaning of the described phenomena” (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2008, p. 3). In the case of this study, the interview questions were designed in such a way as to help the researcher to reveal the language mixing beliefs and practices of the participants from the conversation. Thus, the questions were divided into three groups that aimed at revealing (a) the background information of participants; (b) their beliefs on language mixing; (c) the presence of translanguaging practices at their educational institution (see Appendix A).

With the help of semi-structured interviews, the researcher could focus the data collection on the issues that are considered to be of crucial importance to the research (Brinkmann, 2013). On the other side, the participants had the freedom to speak and had the options for responses. The participants had the space to share their views and experiences “unconstrained by any perspectives of the researcher of past research findings” (Creswell, 2014, p. 240). Hence, the interview design provided the researcher with more elaborate and detailed answers that consequently helped to acquire rich details and thorough information. As a result, this data collection tool was found useful in obtaining data that can best answer the research questions of this study.

Data Collection Procedures

After submitting a proposal for my research and gaining approval from NUGSE Research Committee, the first step in the data collection was about gaining access to the research site. To get access, the researcher needed to obtain permission from the Chair of the Department of Kazakh Language and Turkic Studies, since it organizes the Kazakh language courses for all the bachelor students in the research site. After gaining permission from the Department Chair, the gatekeeper provided a list of professors who teach the above-mentioned courses. The Kazakh language instructors were sent the recruitment letter via Gmail, whereas the student participants were recruited with the help of VK, the popular social network among the university students. The researcher posted the invitation to participate in the study on a special VK webpage for the students from the university, including the main information about the research. Then, those who showed interest in the study were sent emails with detailed information about the research purpose, risks and benefits, and their rights. Most importantly, the researcher attached an informed consent form which was developed in three languages (Russian, English, Kazakh) to avoid ethical issues and to make them feel more secure about the safety, anonymity, and confidentiality of the research (see Appendix B). Overall, there were six students and two teachers who signed the consent form and confirmed their decision to participate in the study. After the researcher received the signed consent forms, the researcher negotiated the time and date suitable for each participant for an interview. Due to the epidemiological situation, it was decided to conduct all the one-on-one interviews online via Zoom, a video conferencing software.

Before the interview, the researcher briefly explained the general information about the study, mentioned the voluntary basis of the participation, and reminded each participant about the freedom to withdraw from the study at any time. Moreover, the aspects of

confidentiality and anonymity, as well as the participants' rights, benefits, and risks were explained. Since all the interview questions were developed in English, Russian and Kazakh, the interviewer asked which language the participant preferred. As pointed out by Creswell (2014), researchers are required to ask participants' permission for note-making and audio recording of an interview, and it has to be asked in the beginning. Therefore, the participants gave their verbal permission to record the conversation. All the interviews lasted from thirty minutes to an hour and were recorded with the researcher's mobile phone with the purpose of later transcription and data analysis. Despite the options to choose English or Kazakh, six interviews were conducted in Russian, whilst two interviews with the Kazakh language instructors were conducted in both Russian and Kazakh. By the end of each interview, the researcher assured the participants about the confidentiality and anonymity of the research and the safe and secure data storage that can be accessed by the researcher only.

Data Analysis Procedures

For the analysis of the data, Braun and Clarke's (2006, 2013) six steps of thematic analysis (TA) were applied. Thematic analysis is defined as "a method for identifying, analyzing, and interpreting patterns of meaning ('themes') within qualitative data" (Clarke & Braun, 2016, p. 1). It helps to describe the data in rich detail, though it can often go further to interpretations of different features of the topic that is being researched (Boyatzis, 1998). Thus, the thematic analysis offers a reachable and structured plan for generating codes and themes from the data that was obtained in a qualitative study, where codes can be defined as small units that contain interesting and relevant features of data and themes as being the larger patterns of meaning that are supported by a certain concept or a core idea (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The data were analyzed using the following phases:

1. Familiarization with the data. First, the researcher transcribed all the interviews verbatim into a digital document (see Appendix C). During the process of transcription, initial patterns were emerging from one interview to another. Then, the researcher read the data in detail to take notes about those initial ideas that came out during the phase.
2. Generation of initial codes, which means systematically coding different aspects of the entire data. Here, after the initial familiarization with the data, the researcher started coding all the interesting segments of the transcripts. The coding methods used were in-vivo and descriptive coding (Saldana, 2013). According to Saldana (2013), in-vivo coding can help to understand and “capture participants’ realities” (p. 61), whilst descriptive coding is related to the overall understanding of the explored phenomenon. The codes were used to develop descriptions of ideas that the participants voiced, and to elaborate the themes, which can show a “broader abstraction” (Creswell, 2014, p. 285). Thus, this step helped organize the data into meaningful groups and combine them into themes in the next steps.
3. Searching for themes, where the researcher gathered the generated codes and all the relevant ideas into potential themes. In this step, the researcher analyzed all the generated codes to sort them out into potential themes. With the help of the mind mapping technique that was used to allocate the codes into the larger features of data, the researcher identified nine possible themes.
4. The next step was aimed at reviewing the themes to make sure about the relation of the themes to the ideas from phase one and the entire data set from step two. In this phase, the researcher generated a thematic map that was useful in organizing the data, reducing the number of themes, and adding meaningful subthemes to answer the research questions.

5. Definition and naming the themes while continuously analyzing each theme and the story that the data tells.
6. In the last step, the researcher produced a report of the analysis by selecting vivid sense-making extracts, critically analyzing and relating them to the research questions and theoretical underpinnings of the study (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 87).

Overall, the researcher identified three themes for describing participants' beliefs towards language mixing, and three themes for reporting the language mixing practices that took place in the classes where Kazakh is taught as a subject. The report of these themes will be presented in two following chapters.

Ethical Considerations

As Creswell (2014) states, it is crucial to engage with ethical practices at every stage of the research. Bui (2014) claimed that it is of crucial importance for the research to be done in an ethical manner (Bui, 2014). Since the study was designed in accordance with the ethical considerations, the researcher needed to ensure that ethical issues were clearly addressed to ensure the safety, anonymity, and confidentiality of the research. Considering this, each interview began with the researcher explaining the purpose, risks, and benefits of the study without "engaging in deception about the nature of the study" (Creswell, 2014, p. 253). It was important to tell all the research participants that the data results would be confidential and completely anonymous. To ensure it, the participants were sent the informed consent form to sign before each interview, since it acknowledged the participants' "right to freedom and self-determination" (Cohen, et al., 2007, p. 52). Moreover, the researcher assured the interviewees about their right to stop participating in the research at any stage. Besides, the participants were informed that their names and the name of their educational institution would be kept confidential. Furthermore, to avoid possible risks for the participants, it was promised and ensured that the gathered data

would be kept on devices with passwords known only to the researcher and would be deleted after the research project ended. Thus, absolute confidentiality and anonymity ensure that the participants' words will not be used against them, hence, the participation in the study will not subject them to any kind of punishment from their superiors.

Conclusion

This chapter provided the details of the methods that were used to study the university teachers and students' beliefs and practices about translanguaging. It included the detailed presentation and justification of the research design and site, sampling, data collection tool, data collection and analysis procedures, as well as ethical considerations. The study is based on a qualitative approach that applies semi-structured one-on-one interviews as the data collection tool. A total of six student and two teacher participants were involved in the study. To ensure the protection of the participants' rights, as well as other ethical considerations, an ethics approval was obtained from the NUGSE Research Committee, which was later explained to the participants of the study.

Chapter 4: Findings

This chapter presents the main findings drawn from the data that was obtained via semi-structured interviews. As can be seen from Chapter 3, the data was analysed by using Braun & Clarke's (2013) six steps for conducting thematic analysis. Since it was assumed that the participants of the study have a history of practicing translanguaging and holding certain beliefs towards it, this chapter presents findings obtained from eight interviews to answer the following research questions:

1. What are university teachers' and students' beliefs towards translanguaging in classes, where Kazakh is taught as a subject?
2. What are university teachers' and students' practices of translanguaging in classes, where Kazakh is taught as a subject?

Biographical Information of Respondents

A total of eight participants were interviewed: three female students, three male students, and two female teachers. Participants were assigned a pseudonym to keep their identities confidential. All students who participated in the research were Kazakhstani citizens and came from Russian speaking families. Six participants were ethnic Kazakhs, whilst two participants were of Uyghur and Russian origins. Two student participants were originally from Southern Kazakhstan, two were from the Northern and other two were from the Western parts of the country. To be more precise, two students came from Almaty, one participant was from Kokshetau, and another participant from North Kazakhstan was a Nur-Sultan citizen. Participants from the West were from Aktobe, which citizens are predominantly Kazakh speaking, and Uralsk, where Russian is more widespread. Participants' educational background is highly diverse, but all the secondary institutions they attended were mostly schools for exceptional students. Three students (Diana, Timur, Adiya) graduated from Nazarbayev Intellectual Schools (NIS). These

schools teach predominantly in English and practice teaching such subjects as History of Kazakhstan, Geography and Kazakh literature through Kazakh. Iskander, Yerassyl, and Aida graduated from high-quality mainstream schools.

All students who took part in the research are multilingual. All of them claim Russian to be their first language, including those who shifted from Kazakh before they turned two. Their level of Kazakh proficiency varies from pre-intermediate to upper-intermediate. All participants attended core academic Kazakh classes designed for those who graduated from Russian-medium schools and cannot speak advanced Kazakh. Since participants study at an English-medium university, therefore, they have a high-level of English proficiency. Participating teachers speak English as well. Five participants stated that they could speak other foreign languages such as Japanese, French, Spanish and German in addition to Russian, Kazakh and English (see Table 1 and Table 2).

Table 1

Biographical Information of Student Participants

Name	L1	Gender	Geography	Languages spoken
Iskander	Russian	Male	Almaty	Kazakh, English, Japanese
Yerassyl	Kazakh, shifted to Russian	Male	Almaty	Kazakh, English, Japanese
Timur	Russian	Male	Aktobe	Kazakh, English, German
Diana	Russian	Female	Kokshetau	Kazakh, English.
Aida	Kazakh, shifted to Russian	Female	Nur-Sultan	Kazakh, English, French
Adiya	Russian	Female	Uralsk	Kazakh, English, Spanish

Source: compiled by the author

Table 2*Biographical Information of Teacher Participants*

Name	Gender	L1	Languages spoken
Nurgul	Female	Kazakh	Kazakh, Russian, English
Zhaniya	Female	Kazakh	Kazakh, Russian, English

Source: compiled by the author

The following sections will show and elaborate on the major findings drawn from the data obtained during the interviews. The emerged themes will be presented based on the relevance to two main questions of this research.

Research Question 1: What are Teachers' and Students' Beliefs towards

Translanguaging in Classes, where Kazakh is Taught as a Subject?

This section provides three themes drawn from the data in relation to the first research question, which sought to identify the beliefs that the study participants have towards hybrid language usage in the Kazakh language classroom. The presented themes are: puristic assumptions towards language mixing practices, monolingual classroom environment as the key to success, and translanguaging as an advantageous tool.

Puristic Assumptions towards People's Language Mixing Practices

Since the first objective of this study was to find out about beliefs that the participants held about translanguaging, it was found that participants do have monolingual views towards different language practices. In the context of Kazakhstan, there are people who still maintain the belief that those mixing Kazakh and Russian are only “half-Kazakhs”, who gave up their own language and made it polluted by adding words from foreign languages. Such a view is present in the Kazakhstani settings due to the Soviet Russification policy, where the use of Kazakh was minimized in educational, scientific,

and professional domains. In addition, monolingual ideologies were dominating in the Kazakhstani language-in-education curriculum for decades. Thus, this belief is related to the notion of linguistic purism, which is “the belief that words (and other linguistic features) of foreign origin are a kind of contamination sully the purity of a language”. (Trask, 1999, p. 169).

When participants were asked questions about their opinion towards language mixing, it was revealed that some students did hold a purist view of languages. This proves that the beliefs towards the solely monolingual patterns of language use are still echoing in the Kazakhstani settings. This attitude might stem from the fact that the multilingual turn, a movement that criticizes monolingual approaches in education, took place not long ago and people’s views towards multilingualism still reflect a negative attitude. For instance, Adiya, a multilingual participant who is proficient in four languages, perceived multilingual practices as a fact and a great step towards the eradication of linguistic discrimination. Yet, she considered purposeful translanguaging an irritating habit, if it was done by a proficient user:

Extract 1:

You know, I don’t know why, but I get irritated when people I know mix Russian and Kazakh on purpose... I mean, they say something in Russian, whilst knowing the word in Kazakh. For instance, adding these words to sound cool. If you are proficient in the language, then speak the language only. It only shows that the proficient speaker of Kazakh does not have a fully developed lexicon. In some cases, it is inappropriate (Adiya, December 23, 2020).

Another participant, Yerassyl, considered such practices as a threat to the beauty of a language.

Extract 2:

When I look at our students, who speak English and use many English words in their speech... I know that’s what multilinguals do, but still, when I was discussing this phenomenon with my friends, we concluded that it is not good. It makes the speech sound worse, not as beautiful and laconic as it could be (Yerassyl, December 22, 2020).

As can be seen from these extracts, the participants who supported such assumptions highlighted the fact that language mixing could spoil the beauty of a language and a speech. However, both Yerassyl and Adiya claimed their awareness of the fact that people's translanguaging or any other kinds of language mixing practices were an indicator of people's multilingual nature. However, these participants still believe that language mixing can be avoided to keep languages pure. This explains the reality of contemporary Kazakhstan's diverse linguistic settings. People prefer to keep the conversation solely monolingual, yet they do not neglect multilingualism.

Diana, a participating student who studies linguistics, also acknowledged this widespread belief, explaining why people are mostly afraid of language mixing in Kazakhstan. According to the participant,

Extract 3:

Well, those people who stand for the usage of one language only, are probably afraid that it would have a negative effect on the language itself. They are afraid that if one uses Russian words in Kazakh, then the language can get worse or damaged. More of a purist view that they believe in (Diana, December 23, 2020).

In other words, linguistic purism in such a case can be compared to the chemical definition of water, which is H₂O, and if any other elements are added to it, this water (language) cannot be pure (Langer & Nesse, 2012). Thus, it is apparent from Diana's statements that such linguistic purism is still present in the views of Kazakhstani citizens.

However, this participant did not have the same opinion towards language mixing as previous ones. For her, Kazakh is a strong, rich and beautiful language, so no multilingual practices can cause harm to it, especially when referring to Russian during the process of learning the Kazakh language. Since some participants of the study claimed the pure monolingual practices to be more appropriate for any discourses, the following theme will present participants' views as to how language management should occur in educational settings.

Monolingual Classroom Environment as the Key to Success

One of the major themes that emerged from the data was based on the presence of monolingual practices and assumptions within the Kazakh language learning classes. Despite the fact that only two participants shared beliefs that translanguaging should be avoided at any kinds of verbal communication, more participants stated there is the need to create and support a monolingual environment in language classrooms. The participants justified their opinion from the perspectives of their personal experiences. Therefore, this adds up to the fact that the consequences of the multilingual turn, as well as the notion itself, have not become popular and/or practiced within the language-in-education system.

As stated in the literature review chapter, the two solitudes assumption not only have been the dominant feature of language education for decades but also continue to be recognized and preferred these days (Manan & Tul-Kubra, 2020). This suggests a link between what participants stated to be true in cases of their language learning experiences. The study participants claimed that the practices within the Kazakh language learning classes, both at school and university levels were dominated by a monolingual environment. Iskander stated that:

Extract 4:

We had to speak only Kazakh. We had to minimize the usage of Russian words or clarifications in Russian. No questions in Russian, everything had to be asked and said in Kazakh, because it is a Kazakh language class (Iskander, December 22, 2020).

Another participant, Yerassyl, who supports the monolingual approach in language education, stated the following:

Extract 5:

My schoolteachers tried to forbid speaking Russian. Which was indeed a right thing to do, because we need to speak Kazakh in classes, where Kazakh is being learnt... The rule at our Kazakh language course at the university was to speak Kazakh only (Yerassyl, December 22, 2020).

Speaking of what students believed to be right, most participants stated the monolingual environment to be the one that was more suitable for language proficiency development. In other words, they thought that Russian, English and other languages could slow the learning process down. The evidence that the participants used to support their claims was also derived from their personal experiences with Kazakh and other languages. These were the beliefs that were formed as a result of at least seven years of studying Kazakh as a subject.

Indeed, their experiences made them think that the lack of Kazakh speaking practice is detrimental, because they believed that practice could make perfect. For instance, Yerassyl experienced a shift from Kazakh to Russian in his early childhood when he started attending a kindergarten, where children were predominantly Russian speaking. Yerassyl said the following:

Extract 6:

Language mixing in language classrooms is a bad decision. No doubt. Because one has to try to create a monolingual environment. If you are not doing that, then you lose your language skills in a very fast way. This is what happened to me, I quit the Kazakh speaking environment and my Kazakh skills worsened year by year, up to the moment when I realized that I even need to study the grammar again (Yerassyl, December 22, 2020).

Though Aida, another participant, did not state that monolingual environment is crucial for language proficiency development, she shared that the same shift happened to her as well because of the Russian-medium kindergarten:

Extract 7:

Kazakh was the first language I spoke, until I turned two. Then I started attending Kazakh kindergarten, where nurses were not that good and kind... That is why my parents made me attend the Russian-medium kindergarten. I remember demanding my nurses to speak Kazakh, I was only 2.5 years old. But it took me just a few months to start speaking pure Russian (Aida, December 23, 2020).

Another reason for holding monolingual beliefs that one of the participants has shared was based on the way English is usually learnt in the Kazakhstani private English

tutoring centers, which people usually attend to learn the language outside their schools or universities. He stated the following:

Extract 8:

Forbidding is, definitely, too radical... However, one can have a better effect only if you regularly speak Kazakh. If you go to any private educational centre where English is taught individually as a foreign language, you'll see that the classes there are based on using only English, minimizing Russian as much as it is possible. The better effect can be achieved only by listening in Kazakh, and speaking in Kazakh (Timur, December 22, 2020).

Certainly, the country has a plethora of educational centres and most of them specialize in teaching English through English. There, the usage of Russian or Kazakh by teachers or students is perceived as a negative practice that stalls the proficiency progress of English. That is another reason why the monolingual assumptions were widespread among the participants.

In addition to the previous assumptions about the presence of monolingual preferences in educational settings, one participant made a comment that he holds such a view because he himself did not even try to speak Kazakh when learning it as a subject at school:

Extract 9:

Actually, it was my mistake... because we did not even try to speak Kazakh, we thought like "Oh, come on, let's say that in Russian". However, we should have tried to at least practice (Timur, December 22, 2020).

Nurgul, an experienced Kazakh language instructor, named the desire to use Russian words instead of Kazakh when not remembering the Kazakh word as the unwillingness to speak the TL. From her perspective, the rejection to practice speaking Kazakh comes from students' character traits, such as laziness to attempt to speak.

Extract 10:

Sometimes, my students ask me "Teacher... We have that word in Russian, how to say it in Kazakh?".... They've been learning these words by heart for so many years, and these words are not being used... but they stayed in their minds for sure.

Sometimes students just feel lazy to remember them. But we just need to pull them out (Nurgul, December 25, 2020).

Therefore, for Nurgul, language mixing practices were not actually the ones that make meaning. As stated in the previous theme, there are different derogatory terms that are used to refer to the non-Kazakh speaking Kazakhs. Such a “culture” resulted in beliefs that translanguaging practices are disadvantageous, and such beliefs arouse the feeling of guilt among its practitioners.

Extract 11:

It's okay when a person mixes languages when speaking, because I do the same thing... I... To be honest, sometimes I feel ashamed for doing it. So, I think it is a weakness anyway. Sometimes I think that I cannot purely express my thoughts in one language. So, it is more of a drawback... I am okay with this, but it's my weakness (Aida, December 23, 2020).

Same student reported earlier that her schoolteacher often criticized her less proficient ethnic Kazakh classmates by comparing them to their non-ethnic Kazakh peers, saying “Aren't you ashamed that you, Kazakhs, speak your own language worse than your Russian or Ukrainian classmates?” Unfortunately, this is a widespread problem. Overall, at least three student participants stated that they came across such a criticism as well. Therefore, five participants of the study believed that the monolingual environment in the language classroom can cultivate effective language acquisition.

Translanguaging as a Last Resort. Another important theme was the students' beliefs that translanguaging is acceptable, but only in cases when it is hard to avoid due to the language proficiency gap. According to Alvarez (2020), when language learners cannot comprehend the topic that is being studied and their first language needs to be used, this notion can be defined as the last resort. For instance, the participating students themselves shared that translanguaging must be minimized, and used only in “extreme cases”. This can be noticed from the following comments of the interviewees:

Extract 12:

For instance, at the university I have noticed that professors try to speak pure Kazakh without using Russian. Russian is used only in cases when students cannot understand anything at all (Iskander, December 22, 2020).

Extract 13:

Using other languages in the language classroom should be allowed only when there is no way out... Students' first languages have to be left outside the classroom (Yerassyl, December 22, 2020).

Nevertheless, both participating teachers stated that they barely resort to the help of Russian and English, even if the situation is extreme, for instance, once or twice throughout the semester. Thus, this shows the connection between what is believed to be true and what the actual practices are: translanguaging is perceived as a tool to resort to in the cases where it is inevitable due to the lack of comprehension.

Translanguaging as an Advantageous Tool

Despite the fact that the monolingual ideologies were manifest in participants' beliefs, there were cases when translanguaging was believed to be a helpful tool in language learning. Some students viewed any kind of language mixing in the classroom as an inclusion and flexibility creating instrument, as well as a tool to make meaning of the content. These components will be presented further as subthemes.

When the participants were asked whether they found it advantageous to use more than one language in classes where Kazakh is taught as a subject, the majority had an affirmative answer. This means that they stand for a more contemporary language learning and teaching paradigm. Firstly, they justified their views by stating that the usage of their first language(s) could be a solid ground that could enhance the language proficiency development. Second, for the participants of the study, translanguaging was a tool that could help to develop a stronger bond between educators and students. Most importantly,

translanguaging was perceived as an instrument that could minimize the degree of psychological barriers, anxiety or other insecurities when speaking.

Extract 14:

I think, using other languages in the classes is advantageous, I don't know, to have no barriers... So that it would be easy to learn the language for those who don't know Kazakh at all. Simply because if they are told like, speak pure Kazakh, then they won't learn anything. ... We've been taught English through Russian, right? We didn't come from Native English teachers. That is why I think it is a good tactic (Iskander, December 22, 2020).

Moreover, students stated that fluid transitions from one language to another could increase the possibility of having a fuller grasp of knowledge. For instance, another student, who has an upper-intermediate Kazakh proficiency level, stated that it could be useful to let students and teachers flexibly use other languages from their repertoire, so that the content would be as comprehensible as possible. Certainly, as stated by Baker (2001), translanguaging is a concept that might "promote a deeper and fuller understanding of the subject matter" (Lewis, et al., 2012, p. 645). Fortunately, that participant witnessed the flexible practices at the university Kazakh classes she attended.

Extract 15:

Sometimes, our teacher could explain material in English or Russian, especially when we felt too stuck when trying to understand something. We simply wouldn't understand many things if a teacher kept the monolingual environment in the classroom (Aida, December 23, 2020).

Overall, four out of six students claimed flexible language practices within the classroom to be a great advantage that helps to feel more confident in both psychological and linguistic sense.

Inclusion and Flexibility. Another crucial aspect that participants revealed during interviews was the sense of inclusion and flexibility that can be felt when translanguaging is employed in the classroom environment. Indeed, inclusion, when used as a part of translanguaging pedagogy, sets a goal to facilitate learning and participation with the usage

of the students' entire linguistic repertoire (Kirsch & Seele, 2020, p. 67). Moreover, some scholars argue that "social justice, inclusion and multilingualism or translanguaging must be contemplated together" and that "this connection is central to the present and the future of education" (Panagiotopoulou, et al., 2020, p. 2). This might be the reason why the participants experienced the feelings of comfort and motivation that, consequently, caused progress. By contrast, the imposed monolingual practices were viewed as the barrier, which prevented them from improving their proficiency. For example, Diana stated that translanguaging pedagogy seemed to be the one to foster comfort, whilst centralized monolingual approach in classrooms usually felt like "being thrown overboard".

Extract 16:

I think it [translanguaging] is a good practice that can help students feel comfortable when learning. I mean, it is not like you are thrown overboard and floundering, not understanding what is going on and not feeling comfortable in Kazakh language (Diana, December 23, 2020).

For students, translanguaging as inclusion means awareness of the linguistic background and interests of students. Adiya referred to her teaching experience, where she was an English teacher volunteer in a remote village.

Extract 17:

When I realized that students do not understand things I say in English, I explained some things using Kazakh. I realized that I can't speak pure English to them, because they don't fully understand, so what kind of effect will there be? (Adiya, December 23, 2020).

Here, she knew that it was against students' interests to have a lack of understanding, because they wanted to and needed to progress. Moreover, she did not want her students to feel "overboard", thus, she made her classroom as inclusive as she could. As a result, as Adiya claimed, such awareness and, hence, flexibility, were crucial in helping her students become more open to understand the language that was being learnt.

Translanguaging as a Useful Meaning-Making Tool. Data showed that the most participants of this study needed translanguaging as a meaning-making tool, which could increase their level of understanding the content being studied. As it was mentioned above, their first languages served as a solid ground, and if there were any references to them, they would feel more confident to use the target language. As stated by the study participants, one of the most favorable aspects where other languages can be used as meaning making tools is drawing parallels with other languages spoken by the students. In such cases, it would be easier for them to remember the studied topic.

Extract 18:

I think that if you learn through your native language or other languages you know, it would be easier to understand not only the rules per se but the language and its meaning overall. I learn faster when there are things in Kazakh that are similar to Russian or English. ... Sometimes it is indeed more efficient to use other languages to explain meanings and to make meaning of the structure and logic of the language (Adiya, December 23, 2020).

Another participant stated that “It would be cool to refer to and use other languages, especially when there are some similarities. It definitely should be used” (Timur, December 22, 2020).

When presenting such a belief towards language mixing, the participants emphasized the importance of their experience, where their teachers referred to English and Russian when teaching Kazakh or other foreign languages. For instance, when Timur learnt German at school, his teacher always made comparisons or simply switched to English, so that they could remember the differences and learned more about German as well. Thus, to the participants of the study, there were many situations where the usage of the target language only could not fully explain or justify words, grammar, or other phenomena. “In this case, we need to use Russian or English, just to make things meaningful. To explain some things that are hard to comprehend” (Adiya, December 23, 2020).

As can be seen from previous themes, the students have established beliefs towards the phenomenon of the study. One of the most crucial views that was held towards cross-lingual practices was about accepting translanguaging for lower proficiency levels, and diminishing it for upper-intermediate level and higher. In other words, they thought that translanguaging practices should be allowed for building the fundamental knowledge of the target language and polishing the language when the foundation is already steady.

Extract 19:

I think, if I am to learn a particular language, it would be better if the teacher used Russian or English when speaking to me at the beginning. Until a particular level, probably B1 or most likely B2. At an advanced level it is better to use the target language only. In other words, reducing the degree of the usage of other languages as the level becomes higher (Iskander, December 22, 2020).

The belief about acceptability of such practices might come from international experience. For instance, there was a large-scale study conducted in 111 countries on the realities of translanguaging practices worldwide (Hall, 2020). One of the findings of that study revealed that educators teaching in lower proficiency classes resort to multilingual practices more often than those teaching in higher proficiency classes. Thus, the finding of the research conducted by Hall (2020) resonates with the views of participants of this study regarding the frequency of translanguaging practices on different proficiency levels. One of the participants, Aida, stated that such practice was helpful for her. She has taken both upper-intermediate and advanced courses at the university and now she is very proficient in Kazakh. She said the following:

Extract 20:

It is inevitable to use other languages at a beginner level. As the level gets higher, it is good to know and use synonyms and explain words in Kazakh. I guess, the higher level is, the more unacceptable language mixing is. ... Again, I learned more Kazakh words at an advanced course, because I had to speak Kazakh there, since it was the course for proficient students (Aida, December 23, 2020).

Nevertheless, the participating teachers did not support even such occasional translingual practices. One of the teachers, Nurgul, stated that it is better to resort to simple explanations or to synonym-words when the understanding of the subject matter is lacking.

Extract 21:

Sometimes my students cannot remember some words and ask me “Teacher, how do we say that word?” or “There is a word in Russian...” I tell them, “If you cannot remember this word, if you simply do not know it in Kazakh, then don’t use it. ... You need to find the way out of this situation by using other words from your lexicon. Kazakh language is not a poor language, it’s rich. It has many synonyms. Therefore, they need to substitute it with other words. That’s it (Nurgul, December 25, 2020).

Overall, four participants showed such belief patterns with their words, regardless of their monolingual or multilingual preferences or ideologies. All the participants stated that translanguaging is inescapable for students from elementary to intermediate/upper-intermediate levels, since there are gaps that should be filled with the help of students’ first languages. Moreover, such a belief was manifested only among students, because teachers found even occasional resort to other languages undesirable and detrimental in the Kazakh language classes.

Research Question 2: What are University Teachers’ and Students’ Practices of Translanguaging in Classes, where Kazakh is Taught as a Subject?

The following section presents the main themes and subthemes which answer the second research question. The research question sought to determine the translanguaging practices that took place in the Kazakh language courses designed for non-Kazakh speaking students. The major themes derived from the interviews are: the Kazakh-only Rule as the main classroom practice, occasional language mixing practices, and the effect of Kazakh language courses on students.

The Kazakh-Only Rule as the Main Classroom Practice

Since all the participants had had a long experience of studying and teaching Kazakh, one of the main objectives of the study was to indicate the presence or the absence of translanguaging practices in the Kazakh language classroom. Overall, it was found that the practices were mostly monolingual at both school and university levels. In other words, Kazakh was considered as the one and only default language of the classroom.

When the participants of the study were asked the question about the rules that they had in their classroom, all of the participants stated “Teq qana Qazaksha soileu” (“To speak Kazakh only”). Despite the fact that all the students had changed at least two schools, Kazakh-only rule was present in all the schools they studied. Moreover, though this rule was controlled differently by different teachers, teachers’ attitude towards language mixing practices were largely characterized by the monolingual rule. For instance, Iskander studied at two schools, one of which practiced trilingual education and officially taught Kazakh through the Kazakh as a medium of instruction (KMI), and another mainstream school also had a monolingual policy in classes where Kazakh was taught as a subject. Moreover, even though rules at the latter were strict, the former school had more complex syllabus and stricter rules.

Extract 22:

All these four years at the gymnasium Kazakh was challenging, since it was designed for students from KMI classes. When I transferred to another school, the program was easier, because it was designed for students with Russian as a medium of instruction (MoI). We did not have long literary texts to read, we simply studied grammar and words. ... When I studied at the gymnasium, we had to speak only Kazakh. Minimize Russian words or clarifications in Russian. No questions in Russian, since it was the Kazakh language class (Iskander, December 22, 2020).

Those students who were transferred to NIS had also shared similar stories. At NIS, Kazakh, History of Kazakhstan, Kazakh Literature, and Geography are taught through Kazakh. To NIS graduates that participated in the research, such changes were too sudden

since the content of the courses mentioned earlier was more challenging.

Extract 23:

I remember the first time I came to the Kazakh class and there were not any explanations in Russian. Everything was in Kazakh. ... Because, the changes were too sudden, at least for me... It was too sudden to switch to Kazakh *kind of instruction*. For Kazakh and Russian-medium classes the program and rules were almost the same [Original English in italics] (Adiya, December 23, 2020).

Thus, both mainstream and trilingual schools demanded speaking Kazakh only, as a tacit or explicit policy.

Nevertheless, according to the participants, the Kazakh-only rule at school was less strict than at the university. The syllabi at the Academic Kazakh courses contained more complex grammar, vocabulary and discussion topics overall, such as discussing globalization, domestic violence or reading Kazakh novels. A possible explanation to this difference may be based on the assumptions that Russian-dominant students attending these core Kazakh courses already have an intermediate or upper-intermediate Kazakh proficiency level, thus it would not be hard for them to study. One participant commented: “It was assumed that we are pretty proficient in Kazakh, thus they thought we can express our thoughts in pure Kazakh” (Yerassyl, December 22, 2020).

Nurgul, the Kazakh language instructor, also stated that speaking Kazakh is the central policy of her classes:

Extract 24:

To speak *only Kazakh*. Speak Kazakh only. For example, all the materials and syllabus - everything in Kazakh. Once my students asked me to send a syllabus in Russian, but I didn't send it, we're not making syllabus in Russian. I can send it in English. Basically, all the things are in Kazakh... Whether the student knows or does not know... maybe, they will understand. I mean, if a student does not have a good vocabulary, then they have to find the way out. We can't say that the student does not speak the language at all, they have been studying for 10 years... [Plain text is translation from Russian, underlined text from Kazakh, italics is original English] (Nurgul, December 25, 2020).

In addition, teachers of those Kazakh courses designed for students with intermediate level

sent the vocabulary list with definitions in Kazakh before the class to help students understand the studied topics better. However, as the participants have noted, all the reading, listening, writing and speaking assignments had to be completed in Kazakh.

To sum up, the vast majority of participants reported the presence of the ‘target language only rule’, which they had to follow during classroom discussions and when completing assignments. This idea shows that the monolingual practices are central to the academic Kazakh classes.

Language Mixing Practices

Even if monolingual practices remain as the main settings of the classes where Kazakh is taught as a subject, language mixing takes place there as well. Since all interviewees are multilinguals, translanguaging, though not planned, was hard to avoid. However, such cases were rare. Despite the fact that teachers encouraged students to use Kazakh only, some teachers tried to be more tolerant and flexible regarding infrequent language mixing, because “they tried to look realistically at the students’ actual proficiency levels. But it depends on a teacher” (Adiya, December 23, 2020). For example, Nurgul, when asked about the spontaneous language mixing practices of her students, stated that from teacher’s perspective, this is just how students’ brains work especially when they speak and hear multiple languages every day:

Extract 25:

It is okay. Our students... they have Russian as a home language, and English as a study language, that’s their environment. Maybe they had come to my class right after Math or Economics and automatically started speaking English or using English words. ... Even in my case, I could have done it automatically. If I go to my English class, I can say a word in Kazakh or I can say a word in Russian [Plain text is translation from Russian, underlined text from Kazakh] (Nurgul, December 25, 2020).

Thus, drawing from teachers’ and students’ words, teachers were aware of the students’ multilingual minds, how they work and what their nature is.

Translanguaging appeared in other contexts as well, from translations and the usage of dictionaries, to resorting to Russian or English in order to ease the understanding of the studied content. For instance, if during the classroom discussions a student forgot or did not know the translation of a particular word, a teacher could translate it and ask the student to repeat the idea again, using the new word. As one participant commented:

Extract 26:

Teachers tried to make us develop our skills, such as pronunciation, that is why every time someone said a word in Russian, teachers would translate it, yes. But then, they always asked to repeat the sentence again, substituting Russian word with its Kazakh translation. I really liked that (Yerassyl, December 22, 2020).

All the participants who mentioned such Russian-Kazakh translation emphasized their fondness of this practice, because their first languages were not neglected and their ideas remained the same.

In addition, it is important to mention the fact that translanguaging occurred when making parallels between students' first and target languages. Some teachers did that when explaining certain topics, usually related to syntax, grammar or particular cultural characteristics. As Adiya stated in her interview:

Extract 27:

Sometimes they explained some things through English or Russian. Usually, grammar... Words, phrases or grammar. They used Russian and allowed us to use Russian to make analogies. Anyway, we still tried to speak Kazakh and ask questions in Kazakh as well (Adiya, December 23, 2020).

Moreover, the participating teacher mentioned such cross-linguistic practices as well. For instance, despite neglecting any kinds of language mixing deep in her mind, Zhaniya stated that translanguaging is inevitable when the need to describe the meaning of cultural values or jokes occurs.

Extract 28:

You know the cases when... there are untranslatable problems, when emotions can be explained only in a certain language. Not only emotions, for example, to explain

a joke or some anecdote, in these cases I switch languages, though I am against such practices. I switch to make a student understand the joke or emotions. In such cases I start speaking Russian. [Plain text is translation from Russian, underlined text from Kazakh] (Zhaniya, March 4, 2021).

Such practices, as part of pedagogical translanguaging, help to activate students' linguistic repertoire for enhancing language acquisition process (Cenoz & Santos, 2020). For example, by explaining Kazakh grammar, students compare the features of grammar, hence, they use their first languages as a resource that can help to learn Kazakh. However, Zhaniya stated that in cases of grammar explanations she stopped making comparisons and that topics related to Kazakh need to be explained in Kazakh:

Extract 29:

I look back at my teaching experience and... I often made comparisons with different languages, like in Russian or English grammar it needs to be done like this and in Kazakh grammar it is done like that. But now I know - it is not needed. If you explain Kazakh grammar, you should explain it through Kazakh. No need to apply a comparison method with different languages (Zhaniya, March 4, 2021).

Therefore, making parallels and analogies in Zhaniya's classes are rare practices. Nevertheless, she might sometimes use Russian to help students understand the subject matter. Participating students also stated that even if their teachers applied such a kind of translanguaging in class, these cases were only occasional.

Overall, teachers and students do translanguage in their Kazakh language courses. It is usually done rarely and as a "last resort", for instance, when simplified explanations in the TL do not make sense, or when explaining similarities or differences between languages from students' linguistic repertoire. Nevertheless, according to the participants, translanguaging is always spontaneous, it is not planned by the teacher, since the main rule of their classes is to speak and use Kazakh solely.

The Effect of Classroom Language Practices on Students

Two previous subsections presented the prevalence of monolingual practices with occasional language mixing in classes where Kazakh is taught as a subject for Russian

speaking students. It is of crucial importance to present students' voices on the above-mentioned practices, since they are central features in the language learning process.

Overall, students voiced a number of challenges that were caused by the Kazakh-only Rule and the courses. In particular, these challenges were related to the course content which was hard to comprehend, speaking anxiety, and awareness of teachers' negative attitude towards translanguaging practices.

Challenging Kazakh Course. Majority of the student participants indicated that the content and the rules of the Kazakh courses were too challenging. To proceed with the discussion of this theme, it is important to remember the background information of the Kazakh courses. The research site offers two Kazakh courses that are called "Academic Kazakh", both designed for non-Kazakh speaking undergraduate students and are core to take. If a student has an intermediate level or below, they have to take the first academic Kazakh course. After completing the first course, students have to take academic Kazakh II before they graduate. Academic Kazakh II is initially designed for students whose KazTest results showed the upper-intermediate (B2) Kazakh proficiency level or who has already passed the first Kazakh course. Nevertheless, a few interviewees claimed that the test does not fully reveal students' actual level of Kazakh proficiency. In other words, not all students have B1-B2 levels when taking the above-mentioned courses. Therefore, some study participants found the course content difficult.

Thus, students reported that the Kazakh classes they took were initially designed for students who had a good intermediate command of the language. "The first Kazakh course is not only for intermediate... Even if you have basic or pre-intermediate... In short, if you are not advanced, you have to pass these two courses." (Adiya, December 23, 2020). Therefore, the increased difficulty level of the university courses, compared to Kazakh classes at school, felt to be too sharp. This can be seen from the following quote:

Extract 30:

At school we usually tried to acquire grammar and the basics of the language. Simple phrases, topics, the difficulty level increases just slightly. Whereas at the university it is assumed that you have a higher level, so the courses seem to be too difficult because of such a gap. As for me, the courses of Kazakh were too complicated. ... it was implied that all students taking the course had at least intermediate level of Kazakh proficiency (Yerassyl, December 22, 2020).

Even students with B2 level, such as Adiya and Aida, said that the second course for upper-intermediate students was hard for them. Such complexity was especially vivid when completing tasks related to the assigned readings. The readings were usually the chapters from Kazakh classic novels written in the literary Kazakh. The challenging part was the amount of workload and the lack of understanding of the content itself. All six interviewees observed that the reading tasks were the hardest because of that.

Extract 31:

Literary Kazakh - it is just like another Kazakh... It's just... There are so many phraseological units and even more unclear words, that was too hard. And the following speaking assignment where we needed to retell the readed story was the hardest for me. Because of these difficulties I had a low mark for it (Timur, December 22, 2020).

Consequently, speaking was another challenge. The classroom activities usually involved watching videos in Kazakh, then answering the questions about the video and discussing them. As mentioned earlier, teachers tried to preserve the monolingual environment of the classroom. No usage of students' first languages was allowed. Thus, speaking activities were challenging for all the student participants, except for more proficient students such as Adiya and Aida. Diana, an ethnic Russian who successfully passed all two Kazakh courses, revealed that she had experienced a terrible stress whenever a speaking assignment was given in the class:

Extract 32:

I remember it was always so stressful for me when there were tasks where we needed to watch, for example, news or talk-show in Kazakh. We needed to watch the video, we had questions we needed to answer and discuss. It was so hard... If I

am not mistaken, we could not even use our phones. I was always hoping not to be asked (Diana, December 23, 2020).

For Diana, such emotional tensivity was an obstacle that disturbed the improvement of her proficiency level. She stated that she always felt the need to use her first language to increase the level of understanding. However, translanguaging was an undesirable practice and thus she had to pull herself back. Therefore, she always felt extreme anxiety when speaking Kazakh. In addition, Diana revealed another crucial problem that can inhibit the desire to speak and learn the language. It is related to the negative attitude of teachers towards less proficient students. As Diana commented, sometimes it was easy to feel teachers' biased attitude towards those students who have difficulties acquiring Kazakh and who tend to codeswitch when speaking.

Extract 33:

Even though such educators teach Kazakh to those who are not highly proficient, it can be easily felt how they judge and do not sympathize with such students... It can be felt during the lesson and you are under the constant stress because you are afraid that they will say something or look at you with a disapproving glance... (Diana, December 23, 2020).

The same thoughts were present in the mind of Iskander, another student who attended Kazakh courses. He stated that because of the "Kazakh-only Rule" he remained silent, since clarifications in Russian were also unwanted. Thus, he often felt unsure about what answer to give and how to answer the discussed questions.

Extract 34:

I usually did not talk in class. It was forbidden to clarify things in Russian. I was afraid that I would have a penalty point for using Russian. Both at school and at the university. The thing is that everyone tried to speak Kazakh, and I was afraid, because I cannot speak if I know I might be incorrect. So, I was sitting quietly, and then I found out that my academic performance in Kazakh was too low. My teacher believed me to be the person who did not try to reach for knowledge. Then I had to speak more Kazakh... So, I find this rule a bit disturbing... (Iskander, December 22, 2020).

Moreover, he felt even more strained and anxious to speak when he witnessed how his teacher was criticizing his classmate for not having advanced Kazakh proficiency level and for adding Russian words when answering the question, because he graduated from a school where Kazakh was widely used. As Iskander stated, it felt discouraging and such criticism should not take place when students are in the process of learning the language. He said the following:

Extract 35:

He was so eager to learn Kazakh, but he used Russian words a few times, and our teacher criticized that. Well, he tried but he couldn't speak pure Kazakh, it can happen to anyone, right? I wish such things never happened in language classes (Iskander, December 22, 2020).

Therefore, complicated content of courses, restricting rules and negative attitude towards less proficient students resulted in a high level of anxiety among the participants. Students wanted to use their first languages when possible, but they could do that mostly when completing homeworks. According to Neokleous (2017), anxiety usually “triggers from incomprehensible L2 input” and students might need to use their L1 to understand more and to feel the “sense of security” (p. 317). Nevertheless, due to the aspects described above, this was not possible.

Conclusion

Summing up all the findings, the monolingual beliefs and practices were still present in classes where Kazakh was taught as a subject. Since the purely monolingual environment had been a popular and preferable trend in education for a long time, all kinds of language mixing was believed to be wrong. These widespread monolingual and puristic trends caused the feeling of guilt among teachers who sometimes translanguaged, and the fear of looking like an underperforming student among students. However, the participating students reported that they almost constantly felt the need to use their first language(s) to make sense of the content, and to feel more comfortable and motivated to

learn the Kazakh language. The rule to speak pure Kazakh, either tacitly or officially pronounced, was perceived as an obstacle that hampered the language proficiency development. Moreover, the workload of complex tasks and differing proficiency levels among students, added to the anxiety of Russian speaking participants.

Overall, though some teachers and students believed the “Kazakh-only rule” to be the key to success in the language acquisition process, spontaneous translanguaging and occasional cross-linguistic meaning-making practices were not completely neglected. However, students felt the pressure of the monolingual rules that led to demotivation and increased their level of anxiety.

Chapter 5: Discussion

The previous chapter presented the major findings that were obtained from eight semi-structured one-on-one interviews with Russian-dominant university students who attended Kazakh language courses at their university, and Kazakh language instructors teaching in the same educational institution. This chapter focuses on the discussion of those findings in relation to the existing literature on the topic. As mentioned in the literature review chapter, this study draws on Macaro's (2014) framework, in which he defined three positions (virtual, maximal, optimal) of teachers' beliefs towards language mixing in language classrooms. The virtual position mirrors the target language country's linguistic environment, the maximal sees no pedagogical value in language mixing but resorts to other languages with the sense of guilt, and the optimal position views some value in other languages and uses them to enhance the language learning. This framework can be applied to students' beliefs as well.

The purpose of the study was to explore beliefs and practices that the study participants have about translanguaging. Thus, there are two research questions that need to be answered. The first one seeks to reveal beliefs that Kazakh language teachers and Russian speaking university students have towards translanguaging, and the second research question aims at finding out about the translanguaging practices during the classes where Kazakh is taught as a subject. Four major findings have been identified for discussion: prevalent monolingualism-oriented beliefs, the target language as the only classroom language, occasional resort to translanguaging, and tension between beliefs and practices. These themes are presented in the following sections.

Prevalent Monolingualism-oriented Beliefs

The first objective of the study was to explore the beliefs that the study participants held towards language mixing. As it was presented in the preceding chapter, at least six out

of eight participants considered the monolingual environment to be the most important contributor to successful language proficiency development. Therefore, the monolingualism-oriented beliefs were prevalent in this study.

This finding illustrates that both teachers and students mostly held the virtual belief about the use of the target language. The position was introduced by Macaro (2009) as part of his framework of beliefs that teachers can have towards hybrid language mixing practices. Macaro defined the virtual position as the belief that stands for “mirroring the environment of the first language learner and the target language country” by using the target language only (p. 35). In addition, another research by Macaro (2014) indicated that teacher educators adopting the virtual position are in the majority. This correlates with the widespread nature of ‘the target language only’ belief, which might stem from the ‘languages in solitude’ (Cummins, 2007) assumption that has been reigning in the field of language education for decades, as well as from the language ideologies.

The results are further consistent with those of other studies on language in education which reveal the presence of the monolingual bias in many countries (Conteh, 2018; Cummins, 2017; Makalela, 2016; Manan, et al., 2020; Manan & Tul-Kubra, 2020; Otwinowska, 2017). University students who participated in this research emphasized the fact that their teachers at both school and university levels were against language mixing practices in their classes. The participating teachers themselves reported that in spite of the unique multilingual environment of the country, additional languages had to be learned without the interference of the first language. For them, hybrid language practices obstruct the development of students’ exposure to the target language and/or make them feel lethargic towards becoming more exposed to Kazakh since they do not practice the Kazakh language in other domains of their lives. Similar to that, Conteh (2018) stated that in English speaking countries like the UK and Australia, language teaching is praising native-

speakerism and standard languages, as well as “teaching and learning one language at a time and imposing narrow models of assessment and success” (p. 475). In addition, in a study conducted by Doiz and Lasagabaster (2017), teachers do believe that the usage of L1 is detrimental because it negatively influences the exposure to the TL. Moreover, Gardner-Chloros (2009) suggested that the negative perceptions of language mixing might be underpinned by the view that codeswitching is a lazier way of speaking, because “people cannot be bothered to search for the words they need in a language’ (p. 14). Thus, the participating Kazakh language instructors believe that the first language of students is a problem and resorting to it can slow the learning process down. Although students reported the need to use their L1 when learning the target language, they also believed translanguaging practices to be the problem and felt guilty when resorting to Russian or English in the Kazakh language learning classes.

Some scholars connect beliefs about languages with language ideologies by using the latter as the lens which shapes the former (Kroskrity, 2004; Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994). In other words, beliefs can be formed with the influence of the initial ideologies of an individual. This might be applied to beliefs of the participants of this study. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the Kazakh language has a bitter history, when the language was suppressed by the Soviet Russification policy, which consequently led to the negative shift from Kazakh to Russian among the Soviet Kazakhstani citizens. In addition to the shift, the Kazakh language lost its prestige and was associated with “backwardness” (Smagulova, 2008, p. 7). Moreover, the Kazakh language was not used in many domains, such as science and education. For instance, as Nurgul, the teacher participant, pointed out, the first Kazakh language teaching bachelor program at her university was opened only at the beginning of the 1990s, right before the collapse of the Soviet Union.

As a result of the Soviet language policy and planning, the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic became the most “Russified” Soviet Republic (Smagulova, 2008). Unfortunately, this also resulted in giving rise to the terms such as “Shala-Kazakh” (Half-Kazakh) and “mangurt”, which are usually used to humiliate those Kazakhs who cannot speak their language. After gaining independence, the prestige of Kazakh at a civil level started to increase. For instance, it was written in Kazakhstan’s Law on Languages that learning the state language (Kazakh) is the duty of every Kazakhstani citizen because it is a crucial factor in strengthening the people of Kazakhstan (Law on Languages, 1997; Wheeler, 2017). These aspects might also have resulted in the purist language ideologies that influence the neglect of any kinds of language mixing and evoke guilt when hybrid language practices do take place.

One of the participating teachers, Nurgul, also voiced this assumption. She reported that her students mostly tried to maintain the monolingual environment in the classroom. In spite of that, some students were trembling when speaking and felt too shy and anxious. The teacher always invited such students to work with her during office hours individually, and oftentimes students mentioned that such anxiety was the result of the purist ideologies and people’s judgemental attitudes to language mixing.

Overall, the virtual position was held more frequently among the participants. This belief was present in not only the participating teachers and students. The participating students also emphasized the presence of monolingualism-oriented beliefs among their school teachers. Both students and teachers displayed an awareness of the Russian language dominance. Therefore, Nurgul and Zhaniya, the Kazakh language instructors, believed that any kind of language mixing is not beneficial for the TL exposure development, since Kazakh is not widely used by the study participants outside of the classroom.

Nevertheless, though translanguaging is often neglected by classroom practitioners, there is ample evidence from previous studies that demonstrate how fluid language practices can be a useful pedagogical tool in language teaching and learning (Canagarajah, 2011; Cummins & Early, 2011; García & Wei, 2014; Joseph & Ramani, 2012). For instance, an empirical study conducted by Cummins and Early (2011) presented how languages in multilingual minds are interdependent and how their contact results in higher efficiency and encouragement in classroom activities. The participants of that study, who were primary school students, reported how allowing to use their first languages helped make sense of writing and reading activities in their English language learning program.

Though the participants of the study believed that translanguaging does not suit the context of developing minority languages, Cenoz and Gorter (2017) propose that cross-lingual practices can be applied in the case of minority languages development as well. They argue that translanguaging practices can be applied if the following principles are followed:

1. Design functional breathing spaces for using the minority language.
2. Develop the need to use the minority languages through translanguaging.
3. Use emergent multilinguals' resources to reinforce all languages by developing metalinguistic awareness.
4. Enhance language awareness.
5. Link spontaneous translanguaging to pedagogical activities (p. 909).

Thus, if these principles are taken into consideration, sustainable translanguaging as a pedagogical tool can help to organize a more inclusive and efficient process of language learning, without causing harm to the maintenance of the minoritized language.

Kazakh as the Only Classroom Language

As seen in the previous finding, the virtual belief was voiced by 75% of the study participants. This finding concentrates on discussing the practices that occurred in the classes where Kazakh is taught as a subject. One of the crucial themes that emerged from the interviews was that the monolingual beliefs were related to the classroom practices. In other words, as teachers and students were holding the virtual position, the practices that took place in their Kazakh language learning classroom were also aimed at minimizing language mixing or neglecting it entirely. Thus, the linguistic environment in the classroom was based on the Kazakh-only rule. As noted by Doiz and Lasagabaster (2017) in their research on beliefs about translanguaging practices, the beliefs of teachers often influence the practices. The same idea was mentioned by Kubanyiova (2014) where the researcher claimed that teachers' beliefs often reflect the way they view and conduct their classes.

The courses that the participating teachers teach are designed for Russian-dominant students and focus on academic Kazakh. Zhaniya and Nurgul claimed that the Kazakh-only rule was right and suitable for their classes; such a position formed the main principles of their teaching, which state that Russian and other languages had to be left outside the classroom so that they do not upset learners' exposure to Kazakh, especially when teaching academic Kazakh. Furthermore, as Yerassyl stated, "It was assumed that we are already proficient in Kazakh, so our teachers thought that we can express our thoughts in pure Kazakh". Therefore, teachers of Kazakh believed the language mixing to be inappropriate, not only because the courses had an objective to teach academic Kazakh, but also because of the assumption that their students already had an experience in learning Kazakh throughout the eleven years of studying at school.

Thus, taking into consideration the above-mentioned presupposition that the students of academic Kazakh courses already have a good command of Kazakh, the tasks

and assignments were more challenging than those the participating students had in high school. The Kazakh language instructors mostly assigned chapters from Kazakh literary novels to read, and the syllabi contained more advanced grammar and vocabulary. In addition, the classroom discussion topics were about more advanced topics such as domestic violence or globalization. Usually, some teachers provided a list of complex vocabulary with definitions in Kazakh before the class, so that the students can get to know the words they might not know. Moreover, students had speaking and writing assignments. Despite the difference in the proficiency levels among students that occasionally occurred, all the students had to complete the assignments in Kazakh; the classroom discussions and explanation of grammar and vocabulary were also conducted in the Kazakh language only. Even though the rule was not explicit in some cases, students understood its tacit presence and tried to follow it as much as possible. This finding is a little different from the other studies on translanguaging that were conducted in Kazakhstan. For example, Tastanbek (2019), who researched the Kazakhstani English language instructors' beliefs on translanguaging, revealed that students often engaged in hybrid language mixing practices despite the English-only rule.

To sum up, the main practices of the Kazakh language classes were based on the view that Kazakh had to be the only language of instruction in the classroom. Language mixing was not welcomed by language instructors, because they believed that students' long educational experience with Kazakh in their Russian-medium schools helped them to become proficient in Kazakh. Hence, all the activities, assignments, and other tasks had to be conducted and submitted in Kazakh only.

Occasional use of Translanguaging

Though the previous section showed that the Kazakh language classrooms at the research site were usually based on monolingual practices, it was reported that occasional

translanguaging did take place as well. Usually, it was spontaneous or mostly used as a “last resort”, evoking the feeling of guilt in those who resorted to the language mixing practices. This finding can be related to Macaro’s maximal position, where no pedagogical value is viewed in translanguaging practices, but in some cases “teachers have to resort to L1” (2001, p. 535).

First, the participants told about how the hybrid language practices could happen spontaneously. The participating students studied in English and used Russian or English when communicating with friends. Therefore, sometimes the language mixing was just “the slip of the tongue”. This can be related to the notion of spontaneous translanguaging that is “complex discourse practices of bilinguals” (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017, p. 904). When asked a question about spontaneous language mixing, Nurgul claimed that when such practices took place in her classes, she never criticized her students despite the TL-only rule. She said that by being multilingual herself, she could spontaneously translanguage as well, so she was aware of how the multilingual brain works.

Second, the translanguaging practices were applied when describing linguistic or cultural values, jokes, or colloquial metaphors. Here, as Zhaniya pointed out, translanguaging was inevitable due to the need to deliver the context so that students understood the meaning. Though she felt guilty every time she switched to Russian or English, she stated that it was for the sake of knowledge and understanding. She believed that in such situations translanguaging makes students more exposed not only to the target language but to the culture to which the language belongs. Nevertheless, the teacher mentioned that in other cases she follows the main rule of her classroom - to speak Kazakh only.

Third, Russian and English were occasionally used as a last resort. Teachers and students utilized translanguaging when the content was found too incomprehensible and

there was no other ways to explain the topic. The “last resort” translanguaging is never seen as a teaching/learning tool and is often perceived negatively. Indeed, teachers with the monolingual ideology hardly ever view students’ first language(s) as a resource (Auerbach, 1993; Cook, 2001). Usually, such reluctance and minimization of translanguaging practices are justified by the fear of not becoming exposed to the target language, as mentioned in previous sections. Nevertheless, these practices cannot be totally reduced, since students might sometimes need to translate words or phrases to fully understand the studied content. Thus, resorting to students’ first languages cannot be avoided because of the gap between the students’ actual Kazakh proficiency levels and the declared level of Kazakh courses they take.

Therefore, Macaro’s (2014) maximal position can also be traced to the above-mentioned situations. This means that despite the dominating monolingual beliefs, teachers and students use other languages to avoid misunderstandings and increase the comprehension of the content. It is also important to mention that when students were completing their homework or assignments outside of the classroom, they used dictionaries and other materials in their dominant languages to make meaning and increase understanding of the tasks they were assigned. These practices were more spontaneous than planned. According to Lin (2020), such application of hybrid linguistic practices is called spontaneous translanguaging pedagogy, which occurs “without planning or design as the bi-/multilingual teacher spontaneously translanguages (or allows students to spontaneously translanguage or both) to scaffold students’ learning in the ongoing dynamic interaction” (p. 6). Nevertheless, spontaneous translanguaging often evoked a feeling of guilt among those who made use of it during the classroom discussions. For instance, Manan and Tul-Kubra (2020) reported similar findings in their study on Pakistani English language teaching (ELT) practitioners and their “monolingual idealism” (p. 1). There, it

was found that whenever teachers had to resort to students' first languages, they felt "compelled to do so rather than admitting this as a strategic act of effective teaching" (p. 15). Therefore, this finding about the last resort to translanguaging with the accompanying feeling of guilt is consistent with other studies within the Kazakhstani context (Tastanbek, 2019; Amaniyaova, 2020) and outside of it (Copland & Neokleous, 2011; Doiz & Lasagabaster, 2017; Manan, et al., 2020; Manan & Tul-Kubra, 2020; Neokleous, 2017).

Tension between Beliefs and Practices

Although the participating students strongly believed that there should be minimal or no resort to their first languages, there was a controversy between the beliefs and the practices. This was evident from the students' answers to interview questions. To be more precise, students reported that they felt the need to make use of the languages from their repertoire. This means that in actual practice, the feeling of comfort and complete understanding of the course were the first priorities.

According to Basturkmen (2012), the relationships between beliefs and practices are complicated and a mismatch between them is not a rare issue. This was partly true for Nurgul and Zhaniya and fully accurate for student participants of the study. For instance, Nurgul and Zhaniya, who preferred their classroom to be based on completely monolingual assumptions, had to resort to Russian and English in order to enhance the understanding of the subject matter where it was lacking. Yet, in other cases, they maintained "native-like" practices.

Certainly, for students whose proficiency was below intermediate level (that is the level that was declared to be the default one for the first Kazakh course they had to take), different assignments, including home tasks and classroom discussion, were too challenging. For instance, almost all the participants stated that they had to reread the assigned literary readings in Russian since the vocabulary was too complex and many

words were unknown. The students claimed that if readings were at least slightly easier, they would have been more helpful in expanding the Kazakh lexicon, enhancing the contextual understanding, and increasing their overall proficiency level. Unfortunately, such a complexity along with the overloaded curriculum made them feel frustrated when completing the reading assignments.

In addition to reading tasks, students usually had classroom discussions of the chapters or classroom listening tasks. There, students had to follow the Kazakh-only rule strictly, in other words, to speak in pure Kazakh. This was the hardest task for most of the interviewees, especially for the non-ethnic Kazakhs who participated in the research. They had to comply with the monolingual environment in the classroom, so they tried to remain quiet, hoping that teachers would not ask them to share their opinion on a certain topic in front of the class. Nevertheless, students were aware of the important speaking assignments that they had during the exam period. Thus, they knew how the lack of speaking practice might influence their academic performance. Therefore, they forced themselves to speak, even though such situations caused terrible stress that made them feel anxious during the speaking activities.

Taking into consideration the above-mentioned factors, the content that the students had to deal with was hard to comprehend (Krashen, 1985). Therefore, they reported the need for the use of their first language as a mediating tool, which should be used at least until they achieve an upper-intermediate level or above. This supports García and Wei's (2014) ideas that translanguaging as a scaffolding tool can help teachers to ensure the understanding of the content and involvement in new linguistic practices. Moreover, though the monolingual environment is often preferable in language learning settings, the participants stated that with some help of their first language they would feel more secure and comfortable to start speaking in the target language. To them, comfort and security are

the feelings that make one feel more motivated to learn. As one of the participants said, inclusion especially matters for emergent multilinguals. Indeed, as Neokleous (2017) pointed out, the anxiety that students might feel when not allowed to translanguage might have been triggered by the absence of a sense of security and comfort. In addition, Darwin and Norton (2015) theorize that when individuals enter new environments or spaces, they can use their linguistic skills and materials as “affordances” that “transform this capital into something that is regarded as valuable in new contexts” (p. 45). Furthermore, the researchers recommend teachers to reflect on the value of viewing learners’ linguistic and cultural resources as affordances rather than taking their values for granted or viewing them as obstacles. With these ideas of security and inclusion in mind, teacher educators can contribute to the increasing degree of effort that students invest in language classrooms.

For the participants of the study, the meaning-making feature of translanguageing was equally important, because they lacked it in their Kazakh language classes. The participants justified this by providing examples of how they have learned the fundamental knowledge of English with the help of Russian. Thus, they believed that the insufficient understanding of the course content had left a bad influence on their progress, and translanguageing practices could assist in minimizing the bad effect. For instance, students showed their fondness for practices where they or their teachers can make parallels between Kazakh and other languages from their linguistic repertoire. Such cases were also reported in a study conducted by Galante (2020) in an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) program in Canada. One of the major findings of her mixed-method study was students’ encouragement to use their first language(s) to make meaning of the content by finding similarities or differences. Same as the participants of this study, some students from Galante’s research reported that learning English idioms through language mixing

practices was more captivating than simply learning them by heart. Therefore, the study participants viewed translanguaging as a valuable pedagogical tool in practice, while the ideologies or beliefs dictated the “wrong nature” of the presence of other languages’ in the language classroom.

Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter was to explain and discuss the main findings of this study, linking them to the existing literature on the investigating topic. These findings suggest that in general, the monolingual beliefs are still widespread in classes where Kazakh is taught for academic purposes. Moreover, the hybrid language practices take place rather rarely and spontaneously, or not at all. These findings suggest that little value is apparently accorded to translanguaging practices, thus, the participants usually hold the maximal or virtual positions towards translanguaging. This is consistent with the Kazakhstani language ideologies that might result from the history of the Kazakh language and the worldwide dominance of the “languages in solitude” assumption. Despite holding such beliefs, the student participants reported that the Kazakh language courses at their university appeared to be challenging for them. Moreover, they stated that they would not mind applying more use of other languages from their repertoire. This need is justified with the sense of inclusion and comfort that the classes lacked, as well as with the importance of understanding the meaning of the course content. Overall, findings show that even though 75% of the study participants hold monolingual beliefs, all students participating in the research still stated that all languages can be treated as resources, rather than a problem, at least when learning the foundation of the target language.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

The previous chapter covered the discussion of the main findings of the study based on eight semi-structured online interviews with university students and Kazakh language instructors. This chapter presents the major conclusions of this study. The purpose of the current study was to determine Russian-dominant university students' and Kazakh language teachers' beliefs and practices about translanguaging in classes where Kazakh is taught as a subject. The following research questions needed to be answered:

1. What are teachers and students' beliefs towards translanguaging in classes, where Kazakh is taught as a subject?
2. What are teachers and students' practices of translanguaging in classes, where Kazakh is taught as a subject?

Therefore, the final chapter presents the main conclusions and limitations of the study. Towards the end, the implications of the study are discussed, and recommendations are put forth for further research and practices.

Main Conclusions of the Study

The first conclusion is based on the discovery that the monolingual beliefs were prevalent among both teachers and students who participated in this study. In particular, though participants were aware of the multilingual context of the country, some of them still maintained purist views, and were opposed to codeswitching, both inside and outside of the language classroom. When speaking about educational settings, six out of eight participants believed the monolingual environment to be the key to successful language acquisition. For four of them, language mixing can damage the beauty of a pure language and it can become a serious obstacle in target language proficiency development. Such an attitude is a reflection of monolingual bias and associating language mixing with the derogatory term "Shala Kazakh" ("Half-Kazakh"). They believed in compartmentalization

of languages. Teachers justified the need to separate Kazakh from other languages, arguing that Russian-dominant students of this English-medium university hardly ever speak Kazakh outside of the Kazakh language learning classes. Therefore, they were of the view that even occasional recourse to Russian and English can damage the development of the target language.

In line with the above beliefs, the influence of monoglossic beliefs was reflected in the content and design of the Kazakh language classes. The classroom tasks and overall language practices were mostly based on mirroring the monolingual environment, where any kind of language mixing was strictly avoided. In other words, Kazakh was the only medium of instruction, thus the class was following the Kazakh-only rule. This was not new for students because they have experienced monolingually designed Kazakh classes, both at their RMI schools and EMI university. Yet, the participants stated that the rules at their university were stricter than the ones they experienced at school because it was assumed that students already had a sufficient level of Kazakh due to eleven years of learning the target language at school. Therefore, the students were often assigned more challenging tasks, such as chapters from Kazakh literary novels to read, more complex discussion and writing topics, etc. All the assignments had to be completed in Kazakh; classroom discussions and grammar/vocabulary explanation were also conducted purely in Kazakh. Though the Kazakh-only rule was often tacit, students still tried to follow the rule as much as they could to get good grades and prepare for the speaking assignment that they had at the end of each semester.

Although the classroom practices were based on the “two solitudes assumption” (Cummins, 2007), it was reported that hybrid language mixing practices did occur in the classroom, though occasionally. Translanguaging was mostly spontaneous in cases where students had to switch to Kazakh right after their English-medium classes. One of the

participating teachers did not mind such translanguaging, since being multilingual herself, she acknowledged that this is how the multilingual brains of students work. Another teacher who participated in the study stated that she switches to other languages when describing cultural values or jokes which are hard to explain to a non-Kazakh dominant student. In other cases, translanguaging was usually used as a “last resort”. These occasional language mixing practices evoked the feeling of guilt because it was usually considered as a sign of low proficiency of students and teachers’ lack of knowledge about language teaching approaches. Therefore, teachers hardly ever viewed translanguaging as a helpful pedagogical tool.

Another important conclusion concerned the challenges that students experienced when learning Kazakh at the university. Even though students had extensive experience in learning Kazakh, most of them reported the gap between the level of classroom content and the actual level that they had. Students found some tasks beyond their comprehension levels and felt extremely anxious and unmotivated while speaking Kazakh during the class. Though students believed that the usage of other languages might obstruct the Kazakh language acquisition process, they claimed that due to the above-mentioned gap, they felt the need to translanguage. They revealed that those rare and guilt-accompanied translanguaging cases were very meaningful. Moreover, they believed that with a little help of English or Russian, (e.g. when translating or making parallels with other languages), they would have more space for scaffolding and meaning-making. In addition, they were sure that occasional and pedagogically planned language mixing could help them feel more secure, comfortable, and, hence, motivated to proceed with learning the target language. For instance, one of the participants referred to their part-time teaching experiences where their students’ first languages were employed as a pedagogical tool. This particular student

stated that language mixing practices encouraged feelings of inclusion and motivation in her students, which helped them to achieve their language learning goals.

Overall, most participants believed that languages should be learned without the interference of other languages. Since teachers' beliefs oftentimes influence their pedagogical practice, the Kazakh language classroom was based on the Kazakh-only rule, which students tried to follow. Even if sometimes both teachers and students had to use other languages to make sense of the studied content, it evoked the feeling of guilt about the practices of translanguaging. However, students, whose proficiency level was below intermediate level, reported that translanguaging could be applied to make the class content more comprehensible and to make them feel less strained when completing different tasks in Kazakh.

Limitations and Further Implications

In conclusion with the major findings drawn from this study, it is important to consider limitations. First, the main limitation of the study was the lack of time to conduct research at a more significant level. The reasons for this limitation were other intensive courses during the academic year and the new online settings which, as a result of COVID-19 pandemic, led to put even extra psychological pressure on the researcher. Another limitation caused by the pandemic was related to the recruitment process because there was a low number of people interested in participating in the research. Moreover, since the latest academic year at the research site was conducted solely online, the researcher decided not to conduct observations. Therefore, these weaknesses led to the shortening of the sample size. Admittedly, since six student and two teacher participants are a relatively small sample size, it is hard to generalize the findings and apply them to the overall Kazakhstani and global contexts. Furthermore, the study may be limited due to the lack of

empirical research on translanguaging in the context of the Kazakh language learning classes at different levels of education.

The findings and limitations of this study suggest further implications. First, due to the small sample size, research with a bigger number of research sites and participants needs to be conducted on the topic of translanguaging beliefs and practices within the context of the classes where Kazakh is taught as a subject. Further research could be conducted at different educational institutions of different levels with other types of research design and data collection tools. For instance, a mixed-method approach could be used to shed more light on correlations and different patterns of the researched phenomenon in the context of different regions of the country. As Tastanbek (2019) pointed out, translanguaging is a broad concept, therefore, more thorough data collection instruments can help explore the workings of other elements and aspects of the translanguaging notion in relation to the context of Kazakhstan. Moreover, since the participants of the study considered school experience to be insufficient for Kazakh language proficiency development, studies exploring Russian-dominant students' challenges and motivation to learn the Kazakh language at the school level could be conducted.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and concluding remarks of the study, the research proposes several recommendations to policymakers, higher educational institutions, and language teachers. First, considering the findings that voiced students' challenges when learning Kazakh, education policymakers need to take into account the need to implement sustainable translanguaging practices in the "language as a subject" curriculum, because the current Kazakh teaching program does not fully consider the multilingual peculiarities of the country's linguistic context. This could help classroom practitioners feel more

confident and motivated when learning and practicing the target language within the classroom. In addition, teacher-training sessions on the role of translanguaging as a pedagogical tool can be carried out for teacher educators, so that they can possibly minimize and perhaps ultimately neutralize the “languages in solitude” assumption practices in their classes and provide more space for students to engage in scaffolding multilingual practices. Therefore, as many scholars propose, there is a need for challenging the prevailing ‘monoglossic ideologies’ (Manan, 2021), and encourage the opening of ideological and implementational spaces for a transformative multilingual pedagogy, multiple languages, cultures and identities (Hornberger, 2003, 2005; Manan, 2020, 2021; Manan, et al. 2019)

Second, educational institutions could revisit their Kazakh language requirements. The participants of the study often claimed that the gap between their actual proficiency and the courses’ language level was significant. Since participating students claimed that the challenging content and strict monolingual rules harmed their willingness to learn the language, language teachers may need to reconsider and rethink their teaching practices more reflectively, especially when teaching in such unique multilingual settings. According to Batyrkhanova (2020), pedagogical practices of Kazakhstani teacher educators need to employ more “transformative” approaches, which, in this case, can be the implementation of a sustainable translanguaging pedagogy. Even though educators teaching a minority language tend to believe in the detrimental nature of language mixing, translanguaging practices can only enhance the process of language acquisition.

References

- Akanova, G. (2017). *Language ideologies of Kazakhstani youth: The value of Kazakh in the context of a changing linguistic marketplace* [Master's thesis, Nazarbayev University]. Nazarbayev University Repository. <http://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/2374>
- Akbar, F. S. (2013). The case against monolingual bias in multilingualism. *Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, 13(2), 42–44.
- Alvarez, H. D. C. (2020). *Translanguaging in the EFL classroom: its usage, purpose, advantages, and disadvantages as perceived by a group of EFL learners and their educator* [Master's thesis, University of Los Andes]. The Institutional Repository Seneca. <http://hdl.handle.net/1992/43843>
- Amaniyazova, A. (2020). *Kazakhstani Teachers' Beliefs on Translanguaging: Evidence from a Trilingual Context* [Master's thesis, Nazarbayev University]. Nazarbayev University Repository. <http://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/4853>
- Arthur, J., & Martin, P. (2006). Accomplishing lessons in postcolonial classrooms: Comparative perspectives from Botswana and Brunei Darussalam. *Comparative Education*, 42, 177–202.
- Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Re-examining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 9-32.
- Basturkmen, H. (2012). Review of research into the correspondence between language teachers' stated beliefs and practices. *System*, 40, 282–295.
- Batyrkhanova, G. (2020). *Exploring Kazakhstani master's students' language learning experiences and strategy uses in an English-medium university in Kazakhstan: A qualitative inquiry*. [Master's Thesis, Nazarbayev University]. Nazarbayev University Repository. <http://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/4890>

- Belova, X. (2017). *Learners' language use in communication in a multilingual learning environment* [Master's thesis, Nazarbayev University]. Nazarbayev University Repository. <http://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/2579>
- Bley-Vroman, R. (1983). The comparative fallacy in interlanguage study: The case of systematicity. *Language Learning*, 33(1), 1-17.
- Borg, S. (2011). The impact of in-service teacher education on language teachers' beliefs. *System*, 39, 370–380
- Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. SAGE.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful qualitative research: A practical guide for beginners*. Sage Publications Ltd.
- Brinkmann, S. (2013). *Qualitative Interviewing: Understanding qualitative research*. Oxford University Press.
- Bui, Y. N. (2013). *How to write a master's thesis* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Butzkamm, W. & J. Caldwell (2009). *The bilingual reform: A paradigm shift in foreign language teaching*. Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Cenoz, J. (2017). Translanguaging in school contexts: International perspectives. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 16(4), 193-198.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2017). Translanguaging as a pedagogical tool in multilingual education. In J. Cenoz, D. Gorter, & S. May (Eds.), *Language awareness and multilingualism. Encyclopedia of language and education* (3rd ed., pp. 309–321). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02325-0_20-1

- Cenoz, J., & Santos, A. (2020). Implementing pedagogical translanguaging in trilingual schools. *System*, 92, 1-9.
- Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2016). Thematic analysis. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 12(3), 297–298. doi:10.1080/17439760.2016.1262613
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). Routledge.
- Conteh, J. (2018). Translanguaging as pedagogy – A critical review. In A. Creese & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language and superdiversity* (1st ed., pp. 473–487). Routledge.
- Conteh, J., & Meier, G. (2014). *The multilingual turn in languages education: Opportunities and challenges*. Multilingual Matters.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the First Language in the Classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), 402–423. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.3.402>
- Copland, F., & Neokleous, G. (2011). L1 to teach L2: Complexities and contradictions. *ELT journal*, 65(3), 270-280.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 103-115.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2015). Translanguaging and identity in educational settings. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 20–35.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0267190514000233>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 221–240.

- Cummins, J. (2008). Teaching for transfer: Challenging the two solitudes assumption in bilingual education. In J. Cummins & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2nd ed., pp. 65–75). Springer.
- Cummins, J. (2017). Teaching for transfer in multilingual school contexts. In O. García, A. M. Y. Lin, & S. May (Eds.), *Bilingual and multilingual education* (3rd ed., pp. 103–116). Springer International Publishing.
- Cummins, J., Bismilla, V., Chow, P., Cohen, S., Giampapa, F., Leoni, L., Sandhu, P. & Sastri, P. (2005). Affirming identity in multilingual classrooms. *Educational leadership*, 63(1), 38-43.
- Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2015). Identity and a model of investment in applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 36–56.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0267190514000191>
- Dave, B. (1996). National revival in Kazakhstan: Language shift and identity change. *Post-Soviet Affairs*, 12(1), 51–72. doi:10.1080/1060586x.1996.10641415
- De Jong, E. (2011). *Foundations for multilingualism in education: From principles to practice*. Caslon Publishing.
- De Mejía, A.-M. (2004). Bilingual education in Colombia: Towards an integrated perspective. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 7(5), 381–397. doi:10.1080/13670050408667821
- Deroo, M. R., Ponzio, C. M., & De Costa, P. I. (2020). Reenvisioning second language teacher education through translanguaging praxis. In Z. Tian, L. Aghai, P. Sayer, & J. L. Schissel (Eds.), *Envisioning TESOL through a translanguaging lens* (pp. 111–134). Springer.

Djilkisheva, M (2016, July 8) Путевка в глобальную жизнь [A ticket to a global life].

Kazakhstanskaya Pravda. <https://www.kazpravda.kz/fresh/view/putevka-v-globalnuu-zhizn>

Doiz, A., & Lasagabaster, D. (2017). Teachers' beliefs about translanguaging practices. In C. M. Mazak & K. S. Carroll (Eds.), *Translanguaging in higher education: beyond monolingual ideologies* (pp. 29-49). Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.

Escobar, C. F., & Dillard-Paltrineri, E. (2015). Professors and students' conflicting beliefs about translanguaging in the EFL classroom: Dismantling the monolingual bias. *Revista de Lenguas Modernas*, 23, 301–328.

Fierman, W. (2006). Language and education in post-Soviet Kazakhstan: Kazakh-medium instruction in urban schools. *Russian Review*, 65(1), 98–116.

Foster, H. L. (2017). *Imagining the shala-Kazakh: Codeswitching and satire in Post-Soviet Kazakhstan* [Master's thesis, The University of Texas at Austin]. UT Electronic Theses and Dissertations. <http://hdl.handle.net/2152/47167>

Galante, A. (2020). Translanguaging for vocabulary development: A mixed methods study with international students in a Canadian English for Academic Purposes program. In Z. Tian, L. Aghai, P. Sayer, & J. L. Schissel (Eds.), *Envisioning TESOL through a translanguaging lens* (pp. 293-328). Springer.

García, O. (2009). Bilingualism and translanguaging. In García, O. (ed.), *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective* (1st ed., pp. 42–51). Wiley-Blackwell.

García, O., & Kleifgen, J. A. (2010). *Educating emergent bilinguals: Policies, programs, and practices for English language learners*. Teachers College Press.

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education* (1st ed.). Palgrave Pivot.

García, O., Johnson, S. I., & Seltzer, K. (2016). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Caslon Publishing.

Gardner-Chloros, P. (2009). *Codeswitching*. Cambridge University Press.

Goodman, B., & Tastanbek, S. (2020). Making the shift from a codeswitching to a translanguaging lens in English language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 55(1), 29–53. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.571>

Gorenburg, D. (2006). Soviet nationalities policy and assimilation. In D. Arel (Ed.), *Rebounding identities: The politics of identity in Russia and Ukraine* (pp. 273–303). John Hopkins University Press.

Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism*. Harvard University Press.

Grossman, P. L., Wilson, S. M., & Shulman, L. S. (1989). Teachers of substance: Subject matter knowledge for teaching. *Profesorado: Revista de Currículum y Formación del Profesorado*, 9(2), 1-25.

Gutiérrez, K., Baquedano-López, P. & Alvarez, H. (2001). Literacy as hybridity: Moving beyond bilingualism in urban classrooms. In M. D. L. L. Reyes, J. J. Halcon, & S. Nieto (Eds.), *The best for our children: Critical perspectives on literacy for Latino students* (pp. 122–141). Teachers College Press.

Hall, G. (2020). Framing the realities of TESOL practice through a translanguaging lens. In Z. Tian, L. Aghai, P. Sayer, & J. L. Schissel (Eds.), *Envisioning TESOL through a translanguaging lens*. (pp. 67-90). Springer

Helot, C. (2006). Bridging the gap between prestigious bilingualism and the bilingualism of minorities: Towards an integrated perspective of multilingualism in the French

- education context. In M. O. Laoire (ed.), *Multilingualism in educational settings* (pp. 49–72). Schneider Verlag Hohengehren.
- Holliday, A. (2015). Qualitative research and analysis. In B. Paltridge & A. Phakiti (Eds.), *Research methods in applied linguistics* (pp. 32–42). Bloomsbury.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2003). *Continua of biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings*. Multilingual Matters.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2005). Opening and filling up implementational and ideological spaces in heritage language education. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(4), 605-609.
- Joseph, M., & Ramani, E. (2012). “Glocalization”: Going beyond the dichotomy of global versus local through additive multilingualism. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 6(1), 22-34.
- Kachru, Y. (1994). Monolingual bias in SLA research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(4), 795-800.
- Karabassova, L. (2020). Understanding trilingual education reform in Kazakhstan: Why is it stalled? In D. Egéa (Ed.), *Education, equity, economy: Education in Central Asia a kaleidoscope of challenges and opportunities* (1st ed., pp. 37–50). Springer Nature.
- Kirsch, C., & Seele, C. (2020). Translanguaging in early childhood education in Luxembourg: From practice to pedagogy. In J. A. Panagiotopoulou, L. Rosen, & J. Strzykala (Eds.), *Inclusion, education and translanguaging* (pp. 63–81). Springer.
- Kraemer, R., Prishchepov, A. V., Müller, D., Kuemmerle, T., Radeloff, V. C., Dara, A., Terekhov, A., & Frühauf, M. (2015). Long-term agricultural land-cover change and potential for cropland expansion in the former Virgin Lands area of Kazakhstan. *Environmental Research Letters*, 10(5), 1-17.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Longman.

- Kroskrity, P. V. (2004). Language ideologies. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 498–517). Blackwell Publishing.
- Kubanyiova, M. (2014). Motivating language teachers: Inspiring vision. In D. Lasagabaster, A. Doiz & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *Motivation and Foreign Language Learning: From Theory to Practice* (pp. 71–89). John Benjamins.
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2008). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks.
- Langer, N. & A. Nesse (2012). Linguistic purism. In J. M. Hernández-Campoy, & J. C. Conde-Silvestre (Eds.), *The handbook of historical sociolinguistics* (pp. 607–625). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Law of Languages of the Republic of Kazakhstan of July 11, 1997, № 151. (1997).
https://online.zakon.kz/document/?doc_id=1008034.
- Leonet, O., Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2017). Challenging minority language isolation: Translanguaging in a trilingual school in the Basque Country. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 16(4), 216-227.
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), 641-654.
- Li L. (2012). Belief construction and development: Two tales of non-native English speaking student teachers in a TESOL programme. *Novitas-ROYAL*, 6(1), 33-58.
- Lin, A. M. Y. (2020). Introduction: Translanguaging and translanguaging pedagogies. In V. Vaish (Ed.), *Translanguaging in multilingual English classrooms: An Asian perspective and contexts* (pp. 1–9). Springer.
- Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. M. (2013). Preparing linguistically responsive teachers: Laying the foundation in pre-service teacher education. *Theory into Practice*, 52(2), 98-109.

- Macaro, E. (2001). Analysing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision-making. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85, 531- 548. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00124>.
- Macaro, E. (2005). Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: A communication and learning strategy. In E. Llurda (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp. 63-84). Springer.
- Macaro, E. (2009). Teacher use of codeswitching in the second language classroom: Exploring 'optimal' use. In M. Turnbull, & J. Dailey-O'Cain, (Eds.), *First language use in second and foreign language learning* (pp. 35-49). Multilingual Matters.
- Macaro, E. (2014). Overview: Where should we be going with classroom codeswitching research? In R. Barnard & J. McLellan (Eds.), *Codeswitching in university English-medium classes: Asian perspectives* (pp. 10–23). Multilingual Matters.
- Makalela, L. (2016). Ubuntu translanguaging: An alternative framework for complex multilingual encounters. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 34(3), 187-196.
- Manan, S. A. (2020). Teachers as agents of transformative pedagogy: Critical reflexivity, activism and multilingual spaces through a continua of biliteracy lens. *Multilingua*, 39(6), 721-747. doi:10.1515/multi-2019-0096
- Manan, S. A. (2021). Don't Speak Local Languages: An Analysis of Monolingual Habitus in Pakistan. *Linguistic and the Human Sciences*, 15(1), 129–155. <https://doi.org/10.1558/lhs.20037>
- Manan, S. A., & Tul-Kubra, K. (2020). Beyond 'two-solitudes' assumption and monolingual idealism: generating spaces for multilingual turn in Pakistan. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 1-22.

- Manan, S. A., David, M. K., & Channa, L. A. (2019). Opening ideological and implementational spaces for multilingual/plurilingual policies and practices in education: a snapshot of scholarly activism in Pakistan. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 20(5), 521-543. doi:10.1080/14664208.2018.1543162
- Manan, S. A., Dumanig, F. P., & David, M. K. (2015). The English-medium fever in Pakistan: analyzing policy, perceptions and practices through additive bi/multilingual education lens. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 20(6), 736–752.
- Manyak, P. C. (2004). "What did she say?": translation in a primary-grade English immersion class. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 6(1), 12-18.
- Martin, P. (2005). "Safe" language practices in two rural schools in Malaysia: Tensions between policy and practice. In A. M. Y. Lin & P. W. Martin (Eds.), *Decolonisation, globalisation: Language-in-education policy and practice* (pp. 74–97). Multilingual Matters.
- May, S. (2014). Introducing the "multilingual turn". In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education*, (pp. 1-6). Routledge.
- McLeish, J. (1972). The Soviet Conquest of Illiteracy. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 18(4), 307-26.
- Meier, G. S. (2017). The multilingual turn as a critical movement in education: Assumptions, challenges and a need for reflection. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 8(1), 131-161.
- Menken, K., & Sánchez, M. T. (2019). Translanguaging in English-only schools: From pedagogy to stance in the disruption of monolingual policies and practices. *TESOL Quarterly*, 53(3), 741-767.

MoCS (Ministry of Culture and Sports), (2011). *The State Program for the Development and Functioning of Languages in the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2011-2020*.

MoCS.

MoES (Ministry of Education and Science), (2015). *Roadmap of Trilingual Education Development for 2015-2020*. MoES.

Montgomery, P. (2013). *Language law limbo: Nationalization and globalization in Kazakhstan* [Unpublished manuscript].

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). Elite closure as a powerful language strategy: The African case. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 103(1), 149-163.

Nazarbayev, N. (2007). *The Address of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan N. Nazarbayev "New Kazakhstan in the New World"*.

Neokleous, G. (2017). Closing the gap: Student attitudes toward first language use in monolingual EFL classrooms. *TESOL Journal*, 8(2), 314-341.

Otwinowska, A. (2017). English teachers' language awareness: Away with the monolingual bias? *Language Awareness*, 26(4), 304-324.

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of educational research*, 62(3), 307-332.

Pavlenko, A. (2013). Multilingualism in Post-Soviet successor states. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 7(4), 262-271.

Phillipson, R. (1992) *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, R. (2018). Linguistic imperialism. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 1-7). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Poza, L. (2017). Translanguaging: Definitions, implications, and further needs in burgeoning inquiry. *Berkeley Review of Education*, 6(2), 101-128

- Reagan, T. (2019). Language planning and language policy in Kazakhstan. In A. Kirkpatrick & A. J. Liddicoat (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of language education policy in Asia* (pp. 442–451). Routledge.
- Rose, H., & Galloway, N. (2019). *Global Englishes for language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Sembiante, S. F. & Tian, Z. (2020). The Need for Translanguaging in TESOL. In Z. Tian, L. Aghai, P. Sayer, & J. L. Schissel (Eds.), *Envisioning TESOL through a translanguaging lens* (pp. 43-66). Springer.
- Sharygin, E. J., & Guillot, M. (2013). Ethnicity, Russification, and excess mortality in Kazakhstan. *Vienna Yearbook of Population Research*, 11, 219–246.
<https://doi.org/10.1553/populationyearbook2013s219>
- Shin, S. J. (2004). *Developing in two languages*. Multilingual Matters.
- Schwartz, B. D. (1997). On the basis of the basic variety... *Second Language Research*, 13(4), 386–402.
- 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.
- Smagulova, J. (2016). The re-acquisition of Kazakh in Kazakhstan: Achievements and challenges. In S. A. Elise. & J. Smagulova (Eds.), *Language change in Central Asia* (pp. 89-108). De Gruyter Mouton.
- Tastanbek, S. (2019). *Kazakhstani pre-service teacher educators' beliefs on translanguaging* [Master's thesis, Nazarbayev University]. Nazarbayev University Repository. <http://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/4328>

- Tian, Z., Aghai, L., Sayer, P., & Schissel, J. L. (2020). Envisioning TESOL through a translanguaging lens in the era of post-multilingualism. In Z. Tian, L. Aghai, P. Sayer, & J. L. Schissel (Eds.), *Envisioning TESOL through a translanguaging lens* (pp. 1–20). Springer.
- Trask, R. L. (1999). *Key Concepts in Language and Linguistics*. Routledge.
- Trentman, E. (2018, Apr 13). *What is language? The multilingual turn and translanguaging pedagogy*. Emma Trentman.
<https://www.emmatrentman.com/blog/2018/4/4/what-is-language-the-multilingual-turn-and-translanguaging-pedagogy>
- Trentman, E. (2019). Reframing monolingual ideologies in the language classroom: Evidence from Arabic study abroad and telecollaboration. In J. Watzinger-Tharp & K. Paesani (Eds.), *Pathways to paradigm change: Critical examinations of prevailing discourses and ideologies in second language education* (pp. 108–132). Cengage.
- Ubiria, G. (2010). Shala Kazak: Proshloe, nastoyashee, budushchee [Shala Kazak: Past, present, future]. *Asian Politics & Policy*, 2(4), 693-698.
- Van Driel, J. H., Bulte, A. M., & Verloop, N. (2007). The relationships between teachers' general beliefs about teaching and learning and their domain specific curricular beliefs. *Learning and instruction*, 17(2), 156-171.
- Vogel, S., & García, O. (2017). Translanguaging. In G. Noblit. (Ed.), *Oxford research encyclopedia of education*. Oxford University Press.
- Wang, D. (2019). Translanguaging in Chinese foreign language classrooms: students and teachers' attitudes and practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(2), 138-149.

- Wei, L. (2014). Translanguaging knowledge and identity in complementary classrooms for multilingual minority ethnic children. *Classroom Discourse*, 5(2), 158–175
- Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9-30.
- Wheeler, L. (2017). *A linguistic ethnographic perspective on Kazakhstan's trinity of languages: language ideologies and identities in a multilingual university community* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Birmingham]. University of Birmingham eTheses Repository. <http://etheses.bham.ac.uk/id/eprint/7812>
- Woolard, K. A., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1994). Language ideology. *Annual review of anthropology*, 23(1), 55-82.

Appendix A

Interview Protocol

Time of Interview:

Date:

Researcher: Symbat Mukhamediyeva

Participant: Student

Questions:

1. What languages can you speak?
2. When did you start learning Kazakh?
3. Did you have Kazakh language classes at school?
4. What are your views about language mixing in the classrooms?
5. When a person tends to mix languages during conversation, what opinion do you make about him/her? Does it indicate their weakness or strength in the use of languages?
6. When you studied at school, how did you view the use of other languages such as Russian or English in classes where Kazakh is taught as a subject?
7. In your view, was it more advantageous or disadvantageous to use more languages in classes where Kazakh is taught as a subject?
8. How did your teachers manage languages in schools? Did your teachers allow only one or more than one languages in the classroom during your school days?
9. In your view, should languages other than Kazakh be allowed in classes where Kazakh is taught as a subject?
10. Which Kazakh language course have you attended?
11. What kind of rules does your current Kazakh language instructor ask you to follow?
12. How does your current Kazakh teacher conduct their classes where Kazakh is taught as a subject? Is your teacher strict or tolerant about the use of more than language in the classroom? Explain please.
13. How often do you feel that you want to use your first language during classroom activities, doing assignments or homework for the Kazakh language course at your university?
14. Does your experience of learning Kazakh at the university differ from your school experience?
Probe: In what ways?
15. What would be your favorite teacher? Is that the one who only uses one language such as Kazakh or the one who flexibly allows the use of languages more than Kazakh language in the classes where Kazakh is taught as a subject?
16. Should languages be kept separate or not during teaching learning processes?

Сұхбат Протоколы

Сұхбат уақыты:

Сұхбат күні:

Сұхбат беруші: Сымбат Мухамедиева

Сұхбат қатысушы: Студент

Сұрақтары:

1. Сіз қандай тілдерде сөйлейсіз (кез келген деңгейде)?
2. Сіз қазақ тілін қашан үйрене бастадыңыз?
3. Сізде мектепте қазақ тілі сабағы болды ма?
4. Сабақтарда әртүрлі тілдерді араластыру туралы не ойлайсыз?
5. Сөйлесу кезінде адам тілдерді араластыруға бейім болған кезде, бұл қандай әсер сізде қалдырады? Сіздің пікірінше, ол артықшылық немесе кемшілік пе?
6. Сіз мектепте оқып жүрген кезіңізде қазақ тілін үйреткен сабақтарда басқа тілдерді (орыс, ағылшын) қолдану туралы не ойладыңыз?
7. Сіздің ойыңызша, қазақ тілі сабақтарында басқа тілдерді қолдану пайдалы ма?
8. Сіздің қазақ тілі мұғалімі оның сабағында бірнеше тілді қолдануға қалай қарады? Олар бұған жол берді ме?
9. Қазақ тілін оқыту сабақтарында басқа тілдерді қолдануға рұқсат беру керек деп ойлайсыз ба?
10. Сіз қандай қазақ тілі курсын оқып жатырғансыз?
11. Университеттегі қазақ тілі мұғаліміңіздің қандай ережелері болды?
12. Сіздің университетте қазақ тілі оқытушыңыз сабағын қалай өткізеді? Қазақ тілінен басқа тілдерді қолдануға қатаң немесе толерантты көзқарас бар ма?
13. Сынып тапсырмаларын орындау кезінде, үй тапсырмасын орындау кезінде немесе өз бетімен оқуда Сіз өзіңіздің ана тіліңізде көмекке мұқтаж екеніңізді қаншалықты жиі сезінесіз?
14. Қазіргі қазақ тілін үйрену тәжірибеңіз бен мектептегі тәжірибеңіздің айырмашылығы бар ма?
Сынақ: бір тәжірибенің басқадан қаншалықты айырмашылығы бар?
15. Сізге қай мұғалім көбірек ұнайтын еді: өз сабақтарында тек қазақ тілін қолданатын немесе қазақ тілі сабақтарында басқа тілдерді икемді қолданатын және қолдануға мүмкіндік беретін мұғалім?
16. Оқыту/оқу процесінде тілдерді бөлу керек пе, жоқ па?

Интервью Протокол

Время интервью:

Дата:

Исследователь: Сымбат Мухамедиева

Участник: Студент

Вопросы:

1. Какими языками Вы владеете (на любом уровне)?
2. Когда Вы начали учить казахский язык?
3. Были ли у Вас уроки казахского языка в школе?
4. Что Вы думаете о смешении разных языков на уроках?
5. Когда человек во время разговора использует разные языки, что Вы думаете о нем/ней? Для Вас это показатель плохого умения говорить на одном языке, или, скорее, сильная сторона?
6. Когда Вы учились в школе, что Вы думали об использовании других языков (русский, английский) на уроках, где Вас обучали казахскому языку?
7. По Вашему мнению, полезно ли использование других языков на уроках казахского языка?
8. Как Ваши школьные учителя относились к использованию нескольких языков на уроке казахского? Позволяли ли они это на их занятиях?
9. Как Вы думаете, следует ли разрешать использовать другие языки на уроках обучения казахскому языку?
10. Какой курс казахского языка Вы проходили в университете?
11. Какие правила установлены Вашим преподавателем казахского языка в университете?
12. Как Ваш преподаватель проводит уроки казахского языка в университете? Имело ли место строгое или толерантное отношение к использованию других языков помимо казахского? Объясните, пожалуйста.
13. Как часто Вы чувствуете, что нуждаетесь в помощи своего первого языка, выполняя задания на уроке, домашнее задание или самостоятельные работы?
14. 14. Есть ли разница между Вашим нынешним опытом изучения казахского языка от Вашего школьного опыта?
Проба: чем именно отличается один опыт от другого?
15. Какой учитель нравился бы Вам больше: тот, который использует только казахский на своих уроках, или тот, который гибко использовал и позволял бы использовать другие языки на уроках казахского языка?
16. Разделять ли языки или нет во время процесса преподавания/обучения?

Interview Protocol

Time of Interview:

Date:

Researcher: Symbat Mukhamediyeva

Participant: Teacher

Questions:

1. What languages can you speak (at any level)?
2. For how long have you been teaching Kazakh as a subject?
3. What is the main language of instruction in your classes?
4. In your view, should languages other than Kazakh be allowed in classes where Kazakh is taught as a subject?
5. Are there any rules that help you manage languages in your classroom?
6. When your students ask you questions in English, Russian or any other language, in what language do you answer them? Why?
7. When a student tends to mix languages during conversation, what opinion do you make about him/her? Does it indicate their weakness or strength in the use of languages?
8. Who would be your favorite student? Is that the one who only uses one language such as Kazakh or the one who flexibly allows the use of languages more than Kazakh language in the classes where Kazakh is taught as a subject?

Сұхбат Протоколы

Сұхбат уақыты:

Сұхбат күні:

Сұхбат беруші: Сымбат Мухамедиева

Сұхбат қатысушы: Мұғалім

Сұрақтары:

1. Сіз қандай тілдерде сөйлейсіз (кез келген деңгейде)?
2. Сіз қазақ тілін қанша уақыттан бері оқытасыз?
3. Сіздің сыныпта негізгі оқыту тілі қандай?
4. Сіздің ойыңызша, қазақ тілі сабағында орыс / ағылшын / басқа тілдерді қолдануға бола ма? Неліктен?
5. Сіздің сабағыңызда оқушыларыңыздан қандай ережелерді сақтауды сұрайсыз?
6. Студенттеріңіз сізге ағылшын / орыс немесе басқа тілдерде сұрақтар қойғанда, Сіз оларға қай тілде жауап бересіз? Неге?
7. Сөйлесу кезінде адам тілдерді араластыруға бейім болған кезде, бұл қандай әсер Сізде қалдырады? Сіздің пікірінше, ол артықшылық немесе кемшілік пе?
8. Сіз студенттеріңізден нені көргіңіз келеді: сабақта тек қана қазақ тілін қолдану немесе қазақ тілі сабақтарында басқа тілдерді икемді пайдалану?

Интервью Протокол

Время интервью:

Дата:

Исследователь: Сымбат Мухамедиева

Участник: Учитель

Вопросы:

1. Какими языками Вы владеете (на любом уровне)?
2. Как давно Вы преподаете казахский язык?
3. Какой основной язык инструкции на ваших занятиях?
4. Как Вы думаете, следует ли разрешать использовать другие языки на уроках обучения казахскому языку?
5. Есть ли на Ваших уроках какие-то определенные правила, связанные с использованием языка(ов)?
6. Когда Ваши ученики спрашивают у Вас вопросы на английском, русском или других языках, на каком языке Вы отвечаете им?
7. Когда студент во время разговора использует разные языки, что Вы думаете о нем/ней? Для Вас это показатель плохого умения говорить на одном языке, или, скорее, сильная сторона? Почему?
8. Что Вы предпочитаете видеть в своих учениках: использование только казахского языка на уроках или периодическое гибкое использование других языков из их репертуара на уроках казахского языка?

Appendix B

Informed Consent Form

Exploring University Teachers' and Students' Beliefs and Practices about Translanguaging in Kazakh Language Learning Classes

DESCRIPTION: You are invited to participate in a research study on exploring university teachers' and students' beliefs and practices of the usage of their first language(s) in the Kazakh language learning classes. You will be asked to participate in an interview and answer 10-15 questions in English or Russian. If you agree, the interview will be audio recorded. All the information about you and your educational background will be strictly anonymous and the data collected will be kept on devices available for the researcher only. All the notes and printed data will be kept in a secured place of the researcher's room, and will be destroyed as soon as the project is completed.

TIME INVOLVEMENT: Your participation will take approximately 30-45 minutes.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: This study has very minimal risks for its participants. The research is confidential and anonymous, and for reducing potential risks, the participants' names will not be used. Each of them will be assigned a pseudonym. The name of their educational institution will be hidden, too. The obtained data will be kept on devices, which will be secured with passwords known for the researcher only. No information about the research participants will be shared with other people. Moreover, the participants can withdraw from the study at any time. You will not get direct benefits from participating in the interview. The indirect benefits which may reasonably be expected to result from this study are getting to share personal narratives, which can help to raise awareness of policymakers on multilingual practices in the "language as subject" curriculum, since it will present the voices of students and teachers— the "protagonists" of the learning process; and to impact on the way educators and emergent multilingual students reflect on the language learning experience. Moreover, since there is a lack of research on the usage of other languages in Kazakh language classes, this research and the data obtained can contribute to the body of literature on this topic. Your decision whether or not to participate in this study will not affect your grades in school, studies and status.

PARTICIPANT'S RIGHTS: If you have read this form and have decided to participate in this project, please understand that you have the right to refuse to answer particular questions. The results of this research study may be presented at scientific or professional meetings or published in scientific journals.

CONTACT INFORMATION:

Questions: If you have any questions, concerns or complaints about this research, its procedures, risks and benefits, contact the Master's Thesis Supervisor for this student work, Associate Professor Syed Abdul Manan at syed.manan@nu.edu.kz

Independent Contact: If you are not satisfied with how this study is being conducted, or if you have any concerns, complaints, or general questions about the research or your rights as a participant, please contact the NUGSE Research Committee at 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 _____

Зерттеу Жұмысы Келісімінің Ақпараттық Формасы
Оқытушылар мен Университет Студенттерінің Қазақ Тілі Сабағында
Транслингвизмге Сенімдері мен Тәжірибелерін Зерттеу

СИПАТТАМА: Сіздерді жоғары оқу орындарының студенттері мен олардың оқытушыларының қазақ тілі сабағында бірінші тілді (тілдерді) қолдану практикасы мен тәжірибесін зерттеуге қатысуға шақырамыз Сізге ағылшын, қазақ немесе орыс тілдеріндегі 10-15 сұрақтан тұратын сұхбатқа қатысу сұралады қатысу ұсынылады. Сұхбат Сіздің келісіміңізбен диктофонға жазылады. Сіз туралы барлық ақпарат толықтай құпия болады және сұхбат барысында алынған барлық мәліметтер тек зерттеуші ғана қол жеткізе алатын құрылғыларда сақталады. Сұхбаттан алынған барлық жазбалар мен баспа деректері арнайы қорапта сақталады және зерттеу аяқталғаннан кейін жойылады.

ӨТКІЗІЛЕТІН УАҚЫТЫ: Сіздің қатысуыңыз шамамен 30-45 минут уақытыңызды алады.

**ЗЕРТТЕУ ЖҰМЫСЫНА ҚАТЫСУДЫҢ ҚАУІПТЕРІ МЕН
АРТЫҚШЫЛЫҚТАРЫ:**

Зерттеу жұмысына қатысудың қауіптері өте аз. Зерттеу толығымен құпия және жасырын болып табылады, және ықтимал тәуекелдерді азайту үшін Сіздің атыңыз қолданылмайды. Ол бүркеншік атпен ауыстырылады және Сіздің оқу орнының атауы жасырылады. Сұхбат барысында алынған мәліметтер құрылғыда зерттеушінің өзіне ғана белгілі және бейтаныс адамдардан жасырылған парольмен сақталады. Сонымен қатар, Сіз кез-келген уақытта сұхбаттасудан бас тарта аласыз. Сұхбатқа қатысу Сізге тікелей пайда әкелмейді. Күтілетін жанама артықшылықтар ретінде Сіздер оқу процесінің кейіпкерлері, мұғалімдер мен студенттердің дауыстарын тыңдауға көмектесетін оқиғаларыңызбен бөлісе аласыз, сондықтан тіл саясаткерлерінің қазақ тілі сабақтарындағы көптілді тәжірибелер туралы хабардарлығын арттырасыз. Сондай-ақ, Сіздің қатысуыңыз көптілді студенттер мен олардың мұғалімдерінің тілді үйрену тәжірибесін көру мен талдауға оң ықпал етуге көмектеседі. Сонымен қатар, Сіз біздің мемлекет шеңберінде зерттелген тұжырымдаманың дамуына үлес қосуға көмектесесіз. Сіздің қатысуға қабылдау немесе бас тарту туралы шешіміңіз Сіздің университеттегі оқуларыңыз бен бағаларыңызға әсер етпейді.

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 зерттеушінің магистрлық тезисі бойынша жетекшісімен хабарласуыңызға болады. Қауымдастырылған Профессор Саид Абдул Манан syed.manan@nu.edu.kz

ДЕРБЕС БАЙЛАНЫС АҚПАРАТТАРЫ: Егер берілген зерттеу жұмысының жүргізілуімен қанағаттанбасаңыз немесе сұрақтарыңыз бен шағымдарыңыз болса, Назарбаев Университеті Жоғары Білім беру мектебінің Зерттеу Комитетімен көрсетілген байланыс құралдары арқылы хабарласуыңызға болады: электрондық поштамен 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
Исследование убеждений и практики учителей и студентов университета о
транслингвизме на уроках казахского языка

ОПИСАНИЕ: Вы приглашены принять участие в исследовании убеждений и практики использования первого языка(ов) их студентов и их учителей на уроках казахского языка. Вам будет предложено принять участие в интервью, состоящего из 10-15 вопросов на английском или русском языке. Интервью будет записано на диктофон с Вашего согласия. Вся информация о Вас будет полностью конфиденциальна и все полученные во время интервью данные будут сохранены лишь на тех устройствах, доступ к которым есть только у самого исследователя. Все заметки и распечатанные данные с интервью будут храниться в специальном защищенном ящике и будут уничтожены после завершения исследования.

ВРЕМЯ УЧАСТИЯ: Ваше участие потребует около 30-45 минут.

РИСКИ И ПРЕИМУЩЕСТВА: Риски, связанные с исследованием, очень минимальны. Исследование полностью конфиденциально и анонимно, и для снижения потенциальных рисков, Ваше имя не будет использоваться. Оно будет заменено на псевдоним, а название Вашего образовательного учреждения будет скрыто. Полученные во время интервью данные будут храниться на устройстве с паролем, известным только для самого исследователя и скрыты от посторонних людей. Также, Вы можете отказаться от участия в интервью в любой момент. Вы не получите прямой пользы от участия в интервью. В качестве ожидаемых не прямых преимуществ, Вы сможете поделиться своими историями, которые могут помочь услышать голоса учителей и учеников, протагонистов образовательного процесса, следовательно, повысить осведомленность языковых политиков о полиязычных практиках на уроках казахского языка. Также, Ваше участие поможет положительно повлиять на то, как полиязычные студенты и их учителя видят и анализируют опыт изучения языка. Более того, Вы поможете внести вклад в развитие изучаемого концепта в рамках нашего государства. Ваше решение о согласии либо отказе в участии никаким образом не повлияет на ваше обучение и оценки 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 магистерского тезиса исследователя: Ассоциированный Профессор Саид Абдул Манан, syed.manan@nu.edu.kz.

Независимые контакты: Если Вы не удовлетворены проведением данного исследования, если у Вас возникли какие-либо проблемы, жалобы или вопросы, Вы можете связаться с Комитетом Исследований Высшей Школы Образования Назарбаев Университета, отправив письмо на электронный адрес gse_researchcommittee@nu.edu.kz

Пожалуйста, подпишите данную форму, если Вы согласны участвовать в исследовании.

- Я внимательно изучил представленную информацию;
- Мне предоставили полную информацию о целях и процедуре исследования;
- Я понимаю, как будут использованы собранные данные, и что доступ к любой конфиденциальной информации будет иметь только 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: _____

Informed Consent Form

Exploring University Teachers' and Students' Beliefs and Practices about Translanguaging in Kazakh Language Learning Classes

DESCRIPTION: You are invited to participate in a research study on exploring university teachers' and students' beliefs and practices of the usage of their first language(s) in the Kazakh language learning classes. You will be asked to participate in an interview and answer 10-15 questions in English or Russian. If you agree, the interview will be audio recorded. All the information about you and your educational background will be strictly anonymous and the data collected will be kept on devices available for the researcher only. All the notes and printed data will be kept in a secured place of the researcher's room, and will be destroyed as soon as the project is completed.

TIME INVOLVEMENT: Your participation will take approximately 25-35 minutes.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: This study has very minimal risks for its participants. The research is confidential and anonymous, and for reducing potential risks, the participants' names will not be used. Each of them will be assigned a pseudonym. The name of their educational institution will be hidden, too. The obtained data will be kept on devices, which will be secured with passwords known for the researcher only. No information about the research participants will be shared with other people. Moreover, the participants can withdraw from the study at any time. The benefits which may reasonably be expected to result from this study are getting to share personal narratives, which can help to raise awareness of policymakers on multilingual practices in the "language as subject" curriculum, since it will present the voices of teachers and students – the "protagonists" of the learning process; and to impact on the way educators and emergent multilingual students reflect on the language learning experience. Moreover, since there is a lack of research on the usage of other languages in Kazakh language classes, this research and the data obtained can contribute to the body of literature on this topic. Your decision whether or not to participate in this study will not affect your employment.

PARTICIPANT'S RIGHTS: If you have read this form and have decided to participate in this project, please understand that you have the right to refuse to answer particular questions. The results of this research study may be presented at scientific or professional meetings or published in scientific journals.

CONTACT INFORMATION:

Questions: If you have any questions, concerns or complaints about this research, its procedures, risks and benefits, contact the Master's Thesis Supervisor for this student work, Associate Professor Syed Abdul Manan at syed.manan@nu.edu.kz

Independent Contact: If you are not satisfied with how this study is being conducted, or if you have any concerns, complaints, or general questions about the research or your rights as a participant, please contact the NUGSE Research Committee at 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 _____

Зерттеу Жұмысы Келісімінің Ақпараттық Формасы
Оқытушылар мен Университет Студенттерінің Қазақ Тілі Сабағында
Транслингвизмге Сенімдері мен Тәжірибелерін Зерттеу

СИПАТТАМА: Сіздерді жоғары оқу орындарының студенттері мен олардың оқытушыларының қазақ тілі сабағында бірінші тілді (тілдерді) қолдану практикасы мен тәжірибесін зерттеуге қатысуға шақырамыз Сізге ағылшын, қазақ немесе орыс тілдеріндегі 10-15 сұрақтан тұратын сұхбатқа қатысу сұралады қатысу ұсынылады. Сұхбат Сіздің келісіміңізбен диктофонға жазылады. Сіз туралы барлық ақпарат толықтай құпия болады және сұхбат барысында алынған барлық мәліметтер тек зерттеуші ғана қол жеткізе алатын құрылғыларда сақталады. Сұхбаттан алынған барлық жазбалар мен баспа деректері арнайы қорапта сақталады және зерттеу аяқталғаннан кейін жойылады.

ӨТКІЗІЛЕТІН УАҚЫТЫ: Сіздің қатысуыңыз шамамен 25-35 минут уақытыңызды алады.

**ЗЕРТТЕУ ЖҰМЫСЫНА ҚАТЫСУДЫҢ ҚАУІПТЕРІ МЕН
АРТЫҚШЫЛЫҚТАРЫ:**

Зерттеу жұмысына қатысудың қауіптері өте аз. Зерттеу толығымен құпия және жасырын болып табылады, және ықтимал тәуекелдерді азайту үшін Сіздің атыңыз қолданылмайды. Ол бүркеншік атпен ауыстырылады және Сіздің оқу орнының атауы жасырылады. Сұхбат барысында алынған мәліметтер құрылғыда зерттеушінің өзіне ғана белгілі және бейтаныс адамдардан жасырылған парольмен сақталады. Сонымен қатар, Сіз кез-келген уақытта сұхбаттасудан бас тарта аласыз. Сұхбатқа қатысу Сізге тікелей пайда әкелмейді. Күтілетін жанама артықшылықтар ретінде Сіздер оқу процесінің кейіпкерлері, мұғалімдер мен студенттердің дауыстарын тыңдауға көмектесетін оқиғаларыңызбен бөлісе аласыз, сондықтан тіл саясаткерлерінің қазақ тілі сабақтарындағы көптілді тәжірибелер туралы хабардарлығын арттырасыз. Сондай-ақ, Сіздің қатысуыңыз көптілді студенттер мен олардың мұғалімдерінің тілді үйрену тәжірибесін көру мен талдауға оң ықпал етуге көмектеседі. Сонымен қатар, Сіз біздің мемлекет шеңберінде зерттелген тұжырымдаманың дамуына үлес қосуға көмектесесіз. Зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға келісім беруіңіз немесе бас тартуыңыз Сіздің жұмысыңызға 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 зерттеушінің магистрлық тезисі бойынша жетекшісімен хабарласуыңызға болады. Қауымдастырылған Профессор Саид Абдул Манан syed.manan@nu.edu.kz

ДЕРБЕС БАЙЛАНЫС АҚПАРАТТАРЫ: Егер берілген зерттеу жұмысының жүргізілуімен қанағаттанбасаңыз немесе сұрақтарыңыз бен шағымдарыңыз болса, Назарбаев Университеті Жоғары Білім беру мектебінің Зерттеу Комитетімен көрсетілген байланыс құралдары арқылы хабарласуыңызға болады: электрондық поштамен 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
Исследование убеждений и практики учителей и студентов университета о
транслингвизме на уроках казахского языка

ОПИСАНИЕ: Вы приглашены принять участие в исследовании убеждений и практики использования первого языка(ов) их студентов и их учителей на уроках казахского языка. Вам будет предложено принять участие в интервью, состоящего из 10-15 вопросов на английском или русском языке. Интервью будет записано на диктофон с Вашего согласия. Вся информация о Вас будет полностью конфиденциальна и все полученные во время интервью данные будут сохранены лишь на тех устройствах, доступ к которым есть только у самого исследователя. Все заметки и распечатанные данные с интервью будут храниться в специальном защищенном ящике и будут уничтожены после завершения исследования.

ВРЕМЯ УЧАСТИЯ: Ваше участие потребует около 25-35 минут.

РИСКИ И ПРЕИМУЩЕСТВА:

Риски, связанные с исследованием, очень минимальны. Исследование полностью конфиденциально и анонимно, и для снижения потенциальных рисков, Ваше имя не будет использоваться. Оно будет заменено на псевдоним, а название Вашего образовательного учреждения будет скрыто. Полученные во время интервью данные будут храниться на устройстве с паролем, известным только для самого исследователя и скрыты от посторонних людей. Также, Вы можете отказаться от участия в интервью в любой момент. Вы не получите прямой пользы от участия в интервью. В качестве ожидаемых не прямых преимуществ, Вы сможете поделиться своими историями, которые могут помочь услышать голоса учителей и учеников, протагонистов образовательного процесса, следовательно, повысить осведомленность языковых политиков о полиязычных практиках на уроках казахского языка. Также, Ваше участие поможет положительно повлиять на то, как полиязычные студенты и их учителя видят и анализируют опыт изучения языка. Более того, Вы поможет внести вклад в развитие изучаемого концепта в рамках нашего государства. Ваше решение о согласии либо отказе в участии никаким образом не повлияет на Вашу работу.

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 магистерского тезиса исследователя: Ассоциированный Профессор Саид Абдул Манан, syed.manan@nu.edu.kz.

Независимые контакты: Если Вы не удовлетворены проведением данного исследования, если у Вас возникли какие-либо проблемы, жалобы или вопросы, Вы можете связаться с Комитетом Исследований Высшей Школы Образования

Назарбаев Университета, отправив письмо на электронный адрес gse_researchcommittee@nu.edu.kz

Пожалуйста, подпишите данную форму, если Вы согласны участвовать в исследовании.

- Я внимательно изучил представленную информацию;
- Мне предоставили полную информацию о целях и процедуре исследования;
- Я понимаю, как будут использованы собранные данные, и что доступ к любой конфиденциальной информации будет иметь только 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 C

Transcription Sample of Interview

Researcher: Let us move on to talk about your university experience. So, what Kazakh language courses have you attended at the university?

Participant: I took both intermediate and upper-intermediate Kazakh courses in a row, each semester.

Researcher: Wow! How was it? Was it complicated?

Participant: It was not very challenging. I just enrolled in the courses, completed them and forgot about them. I see other students feeling anxious about taking these courses because of their low level of Kazakh proficiency, but I feel like I need to share with every one of them that taking these courses is not actually that complicated. I was not very proficient in Kazakh, but still I could complete the course with a good grade.

Researcher: Well done! This is great, actually. What kind of rules does your university Kazakh language instructors ask you to follow?

Participant: They strongly emphasise the importance of speaking Kazakh only. It was not an explicit rule, it was tacit. Yet, the rule was stricter than the one I had at school.

Researcher: How does your current Kazakh teacher conduct their classes where Kazakh is taught as a subject? Is your teacher strict or tolerant about the use of more than language in the classroom? Explain please.

Participant: Well, I had a loyal teacher at an intermediate class. Well, the teacher did not actually approve of us speaking Russian. If someone says something in Russian, the teacher would kindly ask to repeat the utterance in Kazakh. But the teacher at the upper-intermediate course had a more negative attitude towards translanguaging. The classroom energy was negative in a way, because we knew we could receive a penalty point for resorting to Russian.

Researcher: I see... Considering this Kazakh-only rule, how often did you feel that you want to use your first language during classroom activities, doing assignments or homework for the Kazakh language course at your university?

Participant: Constantly. Well, it was easier when completing home tasks, because I knew that I could use a dictionary or ask my Kazakh speaking friends for help. I remember it was always so stressful for me when there were tasks where we needed to watch, for example, news or talk show in Kazakh. We needed to watch the video, we had questions we needed to answer and discuss. It was so hard... The complexity was in understanding the subject matter, especially when you know that there are further questions that need to be discussed. I felt so uncomfortable. If I am not mistaken, we could not use our phones or dictionaries during the second course. So I was always hoping not to be asked.

Researcher: So, the higher the course level is the lesser resort to Russian?

Participant: Yes, exactly.

Researcher: Interesting. Where there any situations when your Kazakh language instructor gave you a list of unknown words so that you could understand the content better?

Participant: Yes, our intermediate Kazakh language teacher did that. That was one of the core elements of our intermediate course. Not at an upper-intermediate course. I guess, it was assumed that for B2 level we have to know these words.

Researcher: Interesting. Can you please tell me, does your experience of learning Kazakh at the university differ from your school experience?

Participant: Honestly, I knew Kazakh much better at school, because it was everywhere. We had a few classes taught through the medium of Kazakh. I can tell that my Kazakh was pretty good at high school, I felt pretty comfortable speaking it. My vocabulary was good, my Kazakh proficiency was at least at B1 level. Then I graduated and stopped practicing it as much as I did at high school, and after taking two academic Kazakh courses as a

sophomore university student I can't say that they were very helpful. Due to the complicated course content I just did my best to have good marks, that is it.

Researcher: Since we mentioned teachers' attitudes, what would be your favorite teacher? Is that the one who only uses one language such as Kazakh or the one who flexibly allows the use of languages more than Kazakh language in the classes where Kazakh is taught as a subject?

Participant: The second one, I think. Yes, definitely the second one. Because it's about progress and comfort... When you feel comfortable when learning a language, you become more and more motivated to learn. Such comfort and motivation make you progress. That was what I experienced at high school.

Researcher: So, now I want to ask you a summing-up question. Should languages be kept separate or not during teaching learning processes?

Participant: No. Again, it is all about comfort, motivation, and progress. Well, those people who stand for the usage of one language only, are probably afraid that it would have a negative effect on the language itself. They are afraid that if one uses Russian words in Kazakh, then the language can get worse or damaged. More of a purist view that they believe in. But Kazakh is a strong language! If there is sustainable usage of Russian or English, it can only help. This cannot damage the Kazakh language. Kazakh will always be a beautiful and strong language. Translanguaging is just a helpful tool for those who are learning Kazakh. Instead of being negative about it, it is better to adopt it as a supportive element that can boost someone's Kazakh proficiency. That would be a great practice that could help to avoid the anxiety and stress that many non-Kazakh speaking people feel when trying to learn Kazakh.

Researcher: We covered all the questions. Do you have anything else to add?

Participant: No, thank you. Good luck with thesis writing!