The Latinization of the Kazakh Alphabet: Kazakh Language Teachers' Perceptions and Readiness

Nurziya Oralbayeva

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Multilingual Education

Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education

May, 2020

Word count: 19,869

Author Agreement

AUTHOR AGREEMENT

By signing and submitting this license, I, Nurziya Orazbayeva 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:

18.05.2020

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: *Qroff*

Date: *18.05.2020*

Ethical Approval

NAZARBAYEV
UNIVERSITY
Graduate School
of Education

53 Kabanbay Batyr Ave.
010000 Astana,
Republic of Kazakhstan
November 2019

Dear Nurziya Oralbayeva,

This letter now confirms that your research project entitled: **"Teachers' Perceptions and Attitudes towards the Latinization in Two Mainstream Schools in Nur-Sultan"** 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

Dr. Mukul Saxena
mukul.saxena@nu.edu.kz

On behalf of Elaine Sharplin
Chair of the GSE Research Committee
Professor
Graduate School of Education
Nazarbayev University

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

CITI Training Certificate

Completion Date 06-Jul-2019
Expiration Date 05-Jul-2022
Record ID 32303980

This is to certify that:

Nurziya Oralbayeva

Has completed the following CITI Program course:

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

Under requirements set by:

Nazarbayev University

Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative

Verify at www.citiprogram.org/verify/?w22f41270-3f3d-4622-a7fd-fff7250bca1c-32303980

Completion Date 06-Jul-2019
Expiration Date 05-Jul-2023
Record ID 32173732

This is to certify that:

Nurziya Oralbayeva

Has completed the following CITI Program course:

Responsible Research Training (Curriculum Group)
Social, Behav, Edu, Etc (Course Learner Group)
1 - Basic Course (Stage)

Under requirements set by:

Nazarbayev University

Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative

Verify at www.citiprogram.org/verify/?wa7db960e-1901-49e8-a875-e9b4b24b3a81-32173732

Acknowledgements

Abstract

The Latinization of the Kazakh Alphabet: Kazakh Language Teachers' Perceptions and Readiness

The transition of the Kazakh alphabet has been a topical issue in the language policy of Kazakhstan. Since the decree on the alphabet revision was adopted (Nazarbayev, 2017), a fair amount of research has been conducted on the public support and acceptance of Latinization. However, as identified from the literature, the educational aspects of the transition like teacher training, teachers' readiness to teach and learn, as well as the difficulties and ease of students' learning the Kazakh Latin script, require further exploration (Kadirova, 2018). Thus teachers are responsible for implementing it in educational settings. In this regard, the present study aimed to explore teachers' perceptions of the transition and of their learning and teaching readiness as educational aspects of Latinization. To achieve this purpose, the study posed three questions: 1) How do Kazakh language teachers perceive the shift from the Cyrillic to the Latin alphabet? 2) How do Kazakh language teachers perceive the learning of the script themselves and by their students? 3) How do Kazakh language teachers perceive their readiness to teach using the new alphabet and orthography? The study employed an interview-based qualitative case study design, involving semi-structured interviews with the participants. Eight Kazakh language teachers, who had undergone training on Latinization, were recruited from three mainstream mixed language schools in Nur-Sultan. The findings revealed that teachers interpreted the transition based on the official policy documents. Regarding the learning, they perceived its ease and difficulty by drawing on several factors such as the familiarity with English and transfer of skills. Teachers' perceptions of their readiness were interpreted through their in-class practices of using the Latin alphabet. The study presented implications for further research focusing on optimal ways of teaching and learning the

script and recommendations for policymakers and researchers in terms of making informed

decisions about the implementation of the Latin script in educational institutions.

Аңдатпа

Қазақ Әліпбиін Латындандыру: Қазақ Тілі Мұғалімдерінің Қабылдауы мен Дайындығы

Қазақ әліпбиінің латын қарпіне ауысуы Қазақстанның тіл саясатындағы өзекті мәселелердің бірі. Әліпбиді қайта қарау жайлы жарлық қабылданғаннан бері (Назарбаев, 2017), осы тақырып аясында халықтың латындандыруды қолдауы және қабылдауы бойынша біршама ғылыми зерттеу жұмыстары жарық көрді. Дегенмен, латындандырудың білім беру үрдісіндегі ерекшеліктері, мысалы, мұғалімдердің латын әліпбиін үйрену мен оқытуға дайындығы, қазақ латын әліпбиін үйренудің жеңіл немесе қиын болуы секілді ерекшеліктері әлі де зерттеуді қажет етеді (Кадирова, 2018). Мұғалімдер қазақ латын әліпбиін мектеп қабырғасында үйретуге жауапты тұлға болып саналады. Осыған орай, бұл зерттеу жұмысының мақсаты мұғалімдердің Латындандыру жайлы түсініктері мен Латын әліпбиін үйренуге және үйретуге дайындығын қалай қабылдайтынын анықтау. Аталған мақсатқа жету үшін үш зерттеу сұрағы қойылды: 1) Мұғалімдер әліпби ауысуын қалай қабылдайды? 2) Латын әліпбиін үйренуді өз тараптарынан және оқушылар тарапынан қалай қабылдайды? 3) Латын әліпбиінде оқытуға дайындығын қалай қабылдайды? Осы сұрақтарға жауап беру үшін жартылай құрылымдалған сұхбатқа негізделген кейсті сапалық зерттеу әдісі қолданылды. Зерттеуге Нұр-Сұлтан қаласындағы үш қазақ-орыс мектебінің латындандыру бойынша дайындық курсына қатысқан сегіз Қазақ тілі пәнінің мұғалімдері қатысып, олардан сұхбат алынды. Зерттеу нәтижесіне сәйкес, мұғалімдер әліпби өзгерісін ресми құжаттар тұрғысынан қабылдайды, ал оқушылардың ағылшын тілі әліпбиінен хабардар болуы мен олардың жазу және оқу машқтарын өзге тілдерге ауыстыра білу қабілеті үйрену үрдісін жеңілдетеді деп сенеді. Мұғалімдердің латын әліпбиін қолдану дайындығы туралы түсініктері

олардың сыныптағы латын әліпбиін қолдану тәжірибелеріне сәйкес қалыптасқан, сондықтан өздерінің дайындық деңгейін орташа бағалайды. Зерттеу нәтижелері мен ұстаздардың ұсыныстары негізінде латын әліпбиін меңгеру мен оқытуға арналған ұтымды шешімдерді қарастыру сұрағы әрі қарай зерттеуді қажет ететіні анықталды. Бұл зерттеу жұмысы латын әліпбиін білім беру жүйесіне енгізу барысы жайлы тіл мамандары мен тіл саясаты мамандарының шешім қабылдауына септігін тигізуі мүмкін.

Аннотация

Латинизация Казахского Алфавита: Восприятия и Готовность Учителей Казахского Языка

Переход Казахского алфавита на Латиницу является одной из актуальных вопросов языковой политики Казахстана. С момента принятия указа о пересмотре алфавита (Назарбаев, 2017), было проведено немало исследований, направленных на принятие и поддержку Латинизации общественностью. Тем не менее, как указано в литературе (Кадирова, 2018), образовательные аспекты перехода алфавита, такие как подготовка учителей, определение сложностей изучения нового алфавита учениками и учителями, готовность учителей к преподаванию казахского языка на латинской графике требуют дальнейшего изучения. Таким образом, учителя несут ответственность за реализацию Латинизации в образовательных учреждениях. В связи с этим, настоящее исследование направлено на изучение восприятий учителей о переходе на Латиницу и об их готовности к преподаванию, используя Латинскую графику. Для достижения цели поставлены три вопроса: 1) Как учителя Казахского языка воспринимают переход от кириллицы к латинскому алфавиту? 2) Как они воспринимают изучение Латинского алфавита самими и своими учениками? 3) Как они воспринимают свою готовность преподавать казахский язык через латинский алфавит? Чтобы ответить на эти вопросы, исследователь использовал метод качественного кейс-стади на основе интервью, включающий полу-структурированные интервью с участниками. Восемь учителей казахского языка, прошедшие специализированное обучение по латинизации, были отобраны для интервью из трёх казахско-русских школ в Нур-Султане. Результаты показали, что учителя интерпретируют переход на основе официальных документов, а в отношении обучения они воспринимают его лёгкость и сложность, опираясь на

несколько факторов, таких как знание английского языка и передача навыков с одного языка на другой. Представления учителей об их готовности основаны на их практике использования латинского алфавита, исходя из этого они воспринимают свою готовность на среднем уровне. Результаты данного исследования выявили, что необходимо провести больше исследований, направленных на оптимальные решения в преподавании и изучении латинского алфавита казахского языка. Это могло бы поспособствовать принятию обоснованных решений ответственными лицами о внедрении латинского алфавита в учебных заведениях.

Table of Contents

List of tables

Chapter 1: Introduction

This chapter aims to provide general information that covers the research background, statement of the problem, and research purpose. It also presents the research questions that guide the present study on teachers' perceptions of the alphabet transition and its educational aspects. The chapter is concluded by stating the significance of the research in the Kazakhstani context and indicating its benefits for different stakeholders.

Background Information

Historically, the writing of the Kazakh language was deeply rooted in the legacies of Turkic, Islamic, and Soviet worlds and varied from runic to alphabetic systems, changing over time (Smagulova, 2008). However, alphabet change reached its highest peak and raised heated debates during the Soviet Union's *korenizatsiia* (nativization) policy, when the Kazakh Latin alphabet, introduced in 1924, was replaced by the Cyrillic one (Smagulova, 2008, 2016). Eventually, with the aim of abandoning the Soviet Russification policy, Kazakhstan took a confident step toward modernizing and increasing the status of the Kazakh language by redefining the language-related laws since the declaration of its independence (Fierman, 2006, as cited in Dotton, 2016). It can be noticed through the decree of Nazarbayev dated 2006, in which he announced the importance of changing the writing script (Shustov, 2006, December).

Changing the script of the Kazakh language has become especially important since the years after independence. It was particularly driven by the resolution adopted in 1929 called "Common Turkic Alphabet" that had been in use during the 1929-1940s within the USSR Turkic states (Nazarbayev, 2017, April 12). The most recent decision about revising the Kazakh alphabet and switching it from Cyrillic to Latin was made in 2012 by Nursultan Nazarbayev (Nazarbayev, 2017, April 12). Based on that decision, in April 2017, Nazarbayev announced the cultural and ideological project named "Rukhani

Zhangyru" (*Spiritual Revival*) as a framework for preserving Kazakh national identity as

well as a set of projects concerning the revival of the Kazakh language. This project's

agenda specified the goals, such as assigning the timetable for transition, publishing

textbooks and materials for learning, training the teachers to teach in the Latin-based

alphabet in mainstream schools beginning from 2018 (Nazarbayev, 2017, April 12). Later,

in October of 2017, Nazarbayev issued a decree "On changing the alphabet of the Kazakh

language from the Cyrillic script to the Latin graphics," which emphasized the

establishment of the National Committee on the alphabet transition, the agenda of which

was to finalize the official, modified alphabet of Kazakh (Nazarbayev, 2017). Since then,

three official versions of the Kazakh Latin alphabet have been proposed: the initial

proposal of 2017, the second revised version of 2017, and the third version dated 2018.

The major reason behind the change in the official script for Kazakh is the

popularization and promotion of the use of Kazakh in the public sphere (Dotton, 2016, p.

76). It is also deemed that by extending its scope of use it will be easy "to promote the

country's integration into the global economy, and to boost its national identity by

distancing itself away from Russian culture" (Dotton, 2016, p. 77). Switching to the script

of the Kazakh language was believed to be advantageous for integrating the country into

the world community, and facilitating the acquisition of English (Nazarbayev, 2017).

However, the latter statement seems ambiguous and less likely due to numerous

differences in two languages. More precisely, though, the major goal in this policy was to

increase the use of Kazakh in the social domains, to maintain and revive it, and expose it to

world as a lingua franca; otherwise, to promote the Kazakhization policy (Fierman, 2005;

Kadirova, 2018; Konyratbayeva & Satemirova, 2019; Smagulova, 2016).

In light of the Latinization reform, the agenda and roadmap for the transition were

prepared by stages and expected dates (MoES, 2007a; Smagulova, 2008; Dukenbaev,

2018; Mynzhasarkyzy, Ospan, & Galym, 2017, May 3). This roadmap included three

stages of transition: the first stage in years 2018-2020, the second stage in 2021-2023, and

the third stage in years 2024-2025 (Borashev, 2018). Later on, the Ministry of Culture and

Sports (2019) has adopted a State Program on the implementation of language policy in the

Republic of Kazakhstan (hereinafter State Program), which indicates the key objectives

and target indicators of the language planning to be achieved during the years 2020-2025.

Problem Statement

Since the announcement of Latinization, there have been ongoing arguments for

and against the alphabetic reform among different stakeholders of society (Dotton, 2016;

Kadirova, 2018; Tanayeva, 2007; Mynzhasarkyzy, Ospan, & Galym, 2017, May 3).

Drawing on Kadirova's (2018) study, the general population has become more actively

involved in choosing the alphabet, which shows their acceptance of the transition. This

positive shift is partially due to numerous campaigns held with learners and parents

(Zhunusova, 2018, p. 50). However, the result of Kadirova's (2018) study cannot be

generalized to educational stakeholders in terms of identifying the educational aspects of

Latinization. Therefore, considering the educational aspects of the alphabetic transition,

such as learning and teaching, is critical in this process.

MoES (2007a) pointed out the role of education as crucial in switching the Kazakh

alphabet into the Latin-based script. According to the experiences of post-Soviet states, the

milestone of successful implementation of the alphabet transition was introducing it in

secondary education (Kadirova, 2018). As educators are to teach Kazakh using the Latin-

based Kazakh script according to the planned schedule described in the State Program

(2019), their readiness and engagement is valuable in the process of implementation. It has

been mentioned that teachers ought to be prepared and provided professional training

courses to promote the transition in primary, secondary and tertiary levels of education

(MoES, 2007a; MoES, 2007b; Shodyr, 2017, May 17).

Since the agenda of switching to the Kazakh Latin alphabet is planned for the

upcoming years 2020-2025 (MoCS, 2019), the concerns arise regarding Kazakh language

teachers' preparedness to take on the responsibility of serving as pioneers in its

implementation process while teaching Kazakh through the new alphabet. Along with the

timeline, the State Program identifies the target indicators for each subsequent year for the

population's ability to communicate through written Kazakh Latin alphabet (MoCS, 2019).

In this regard, Kadirova (2018) argued that "Kazakh language planners and experts do not

show any anxiety in terms of the population learning a new alphabet" and, according to

them, "various sectors of the population of Kazakhstan are at least familiar with a standard

Latin alphabet and that the Kazakh society is ready to shift to the alphabet" (p. 60). As

noted by Sherwin (2019, July 1), teachers do express worries in terms of introducing the

Kazakh Latin alphabet and using it to teach written communication in Kazakh classes.

Although recent surveys and workshops, conducted among various educational institutions

across Kazakhstan, demonstrated the overall acceptance from the educators' part, their

perceptions regarding the learning and teaching are overlooked (MoCS & SANA

Independent Information Analytical Centre, 2018; Borashev, 2018). Notably, teachers have

undergone courses that aimed at training and introducing the features of the Latin alphabet

and orthography (MoCS & SANA IIAC, 2018; MoCS, 2019).

As for the learning part, Konyratbayeva and Satemirova (2019) hypothesize that

learning Kazakh can become easier since the new alphabet reduces unnecessary spelling

rules, and therefore teaching might be relatively less challenging. However, as anecdotal

evidence, this statement is not supported by empirical data. Since education is generally

provided in Kazakh and Russian, navigating between Latin and Cyrillic scripts in Kazakh

language classrooms may now become challenging for teachers and students. It can be explained by the diverse ethnicities for whom Cyrillic is the main script for written communication (Mynzhasarkyzy, Ospan, & Galym, 2017, May 3). Given that, researching teachers' perceptions would provide relevant data on the educational aspects of Latinization, and build on the earlier literature. Moreover, since the Kazakh language teachers have been provided training courses, it will be possible to get insight into their readiness to teach using the Latin-based Kazakh alphabet. Although the literature pays attention to the educational stakeholders' views, most of them approached the topic from a sociolinguistic perspective and have not adequately addressed the perspectives of teachers on shifting from the Cyrillic to the Latin script in terms of their readiness to facilitate it through different grades (Dotton, 2016; Kadirova, 2018). Therefore, it is of utmost importance to explore educators' perceptions in terms of learning and teaching of the Kazakh Latin alphabet.

Taken together, as identified in the literature, the learning and teaching of the Kazakh Latin alphabet require thorough exploration and should be addressed with careful attention.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the present research study is to discover Kazakh language teachers' perceptions of shifting from the Cyrillic to the Latin alphabet in terms of its educational aspects as learning of the script and teachers' readiness to teach using the Kazakh Latin alphabet and orthography in a school setting.

Research Questions

The following research questions were posed to reach the purpose:

1. How do Kazakh language teachers perceive the shift from the Cyrillic to the Latin alphabet?

2. How do Kazakh language teachers perceive the learning of the script themselves and by their students?

3. How do Kazakh language teachers perceive their readiness to teach using the new alphabet and orthography?

Significance of the Study

Exploring the teachers' perceptions is likely to help in identifying the learning and teaching needs that may occur in light of the alphabet replacement. The study is intended to provide meaningful insight into teachers' reflections on their practices and beliefs, and readiness to teach Kazakh language using the new Latin-based alphabet. The findings may also contribute to the limited body of research on Latinization in Kazakhstan by providing valuable knowledge about the educational aspects of the alphabet reform.

The potential beneficiaries of the study are teachers at large, policy-makers, and the committee responsible for the alphabet transition. First, teachers are likely to benefit from it by increasing their understanding of their preparedness for this change as well as seeking ways of professional improvement to teaching through the new alphabet effectively. Moreover, reflecting on the learning aspects of the Kazakh Latin alphabet on their students' part may allow teachers to reconsider the teaching techniques or come up with innovative ways of teaching in order to meet the students' needs for the accomplishment of the written communication as specified in the State Program (MoCS, 2019).

Policy-makers will benefit from the findings regarding the consideration of teachers' voices in language planning and developing step-by-step guidelines for the smooth implementation of the alphabet reform through different grades of school education. As for the committee that is in charge of the alphabet transition, this study may create a ground for discussion of some overlapping issues of the alphabet discovered from

the teachers' reflections, and draw their attention to the importance of the educational considerations of developing the alphabet.

Outline of the Study

   This chapter outlined the general characteristics of the study. It drew the reader's attention to the background of the central phenomenon and the reasons behind the alphabet reform initiative. The chapter also presented the research purpose based on the problem, research questions and the significance of the study. The subsequent literature review chapter presents the analysis of the empirical and theoretical literature relevant to the topic of the research. The literature focuses on similar cases of alphabet changes in international, regional and local contexts by comparing their experiences in implementing the new alphabet. Through the analysis of various contexts, the researcher focuses on teachers' perceptions of an alphabetic reform in general as well as in terms of the learning and teachers' readiness. The methodology chapter delineates the approach to research, data collection instruments with due justification, the research site and sample, discusses the data analysis process and ethical considerations. In the findings, the researcher provides the information elicited from the data collection and analysis. Consequently, the discussion part presents the findings in relation to the previous studies that assist in interpreting the findings and answering the research questions. Finally, the conclusion part remarks on the implications for further research as well as the limitations of the present research.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

This chapter provides a critical review of the literature related to the Latinization of the Kazakh alphabet. In particular, the research addresses teachers' perceptions of the transition to the Latin-based alphabet, and of their learning and readiness to teach using the new alphabet. First, alphabet reform is explained as part of corpus planning. Second, both early and recent research on the educational considerations of Latinization and the educators' perceptions of the alphabet replacement are reviewed. Then the various contexts as regards learning and teaching aspects of Latinization are compared. The chapter also presents the conceptual framework of the study. Finally, the conclusion summarizes this discussion and highlights the gaps identified in the Kazakhstani context.

Latinization as a Goal of Corpus Planning

Since the alphabet transition, commonly referred to as Latinization, is the focus of the study, it is important to discuss the concept from its basis. It is essential to delineate the underlying motives for and instances of similar cases across contexts to better understand the phenomenon and identify gaps and implications for further practical or educational considerations.

The basis of Latinization is set by corpus planning, one of the three types of language planning, along with status and acquisition planning, often referred to as the planned changes to the "shape of language" (Clyne, 1997, p. 1). Shape or the nubs of the language, comprise the corpus, such as the alphabet, orthography, and vocabulary. Ferguson (2006) points out that corpus planning "seeks to engineer" the language form, further specifying its three basic directions such as graphization, modernization, and standardization (p. 21). Furthermore, Lupke (2011) added that corpus planning constitutes a broader scope of activities, which should include graphization as a direction (p. 313). Among other types of corpus planning, graphization entails the changes and revision of an

alphabet and orthography. Because modernization involves the expansion of vocabulary, and a necessary consideration of terminologies in various domains and developing dictionaries (Christian, 1988; Ferguson, 2006; Hornberger & Coronel-Molina, 2004), and standardization refers to grammatical, lexical, and phonological changes (Christian, 1988), these two corpus planning goals are secondary to this particular study. Yet graphization is a set of "activities which establish and/or refine the writing system of a language" (Christian, 1988, p. 205), whereas Ferguson (1968) defined it as "reduction to writing" (as cited in Cooper, 1990, p. 125). However, Cooper (1990) refuted the term graphization as the replacement of an existing alphabet, and referred to it as re-graphization, employing the term 'renovation' to better explain the rapid switches of alphabet scripts such as from Cyrillic to Latin (p. 154). Consequently, the term Latinization is used throughout the study as a manifestation of the graphization of the Kazakh alphabet from Cyrillic to Latin.

Coluzzi, Brasca and Miola (2019) and Christian (1988) specified two instances of graphization in which the first case entails the development of a writing system for previously unwritten languages, while the second involves the refinement and revision of existing scripts. Annamalai and Dahal (1986) further describe that "graphization involves a decision about whether to adopt an existing script for the language to be written or whether to develop a new script for that particular language" (as cited in Liddicoat, 2005, p. 995). In this regard, Hornberger and Coronel-Molina (2004) exemplify of the Quechua language, which was previously based on the Spanish alphabet which inadequately represented some of its core sounds. Many scholars (Christian, 1988; Ferguson, 1968; Cooper, 1990) agree that, in both instances, the need for graphization may arise for the purpose of making a language suitable and accessible for education and literacy acquisition. However, as seen in the example of Quechua, the extent to which an alphabet represents a language can also be a driving force for graphization. The underlying reasons of such alphabet revisions

normally derive from the broader goals of language planning and its dimensions, which serve the purposes of language maintenance and globalization (Ferguson, 2006). Nonetheless, each individual state is motivated by a range of goals and thus makes their own decisions regarding their languages. It is worth quoting Liddicoat (2005), who stated that "script selection can be a marker of political, social, or national identity and various orthographic changes have as their motivation an issue of political or social identity" (p. 996). In general, as Coulmas (2013) pointed out, writing reforms are carried out to meet the public needs which bring about collective benefits. However, Coulmas (2013) also drew on political, social and economic reasons for such alphabet alterations and revisions, while Lupke (2011) highlighted that along with the factors that motivate alphabet and orthography reform, linguistic and practical considerations should be taken into account during such reform. By this, the latter implies that available resources should be provided for reading and instruction (Lüpke, 2011). Hence, decisions about reforming an alphabet may considerably impact educational domains which normally result in the discontinuation of existing educational resources (Reagan, 2019).

Educational Considerations of Latinization

Several researchers present a theoretical basis for alphabet reform with important considerations, educational being one of them (Karan, 2006; Karan, 2014; Malone, 2004). Education is recognized as an important feature in the implementation of corpus planning goals as the language is disseminated through schooling (Haugen, 1983, as cited in Liddicoat, 2007). Regarding this, schooling can become as a battleground for innovations that are implemented through policies. The agents of such policy enactment are normally teachers. It is thus critical to uncover their stances on the changes in the language that occur on an alphabetical and orthographic level. Many scholars confirm the

teachers' agency and the role of their reflections (Limerick, 2017; Limerick & Hornberger, 2019; Niyomugabo & Uwizeyimana, 2018).

Justification can also be drawn from Karan's (2006) study of writing systems that presented clear implications of researching the educational factors of orthographic and writing reforms. She asserted that teachers' opinions are not always heeded and mostly language policymakers and language experts do not address the teachers' pedagogical needs in using the newly-adopted, reformed or replaced alphabet and orthography (Karan, 2006). Coulmas (2013) agreed that school is the most appropriate institution for handling and administering, mastering and disseminating the writing conventions of a language. Although these researchers emphasize education as being a flexible domain for alphabet reform, they do not specify which considerations should be focused on, notwithstanding Karan's (2006) assumptions that the orthography should "contribute to confident writing" by educators and students (p. 124). Another important view was proposed by Berry (1977), who argued that "what is easy to learn is not necessarily easy to use" (as cited in Cooper, 1990, p. 126). Elsewhere, Liddicoat (2005) argued that materials modified in line with the objectives of corpus planning should "present the language in pedagogically useful and appropriate ways" (p. 1005). It can then be concluded that for such planning and implementation in educational settings, provisions such as training and learning materials ought to be in place, as well as considerations of teachers' initiatives.

An early work on script reform conducted by Raizen (1987) focused on the problems associated with the romanization of the Hebrew alphabet and analyzed the arguments in favour of this process. He argued that the 'romanization' of the alphabet is beneficial for the "intensification of education" as it influences literacy acquisition (p. v). However, Raizen (1987) referred to 'romanization' as a transliteration or additional writing system used along with the main conventional Hebrew script that facilitated learning.

Despite the ambiguity of the term, it reflects a direct implication for Latinization, meaning that it might be beneficial for acquiring reading and writing skills in a context where two or more writing systems coexist.

Teachers' Perceptions

The concept of perception plays a key role in this study where the focus is on how educators interpret the transition to the Latin-based alphabet and the way this reflects the educational aspects of Latinization. Based on the literature, using the concept of perception was deemed appropriate for discovering the educational dimensions of Latinization through the ways teachers make meaning as they experience the learning and teaching on their part. Therefore, this concept will be used to generate and process data about the learning and teaching of the new alphabet and orthography. In fact, the term, perception, is widely applied in psychology studies. However, McDonald (2012) suggested that perception is an interdisciplinary concept and can be appropriated to any field of study. For example, Keenan (2018) referred to perception as an attribute that enables people to make meaning out of what they experience through their sensations. Furthermore, Munhall (2008) highlighted that in qualitative research, perceptions allow us to grasp the meaning of an individual's situation or experience. She defined perception as "interpretations" that influence opinion, judgement, and the way an individual understands and responds to a situation (p. 2). Hence, this study employs the definition suggested by Munhall (2008) as it accurately fits the research purpose. Therefore, it will refer to a source of knowledge with regards to how teachers interpret what Latinization means to them, and what they perceive regarding the learning and their teaching readiness.

Recent years have seen an increasing amount of research on alphabetic and orthographic reform that draw on teachers' perspectives on using the reformed or replaced alphabet in education via a sociolinguistic approach (Limerick, 2017; Limerick &

Hornberger, 2019; Niyomugabo & Uwizeyimana, 2018). More precisely, Niyomugabo and Uwizeyimana (2018) investigated the effects of top-down orthography reform on the attitudes of Kinyarwanda users. Based on these findings, while policymakers attempted to assure the correspondence of the reform to all necessary linguistic principles, the language users and experts expressed a strong resistance. This rooted from the users' concerns regarding the new orthography as they perceived that it "may affect their unity, identity and culture" (Niyomugabo & Uwizeyimana, 2018, p. 314). While this study highlights the importance of exploring such stakeholders' attitudes, Limerick and Hornberger (2019) draw, particularly on teachers' perspectives. In an earlier study, Limerick (2017) demonstrated the attitudes of educators regarding orthographic reform and suggested that even advanced readers of Quechua resist the alterations of the writing conventions and show low acceptance levels for the newly adopted standardized alphabet. Likewise, Limerick and Hornberger (2019) highlight teachers' responses to alphabets in classroom settings. Their findings revealed the consistency of the teachers' responses with the Smalley's (1964) criteria. For instance, the analysis of Quechua language teachers' responses implied the change of alphabet and the introduction of texts based on that alphabet can cause some 'unforeseen' difficulties in reading and writing (Limerick & Hornberger, 2019). Namely, teachers should be recognized among people who deal with language on a daily basis. Accordingly, it is important to consider the educators' perceptions in developing the script and orthography, as their efficacy in this development is reflected in education. Commonly, when decisions are made in the top-down direction, educational stakeholders have an inconsiderable amount of power to intervene (Malone, 2004; Zhunisbek, 2018). Teachers, therefore, as agents of change may bring critical insight into the learning and teaching dimensions of Latinization and its further implementation.

Latinization in Central Asia

As previously mentioned, the rationale for alphabet transition depends on a country's overall perspectives and national goals. In Soviet Central Asia, the topic of alphabet transition was largely associated with the preservation of the national identity, modernization of the language, and unification with other Turkic worlds (Winner, 1952; Landau & Kellner-Heinkele, 2001). However, Winner (1952) also highlighted that people perceived the Latin script as an "international alphabet", which would be advantageous for "facilitating and accelerating intellectual intercourse" with Western states (p. 136).

A large body of literature from the Central Asian contexts (Bartholoma, 2016; Clement, 2008; Dwyer, 2005; Winner, 1952; Yilmaz, 2011), which shave undergone script reforms, commonly employ a sociolinguistic approach to research on Latinization. For example, in the context of Turkmenistan, Clement (2008) analyzed the population's active participation in such debates and their initiation of bottom-up activities during the alphabetic reform. This study shed light on language users' opinions and concerns about the impact of alphabet reform on language-in-education policies. Turkmenistan's alphabet replacement was intended to generate a shift of identity away from the USSR. Thus, the implementation process began with replacing public signs and continued into the educational field, including teacher training, classroom instruction and textbook development in the Latin-based alphabet (Soyegow & Rejepow, 1993, as cited in Clement, 2008, p. 180). In Tatarstan, too, where the Tatar and Russian languages are used simultaneously, the intent of the script reform was to reconstruct the national identity (Bartholoma, 2016), while the revitalization of the heritage language was an additional goal. In her study, Yilmaz (2011) examined the process of alphabet replacement and people's lived experiences in Turkey and found that low literacy levels in the Arabic script and the mismatch of the Arabic letters to the Turkish sound system were the main triggers for Latinization. Nevertheless, after switching to the Latin alphabet, re-learning the new

alphabet caused illiteracy, which seemed inevitable, considering the existence of the previous one (Yilmaz, 2011). From a language planning perspective, considering its stages of preparation, Turkey's example can be one that effectively realized the reform in terms of knowledge dissemination. It is noteworthy that an important factor of the successful transition to the new alphabet in educational institutions largely depended on teachers with sufficient knowledge and training to read and write in the Latin-based Turkic alphabet (Yilmaz, 2011). Consequently, training teachers to read and write in the new alphabet should be prioritized for the prevention of illiteracy.

Similar to Clement (2008), Yilmaz's (2011) study revealed that although the new Latin-based alphabet was socially accepted, there remained a persistence to using the competing alphabets as alphabets reflected ideologies and social attitudes. Likewise, Bartholoma (2016) examined the role of alphabet reform in the construction of national identity. Her chapter presents the findings of a larger-scale research conducted in 2010, which is based on a discourse analysis of people's reactions from exisiting data sources covering the contexts of Tatarstan and Kazakhstan. According to Bartholoma's (2016) findings, a division of opinions creates space for rejection or acceptance for many different reasons. For instance, she specified cultural and habitual reasons - the former entailing the loss of the written cultural heritage, the latter the difficulty of "readjustment" due to years of using the Cyrillic script (p. 183). Frequent orthographic and alphabetic reforms present the potential risks of reducing the learning resources for future generations by eliminating the existing written corpus of the language (Bartholoma, 2016; Dwyer, 2005). On this matter, Dwyer (2005), drawing from Landau and Kellner-Heinkele (2001), pointed to the motive of alphabet revision "as an instrument of de-Sovietization and at the same time as a means of individual nation-building, westernization, and modernization" (p. 22).

Compared to the previously mentioned nation-states, the field of education was particularly emphasized in Uzbekistan during its alphabetic transition, and this was manifested through prioritized literacy campaigns in 1928-1932 (Uzman, 2010). These campaigns resulted in an increase of literacy rates in the Latin-based script among the population. However, in the second attempt to Latinize the Uzbek alphabet, particularly, to implementing it in educational institutions in 1995, educators perceived the implementation approach as shallow (Kadirova, 2018). In the context of Azerbaijan, however, Latinization was mooted due to a shortage of available learning materials for students to obtain quality education (Hatcher, 2008). This leads to a consideration of learnings provision as education is pivotal to the implementation of alphabet change. Otherwise, according to Hatcher (2008), the consequences of competing alphabets in use may prevent the obtention of knowledge and information resources. Dwyer (2005) also pointed out the influence of alphabet reform on the scope of a language in educational domains as being either expanded or shrunk. Thus, careful decisions about the language of instruction, taking into account the status of the language and the efforts of switching its alphabet need to be made.

To sum up, despite the varying contexts, the literature is generally focused on the attitudes and opinions of public, while only few authors have examined the educational aspects of the alphabet transition. Those researchers (Hatcher, 2008; Karan, 2006; Limerick, 2017) suggest taking into account the issues concerning the learning and literacy development in a new alphabet.

Latinization in Kazakhstan

According to the policy documents (MoCS & SANA Independent Information Analytical Centre, 2018; MoCS 2019), the planned transition to the Latin alphabet has been scheduled for 2020-2025. This timeline applies to almost all the domains for

implementing the Kazakh Latin alphabet, educational institutions included, from which it

follows that educational institutions will be particularly accentuated. More specifically,

MoCS (2019) even emphasizes the target indicators for achieving a written communication

in the Latin-based script by 2025. As evidence demonstrates, in the first wave of

Latinization of the Kazakh alphabet during the late 1920s, the Latin-based alphabet was

introduced to all municipal educational institutions and teachers underwent massive short-

term intensive training courses to teach the alphabet (Winner, 1952). According to this

evidence, nearly 6,300 people mastered the Latin-based alphabet and were able to read and

write in it (Winner, 1952), thus suggesting that the acquisition of the alphabet is possible

once the teachers are trained and necessary educational resources are provided.

As for the current wave of Latinization, Nazarbayev (2017) urged that training for

teaching the Latin-based alphabet as well as developing new textbooks on that basis should

start immediately in order to be effectively implemented. Drawing on that, the Strategic

Plan for the Development of Kazakhstan (2018) also highlights the training of the cadre to

teach the Latin-based alphabet as one of the main objectives of the Latinization reform. To

illustrate, the professional training course titled "Developing Teachers' Professional

Competencies in the Context of Transition of the Kazakh Alphabet to the Latin script" was

organized and held by the Akhmet Baitursynuly Linguistic Institute in 2018 (Orleu Astana,

2018, September 26). The course was designed for senior Kazakh language teachers and

language experts, and encompassed the history of the language, an introduction to the

Kazakh writing system and its phonology, orthography and terminology. Teachers were

also introduced to the methodological basics of teaching and working with the Latin-based

orthography and alphabet (Orleu Astana, 2018, September 26; Pshenova, 2018). From this

we can elicit an implication for the present study in terms of how well the teachers are

prepared to teach via the new alphabet and orthography. Another integral part of the

implementation is pilot-testing the new alphabet. Interestingly, according to data collected

by the Ministry of Culture and Sports (2018), schools have been involved in the promotion

of the new Latin-based alphabet, and several regions have been engaged in the piloting of

the Latin-based alphabet with the digraphs and diacritics that were adopted on February 19,

2018 (MoCS & SANA IIAC, 2018).

Akin to its Central Asian neighbours, Kazakhstan's alphabet transition has stirred

varying and diverse reactions and opinions concerning various aspects of the Latin

alphabet itself and the consequences of the reform. Although studies by Dotton (2016) and

Kadirova (2018) approached Latinization from the sociolinguistic perspective, uncovering

the public's acceptance, they are critical in terms of understanding the general picture of

how the educational field responds to Latinization. As Coulmas (2013) put it, "for writing

reforms involve the speech community and are not easily carried out by decree: acceptance

is crucial", the previous studies showed the level of acceptance of various stakeholders (p.

107). The present study, in turn, sheds light on the educators' perceptions in particular.

In her study, Dotton (2016) looked into the development of Language planning and

policy practices in Kazakhstan by analyzing the legislative language-related documents

with regards to the alphabet reform. According to her findings based on interviews with

public representatives, school administration, and educators, there was a concern about the

timely enactment of the reform initiative because of the absence of official documents

articulating the implementation stages (p. 74). In addition, the result of Dotton's (2016)

study revealed that a few educators had expressed concerns about their readiness to teach

through the new alphabet, pending consecutive implementation. Although the stages of

implementation are outlined by the working group of the Science Committee of the

Ministry of Education and Science (2007b) as general objectives, this decree does not

specify the strategies and guidelines for educators. The results also showed that the public

is indifferent to the effects of the shift on their understanding and use of the Russian

language (p. 74). The author also highlighted the unpreparedness of the public to face the

changes of the alphabet and its challenges (p. 75). Although Dotton (2016) considered the

views of some teachers and education authorities in one particular context, it only

inadequately acknowledged the situation today due to the constant alterations in the

alphabet and policy amendments. Thus, she indicates further implications for researching

the orthographic knowledge of educators for teaching the Latin-based Kazakh alphabet to

track what has been done in terms of teaching this new alphabet at schools (p. 83).

Considering the present situation, Kazakh language teachers are responsible to transfer

their knowledge of the new script and to teach through it. Thus, the literature discloses

significant implications for research on the engagement of the Kazakh language teachers in

this area.

Other studies have spotlighted the issue of the social acceptance of Latinization

(MoCS & SANA IIAC, 2018; Kadirova, 2018). Kadirova's (2018) mixed-method study

involved participants of different nationalities, backgrounds and ages, residing in various

regions of Kazakhstan, and revealed the general preferences of the Kazakh alphabet,

63.93% of whom were in favour of the Latin-based alphabet, while 29.51% favoured the

Cyrillic-based one. Similar to Dotton (2016), Kadirova (2018) does not elaborate on the

teaching and learning aspects of the Kazakh Latin alphabet in school settings. Although the

study highlights the participants' interest and involvement in the process of Latinization as

being proactive, there still is space to scrutinize the teachers' opinions. Interestingly, the

author argues that the absence or inaccessibility of orthographic rules constitutes a problem

(p. 91). However, this might be caused by the mere issue of access depending on the

context and therefore might indicate a one-sided bias. According to the surveys

administered by the Ministry of Culture and Sports (2018), there is a preliminary unofficial

version of the new orthography based on the Latin script, which is being constantly piloted by students and educators. These surveys, however, do not provide transparency of results in terms of informing the stakeholders; and, therefore educators' perspectives might be neglected. Although Kadirova (2018) touched upon the difficulties in learning the new orthography by people of different age categories, it is not elaborated further as the scope of Kadirova's (2018) study is limited to identifying speakers' sociolinguistic attitudes and not the aspects of teaching and learning with regard to challenges and advantages. In contrast, Konyratbayeva and Satemirova (2019) hypothesize that learning Kazakh could become easier as the new alphabet reduces unnecessary spelling rules, and teaching might thus become more manageable. However, this evidence is anecdotal and purely hypothetical in nature. As the Latin-based Kazakh alphabet and English Latin alphabet share common letters, the aftermath of this commonality may result in a cross-language orthographic interference (Fazylzhanova, 2017). Such cases could include the confusion of pronunciation, for instance, the letter 'a' being pronounced as [ei] in English instead of [a] in Kazakh or vice versa (Fazylzhanova, 2017, p. 29). Since English and Kazakh are taught simultaneously from the first grade (NAE, 2013), this renders the learning of the Kazakh and English alphabets difficult for schoolchildren (Fazylzhanova, 2017). Yet, Zhunisbek (2018) argued that the similarities between the two scripts could eliminate these challenges. Furthermore, Sherwin (2019, July 1) interviewed a mainstream school teacher, who asserted that learning the Latin script would be easier for pupils as they already know English. Regarding students learning, Chsherbakov (2017) assumed that the transition to Latin may result in illiteracy in Cyrillic by the Kazakh-speaking student population, while illiteracy in Latin is likely to occur in Russian-speaking students. It is also believed that the change to Latin can challenge the learning of the Kazakh language for the representatives of various ethnicities (Harrington, 2019, January 10). In addition, several experimental

studies have been devoted to testing the difficulties in using the Latin-based script and

measuring the time spent for tasks like typing, writing by hand and reading (Kuderinova,

2017). The studies highlighted the perceptions of higher education students and

demonstrated that it was easier and faster to type texts for students familiar with the script

although the reading and writing tasks required a larger amount of time. The students made

many errors in writing tasks. They also reported that understanding a text written in the

Latin-based alphabet required much effort. The study revealed that familiarity with the

script assisted in the typing and reading tasks despite confusion and difficulties, and due to

their literacy, the students succeeded in the given tasks (Kuderinova, 2017, p. 123).

However, in another study, Fazylzhanova et al. (2017) focused on the perceptions of

individual letters in the three versions of the Kazakh Latin alphabet (dated August,

September, October 2017). The respondents were surveyed, and then asked to partake in a

reading experiment. While the survey on individual letters showed a positive shift in the

perceptions of the respondents, displaying their understanding of the letters with ease, the

reading experiment displayed a decrease in their understanding.

Another important point is that teachers may struggle initially as the difficulty of

learning the Kazakh Latin alphabet by teachers is bound up to the fact that they are

accustomed to Cyrillic (Sherwin, 2019, July 1). This statement accords with the stances of

scholars from the Central Asian context about the embeddedness of one alphabet (Dwyer,

2005; Yimaz, 2011). Dwyer (2005) stated that "people become invested in reading and

writing in a particular script..." (p. 21). Therefore, the main obstacle for teachers'

mastering the alphabet might be the habituality of having used the Cyrillic for many years.

Overall, considering schools and educators' preliminary use of the Kazakh Latin

alphabet during the piloting, the surveys do not elaborate further than the acceptance level.

This elaboration might cover the advantages and challenges of the script for teaching and

learning. Thus, the available literature presents less evidence on educators' general

perceptions and that of the learning and teaching readiness.

Conceptual Framework

Fishman (2015) implied that such planned shifts as Latinization, Cyrillization and

Sinoization have not only the politically desired social change, but can also result in the

relevance of the skills to be attained. Accordingly, scholars (Cooper, 1990; Fishman, 2015;

Karan, 2006, 2014; Smalley, 1959; Venezky, 1970) suggested a set of criteria for

measuring the effectiveness of a revised writing system. However, this study applies these

criteria to explore educators' perceptions of the transition in terms of practical educational

considerations of the alphabet replacement. To yield insightful information on teachers'

perceptions of Latinization and evaluate their readiness, the study employs a framework

developed by integrating criteria suggested by several scholars in the field. Some features

of psycholinguistic (Berry, 1977; Cooper, 1990), sociolinguistic (Smalley, 1959; Smalley,

1964, as cited in Berry, 1977), and pedagogical (Venezky, 1970) criteria have been chosen

because they correspond to the research purpose and questions. For instance, concerning

the learning aspect, Cooper (1990) identified psycholinguistic features that focus on "the

extent to which the writing system is easy to learn, easy to read, easy to write, easy to carry

over to another language (transfer of skills)" (p. 126).

Furthermore, educational considerations involving integral factors such as the

alphabet and orthography being easy to teach and learn for attaining literacy skills (reading

and writing), and the transferability of those skills (Smalley, 1959). Smalley (1959)

suggested that the difficulty of reading is bound to the writing system rather than the

language itself. On the other hand, Cook and Bassetti (2005) highlighted the factor that

eases the learning of the alphabet: "knowing a second writing system helps the person to

use a second language writing system" (p.40). They claim that readers of Chinese and

Japanese roman alphabets can better recognize and read English words (Yamada, 1988, as cited in Cook & Bassetti, 2005). Some countries (e.g., Central and East Asia) are maintaining the use of several scripts (e.g., Latin and Cyrillic in Uzbekistan, Pinyin and hieroglyphic writing in China). This allows us to assume that the ease in reading results from the transfer of skills in two distinct alphabets. For example, in the Central Asian context, the Uyghur Latin-based alphabet was developed according to the principle that the Latin letters correspond to their "common international phonetic value" to alleviate the difficulties in learning and reading processes (Janbaz, Saleh, & Duval, 2006, p. 7). Wang, Perfetti and Liu's (2005) finding also indicated that "learning to read two alphabetic languages rests on common phonological principles" and the orthographic ones (p. 68). Therefore, two alphabets sharing a common script and approximation of sounds can enable the second to be easily acquired. However, according to research, the influence of L1 orthography on L2 pronunciation is inevitable (Bürki, Welby, Clément & Spinelli, 2019).

One issue in alphabet design, as Venezky (1970) stated, was that the design of an alphabet and orthography should be "psychologically and pedagogically appropriate to the speakers" (p. 256). In his study "Principle for the Design of Practical Writing Systems," Venezky (1970) questioned the reasons behind the difficulty in acquiring a new orthography and pointed to procedures used to teach the orthography as being the cause for this. Karan (2014), on the other hand, juxtaposes Venezky's (1970) assumption by elaborating on the ease of orthography not only for acquiring, but also for teaching it on the part of both younger and adult learners (p. 3). Concerning teacher training on Latinization, as adults, teachers undergo this learning process. Therefore, Karan's (2014) point seems reasonable. She also affirms that literacy acquisition is more manageable for non-literate acquiring a new script, while literate learners should be able to transfer their skills easily. Karan (2014) also points out minor factors that might be at play, such as the

age of learners, their literacy rates, and the setting in which they learn. Among the factors

that facilitate and enhance the learning of the script are textbooks, reading materials and a

well-planned literacy education (Smalley, 1959).

Another aspect that Karan (2014) considers is teachers' readiness to learn and teach

through the new alphabet. She claims that "teachers will readily learn and embrace the

system, especially if the language will be taught as a subject or used as a language of

instruction" (p. 3). In her previous study, she mentioned: "if the chosen script is not the

desired one, the community is not likely to promote its use" (Karan, 2006, p. 115).

Consequently, this implies that teachers' perceptions might display their acceptance as well

as their readiness to use the new script in schooling.

The sociolinguistic criteria refer to people's symbolic associations about the script,

its functionality, and status in society (Cooper, 1990; Liddicoat, 2005). Regarding this set

of criteria, one of its constituents that aligns with the aim of the present research is the

"symbolic associations that people make with the script" (Liddicoat, 2005, p. 997). Cooper

(1990), who established the term, claimed that such associations are often the main driving

force for the spread of a particular script. For example, the Arabic and Latin scripts are

bound to associations with religious texts, which served to motivate their further use

(Cooper, 1990, p. 129). With reference to previous research conducted in the context of

Kazakhstan, for instance, Dotton (2016) and Kadirova (2018) revealed that the population

viewed Latinization positively. Meanwhile, Bartholoma (2016) emphasized that people

perceive the Latin script as a "progressive script" due to associations of modernity and

globalization (p. 183). Similarly, the teachers' interpretations of the alphabet transition

through such symbolic associations would display the extent to which they are ready to

promote the Kazakh Latin alphabet. This criterion can help decipher teachers' general

perceptions of the alphabetic transition.

Besides, Malone's (2004) suggestions regarding the educational aspects of the alphabet change are considered as additional support for the findings regarding the teachers' readiness to use the Latin-based script. Likewise, Cahill and Karan (2008) and Karan (2014) developed the educational aspect of the alphabetic reform further by asserting that "teaching and learning of reading and writing become more complicated when there is a mismatch between the spoken and written language" (p.7). Additionally, this may result in increasing the time for learning as well as human capital and additional funds (Cahill & Karan, 2008).

As for the analysis of teachers' perceptions of their readiness to teach using the new writing system, Malone (2004) proposed a set of considerations that should be taken into account for achieving the effective planning of a lesson in cases of alphabet revision. According to Malone (2004), learning to read and write in a new alphabet requires the teacher adopting planned measures and considering four essential skills (reading for meaning, reading symbols and words, writing to communicate, forming symbols/ spelling) (p. 62). Thus, teachers should plan their lessons in a way that benefits students' acquisition of the alphabet for reading and writing. From this, it follows that teachers can demonstrate a certain extent of readiness and confidence in using the revised alphabet in class. Stevenson (2007) stated that "the development of knowledge, skills and values are not only directed towards action, but emerge in the context of preparing for (i.e., the inquiry) and taking action" (p. 146). In particular, Malone (2004) delineated the steps in order for teachers to cultivate their students' acquiring reading and writing skills in a new alphabet. Those are the in-class and extra-curricular activities such as listing the symbols of the alphabet, exercises directed to the recognition and practical use of the letters, as well as the development of textbooks and workbooks for facilitating the learning of the new alphabet

(Malone, 2004). Hence these suggestions are employed for developing the framework for this study.

Overall, the framework developed for analyzing the teachers' perceptions of the alphabetic transition in terms of their learning and teaching readiness consists of the following dimensions: 1) symbolic associations; 2) ease and difficulty (for reading, writing, and learning); 3) transfer of skills; and, 4) teacher readiness.

Conclusion

Summing up, the literature review has provided an explanation of the key concepts and the conceptual framework for this study. It has drawn a broad picture of what Latinization entails as a part of graphization, pinpointed the underlying reasons for alphabet reform, and the current issues around it. Moreover, reviewing such instances from international, regional and national contexts underlined further implications and considerations for research that should be taken into account regarding the educational domain. Hence, the literature review further identifies the choice of methodology that would be applicable for the present research. The following chapter elaborates on the methodological basis of the study.

Chapter 3: Methodology

The previous section covered the discussion of the relevant literature related to the research purpose and questions. This chapter provides the methodological basis of the present research that explores Kazakh language teachers' perceptions of the alphabetic transition in terms of learning and teachers' readiness to use the Kazakh Latin alphabet in teaching. The study attempts to answer the following questions:

1. How do Kazakh language teachers perceive the shift from the Cyrillic to the Latin alphabet?

2. How Kazakh language teachers perceive the learning of the script by themselves and their students?

3. How do Kazakh language teachers perceive their readiness to teach using the Kazakh Latin alphabet and orthography?

Accordingly, the choice of research methodology is explained and described with support and justifications from literature. Following that, the rationale for the choice of the site and sample is justified. Then the data collection tools and procedures are thoroughly discussed. The final section delineates the ethical issues taken into consideration throughout the data collection process.

Research Approach and Design

As the study aims to investigate teachers' perceptions of the alphabet transition and its educational considerations, the qualitative approach is found to be relevant for understanding the phenomenon from participants' stances. According to Merriam and Tisdell (2016), "understanding the meaning people have constructed" on a particular phenomenon requires the qualitative research design (p. 15). Furthermore, one distinctive characteristic of qualitative research is that it centers around making sense and increasing awareness of the social phenomenon, be it a setting or an activity, solely from participants'

perspectives (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Creswell, 2012; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). As Stake (2010) further described, qualitative research can sometimes be referred to as an interpretive research. He also stated that interpretive research "relies heavily on observers defining and redefining the meanings of what they see and hear" (p. 36). The observers' interpretations of the central phenomenon are thus integral in qualitative research. In particular, a qualitative method enables a researcher "to investigate situations where little is known about what is there or what is going on" (Gillham, 2000, p. 11). Although the phenomenon of Latinization has been researched multiple times from language planning perspectives, little is known about its educational aspects from teacher educators' viewpoints. In her article "*The ABD of Orthography Testing: Practical Guidelines*," Karan (2014) encourages the use of a qualitative approach in research on orthography by highlighting its strength in gaining "insight into people's behaviors and perceptions" (p. 7).

The present research uses a case study design. According to Simons (2014), qualitative case studies are used to "provide a rich portrayal of an event, project, or program" (p. 457). Simons (2014) also pinpointed the interpretivist nature of case study, which draws on how the participants perceive and interpret the case under research (p. 458). In this regard, the present research corresponds to the description of case study. As the study focuses on Latinization, which is a specific phenomenon, and aims at illuminating it by means of engaging several cases, it is further described as an instrumental case study (Creswell, 2012, p. 465). Another characteristic of a case study is that the sample size should be small and fixed (Timmons and Cairns, 2012, p. 5). Similarly, eight participants were sampled in the present study as individual cases in order to explore the central phenomenon. Although many authors (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Volmar & Eisenhardt, 2020, p. 1) agree that case study often relies on multiple data

collection tools, according to Saldana (2011), every so often qualitative research "may employ only one data collection method, such as interviewing participants, because the personal histories and worldviews of individuals will best answer the researcher's questions" (p. 31). Besides, due to the limited scope of this research interviewing is found to be an adequate data gathering tool. Hence, in order to obtain the data on teachers' perceptions regarding the alphabet transition and its educational aspects, the researcher opts for the qualitative interview as a primary data collection instrument. There is a consensus that an interview enables a researcher to grasp unique information from the perspectives and interpretations of others (Brinkmann, 2013; Rubin & Rubin, 2012; Stake, 2010). Karan (2014) also emphasized interviewing as one of the most common methods of data collection in writing system research.

Research Site

The study was conducted at three mainstream schools in Nur-Sultan, with mixed-medium of instruction, which presumably went through piloting of the new alphabet and orthography (Borashev, 2018). More precisely, these were the schools with Kazakh and Russian language streams. The rationale for the choice can be drawn from the fact that the Kazakh language is taught as a required language subject in classes with both Russian and Kazakh medium of instruction (Smagulova, 2016). Moreover, there is a greater feasibility of grasping rich data on the educational aspects of the transition from the Kazakh language teachers in both streams rather than solely selecting a Kazakh or Russian medium schools. Besides, schools are the leaders that carry the orthographic change and translate it into educational practice (Haugen, 1983; Raizen, 1987), it is of utmost importance to consider them as a serious context. Besides, under Nazarbayev's decree (2017) and within the Rukhani Zhangyru framework, local authorities have launched the preparation campaign for Latinization in mainstream schools, including all grades of school education (Akimat of

Nur-Sultan, 2018, November 8). Accordingly, the research sites were chosen among the schools, which reportedly piloted the new Kazakh Latin alphabet and orthography.

Sampling

Participants were eight Kazakh language teachers from three mainstream secondary schools with mixed-medium of instruction in Nur-Sultan. The rationale for choosing teachers can be explained by the necessity of considering their voices in the process of implementing and dispersing the Latin alphabet and orthography in schools (Clement, 2008; Kadirova, 2018; Limerick, 2017;). Empirical studies from international contexts show the importance of shedding light on educators' voices about changes in writing systems, that is, the alphabet and orthography (Niyomugabo and Uwizeyimana, 2018; Limerick, 2017). The participants were sampled through the purposeful sampling, which, according to Creswell (2014), allows a researcher to select participants and sites based on specific characteristics deliberately. Among the purposeful sampling strategies, homogeneous sampling, which implies that the participants possess the same characteristics and belong to a particular group, is the type that primarily helps the researcher to focus on common defining characteristics (Creswell, 2014). This strategy implies that a certain set of criteria had to be established for selecting the participants. Hence, the participants were recruited according to the following eligibility criteria:

1) individuals are to be Kazakh language teachers (in Russian and Kazakh streams);

2) individuals who had undergone a special training session on learning and teaching the Latin-based Kazakh alphabet.

As qualitative research aims to interpret the meaning of the obtained data rather than to generalize it, determining the number of participants depended solely upon the researcher (Litchman, 2014). Therefore, eight participants were seen as being sufficient to elicit insightful data and understand the phenomenon. Surprisingly, although the teachers

were sampled according to the criteria above, three participants reported not attending any
training during the interviews. Yet, the three participants were allowed to take part in the
study as they expressed willingness, and their perceptions could provide juxtaposition with
that of the trained ones. The following table represents additional demographic information
about the participants. As can be noticed, almost all teachers have a substantial teaching
experience, which draws our attention to their training years belonging to a timeframe
before the independence. As for the language of instruction, five teachers teach at Russian-
medium classes, while the rest teach in Kazakh-medium ones. The grade levels were also
revealed as additional information.

Table 1.

Participants

Participant	Years of Teaching	Medium of Instruction	Grade Level of Instruction	Training on learning and teaching the Latin script
Roza	16-17	Russian	Grades1-4	Attended
Leila	Over 30	Kazakh	Grades 1-11	Attended
Asiya	27	Russian		Did not attend
Aina	19	Russian	Grade 9	Attended
Tumar	19	Russian		Attended
Aisha	24	Russian	Grade 9	Did not attend

| Fatima | Over 30 | Kazakh | | Attended |
| Ziyash | Over 30 | Kazakh | Grades 5-6 | Did not attend |

Note. Real names are replaced with pseudonyms to maintain anonymity.

Data Collection Instruments

The primary tool for data collection is *a semi-structured one-on-one interview* with each participant. According to Brinkmann, Flick and Kvale (2018), a semi-structured interview offers the comfort and freedom of an everyday-life conversation style for the interviewers. It is largely due to the prevalence of open-ended questions with pre-planned prompts and probes that serve to facilitate the interaction between the interviewer and the participant through careful and active listening (Rubin & Rubin, 2012; Leavy, 2017). Likewise, Berg (2009), who refers to this type of interviewing as "semistandardized interview," enumerates its key characteristics, such as enabling the researcher to reorder the questions during the interview, to alter or add probes in between the questions, as well as allowing flexibility of wording and adjusting the level of language (p. 105). One of the key pillars of a successful interview, as Taylor, DeVault and Bogdan (2016) highlight, is "knowing when and how to probe" (p. 123).

The interview questions were organized in correspondence with the research questions, which would allow both the researcher and the participants a smooth, logical flow from one feature to another as well as provide enough time for thinking. The questions were ordered from general demographic ones to topic-specific ones that were tailored in accordance with the reviewed literature and adjusted to the conceptual framework. More specifically, there were questions regarding the perceptions of Kazakh language teachers that sought to answer the research questions. The researcher thus developed an interview protocol (See Appendix A), the questions of which help elicit

"specific information related to the aims of the study" (Patton, 2015, as cited in Castillo-Montoya, 2016, p. 813). Overall, it consisted of 15 open-ended questions with probes and follow-ups altogether.

Data Collection Procedures

Before beginning the data collection process, the interview questions were piloted with the members of the NUGSE community. The piloting allowed the researcher to adjust the questions comprehensively and word them appropriately. After the NUGSE Ethics approval was granted, the researcher started contacting the schools a week before the data collection. Upon request, the NUGSE faculty provided the support letter for entering the research sites. The three schools were accessed in different ways: the access to the first site was provided by a gatekeeper, whereas the other two required contacting the school principals directly and gaining their permissions in advance. Each site was visited for introducing the research study to the heads of the schools. Following that, the researcher requested the contact information of the potential participants. As the schools reported piloting the Latin script, the principals provided the information on teachers selectively based on the research criteria and gathered them in one venue, which seemingly simplified the recruitment process. Thus, eight participants were selected among those who met the criteria and showed willingness to participate.

During the meeting with the potential participants, the researcher disseminated the hard copies of the informed consent forms in order for the participants to get introduced with the research, their rights, and ethical considerations. Eight participants who agreed to take part in the study and signed the consent forms were further approached individually for scheduling the time and venue for the interview in accordance with their workload. During the interviews, the researcher displayed the current versions of the Kazakh Latin alphabet in order for teachers to recall its features (See Appendix B).

The procedures of the actual interview were as follows. Before starting the one-on-one interview, the researcher restated the description of the research, the participant's rights, and the anonymity and confidentiality. By gaining the verbal assent from the participant, the researcher started recording the interview with the voice recorder application on the smartphone. During the interview, the researcher tried to remain unobtrusive and let the interviewee elaborate on specific questions while following the interview protocol (Litchman, 2014; McCracken, 1988) to obtain valuable information. The interviewees were given a free choice for the language of an interview; however, many preferred Kazakh or occasionally code-switched. Each interview lasted up to 18 minutes on average.

Data Analysis Procedures

After collecting all the data, the next crucial step was to analyze the data in order to retrieve meaningful patterns for further interpretation in accordance with the research questions. The comprehensive data analysis went through several critical steps such as transcribing, coding, and retrieving themes and performing a thematic analysis upon those bits of data.

First, the audio recordings of the interviews were transcribed manually into a Word document (See Appendix C). Although the process of transcribing is a time-consuming one, the verbatim transcription of research interviews is found to be the most valuable database (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Furthermore, coding was performed to elicit important topics and refine the themes from the transcribed interviews that correspond to the reviewed concepts about the participants' perceptions of the transition to the Latin script and its educational aspects. The researcher applied *in vivo* and *descriptive coding* approaches to generate and organize the initial codes. As Creswell (2012) highlights, in vivo coding allows to use the participants' actual words for segmenting the text into codes,

while descriptive coding, according to Saldana (2011), categorizes the data briefly. The

subsequent coding techniques, such as *template* and *editing,* were used to categorize

further the codes derived from the literature concepts and non-determined emergent ones

(Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012, p. 138). These codes were then synthesized into themes

commonly recurring from the interviews, and afterward, the major themes were put into

categories in compliance with the research questions. All the steps were carried out

manually by the researcher throughout the whole data analysis procedure.

Ethical Considerations

Before launching the data collection procedure, the researcher completed the

Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) in order to administer the data

collection ethically and prevent the participants from unforeseen risks. Most importantly,

the researcher went through the Research Ethics Approval process and gained permission

from the Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education's Research committee on

November 18, 2019. The approval, in turn, guaranteed that the study posed minimal risk to

the participants, such as those "encountered in daily life" (Creswell, 2012, p. 148;

Louisville University, 2016). The permissions were also obtained from the actual research

sites and the participants to proceed with the study (Creswell, 2012).

Drawing on the ethical considerations of research involving human subjects, the

anonymity and confidentiality of the participants and the site were provided from the very

beginning of the study. By disseminating the informed consent forms, the researcher

ensured the school principals and the participants' acquaintance with the study, i.e.,

grasping the general idea, gaining insight into the procedures of the research, indicating

their rights (See Appendix D). Identifiable private information such as names, surnames,

contact details and references to research sites were removed and alternatively replaced

with pseudonyms from hard and soft copies of the disseminated materials so that to ensure

the anonymity of all subjects in terms of protecting their privacy (Brinkmann et al., 2018).

To maintain confidentiality, the researcher ensured to protect the participants' responses

and information about their participation from disclosure outside of the research setting.

Similarly, the names of schools and their locations are not disclosed throughout this thesis.

The interviews were recorded only with the participants' permission and approval.

Additionally, as a backup, the researcher chose to take occasional written notes (Saldana,

2011). Recorded responses were stored electronically in a folder on a password-protected

computer that could only be accessed by the researcher for further analysis of the obtained

data. Meanwhile, the researcher also provided the protection for soft and hard copies of

transcribed data and written interview notes in a locked drawer. The researcher thus acted

upon the extent of permission and tried to refrain from causing additional disruption and

disturbance to the participants, respecting the individuals and the site (Creswell, 2012, p.

211).

Conclusion

This chapter described the methodology for the present research study on exploring

Kazakh language teachers' perceptions of the transition to the Latin script. It explained the

choice of research approach and design, site and sample, data collection and analysis

procedures. Besides, the chapter delineated the ethical considerations of the research. In

particular, the study employed a qualitative interview-based case study design, the main

data collection instrument of which was a semi-structured one-on-one interview. The

participants of the study were eight Kazakh language teachers from three mainstream

mixed-medium schools in Nur-Sultan. The following chapter presents the most relevant

findings of the study.

Chapter 4: Findings

The present qualitative case study aimed to explore teachers' general perceptions of the transition from the Cyrillic to the Latin-based Kazakh alphabet as well as their perceptions in terms of the learning of the script and their readiness to teach using the new alphabet in Kazakh language classes. In order to achieve the aim, the study posed the following three research questions:

1. How do Kazakh language teachers perceive the shift from the Cyrillic to the Latin alphabet?

2. How do Kazakh language teachers perceive the learning of the script themselves and by their students?

3. How do Kazakh language teachers perceive their readiness to teach using the new alphabet and orthography?

This chapter presents the findings from the analysis of the qualitative semi-structured one-on-one interviews with each participant. Three emergent themes were identified from the analysis: teachers' interpretations of the alphabet transition, learning the Latin script, and readiness to teach the Latin script. Each of the themes is elaborated in the sections below. The findings presented at the end of this chapter will be further interpreted and explored according to the literature in the Discussion chapter that follows.

Teachers' Interpretations of the Alphabetic Transition

Teachers' perceptions of the alphabetic transition are indications of how they interpret it, which was a major theme across all interviews. This theme integrates the following sub-themes: symbolic associations and Latinization as an opportunity, which are demonstrated below.

Symbolic associations

Teacher participants make interpretations mainly based on such inputs as official and unofficial decrees and media, which presumably dictate and shape their perceptions. For example, one participant quoted the former president's statement: "[…] the president says we are not switching to the Latin alphabet – we are revisiting history. That is why I think it is the right decision" (Leila). The majority of the participants agree with this, and thus perceive the process of Latinization as a priority.

Furthermore, the participants referred to Latinization as a means of Kazakhization policy. More precisely, a participant named Fatima believed that Latinization was to bring about Kazakhization. She stated: "The advantage is that… I think at last it will be useful for Kazakhization, for increasing the status of the Kazakh language after all." In addition, they noted how beneficially the switch may turn out for the de-russification of the language as well as its speakers. For instance, Aisha asserted that "One should care [for a language]. Should care for the language from one's own enthusiasm. If we distance ourselves from Cyrillic, only then can we distance ourselves from Russian language. The problem of the state language will thus be tackled." While they attribute symbolic meanings to the alphabet change, the teachers' concerns for the future of the Kazakh language can be noted in the aforementioned quotes. In addition, by referring to de-russification, over half of the participants argued that switching to the Latin alphabet could eliminate the impact of the Russian on Kazakh spelling in daily written communication. Aisha, for example, uttered: "For example, they (students) often spell [тіл] as [тил], [біл] as [бил] (modified by Russian spelling). I think [Latinization] will change this [tendency]." The teachers thus felt that the Latin script would improve the written communication in Kazakh and the orthography in general.

Latinization as an opportunity

The findings also displayed that a number of participants perceived the shift to the Latin-based script as an opportunity for the language. In particular, they referred to it as a chance to enter the world economic arena and integrate into diverse cultures, thus, connecting it with globalization.

> [...] That, secondly, when we move to that language [script], it will be easier for us to join those thirty [developed] countries. We will be able to show other countries that we are Kazakhs and we have our language, our history; consequently, our fellow Kazakhs living abroad start understanding us. They will probably start learning [the language], find out more about us. Then, with this Latin alphabet we can elevate to the global level, which is difficult to do with the Cyrillic.

This excerpt illustrates that Aisha perceives the benefits of switching to the Latin-based script with regards to the recognition of the Kazakh nation and language worldwide.

The majority of the teacher educators expressed that the perception of the alphabet switch as being a chance to preserve the Kazakh language. As has been mentioned above, the Kazakh language teachers showed concerns about the status of the language, therefore, a participant named Ziyash stated the following:

> …the first time this news was made public, when the problem was touched for the first time, I was delighted as a language specialist [meaning teacher]. The reason why I was delighted is it is undoubtedly the only way to preserve the Kazakh language.

Another participant, Aisha, draws on language revitalization as well by stating that "[it is believed] that in order to save the language…it is, first of all we have to…to transfer to the Latin alphabet." The similar response was given by Leila: "But I support it, yes. In my personal view, it has a great impact upon our language for avoiding its extinction". Overall, the findings revealed that teachers unanimously agree that Latinization is a

necessary action towards preserving the Kazakh language, and increasing its status in society.

The section displayed the perceptions of Kazakh language teachers about the planned switch to the Latin script. The findings uncovered the ways teachers interpret the transition. All in all, teachers' perceptions range from symbolic associations to the potential benefits of the switch from the Cyrillic to the Latin script, which underlie policy-oriented and language-oriented stances. The next section will focus on the teachers' perceptions of learning the script by themselves and by their students.

Learning the Latin Script

The participating teachers were posed several questions regarding the use of the alphabet in the classroom as well as the extent to which the script is easy or challenging to learn for the teacher population. The interview questions also allowed teachers to reflect on the learnability of the script by their students. The findings of this theme are presented in the following three sub-themes: ease of learning, difficulty of learning, and illiteracy.

Ease of learning

By reflecting on the individual letters and versions of the alphabet as well as recalling the introductory in-class activities, the teachers could assess the ease and difficulty of learning. According to the collected data, the majority of the teachers reported learning to be easy for students. This is due to the transfer of skills such as writing and reading from one alphabet to another. Ease of learning, as they saw it, is scaffolded by the transfer of skills, which in this particular case is deemed to be carried out through English. The teachers mentioned the benefits of familiarity with English letters in transferring the skills of writing. They commonly agreed that because of that the students will learn quickly. To illustrate but a few examples, Aina claimed: "In my opinion, since the Kazakh youths know English the writing part will be easy for them". Likewise, Roza stated that

"because students are familiar with these letters as they study English, they are often already introduced with the Latin script…". The perceived similarity of the two alphabets was thus a hallmark of successful learning of the new script. However, many teachers also took into account the unique letters of the alphabet which, as they perceived it, required more attention. Additionally, these teachers' statements do not take into account the presence of two competing alphabets - Cyrillic and Latin-based - in use.

According to the teachers, it is crucial that a student is interested and willing to learn the script in the first place. It might serve as a catalyst that can provide a less challenging learning experience when mastering the new alphabet and orthography. Three reported that students' express their interest by asking questions regarding the new alphabet, the teachers' opinions on the transition, and often show a willingness to discuss. Therefore, teachers perceive the students' involvement as a key factor in the ease of learning.

Overall, English is perceived beneficial for mastering the writing of letters of the alphabet rather than dealing with particular orthographic rules of the language. Nevertheless, this cannot be generalized to the teachers themselves and other student populations. Therefore, the next sub-theme focuses on the difficulties for these instances.

Difficulty of learning

As data have shown, learning the Latin-based alphabet and orthography might be bound to such factors as alphabet features, age and habituality to the Cryillic alphabet. Additionally, there are such considerations as medium of instruction and ethnic composition of a classroom, and allocation of time, which should be taken into account.

Even though the participants previously agreed that learning would be easy for students, they further asserted that mainly learning the individual letters was likely to cause additional burden. For example, Roza articulates: "Most of them [students] are already

familiar with the Latin alphabet, however, they may be confused by letters with diacritics".

One participant even admitted not being able to explain the differences in some letters

when the students and her colleagues made mistakes in writing dictation.

Over half of the participants noted that compared to students, teachers found

learning difficult. They explained this trend by being accustomed to the Cyrillic alphabet,

and using it throughout the years. Therefore, when it comes to using a Latin alphabet, at

this stage, teachers reported their preference for the Cyrillic one despite their overall

support for Latinization. One participant, for instance, pointed out: "I am for Cyrillic

because we are accustomed to it and we have already reached the retirement age…"

(Tumar). She further added: "I think there is a controversy between what we perceived

before and the new letters of our language. Because we [are accustomed to] perceive the

letters I and [i] otherwise, that is why it seems to be different". On their part, teachers

sometimes found it rather complicated to differentiate between some titular Kazakh letters

in the Latin alphabet. Another participant explained: "I resonate with the Cyrillic alphabet.

If I studied English, I would probably resonate with the Latin alphabet…" (Leila). Leila

thus considered that the main obstacle for her mastering the Latin script was her

unfamiliarity with English. Two other participants also found that they developed a sort of

commitment to the Cyrillic alphabet, and therefore learning the Latin script would be quite

time-consuming for them. Almost all recruited participants turned out to have a post-Soviet

educational background, which is one possible explanation for their perceptions of

difficulty. One participant explicitly referred to their age as a variable impeding the

learning process. She said: "learning…it might be challenging for us [adults], but we must

learn" (Aisha). Interestingly, though, the majority of the teachers who responded to the

question regarding the difficulty were previously trained to teach the Latin script.

Many teachers agree that differences in medium of instruction can also be one factor that challenges the learning due to slow learning and retention by students of various ethnic backgrounds. Aisha, who teaches at Russian-medium classes, stated, "There are huge differences between Kazakh and Russian medium classes. If these are divided, we would know when and how to start this [teaching the Latin script] in Russian-medium classes…". She also elaborated further on this point: "I can't say anything about the Kazakh-medium classes, it is definitely easier for Kazakh-medium classes. As for Kazakh…Russian-medium classes should be paid more attention to". On the contrary, however, another teacher claimed that there should not be a division according to the medium of instruction in order to start implementing the Latin alphabet and orthography in schools. She claims:

> [...] they say, only the Kazakh-medium classes should transfer to the Latin alphabet, and Russian-medium classes should remain with Cyrillic…this problem should not take place. If the transition happens, everyone should switch once it [the alphabet] is ready (Roza).

Thus, Kazakh language teachers from Russian and Kazakh medium classes express opposing views in terms of implementing the Latin-based Kazakh alphabet in classes with different MOI attributing to the learning discrepancies. They explain this discrepancy by the students' proficiencies in Kazakh and knowledge of orthography, thus holding a view that the exposure to the language is greater in Kazakh-medium classes. While the Kazakh language teachers suggested paying as much attention to the Russian-medium classes, the Kazakh-medium teachers are confident about their students and demand equal dissemination of Latinization in education.

An interesting finding is that learning the new script seems to be difficult for ethnic Kazakh students repatriated from China, who study in the Kazakh-medium classes.

Regarding that, Leila says "What I am doubtful about is the girls repatriated from China, it is mostly challenging for them... because they did not learn English in China". Thus, she also attributes the difficulty of learning the script to the knowledge of the English Latin script as has been previously mentioned. The perceptions of ease or difficulty of learning emerged from the teachers' in-class practices of implementing the Latin alphabet.

Furthermore, most teachers indicate the necessity of an additional hour for effective learning of the script and orthography. Roza stated "Once [additional hour] is added, with the help of certain tasks and teachers' efforts of planning the lessons, we can achieve good results". Therefore, an additional hour is to ease the retention and learning of the script as it can offer time for practical implementation of the script both for teachers and students.

Illiteracy

Besides the ease and difficulty of learning, consequences of not being able to master/ not mastering the new alphabet & orthography may lead to illiteracy. Furthermore, the interviewed teachers mentioned the possibility of illiteracy during the first years of the alphabetic transition. Among the participants, two admitted that "illiteracy is inevitable" (Leila & Fatima, personal communication, 2019) However, they do not specify the exact aspects of illiteracy as to whether it leads to illiteracy in reading, writing in one or both of the official languages. In contrast, the rest mentioned illiteracy is to take place because students might become illiterate in reading Cyrillic-based heritage literature. A participant named Aina put it in the following way:

> ...if we consider translation of books [into Latin-based script], for example, the publishing of books, we will need a working orthography - to be literate in writing. If we don't bother about learning to write in a literate manner now, that is, since it is writing, if we don't learn to write correctly, our minds will become illiterate.

Based on Aina's statement, there is a clear implication for developing a working and practical orthography that would not hinder the literacy acquisition for both adults and younger generations. Reflecting on her students, one participant claimed that illiteracy in writing using the Latin-based script in learning it. Especially, she refers to students who face difficulties even with writing in Cyrillic. She stated:

> ...there are children who write incorrectly even in the Cyrillic script. Although we have been teaching it [Kazakh] for many years, they don't have an aspiration to learn and many children make a lot of mistakes. And now with the Latin script there might be even more difficulties among children [become more illiterate in writing] (Tumar).

Thus, considering the educational domain, teachers show concern about drawbacks of switching to the Latin alphabet connecting it with the difficulty of learning the script.

Summing up, findings of the second research question unveiled meaningful insight into the educational aspects of the transition as to what actions need to be taken and how to translate the alphabetic reform into diverse classrooms.

Readiness to Teach the Latin Script

As it was initially planned, the teachers were sampled on the basis of a criterion that they had undergone a training session on learning and teaching the Latin-based Kazakh alphabet and orthography. Thus, among the eight recruited teachers five had taken a short-term training session either on a paid basis or as a mandatory free course for all teachers whereas the remaining three did not take any kind of training. The participants were posed several questions related to their training for the purpose of obtaining information on how they reflect on their preparation and readiness to use the Latin-based Kazakh alphabet and orthography in teaching the Kazakh language. The sub-themes such as teacher training and teacher-initiated activities emerged from data analysis.

Teacher training

The vast majority found the training session to be effective by stating that they learned a lot during the short period of time. Based on that, teachers felt more confident in their readiness. A participant named Roza reflected, "It was effective… We learned the borrowed words [how to spell them], generally, we learned a lot of things, we trained our hands a little by writing, writing, we wrote a lot… we learned well enough".

Teachers also highlighted the contents of the short-term training:

...the course was good. Many questions have been clarified. Teachers and researchers were…well, it was held by researchers [linguists]… . Many things… were explained to us.

Drawing on the statements above, it can be highlighted that teachers understand the importance of undergoing training in order to be able to teach using the new Latin script. Nevertheless, there are a few teachers who found it challenging and expressed their hope for more advanced and sophisticated sessions. In this regard, some teachers even pointed out the lack of pedagogical techniques and support in teaching. Regarding this, Tumar put forward the following: "We actually came to grips with the meaning of the Latin alphabet, learned how to write it, its orthographic spelling, and what marks are used. But there wasn't anything concerning the methodological part, about how to teach a student…". This implies that the teachers still need teaching guidelines to facilitate the instruction of the Kazakh Latin alphabet and orthography. However, other teachers stated the opposite to Tumar's claim. For instance, Aina replied: "The teaching guidelines were distributed to us. There were three books, I think, about those [Latin alphabet and orthography] ...". Interestingly, both teachers underwent the training, however, while the former expressed readiness, the latter showed some concern. Furthermore, a small number of teachers clearly emphasized their unpreparedness as they perceived the implementation requiring

responsibility, significant effort and training. It can be seen from Aina's statement: "No, I am not ready...because it requires very intensive training".

Another interesting pattern was noticed from the teachers who had not undergone the training. According to their perception, there is no need for training if a teacher is self-motivated and committed to the development and the prosperity of the language. A participant named Ziyash believes that mastering the new alphabet with its orthography will not cause any difficulties due to the availability of sources nowadays. She said:

> I have not undergone the training. However, personally, I think that with the last version [of the alphabet], I actually take it home and to work with me – bring it to my lessons…I think that today for someone who wants to develop there is no need for a course.

After a small pause she added: "There are resources available and affordable. […] it does not require any…financial expenses. If you want to develop [professionally], it is up to you". Consequently, at this stage of implementation, teachers perceive their readiness to be somewhat bound to the top-down adopted guidelines and the provision of methodological support. In other words, these findings display how teachers perceive their preparedness: while some are confident in their knowledge gained during the training, others refer to the lack of teaching guidelines for launching the implementation of the script at a school level, yet others deny the necessity of extra training courses.

Teacher-initiated activities

To the question asking whether teachers took any measures to introduce students with the Latin alphabet and orthography, five out of the eight teachers responded positively. This means that most have been using the new script in their Kazakh language classes and negotiating between the Cyrillic and Latin scripts. These teachers reported organizing occasional dictation writing and other exercises oriented to training writing as

well as literacy development in the Latin script. For example, Roza admitted "At this stage, we don't have any plans, we just decided to teach students gradually, as we are worried about Kazakh, [...] and started integrating the Latin script little by little." Among the practices Roza uses were the exercises involving spelling of students' names, writing the date, and using dictation exercises (Roza). Additionally, the teachers revealed conducting class discussions on Latinization, and assigning extra-curricular tasks to practice the Latin-based script. A participant named Aisha even displayed the photos and videos of the open lessons and discussions she held with her students and school representatives. A couple of teachers revealed their attempts to contribute to the teaching of the Kazakh Latin script within the scope of their schools. A case in point is the self-developed curricular programs by Aisha and Aina, who hoped to promote it across schools after proceeding through the formalities from the responsible decision-making figures. With regard to the program, Aisha articulated: "Last time, I tried to write a program called "Let's learn to write in Latin. It's a self-labeled program, mainly for the Russian-language classroom." This data shows that teachers are getting prepared and realize what they might face once the official implementation is launched.

On the contrary, however, the remaining three teachers admitted not conducting introductory class activities related to teaching the Latin-based script. This can be due to factors such as unpreparedness, the fear of making mistakes, or the anticipation of an official top-down statement to implement the Latin script in education. For instance, although Tumar underwent a training session, she acknowledged: "We can't demand from students since we don't know ourselves". Another participant responded: "We are not integrating it that much because we will undoubtedly do it once the official statement from the education department is released. If I go and say I will teach students this and that on my own initiative, it won't be appropriate" (Fatima). Although Fatima showed readiness

by stating that "...I can and desire to teach..", it is explicit that there was a self-restraint in taking actions bound up to the guides of official decrees and statements, which signifies the unpreparedness of some teachers along with the mismatches present in the alphabet itself. A common trend among teachers is that the constant changes of the alphabet impedes their readiness. It is echoed in Roza's perception: "That is, when we write dictations, even we teachers hesitate, not to mention the students". Therefore, such constant and unstable modifications in the alphabet impact the teachers' preparation and readiness.

Conclusion

This study revealed Kazakh language teachers' perceptions in terms of teaching and learning the new orthography along with their readiness. The presented analysis can be summarized in four findings:

1. Teachers perceive the transition to the Latin alphabet as significant and appropriate for the Kazakh language, its development and the spread. Teachers' general perceptions revealed that they associate and prescribe symbolic meanings derived from official decrees and policies.

2. Learning the Latin script is easy for students as they can transfer their knowledge of English letters to writing and reading the Kazakh Latin alphabet.

3. Learning the Latin script is challenging for the teachers for two major reasons: habituality of the Cyrillic alphabet and generation differences. Moreover, teachers perceive that learning is also difficult for students of other ethnicities and repatriated students.

4. According to the teachers' perceptions of learning, illiteracy might occur as a result of translating the learning materials into the Latin script and lack of hours allocated to classroom practising and mastering of the new script.

5. The training was found to be less privileged by a number of participants as they
    considered mastering the Latin-based alphabet and orthography possible through
    various open sources. Regardless of the fact whether teachers were trained or not,
    they had a sense of readiness which was transparent through their self-initiated
    programs and activities. Based on the teachers' perceptions of their readiness to
    teach the new script, they seem to be prepared to a moderate level, considering the
    constant changes of the alphabet.

Chapter 5: Discussion

This chapter aims to discuss and interpret the findings from the previous chapter in relation to the reviewed literature and conceptual framework. The conceptual framework included the following dimensions directly linked to the research questions: 1) symbolic associations; 2) ease and difficulty (for reading, writing, and learning); 3) transfer of skills; and, 4) teacher readiness.

The purpose of this study was to discover teachers' perceptions of the alphabet transition in general terms and regarding its educational aspects such as learning and teaching readiness. The study was guided by the following three research questions: 1) How do Kazakh language teachers perceive the shift from the Cyrillic to the Latin alphabet? 2) How do Kazakh language teachers perceive the learning of the script themselves and by their students? 3) How do Kazakh language teachers perceive their readiness to teach using the new alphabet and orthography? The chapter is organized and presented in alignment with the research questions.

RQ1. How do Kazakh language teachers perceive the shift from the Cyrillic to the Latin alphabet?

This question sought to determine the ways teachers perceive the alphabet transition from Cyrillic to Latin in terms of how they interpret it. It was essential to explore the perceptions in order to see how they shape teachers' readiness as the major agents of change. The following finding sheds light on the matter.

Finding 1. The Kazakh language teachers' general perceptions revealed that they prescribe symbolic meanings to Latinization which are consistent with evidence from the existing literature (Cooper, 1990; Dotton, 2016; Kadirova, 2018; Liddicoat, 2005). Moreover, these perceptions strongly reflect the official statements of decrees and language planning goals described in the major policy documents (State Program, 2019;

Strategic Plan, 2018). Among those symbolic associations, most commonly the educators

referred to the Kazakhization, which is a covert policy that supposes spreading the scope of

the Kazakh language (Fierman, 2005; Kadirova, 2018; Konyratbayeva & Satemirova,

2019; Smagulova, 2016). However, the participants tended to speculate that Latinization

was the only way to accomplish that goal of Kazakhization. Furthermore, the majority of

the teachers perceived Latinization as de-Russification. It corresponds to the evidence from

previous studies that orthography and orthoepy of the Kazakh language was greatly

affected by those of the Russian language and the Cyrillic script (Dotton, 2016; Kadirova,

2018). Some teachers even mentioned how Russian influences a Kazakh written

communication through Cyrillic, corrupting the orthography and spelling of Kazakh words.

Hence, the ongoing transfer is interpreted as a way to purify the Kazakh language.

Consequently, most of the teachers referred to Latinization as a means of

revitalizing the Kazakh language. Indeed, the alphabet reform as part of a broader language

planning initiative can result from the aim to revitalize or modernize the language

(Ferguson, 2006; Hornberger & Coronel-Molina, 2004; Landau & Kellner-Heinkele,

2001). The teachers, however, also mentioned the possibility of gaining more worldwide

recognition for the Kazakh through the Latin-based alphabet (Dotton, 2016; Kadirova,

2018; Winner, 1952). From the language education perspective, teachers perceive that

Latinization may stir the students' interests and thus increase the prestige of the language.

This view supports the policy that is attempting to extend the scope of using the Kazakh

language, not only in the educational domain, but across the country and beyond (Strategic

Plan, 2018, February 15). This policy document emphasizes the shift to the Latin script as

"an independent dimension of language modernization" paying specific attention to the

educational domain. As found in Dotton's (2016) study, the transfer to the Latin-based

script is guided by the goals of increasing the status of the language, maintaining the language and building its corpus.

Furthermore, as mentioned by Aisha, it is seen as a bridge to enter the global arena (Konyratbayeva & Satemirova, 2019). This sort of interpretation is present in the studies of Fierman (2009) and Winner (1952), who argued in favour of the alphabet shift bringing in an "international" identity as it fosters an invisible connection. What teachers perceive can be interpreted according to this symbolic meaning. Moreover, as Coulmas (1989) pointed out "depending on the colonial history, a Western orthography may be either the prestige model to imitate or a standard to be avoided and deviated from" (as cited in Hornberger, 1993, p. 235). The former is found to be the association teachers drew on when they referred to Latinization.

Taken together, a conclusion that can be drawn from the discussion of the teachers' general perceptions is that they see the transition to the Latin script as being an important stage for the development of the Kazakh language in general, and improving the written communication and literacy learning in Kazakh by abandoning the Russian language.

RQ2. How do Kazakh language teachers perceive the learning of the script by themselves and by their students?

It was important to discover how teachers perceive the learning of the alphabet in an educational setting. Three findings answered the question regarding the learning. The findings of this research question are particularly crucial in terms of further considerations for the implementation of the Latin script in the educational field. The educational considerations are somewhat in line with those suggested by Karan (2014) in the Literature Review chapter, as they concern the ease in learning and teaching of the new script.

Finding 2. According to the teachers' perceptions, learning the Latin script is easy for students as they can transfer their knowledge of English letters to writing and reading

the Kazakh Latin alphabet. Thus, the underlying factors that ease the learning of the letters, as the teachers specified, were features of the Latin-based Kazakh alphabet and familiarity with a Latin-based alphabet of other languages. These factors correspond to the literature that discusses the learning of a new alphabet through the similarities in two scripts (Cook & Bassetti, 2005). Researchers (Janbaz, Saleh, & Duval, 2006; Wang, Perfetti & Liu's (2005) highlighted that alphabets, developed according to universal principles and not deviated from the international standard are easier to master. In this respect, teachers' perceptions of learning corroborate with the evidence for ease of mastering the Kazakh Latin alphabet. Transfer of skills, which is to happen easily as learners possess prior knowledge of another Latin-based script that is the English alphabet or any other language they learn that employs a Latin-based alphabet (Cahill & Karan, 2008). The interviewed teachers believe that the Latin-based alphabet at one's repertoire can serve as a facilitator for transferring the skills of writing in particular. What Fazylzhanova (2017) assumed as a cross-language orthographic and phonological interference is strongly denied by the teachers as they compared the Kazakh Latin script with the English alphabet rather than with the Cyrillic. Instead, they perceived the Latin alphabet to be beneficial in eliminating the incorrect usage of purely Kazakh sounds, resulted from the influence of the Cyrillic script (Aisha's example). Therefore, the teachers did not perceive the cross-language interference as being a difficulty in learning.

The participants' perceptions of learning the new Latin-based alphabet is also on par with Konyratbayeva and Satemirova's (2019) assumption about the reduction of some letters in the alphabet can facilitate the learning. However, what the authors referred to as the reduction of 'excessive characters' can be seen as ease of learning due to the knowledge of another Latin-based alphabet. Along with the ability to transfer the skills from one writing to another, teachers attributed the ease of learning to students' young age,

which they think is also a crucial factor. Nevertheless, this can be considered a limitation due to the narrow scope of the study. Therefore, it can be suggested as a future course of action in researching the acquisition of the Latin-based Kazakh alphabet.

Finding 3. Learning the Latin script is challenging for the teachers for two major reasons: habituality of the Cyrillic alphabet and generation differences. Moreover, teachers perceive that learning is also difficult for students of other ethnicities and repatriated students.

Considering themselves, teachers reported learning the new alphabet and its orthography during the short-term training. However, many pointed out having difficulties using it in class, ascribing it to their age. This is in line with Berry's (1977) argument about the difference between learning and using. Therefore, although learning was easier for some teachers, in practice they tended to face challenges or get confused due to the age factors and unfamiliarity with other Latin-based scripts. This finding again confirms the suggestions of Cook and Bassetti (2005). As can be seen, knowledge of other scripts based on Latin graphics plays a significant role when introduced to a resembling alphabetic writing. At the same time, as Yilmaz (2011) indicated, it will force people to re-learn the new script. As Dwyer (2005) and Bartholoma (2016) mentioned, the investment in one particular writing may become an obstacle, especially on teachers' way of fully mastering the Kazakh Latin alphabet. This investment has been manifested in the teachers' age, educational background, and language education policies that were in effect at different time frames (i.e., Soviet-time or post-Soviet language policies). Although there was no sign of resistance to be expressed on the teacher educators' part, they indeed showed investment in using the Cyrillic for reading and writing (Dwyer, 2005), and attributed it to their Soviet and post-Soviet educational background.

This finding is quite controversial to Kadirova's (2018) statement that teachers did not show any anxiety regarding the learning of the script. Along with the difficulties related to age and habituality of the Cyrillic, several teachers drew their attention to debatable letters that caused difficulties in learning and thus sparked anxiety in both teachers and students. In particular, as the majority of the interviewed teachers had a post-Soviet educational background, they were concerned about their ability to transfer the skills for learning to write in the Latin script. This finding further supports the idea suggested by Cooper (1990) that "many writing systems are designed as transitional orthographies" which facilitate the transition of literacy skills.

Thus, although learning the script might be assisted through the knowledge of an English alphabet, the transfer of reading skills might be impossible due to linguistic differences of two scripts.

Finding 4. According to the teachers' perceptions of learning, illiteracy might occur as a result of translating the learning materials into the Latin script and lack of hours allocated to classroom practising and mastering of the new script. They mentioned that the students might become illiterate in reading the heritage literary works written in Cyrillic or reverse might happen with adults. Besides, as the findings demonstrated, many teachers perceived that illiteracy is most likely to happen to students who had pre-existing problems with writing in Kazakh both in Russian and Kazakh-medium classes. This somewhat confirms Chsherbakov's (2017) assumption that Russian- and Kazakh-speaking students may become illiterate either in Cyrillic or Latin. Besides, the finding is in line with Yilmaz's (2011) evidence of putting much effort into re-learning the new script in order to prevent and eliminate illiteracy. Similar to the findings of Hatcher's (2008) and Yilmaz's (2011) study, the teacher participants were concerned that the learning materials might become inaccessible for generations.

In addition, as Aina rightly highlighted, the transition to the Latin alphabet needs a working orthography and transliterated books, which could be used in the classroom. It is mirrored in the statement of Raizen (1987), which highlights that in the context of alphabet switch "access to material produced before the script reform is restricted unless a substantial program of transliteration of older publications is undertaken" (as cited in Liddicoat, 2005, p. 996). Otherwise, both the literature and the participant agree that it can result in illiteracy.

To conclude the findings related to the second research question, it can be said that the teachers believed learning to be achieved without great effort by students, while questioning their own learning. The latter, in turn, can influence the quality of learning the new script, which directly depends on the extent to which the teachers are trained. Learning of the script needs to be considered as an essential part of the alphabet transition and implementation. Further developments linked with education might include a close examination of the correlation between the acquisition of a new writing script and age, ethnicity, as well as literacy rate.

RQ3. How do Kazakh language teachers perceive their readiness to teach using the new alphabet and orthography?

As for the fourth research question, it sought to explore the teachers' readiness through their perceptions of learning and teacher training, which were discussed in the previous finding, and that of teaching the new script.

Finding 5. A number of participants found the training to be less privileged as they considered mastering the Latin-based alphabet and orthography possible through various open sources. Regardless of the fact whether the teachers were trained or not, they had a sense of readiness which was transparent through their reflections on the in-class activities. Based on the teachers' perceptions of readiness to teach the new script, they seem to be

prepared to a moderate level, although taking into account the constant changes of the

alphabet and other issues that might occur within the process.

       As data revealed, the participants reported their readiness through various activities

they integrate in their Kazakh language classes on a daily basis as well as assign extra-

curricular tasks to students. This kind of arrangement of tasks were proved by Malone

(2004) to be a cornerstone in the way to a successful implementation of a writing system.

They also reflect the extent to which teachers are prepared. Moreover, by doing so, the

participants were able to define the teachability of the new script, which is one of the

integral parts of educational factors often neglected by the language decision-makers

(Karan, 2006). Also, they indicated the availability of the orthographic rules based on the

recent version of the alphabet, although they pointed out its discrepancies. This statement

agrees with Karan (2006) that teachers should be able to maintain a quality instruction

which is supported by their motivation and provision of necessary materials in the process

of alphabet change. In this regard, over half of the participants reported introducing the

Kazakh Latin alphabet in classes. The findings also revealed that the majority of teachers'

desire to use the new alphabet and orthography in both teaching and promoting it in school

(Karan, 2006). Even so, there is a minority of teachers who expressed anticipation of

official decrees and policies rather than unpreparedness in teaching even though they were

trained and ready to implement the transition. A working orthography also plays a

considerable role in teachers' level of preparedness to teach using the new script (Karan,

2006). Therefore, some teachers' responses are consistent with the literature, stating the

importance of designing an easily comprehensible working orthography for students with

different backgrounds.

       According to the participants, the training proved useful as it provided a foundation

for the teachers with the post-Soviet educational background in terms of refreshing their

knowledge of the Latin-based script or acquiring it from scratch. Among the educational considerations, training was indicated by previous research as being essential for a successful transition (Winner, 1952). This gives a rationale for why Karan (2006) highlighted educational factors being neglected by the language planners. Training teachers and cadre to further implement the alphabet transition is vital as teachers are directly in charge of disseminating knowledge. This comes in line with the initiative specified in the Strategic Plan for the Development of Kazakhstan until 2025 (2018), which indicates teacher training for the transition to the Latin script in schools.

Overall, several trained teachers struggled to pinpoint the challenges of teaching in Kazakh Latin script in class even though they occasionally provided introductory lessons in order for students to learn the basics of the new alphabet. Thus, the insights of the teachers on their readiness could be useful for stakeholders to make mindful decisions regarding the gradual transition.

Conclusion

This chapter aimed at discussing the major findings with support of the literature. The findings regarding the general perceptions of the participating teachers correspond with the existing literature.

Kazakh language teachers' general interpretations of the transition to the Latin-based alphabet are connected with the historical past of the Kazakh language writing and the newly-developed language policies, which promote the Kazak language. It is mostly in line with the reviewed literature on the sociolinguistic attitudes of the public. Besides, teachers held a strong belief that Latinization could preserve the Kazakh language and solve its problems of lack of use and prestige. The participants who reflected on the effects of the Russian language on the orthography of the Kazakh language considered the transition to the alphabet as being an aid for improving it. The findings would be more

meaningful if the teachers reflected on their perceptions of the alphabet transition with regards to its educational considerations even though the study attempted to touch upon the issues of learning and teaching readiness.

As for the learning, the interviewed teachers unanimously agreed that the ease of learning depends on the familiarity with another Latin-based alphabet; therefore, they believed it would be less challenging for students. Many teachers, however, questioned their ability to master the new alphabet and orthography for a reason of unfamiliarity. Learning of the script needs to be considered as an important part of the alphabet transition and implementation. The findings also showed that training teachers is critical in order to convey a quality learning through the different grades, media of instruction, and between students of various ethnic backgrounds. Although some teachers denied the necessity of the training, it is found to be a key to being able to teach the Kazakh Latin alphabet. A few trained teachers showed uncertainty about their ability to introduce the Kazakh Latin alphabet due to the shortage of training or lack of teaching guideline, confused about when and how to integrate it. The rest of the teachers, both trained and untrained ones, however, showed some degree of readiness through their introductory activities in class. There is a space for considering the teachers' suggestions regarding the development of the learning materials in the Latin script, their involvement in the decision-making as they possess practical knowledge of teaching the language, and allocation of an additional time for distributing the new Kazakh alphabet and orthography appropriately. The teachers' insights might be useful for stakeholders in making mindful decisions regarding the ongoing alphabet transition and its gradual implementation.

Conclusion

This chapter is dedicated to conclusions elicited from the discussion of the most relevant findings with regard to the research purpose and research questions. The purpose of this study was to explore the Kazakh language teachers' perceptions of the alphabet transition and its educational considerations as teaching and learning. Three research questions guided the study: 1) How do Kazakh language teachers perceive the shift from the Cyrillic to the Latin alphabet? 2) How do Kazakh language teachers perceive the learning of the script themselves and by their students? 3) How do Kazakh language teachers perceive their readiness to teach using the Kazakh Latin alphabet and orthography?

Along with the main conclusions, the researcher presents the limitations and implications of the study, further specifying future research directions. Eventually, based on the findings, the chapter delineates recommendations for important stakeholders.

Major Findings and Conclusions of the Study

With respect to the first research question on teachers' perceptions about the alphabet replacement, it was found that the teachers' overall perceptions of the planned alphabet switch were rooted from the symbolic associations, which were, in turn echoed from the national addresses, policy documents and their objectives. The teachers' understanding of the goals set for Latinization makes the achievement of the targeted written communication and literacy feasible, since they pointed to the advantages of the Kazakh Latin alphabet for the educational and other domains (MoCS, 2019). Most of the participants unanimously referred to the Kazakhization policy, abandoning the Russian language, and improving the orthography of the Kazakh language by means of the Kazakh Latin alphabet and orthography. Furthermore, the Latin-based script, as they perceived it, was a key to promulgate the Kazakh language worldwide. This is also thought to be a

statement that the Kazakh language is thriving and claims a status of a lingua franca in Kazakhstan and beyond in years to come. In doing so, it is crucial to implement the transition effectively.

The collected data provided an adequate number of evidence to the second research question concerning the learning aspect of Latinization. The findings emphasized the possibility of learning difficulties for repatriated students, ethnic minorities and the adult population. Apart from that, prior knowledge of the Latin-based script is supposed to ease the learning process. In this regard, teachers questioned their knowledge of the Latin-script, referring to their unfamiliarity with the Latin script. Teachers thus concluded that learning should be planned once the correct alphabet is in place and teachers meet the requirements to teach based on the level of their readiness. This also implies that policy-makers and language specialists should be aware of such details in planning the implementation of the new alphabet.

As for the third research question, some of the teacher participants reported teaching to be less confusing as they relied on the teaching guidelines provided during the short-term training. Based on that, they carried out lessons introducing the Kazakh Latin script through many different activities. On the other hand, a few untrained teachers explained not taking any initiatives to introduce the new alphabet in class by referring to the absence of the official policy statement and guidelines for carrying it out. In addition, half of the participants denied the necessity of training, emphasizing the motivation to take the responsibility for teaching the new alphabet and orthography. However, the training remained to be important for an effective implementation and appropriate teaching for literacy development by the rest of the teachers. It was perceived as a catalyst for starting off the implementation process in schools. Thus, the activities that they described employing to introduce the Kazakh Latin alphabet reflected the teachers' readiness.

Regardless of the twofold stances expressed by the participants, the training should be carefully planned in order for teachers to be able to address the challenges of learning with the new alphabet as was revealed in the previous research question.

Overall, in terms of achieving the purpose of the study, it can be noticed that the findings helped to partially reach the purpose. While there are a number of insightful findings regarding the learning and teaching readiness, the learning part could be elaborated with a little more attention to it by teachers and students. Therefore, the study leaves space for further developments on the topic of Latinization and its learning by students. The limitations of this kind are further negotiated in the next paragraph.

Limitations and Further Implications

One limitation of the present research is the small sample size. Although initially it was deemed to be appropriate for achieving the research purpose and answering the research questions, due to the lack of time and limited scope of the study, it was clearly not sufficient for deeper understanding of the variations in the perceptions and the readiness of teachers to be able to arrive at some generalization. In order to do so, it requires a large number of participants not only from one particular context in Kazakhstan, but from various regions. Doing this would make the findings more reliable and valid for the educational domain. Furthermore, as this study focused on the Kazakh language teachers' perceptions, the findings are limited to solely their opinions and learning and teaching issues. Therefore, the findings might be one-sided. However, involving subject teachers of Kazakh medium education would broaden the scope of the research and provide much meaningful insight for the implementation and development of the Latin alphabet in school settings.

Another limitation arose as a result of the data collection instrument. Interviews were employed as a major data collection tool in order to explore teachers' perceptions of

the central phenomenon. However, in terms of learning and teaching, the use of multiple

instruments such as experiments, observation and surveys would bring out deeper insights.

As a mixed-methods research approach, an integration of multiple data collection

instruments would assist in determining the appropriateness of the current alphabet

versions and the orthography for the practical use in the classroom. Considering the

interview alone, it is also likely that the teachers' responses are altered in the presence of

the researcher.

The study findings suggest directions for future research with regards to identifying

the relationship between the alphabet acquisition and age, ethnicity, and medium of

instruction. Moreover, further studies are needed to determine and test the literacy

development in Cyrillic for the validity of Chsherbakov's (2017) hypothesis about the

possible illiteracy in Kazakh- and Russian-speaking language learners. Since this study

provided general explanation to the ease and difficulty of learning the new alphabet and

orthography, the findings lacked in providing understanding of this particular case, and

therefore it requires further elaboration. Conducting an experimental study would be handy

in terms of both testing the alphabet and orthography, as well as identifying the actual

learning issues and practical considerations as suggested by Karan (2004).

Recommendations

The study suggests that the **educational and language policy makers** give priority

to the practical implementation of the alphabet in school setting by allocating enough time

and resources for educators and students. This could also include involving teachers in the

process of making decisions with regards to educational aspects of the alphabet transition.

As the participants of the study reflected, only selected educational institutions went

through piloting and testing the Kazakh Latin alphabet. Despite that, the piloting should be

spread across all schools since Latinization is not carried out on a selective basis even

though it starts from primary school and supposes further transmission to various grades until 2025. Thus, the achievement of the target indicator, specified in the State Program (2019), would become feasible. The differences in medium of instruction should also be taken into account since the Kazakh language is taught as a compulsory subject in Russian-medium and other minority language schools as well.

Educators, on their part, are recommended to attend the training on time and be open to discussions of the alphabet features as it has direct implications for acquiring the letters and orthography.

Language specialists could work in collaboration with the Kazakh language teachers in order to advance the features of the alphabet and align it in accordance with the rules of the Kazakh language. In addition, such alignment would help avoid unnecessary burden and challenges in learning the new script by younger and older populations.

References

Akimat of Nur-Sultan. (2018, November 5). Testing of Latin graphics is carried out in five

schools of the city [online]. Available from

http://astana.gov.kz/en/news/news/16372

Bartholoma, R. (2016). The construction of the Tatar nation in the debate about the

introduction of Latin script in the republic of Tatarstan. In E. S. Ahn, & J.

Smagulova (Eds.), *Language change in Central Asia* (pp. 169-196). De Gruyter

Mouton.

Cook, P. V., & Bassetti, B. (Eds.). (2005). *Second language writing systems*. Retrieved

from https://ezproxy.nu.edu.kz:2077

Berg, B. L. (2009). *Qualitative research methods: For the social sciences* (7th ed.).

Boston: Allyn & Bacon

Berry, J. (1977). The making of alphabets revisited. In J. Fishman (Ed.), *Advances in the

Creation and Revision of Writing Systems* (pp. 3-16). Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter

Mouton. Retrieved from https://ezproxy.nu.edu.kz:2459/view/product/148911

Bloomberg, L. D., & Volpe, M. (2012). *Completing your qualitative dissertation: A road

map from beginning to end* (2nd ed.)

Borashev, K. K. (2018). *Transition to the Latin alphabet: Scientific and practical bases,

development and major issues.* Astana: "Til-Kazyna National Research and Practice

Center named after Sh. Shayakhmetov"

Brinkmann, S. (2013). *Qualitative interviewing: Qualitative interviewing*. Retrieved from

https://ezproxy.nu.edu.kz:2077

Brinkmann, S., & Kvale, S. (2018). *Qualitative Research kit: Doing interviews*. 55 City

Road, London: SAGE Publications Ltd. doi: 10.4135/9781529716665

Bürki, A., Welby, P., Clément, M., & Spinelli, E. (2019). Orthography and second

     language word learning: Moving beyond "friend or foe?". *The Journal of the*

     Acoustical Society of America, *145*(4), EL265-EL271.

Cahill, M., & Karan, E. (2008). Factors in designing effective orthographies for unwritten

     languages. *SIL International*.

Castillo-Montoya, M. (2016). Preparing for Interview Research: The Interview Protocol

     Refinement Framework. *Qualitative Report*, *21*(5).

Christian, D. (1988). Language planning: The view from linguistics. In F. Newmeyer

     (Ed.), *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey* (pp. 193-209). Cambridge: Cambridge

     University Press.

Chsherbakov, A. (2017). An exercise in argumentative writing: Arguing both sides of an

     issue. *NUGSE Research in Education, 2*(2), 32-34. Retrieved from

     nugserie.nu.edu.kz

Clement, V. (2008). Emblems of independence: script choice in post-Soviet Turkmenistan.

     International Journal of the Sociology of Language, *2008*(192), 171-185.

Clyne, M. (Ed.). (1997). *Undoing and redoing corpus planning* (p. 1). Retrieved from

     https://ezproxy.nu.edu.kz:2077

Coluzzi, P., Brasca, L., & Miola, E. (2019). Writing systems for Italian regional languages.

     Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 40(6), 491-503.

Cooper, R. (1990). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge: Cambridge

     University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511620812

Coulmas, F. (2013). *Writing and society*. Cambridge University Press.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating*

     quantitative and qualitative research (4th ed.). Pearson.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Educational research: planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). SAGE.

Dotton, Z. (2016). *Language policy and language planning in Kazakhstan: About the proposed shift from the Cyrillic alphabet to the Latin alphabet* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://repository.arizona.edu/handle/10150/621896 (2019, April 10)

Dukenbaev, K. (2018). *Qazaq tili men Latyn qaripi* [Kazakh language and the Latin script]. Almaty: Service Press.

Dwyer, A.M. (2005). *The Xinjiang conflict: Uyghur identity, language policy, and political discourse.* Washington: East-West Center Washington.

Fazylzhanova, A. (2017). *Problemy i perspektivy reformirovaniya kazakhskogo yazyka na osnove novogo latino-graphicheskogo alphavita* [Problems and prospects of reforming the Kazakh language based on the new Latin-graphic alphabet]. [Proceedings of Social and Political Aspects of the Realisation of Kazakh Orthography Switch to Latin] (pp.27-32). Almaty: National Institute of Philology, Politics and Religious Studies.

Fazylzhanova, A., Duisen, K., Akhmetkalieva, A., Nurgalieva, M., & Piyazbayeva, A. (2017). *Zhana alipbii negizindegi reformanyn aleumettik tiltanymdyk zhane aleumettik-sayasi aspektileri* [The sociolinguistic and socio-political aspects of the reform on the new alphabet]. In A. Seitbekova, & G. Mamyrbekova (Eds.), *Zhana ulttyk alipbi: Kazak zhazuyn zhangurty* [New national alphabet: Modernization of the Kazakh writing] (pp. 829-926). Almaty: The Akhmet Baitursynuly Institute of Linguistics. Retrieved from http://kazneb.kz/FileStore/dataFiles/f7/68/1559544/content/full.pdf?time=1588265130595&key=d2bccfe995a958534a24aa16c63695cf&isPortal=true

Ferguson, G. (2006). *Language planning and education*. Retrieved from

https://ezproxy.nu.edu.kz:2077

Fierman, W. (2005). Kazakh Language and Prospects for its Role in Kazakh Groupness.

Ab Imperio, *2005*(2), 393-423.

Fierman, W. (2006). Language and education in post-Soviet Kazakhstan: Kazakh-medium

instruction in urban schools. *The Russian Review*, *65*(1), 98-116.

Fishman, J. A. (Ed.). (2015). *Advances in the creation and revision of writing systems*

(Vol. 8). Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.

Gillham, B. (2000). *Case study research methods*. Retrieved from

https://ezproxy.nu.edu.kz:2077

Harrington, K. (2019, January 10). Following the trend: Kazakhstan's planned alphabet

change - analysis. Available from https://www.eurasiareview.com/10012019-

following-the-trend-kazakhstans-planned-alphabet-change-analysis/

Hatcher, L. (2008). Script change in Azerbaijan: acts of identity. *International Journal of

the Sociology of Language, 2008*(192), pp. 105-116. Retrieved from

doi:10.1515/IJSL.2008.038

Haugen, E. (1983). The implementation of corpus planning: Theory and practice. *Progress

in language planning: International perspectives, 31*, 269-290.

Hornberger, N. H. (1993). The first workshop on Quechua and Aymara writing. In J.

Fishman (Ed.), *The earliest stage of language planning: The "first congress"

phenomenon* (pp. 233-256). Mouton de Gruyter. Retrieved from

https://ezproxy.nu.edu.kz:2077

Hornberger, N. H., & Coronel-Molina, S. M. (2004). Quechua language shift,

maintenance, and revitalization in the Andes: The case for language planning.

International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 9-68.

Kadirova, R. (2018). *The sociolinguistic attitudes of Kazakhs towards the Latin alphabet and orthography reform in Kazakhstan* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://cdr.lib.unc.edu/concern/dissertations/br86b405f

Karan, E. (2006). *Writing system development and reform: A process* (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Dakota). Retrieved from https://arts-sciences.und.edu/academics/summer-institute-of-linguistics/theses/_files/docs/2006-karan-elke.pdf

Karan, E. (2014). The ABD of orthography testing: Practical guidelines. *Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota Session, 54*(1), 1. Retrieved from scholar.google.com

Keenan, M. (2018). *Perception. Salem Press Encyclopedia of Health*. Retrieved from https://ezproxy.nu.edu.kz:2358/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ers&AN=109057209&site=eds-live

Konyratbayeva, Z. M., & Satemirova, D. A. (2019, April). Effectiveness of the Transition to Latin Alphabet. In *6th Eurasian Conference on Language and Social Sciences Samarkand State University* (p. 421).

Kuderinova, K. (2017). *Zhana Kazakh alipbiinin grammatologiyalyk erekshelikteri* [Grammatological features of the new Kazakh alphabet]. In A. Seitbekova, & G. Mamyrbekova (Eds.), *Zhana ulttyk alipbi: Kazakh zhazuyn zhanggyrtu* [New national alphabet: Modernization of the Kazakh writing] (pp. 119-127). Almaty: The Akhmet Baitursynuly Institute of Linguistics. Retrieved from http://kazneb.kz/FileStore/dataFiles/f7/68/1559544/content/full.pdf?time=1588265130595&key=d2bccfe995a958534a24aa16c63695cf&isPortal=true

Landau, Y., & Kellner-Heinkele, B. (2001). *Politics of Language in the Ex-Soviet Muslim States*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Pr.

Leavy, P. (2017). *Research design: Quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods, arts-based,*

      and community-based participatory research approaches. The Guilford Press.

Lichtman, M. (2014). Interviewing. In Lichtman, M. (Ed.), *Qualitative research for the*

      social sciences (pp. 241-278). 55 City Road, London: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi:

      10.4135/9781544307756

Liddicoat, A. J. (2005). Corpus planning: Syllabus and materials development. In E.

      Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp.

      993-1009). Retrieved from https://ezproxy.nu.edu.kz:2077

Liddicoat, A. J. (Ed.). (2007). *Language planning and policy: Issues in language planning*

      and literacy. Retrieved from https://ezproxy.nu.edu.kz:2077

Limerick, N. & Hornberger, N. H. (2019). Teachers, textbooks, and orthographic choice in

      Quechua: Comparing bilingual intercultural education in Peru and Ecuador across

      decades, *Compare: A journal of Comparative and International Education*. doi:

      10.1080/03057925.2019.1613149

Limerick, N. (2017). Kichwa or Quichua? Competing alphabets, political histories, and

      complicated reading in indigenous languages. *Comparative Education Review*,

      62(1), 103-124.

Louisville University. (2016). *Human subjects protection program plan: Policy manual*.

      Louisville. Retrieved from

      http://louisville.edu/research/humansubjects/policies/hrpp-policies

Lüpke, F. (2011). *Orthography development* (pp. 312-336). Cambridge University Press.

Malone, S. (2004). *Manual for developing literacy and adult education programmes in*

      minority language communities. Retrieved from

      https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000135164

McCracken, G. (1988). *Qualitative Research Methods: The long interview*. Newbury Park,

  CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: 10.4135/9781412986229

McDonald, S. M. (2012), Perception: A Concept Analysis. *International Journal of*

  Nursing Knowledge, 23: 2-9. doi:10.1111/j.2047-3095.2011.01198.x

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and*

  implementation (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Ministry of Culture and Sports [MoCS], & SANA Independent Information Analytical

  Centre [IIAC]. (2018). *Kazakstan Respublikasynyn til sayasaty maseleleri boiynsha*

  aleumettik jane analiticalyk zertteu [Sociological and analytical research on the

  issues of language policy in the Republic of Kazakhstan]. Astana.

Ministry of Culture and Sports [MoCS]. (2019). *Kazakstan Respublikasyndagy til*

  sayasatyn iske asyrudyn 2020-2025 zhyldarga arnalgan melekettik bagdarlamasy

  [State Program for the implementation of the language policy in the Republic of

  Kazakhstan for the years 2020-2025]. Retrieved from

  http://adilet.zan.kz/kaz/docs/P1900001045

National Academy of Education [NAE]. (2013). *Preemstvennost' soderzhaniya predmeta*

  «Angliiskii yazik» na urovnyah nachalnogo I osnovnogo srednego obrazovaniya

  [The continuity of the English language subject content at the levels of primary and

  basic secondary education]. Astana.

Munhall, P. L. (2008). Perception. In L. M. Given (Ed.), T*he SAGE encyclopedia of*

  qualitative research methods (Vols. 1-0). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications,

  Inc. doi: 10.4135/9781412963909

Mynzhasarkyzy, D., Ospan, A., & Galym, J. (2017, May 3). *Latyn alipbii: Zhangyru -*

  zhazudan bastalady [The Latin alphabet: Renovation starts from writing]. Available

  from https://tilalemi.kz/article/621-.html

Nazarbayev, N. (2017, April 12). Course towards the future: Modernization of

Kazakhstan's identity. Retrieved from

https://www.akorda.kz/ru/events/akorda_news/press_conferences/statya-glavy-

gosudarstva-vzglyad-v-budushchee-modernizaciya-obshchestvennogo-soznaniya

Nazarbayev, N. (2017, October 27). On switching the Kazakh alphabet from the Cyrillic to

the Latin script. Retrieved from http://www.akorda.kz/ru/legal_acts/decrees/o-

perevode-alfavita-kazahskogo-yazyka-s-kirillicy-na-latinskuyu-grafiku

Niyomugabo, C., & Uwizeyimana, V. (2018). A top–down orthography change and

language attitudes in the context of a language-loyal country. *Language Policy*,

17(3), 307-318.

Orleu Astana. (2018, September 26). Training the Latin graphics. Retrieved from

http://orleuastana.kz/2018/09/obuchenie-latinskoj-grafike/

Pshenova, T. N. (2018). *Metodicheskii desant v pomosh shkolam* [Methodical invasion

troops are to aid schools]. In L. A. Sainova (Ed.), *Respublikanskaya dialogovaya*

ploshyadka. Panorama pedagogicheskih idei [Republican interactive platform. The

panorama of pedagogical ideas] (pp. 449-456). Astana: JSC National Centre of

Professional Development. Retrieved from http://orleuastana.kz/wp-

content/uploads/sbor_stat/rukhani.pdf

Raizen, E. (1987). *Romanization of the Hebrew script: Ideology, attempts and failure*

(Order No. 8806400). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global

Reagan, T. (2019). Language planning and language policy in Kazakhstan. In A.

Kirpatrick, & A. J. Liddicoat (Eds.), *The Routledge International Handbook of*

Language Education Policy in Asia (pp. 442-451). Retrieved from

https://ezproxy.nu.edu.kz:2222/ehost/ebookviewer/ebook/bmxlYmtfXzIxMDYyM

DJfX0FO0?sid=ef07460d-6c3e-4d3e-b264-ae89315bdaae@sdc-v-

sessmgr03&vid=1&format=EB&rid=1

Rubin, H, J., & Rubin, I, S. (2012). *Qualitative interviewing: the art of hearing data* (3rd

ed.). California: Sage Publications Inc.

Saldana, J. (2011). *Fundamentals of qualitative research*. Retrieved from

https://ezproxy.nu.edu.kz:2077

Sherwin, E. (2019, July 1). Kazakhstan rewrites its alphabet to shed its Soviet past.

Available from https://p.dw.com/p/3LQ7B

Shodyr, N. (2017, May 17). *Latyn alipbiine koshu: masele, pikir, usynys* [The transition to

the Latin alphabet: problem, opinion, and suggestion]. Retrieved from

https://tilalemi.kz/article/690-.html

Shustov, A. (2006, December 6). *Kazakhstan: Pliusy i minusy latinizatsii* [Kazakhstan:

Advantages and disadvantages of Latinization]. Retrieved from

https://www.zakon.kz/79622-kazakhstan-pljusy-i-minusy-latinizacii.html

Simons, H. (2014). Case Study Research: In-Depth Understanding in Context. In P. Leavy

(Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 455-470). Oxford

University Press. Retrieved from

https://ezproxy.nu.edu.kz:2948/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199811755.001.0001/

oxfordhb-9780199811755-e-005.

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, doi: 10.1080/13670050802148798

Smagulova, J. (2016). The re-acquisition of Kazakh in Kazakhstan: Achievements and

challenges. In A. S. Elise & J. Smagulova (Eds.), *Language Change in Central Asia*

(pp. 89-108). Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter. Retrieved from

https://ezproxy.nu.edu.kz:2459/view/books/9781614514534/9781614514534-009/9781614514534-009.xml

Smalley, W. A. (1959). How shall I write this language? *The Bible Translator, 10*(2), 49-69. Retrieved from http://www.ubs-translations.org/tbt/1959/02/TBT195902.html?seq=3

Stake, R. E. (2010). *Qualitative research: Studying how things work.* Guilford Press.

Stevenson, R. B. (2007). Schooling and environmental education: Contradictions in purpose and practice. *Environmental education research*, *13*(2), 139-153.

Strategic Plan for the Development of Kazakhstan. (2018). The third modernization of Kazakhstan: New opportunities for citizens and qualitative growth. Retrieved from https://www.akorda.kz/ru/official_documents/strategies_and_programs

Tanayeva, L. (2007). The Politics of the Latin alphabet in Kazakhstan. *The Annual of Language & Politics and Politics of Identity*, *1*, 79-84.

Taylor, S., DeVault, M., & Bogdan, R. (2016). *Introduction to qualitative research methods, 4th ed.*, Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

The Science Committee of the Ministry of Education and Science [MoES]. (2007b). *O perehode Kazakhskoi pis'mennosti na Latinskuyu graphiku (Predvaritelnaya analiticheskaya spravka)* [On the transition of the Kazakh alphabet to the Latin graphics (Preliminary analytical report)]. Retrieved from http://online.zakon.kz

The Science Committee of the Ministry of Education and Science [MoES]. (2007a). *Kazak alipbiin Latyn graphikasyna koshiru turaly gyglmi zertteu materialdary* [Research publications on the transition of the Kazakh alphabet to the Latin graphics]. Almaty.

Timmons, V., & Cairns, E. (2010). Case study research in education. In A. J. Mills, G.

Durepos, & E. Wiebe (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of case study research* (Vols. 1-0).

Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: 10.4135/9781412957397

Uzman, M. (2010). Romanization in Uzbekistan: Past and present. *Journal of the Royal

Asiatic Society, 20*(1), 49-60. Retrieved from

https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-the-royal-asiatic-

society/article/romanisation-in-uzbekistan-past-and-

present/99A287F82815370DF1EF0EB8C4C914F5

Venezky, R. (1970). Principles for the Design of Practical Writing Systems.

Anthropological Linguistics, 12(7), 256-270. Retrieved from

www.jstor.org/stable/30029259

Volmar, E., & Eisenhardt, K. (2020, January 30). Case Study Research: A State-of-the-Art

Perspective. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management*.

Retrieved from

https://ezproxy.nu.edu.kz:5221/business/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190224851.00

1.0001/acrefore-9780190224851-e-206.

Wang, M., Perfetti, C. A., & Liu, Y. (2005). Chinese–English biliteracy acquisition: Cross-

language and writing system transfer. *Cognition*, *97*(1), 67-88.

Winner, T. G. (1952). Problems of alphabetic reform among the Turkic peoples of Soviet

Central Asia, 1920-41. *The Slavonic and East European Review*, *31*(76), 133-147.

Yilmaz, H. (2011). Learning to read (again): The social experiences of Turkey's 1928

alphabet reform. *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, *43*(4), 677–697.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020743811000900

Zhunisbek, A. (2018). *Kazak til biliminin maseleleri: Kazak phonetikasy* [The issues in

Kazakh linguistics: The phonetics of the Kazakh language]. Almaty: Abzal-ai.

Retrieved from https://tilalemi.kz/viewer/viewer.php?file=/books/2018019.pdf

Zhunusova, Zh. Zh. (2018). *Doshkolnoye obrazovanie - pervaya stupen' duhovnogo i

nravstvennogo vospitaniya podrastayushego pokoleniya* [Preschool education as a

first step of spiritual and moral education of the growing generation]. In L. A.

Sainova (Ed.), *Respublikanskaya dialogovaya ploshyadka. Panorama

pedagogicheskih idei* [Republican interactive platform. The panorama of

pedagogical ideas] (pp.49-50). Astana: JSC National Centre of Professional

Development. Retrieved from http://orleuastana.kz/wp-

content/uploads/sbor_stat/rukhani.pdf

Appendix A

Interview Protocol

Time:

Date:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. Let us start our interview.

Сұхбатқа қатысуға келіскеніңіз үшін көп рахмет!

Categories	Interview questions	Интервью сұрақтары
Demographic questions	a) How long have you been teaching Kazakh? b) What medium classes do you teach Kazakh for? (Kazakh-medium, Russian-medium)	a) Қазақ тілін оқытып жүргеніңізге неше жыл болды? b) Қазақ тілін қай тілді сыныптарға үйретесіз (орыс немесе қазақ тілді)?
General perceptions	1. How do you feel about the Latinization of the Kazakh Alphabet? Why? **Probes:** What are your overall thoughts about it? Do you accept it? Why or why not? 2. Are there possible advantages of changing the Kazakh alphabet into Latin? Could you specify? 3. What are the possible disadvantages of using Latin script? Can you specify some of them? 4. Which script (alphabet) do you prefer: Cyrillic-based or Latin-based? Why? 5. Since the reform began to be implemented, what do you think have the significant and distinctive features of the new Latin alphabet been? (How have they developed?) **Probes:** a. How do the three versions of the Latin alphabet compare?	1. Қазақ әліпбиін латын қарпіне көшіру жайлы жалпы ойыңыз қандай? **Probes:** Латын әліпбиі мен емлесін (орфография) қабылдайсыз ба? Неліктен? 2. Латын қарпіне көшудің артықшылықтары бар ма? Қандай? 3. Латын әліпбиінің кемшіліктері болса, атап өте аласыз ба? 4. Қай әліпбиге жақынсыз? Неліктен? 5. Латындандыру реформасы қолға алынғаннан бері, жаңа әліпбидің елеулі айырмашылықтары қандай болды және олар қалай қалыптасты? **Probes:** a. Латын қарпіне негізделген жаңа әліпбидің үш (ендігі төрт) нұсқасының өзара айырмашылықтары қандай? b. Латын әліпбиінің үш нұсқасының ішінен қайсысы

	b. Among the three versions (and now four) which Latin-based Kazakh alphabet do you think is the most appropriate one? Which one do you prefer? c. Do you know there is a fourth version of the Latin-based alphabet?	дұрыс деп ойлайсыз? Қайсысы көңіліңізден шықты? с. Төртінші нұсқасы шыққаны жайлы хабарыңыз бар ма?
Perceptions of learning	6. How would you evaluate the quality of the recent official (third) script in terms of learning them? How about reading and writing? 7. What do you think of learning materials being changed into Latin script? To what extent do you think they will be comprehensible in Latin script? **Probes:** How do you think the literacy skills will transfer from Cyrillic to Latin?	6. Әліпбидің соңғы ресми мақұлданған, яғни үшінші нұсқасының (оқып-үрену үшін) сапасын қалай бағалайсыз? Латын әліпбиі арқылы қазақ тілін оқу қаншалықты қиын деп ойлайсыз? (жазу, оқу, түсіну) 7. Оқу құралдарының жазба тілін Латын қарпіне ауыстыру жайлы не ойлайсыз? Оқушыларға қаншалықты түсінікті болады? **Probes:** Жазу және оқу дағыдылары Кириллицадан Латынға қалай тасымалданады деп ойлайсыз?
Perceptions of readiness	8. As you have taken training courses for Latin, how helpful did you find them (the courses)? **Probes:** a. Can you remember when it was held? b. Do you think it (the training) was sufficient? What challenges have you faced personally? What are the benefits and drawbacks that have you noticed in the training courses? Have there been any other additional training since then? 9. Could the training give you important pedagogical instruction about how to put the knowledge of Latin alphabet and orthography into practice in Russian/ Kazakh-medium classes?	8. Латын әліпбиіне дайындық курсын өттіңіз. Сол курсты қаншалықты тиімді болды деп санайсыз? **Probes:** a. Дайындық курсын қай жылы өттіңіз? b. Дайындық курсында Латын емлесін оқу барысында қандай қиындыққа тап болдыңыз немесе қандай кемшілік байқадыңыз? 9. Дайындық курсы сізге Латын емлесін қазақ-орыс ағымдарына үйрету бойынша маңызды әдістемелік нұсқаулық бере алды ма? 10. Қазақ Латын әліпбиін үйрету ұаншалықты қиын немесе жеңіл болады деп ойлайсыз?

10. What can you say about the level of difficulty of teaching through Kazakh Latin alphabet?

11. Can the existing pedagogical strategies of teaching the Cyrillic alphabet and orthography apply for teaching the Latin-based ones? Can you use the same strategies?

12. Based on your knowledge of the orthography built on the new Kazakh Latin alphabet, how would you evaluate your preparedness?

13. What do you think about adding an extra course on the curriculum for preparing students how to use the new orthography effectively?

14. What activities have you already done to familiarize students with the Latin script?

15. What do you think of teachers' participation in the process of creation and implementation of the proper alphabet?

11. Жаңа әліпбидің емлесін білетініңізге сүйене отырып, өзіңіздің оны (мектепте) үйретуге дайындығыңызды қалай бағалар едіңіз?

12. Кириллицаға негізделген қазақ әліпбиін үйретуде қолданылған әдістемелік нұсқаулары Латын емлесін үйретуге жарайды ма?

13. Білім беру жоспарына латын негізіндегі жаңа әліпби мен емлесін оқушыларға тиімді түрде (үйрететін) оқытатын қосымша сабақ қосу керек пе? Неліктен?

14. Оқушыларды Қазақ латын әліпбиі және орфографиясымен таныстыру мақсатында қандай да бір іс-шара қолдандыңыз ба? (жаттығулар, диктант, т.б.)

15. Дұрыс қазақ латын әліпбиі мен емлесін құрастыру үрдісінде мұғалімдердің қатысуы жайлы ойыңыз қандай?

Appendix B

Versions of the Kazakh Latin Alphabet

ПРИЛОЖЕНИЕ
к Указу Президента
Республики Казахстан
от 19 февраля 2018 года
№ 637

УТВЕРЖДЕН
Указом Президента
Республики Казахстан
от 26 октября 2017 года
№ 569

АЛФАВИТ
казахского языка, основанный на латинской графике

№	Написание	Звук	№	Написание	Звук
1	A a	[а]	17	Ń ń	[н]
2	Á á	[ә]	18	O o	[о]
3	B b	[б]	19	Ó ó	[ө]
4	D d	[д]	20	P p	[п]
5	E e	[е]	21	Q q	[қ]
6	F f	[ф]	22	R r	[р]
7	G g	[г]	23	S s	[с]
8	Ǵ ǵ	[ғ]	24	T t	[т]
9	H h	[х], [h]	25	U u	[ұ]
10	I i	[i]	26	Ú ú	[ү]
11	I ı	[н], [й]	27	V v	[в]
12	J j	[ж]	28	Y y	[ы]
13	K k	[к]	29	Ý ý	[у]
14	L l	[л]	30	Z z	[з]
15	M m	[м]	31	Sh sh	[ш]
16	N n	[н]	32	Ch ch	[ч]

Диграфтар

№	Латын таңбасы	Дыбысталуы	Транскрипциясы	Мысалы
1	Ae / ae	Әә	[ә] [æ]	aelem
2	Oe / oe	Өө	[ө]	oerken
3	Ue / ue	Үү	[ү]	uekimet

Диграфтар

№	Латын таңбасы	Дыбысталуы	Транскрипциясы	Мысалы
1	Gh / gh	Ғғ	[ғы]	ghylym
2	Ch / ch	Чч	[чы]	chempion
3	Sh / sh	Шш	[шы]	shyndyq
4	Zh / zh	Жж	[жы]	zhazw

ҚАЗАҚ ӘЛІПБИІНІҢ ЛАТЫН ҚАРПІНДЕ ЖАЗЫЛУЫ

№	Жазылуы	Дыбыс-талуы	№	Жазылуы	Дыбыс-талуы
1	A a	[а]	17	N' n'	[ң], [нг]
2	A' a'	[ә]	18	O o	[о]
3	B b	[б]	19	O' o'	[ө]
4	D d	[д]	20	P p	[п]
5	E e	[е]	21	Q q	[қ]
6	F f	[ф]	22	R r	[р]
7	G g	[г]	23	S s	[с]
8	G' g'	[ғ]	24	S' s'	[ш]
9	H h	[х], [h]	25	C' c'	[ч]
10	I i	[і]	26	T t	[т]
11	I' i'	[и], [й]	27	U u	[ұ]
12	J j	[ж]	28	U' u'	[ү]
13	K k	[к]	29	V v	[в]
14	L l	[л]	30	Y y	[ы]
15	M m	[м]	31	Y' y'	[у]
16	N n	[н]	32	Z z	[з]

Appendix C

Transcription of an Interview with Aina

Kazakh (original)	English (translation)
Researcher: Қазақ тілін оқытып жүргеніңізге неше жыл болды?	**Researcher: How long have been teaching Kazakh?**
Interviewer: Он тоғыз.	Interviewer: For nineteen years
R: Он тоғыз жыл, мхм. Қазақ тілін қай тілді сыныптарға үйретесіз?	**R: For nineteen years, mhm. What medium classes do you teach Kazakh in?**
I: Орыс тілді сыныптар.	I: Russian-medium classes
R: Енді келесі тақырып бойынша сұрақтар. Қазақ әліпбиінің латын қарпіне көшуі жайлы жалпы ойыңыз қандай?	**R: And now let's move to the main questions. How do you feel about the transition of the Kazakh alphabet to the Latin script?**
I: Негізі мен қазақ тілін латын қарпіне көшу туралы ойым жақсы, оңтайлы. Өйткені біз жаһандану өркениетіне көшіп жатқандықтан, менің ойымша, бұл оң әсерін береді деп ойлаймын. Біздің қазіргі жастарымыз дамыған елде өсіп жатқаннан кейін, олар міндетті түрде латын қарпінде болуы, білуі тиіс деп ойлаймын.	I: Actually, my feelings about the transition of the Kazakh alphabet to the Latin script are positive. Since we are moving towards globalization, I think, it is going to bring about positive changes. In my opinion, as our youths are growing in the developing country, they must know the Latin script.
R: Келесі сұрақ: Латын әліпбиінің жаңа сіз айтып кеттіңіз, ол артықшылығы, иә? Жастар үшін. Ал кемшіліктері қандай болуы мүмкін?	**R: Next question…you just mentioned the advantage of the Latin script, right, for the youths. Now, what are the disadvantages?**
А: Кемшіліктері… қандай деп айтуға...кемшіліктері - біздің енді бұл не жағына көшетін болсақ, кітаптардың, мысалы, басылым жағына көшетін болсақ, иә, осы әсіресе бізге орфография жағы керек қой - сауатты жазу. Бұл латын әрпі...қарпіне көшу - бұл сананы жаңғырту деген нәрсе ғой. Егер де біз қазір осы бастан дұрыс сауаттылық...сауатты жазып үйренбесек, жаңағы, жазу ғой бұл өзі, жазу болғандықтан дұрыс жазып үйренбесек, біздің санамыз да сауатсыз болады.	I: What disadvantages…now if we take publishing book, for example, we will need the orthography most of all, right…In fact, switching to the Latin alphabet is a renovation of our mentality. If we don't start to learn to write and be literate in writing, as this has to do with writing directly, we can become illiterate…our mind will become illiterate.
R: Жақсы, ал жалпы өзіңіз қай әліпбиді қолдайсыз: Кириллицаға негізделген немесе Латынға негізделген?	**R: Okay. What alphabet do you personally prefer and support? Cyrillic or Latin?**
	I: No, I support Latin.
	R: The Latin script, right? Since the reform began to be implemented, what do you think have the significant and distinctive features of the new Latin

I: Жоқ, латынға.

R: Латынға негіздлеген, иә? Енді осы латындандыру реформасы қолға алынғаннан бері бірнеше нұсқасы шықты латын әліпбиінің, иә, білесіз. Сол әліпби(лер)дің айырмашылықтары қандай болды және олар қалай қалыптасты?

I: Енді мен өзім бірінші латын қарпіне, осы басты тақырып көтерілген кезде бізді курсқа шақырған болатын. Сол кезде бізде бір мындай нелер болды...жаңағы, қаріптердің ішінде, жаңағы, У әріпінен, У әрпі мен И әрпі...осы, осы кезде жаңа мен өзім мектепте де жұмыс жүргізем, диктант жазғыздырам, әріптестерімнің арасында, оқушылардың арасында туғызды - У мен И әрпінде болды. Соны әлі күнге шейін білмеймін талқыланып жатыр ма…? Ол, одан кейін мен курстарға бармадым, қолым тимей кетті, сондықтан осы екі әріпке менің өзімнің ойым - өзгертсе деген.

R: Жақсы. Ал енді, осы латын әліпбиінің үш нұсқасының арасында, сіздің ойыңызша, қайсысы ең сапалы? Және сіз қалай бағалайсыз оның сапасын?

I: Үш нұсқа дейсіз ба? Үш нұсқасы бар ма екен?

R: Иә, яғни, үш нұсқа дегенім - ең алдымен ұсынылғаны бірінші жылы, 2017 жылы мінекей мынау (суреті) ұсынылғаны; одан кейін мынау ресми бекітілгені және мынау соңғы қазіргі қолдансытағы нұсқасы осы. 2018 жылдың Қараша айында ресми түрде бекітілген. Соның сапасын қалай бағалайсыз?

I: Бұлардың арасында өзгешелік бар ма?

R: Мхм, мына жерде мысалы, сынау апострофпен берілген

I: Апострофпен берілген...

R: Ал ең алғашқы, мына жерде дифтонгтар берілген, яғни

alphabet been? How have they developed?

I: Well, personally for the first Latin alphabet, there was a training that we were invited to. At that time there were the letters as U and I…which generated debates when I conducted lessons at school, I had students and colleagues write dictations, and they [the letters] stirred heated discussions. I'm not sure if they are still being discussed…? But after that I did not attend any further trainings, because I was busy. That's why I think these two letters should be reconsidered [changed].

R: Alright. Now, Among the three versions of the Latin alphabet, which one seems to be well-developed? How would you evaluate its quality?

I: You say three versions? Are there really three versions?

R: Yes, I mean the first versions, adopted in 2017 (this one in the picture); then the officially recognized one and the most recent one adopted in November 2018. How would you evaluate their quality?

I: Are there differences between them?

R: Mhm, here, for example, this one has apostrophes.

I: has apostrophes….

R: And the very first one has digraphs. This one is accent, for example. But the third version uses confusing symbols for I and i.

I: Yes, they really confuse you. I think the first version is better…the one with the digraphs.

R: And there is also the fourth version being suggested. Here, have a look. What do you think of it?

I: I haven'e even seen this before. I didn't know about it.

R: It has been suggested recently.

диграфтар. Ал мына жерде мынадай аксон дейді, акцент берілген. Бірақ бір мәселесі мынау үшіншісінің ол - мына жерде И мен І екеуі шатастырады.

I: Иә, екеуі шатастырады. Меніңше, бірінші нұсқа дұрыс сияқты. Диграф, нелермен бірге иә, диграфтармен...

R: Ал енді жақында тағы да бір төртінші нұсқасын ұсынып отыр. Мінекей қарап көруіңізге болады. Бұл жайлы не ойлайсыз?

I: Мен даже мынаны көрмеппін де...бұны мен білмейді екем.

R: Бұны... жақында ғана шыққан

I: Бұл жерде мынау… мынау қандай нелер?

R: Ө

I: Қ ма? Мынау? А Ө ма? Иә, бұл үстінде апострофы ма, ноқат бар, иә?

R: Үстінде екі ноқаты бар.

I: Екі ноқаттан қойяды дейміз ба...

R: Және де мынадай Ш...мына жақта бірақ И мен І-ні ажыратуға болады...үстіне нүктесі пайда болған.

I: Мынау жақсы сияқты, төртінші нұсқасы кішкене иә? Келетін сияқылды. Өйткені осымен диктант жазу барысында әріптестерім мен оқушылардың арасында осындай бір келіспеушіліктер болды. Сондықтан мен оларды өзім де түсіндіре алмадым, түсіндіріп жеткізе алмадым оны қалай жазу керектігін.

R: Жалпы, латын әліпбиі арқылы тілді - Қазақ тілін үйрету және оны оқыту қаншалықты қиын немесе жеңіл болады деп ойлайсыз?

I: Меніңше қазіргі қазақ жастарына ағылшын тілін білгеннен жазу жағы оңай сияқылды. Әсіресе қазақ сыныптарына, ал енді орыс сыныптарында өзім оқытқаннан кейін кішкене қиыншылықтар туындайды....қиыншылықтар

I: What are these ones…these letters over here?

R: It's Ө

I: Is this Қ or Ө. There is an apostrophe above, the dots, right?

R: There are two dots above.

I: So, it has two dots then…

R: Also the Ш is different…here, however, the I and i can be differentiated…i has got dots above.

I: The fourth version seems good. It seems to fit [the sounds]. Because when we wrote a dictation with my colleagues and students, there were some mismatches. And I couldn't even explain them myself, couldn't explain [show] how to write them correctly.

R: In general, what do you think about the ease or difficulty of teaching and learning Kazakh through the Latin alphabet?

I: In my opinion, the writing part will be easier for the younger generation as they know English. Especially, for those in Kazakh-medium classes, but since I teach in Russian-medium classes, I can see they face some challenges. Because those in Russian-medium class make a lot of mistakes when writing in Kazakh [even in Cyrillic], that's why the Latin alphabet is difficult for them. But, actually, now I teach to the ninth grade, and when I assign a task, I occasionally tell them to use the Latin alphabet to complete the task. They try to do it because their minds are accustomed to the English alphabet, and therefore they try to write it correctly [in Kazakh Latin alphabet].

R: You say that it helps, right?

I: Yes, it helps.

R: Okay. What do you think of teachers' participation in the process of creation and implementation of the proper alphabet?

туындайды. Өйткені олар енді орыс сыныбы ғана қазақша жазған кезде қателік жібереді ғой, сондықтан да латын әрпі қиын. Бірақ та негізінен...негізі қалай...қазір мен тоғызыншы сыныптарға беріп жүрмін арасында кейбір кездерде жаттығу жұмыстарын тапсырма берген кезде Латын әрпінде, қарпінде берем, сол кезде жазып не етеді. Өйткені олар ағылшын тілінде, саналарында ағылшын болғандықтан олар стараются дұрыс жазуға.

R: Соның көмегі бар дейсіз ғой?

I: Соның көмегі бар.

R: Жақсы. Дұрыс қазақ латын әліпбиі мен емлесін құрастыру үрдісіне мұғалімдердің қатысуы жайлы не ойлайсыз? Мұғалімдер қатысу керек пе?

I: Міндетті түрде қатысу керек деп ойлаймын. Өйткені енді басты негізі мәселе шешкен кезде мұғалімдер ғой, біз ғой үйрететін. Біз ғой басты рольді атқарамыз. Өйткені бізге де ол жүк жүктеледі, өйткені бізге алдында курсқа барғанда бізге сразу келді иә мындай-мындай жұмыс жасаңдар деп...біртіндеп болса да әйтеуір, толық жұмыс жасамасақ та, жасадық. Бірақ өзіміз оны дұрыс білмегендіктен, біз де оны талап ете алмаймыз басқа.

R: Ал енді келесі зерттеу сұрағы бойынша, яғни, жалпы мұғалімдердің дайындығы бойынша. Латын әліпбиі бойынша дайындық курсын өттіңіз. Сол курсты қаншалықты тиімді болды деп табасыз?

I: Мхм… Енді мен өтірік айтпай-ақ қояйын, басында үш күн болған ең бірінші жылы осыдан неше… бір жыл жарым болды ғой...сол кезде барып қатыстым, үш күн болды бізде. Өте жақсы деңгейде өтті. Педагогтардың саны да көп болды. Ол жерде, жаңағы, Алматы қаласының Ахмет Байтұрсыновтың не...зерттеу нелері - ғалымдары келді. Ол кісілермен біз

I: I think that the teachers' participation is mandatory, because it is bound to teachers to make decisions when teaching, we teach it. We carry the main weight, because when it was announced, we were obliged to take the training courses. And we were trained to implement it …we were given directive to carry out particular activities, and we did it however little by little. But we cannot demand [from students] as we ourselves don't know it well yet.

R: Now, the next question is about the teachers' readiness. You told that you attended the training courses on Latinization. How effective do you think the training was?

I: Mhm…Well, I won't lie, initially it was a year and a half ago and it lasted for three days, so I attended it. It was held really well. There were many participating pedagogues. There were researchers from the Akhmet Baitursynuly Institute in Almaty…We are still in touch and keep working with them…we even have a chatroom. Sometimes when we need to hang some signboards in school [using the Latin alphabet], we ask for their advice [to write it correctly]. I think the training was conducted very well.

R: Alright. Could the training give you important pedagogical instruction about how to put the knowledge of Latin alphabet and orthography into practice in Russian/ Kazakh-medium classes?

I: Yes, we were given methodological guidelines [handbooks]. I think there were three books on that matter. I have one thick book that I occasionally use to consult when I need. And then we had lectures, also there were other teaching materials that they sent us via email. That's it, yes, they were useful.

R: Do they continue sending updated materials and guidelines?

I: No, they don't do it anymore now. Because I am not attending the course now due to my busy work schedule.

тығыз байланыста жұмыс жасап жатырмыз, біздің өзіміздің чатымыз бар. Кейбір кезде мысалы керекті мектепке вывискалар болады ғой, сол кезде өзіміз сұрап, жаңағы, ақылдасып сосын нетеміз. Өте жақсы деңгейде өтті деп ойлаймын.

R: Жақсы. Ал сол дайындық курсында сізге Латын емлесін оқыту, оны үйрету жайлы әдістемелік нұсқаулықтар бере алды ма курс?

I: Иә, берді. Әдістеме оқулықтары таратылды. Үш кітап қой деймін, по-моему, нелер бойынша жаңағы. Толық кітап бар еді өзімде, ол бірақ үйде өзім керек кезде қарап отырам. Содан кейін, нелер болды бізде...лекциялар болды, сосын неге...электронный почтаға жіберілді материалдар. Сол, аха, көмегі болды.

R: Әлі күнге дейін жіберіп отыра ма осындай жаңартылған әдістемелер, нұсқаулар?

I: Жоқ, қазір енді жібермейді, қазір. Өйткені мен барып жүрген жоқпын ғой курсқа қазір, уақытым болмаған соң.

R: Түсінікті.

I: А былай қатысып жүрген кісілерге жіберетін шығар...қазір мен барып жүрген жоқпын, просто уақытым тығыз болып.

R: Жақсы. Ал өзіңіз үшін сол курста қандай кемшілік немесе артықшылық байқадыңыз?

I: Кемшілігі сол жаңағы, И мен У әрпінің несі ғой, сол кезде басынан бастап келіспей, келіспеген бізде басым көпшілігі келіспей, солай даже біз не жазғанбыз...сол жерде бір диктант жазған кезде бір үлкен бір дау болды сол кезде. Сонда, сол кезде өзіміздің атымыздан пікірімізді білдіру ретінде ұсыныс жазғанбыз.

R: Келесі сұрақ: Жалпы Кириллицаға негізделген қазақ әліпбиін оқыту әдістері қаншалықты

R: Understood.

I: I think they probably send to those who are attending. It is just that I am not attending because of my busy schedule.

R: Alright. What challenges have you faced personally? What are the benefits and drawbacks that have you noticed in the training courses?

I: The drawback is that the letters I and U were being debated and we couldn't come into one consensus as the majority didn't agree. We even wrote a dictation, and there was another debates during the dictation. And we wrote our suggestions to express our opinion.

R: So the next question…Can the existing pedagogical strategies of teaching the Cyrillic alphabet and orthography apply for teaching the Latin-based ones? Can you use the same strategies? How are you going to teach using the Latin script?

I: Ah, so here you're asking, as I understand it, for example, the words like дирижер which we divert into дирижөр, the word цирк into сирк, right? Yes, I tend to explain them to the students from time to time. It is interesting though I think that the grammar will be the most challenging…while the orthography and orthoepy are [quite manageable]…because they will have to change the way they think [perceive]. When they were told about the Latin script first time, they reacted to it laughing [not in a serious manner], second time they kind of accepted it [perceived it].

R: Next question is… Based on your knowledge of the orthography built on the new Kazakh Latin alphabet, how would you evaluate your preparedness?

I: No, I'm not ready yet…I don't think I'm ready, I cannot tell for sure that I'm 100% or 50% ready. Because it requires a solid training. I cannot say I am ready for this or I know that…I don't even know.

Латынға негізделген емлені оқытуға жарамды (немесе жарамсыз) деп санайсыз? Яғни, мысалы кейбір кезде мынадай қазақтың фонетикасы орысқа жаұындап кетеді..соны қалай сіз енді Латынға көшкенде қалай үйретесіз дегенім?

I: А вот мына жерде ма, сіз айтып отырғаныңыз, мысалы, дирижер деген сөзде дирижөр деп айтамыз, цирк деген сөзді сирк деп айтамыз, иә? Иә, ол балаларға мен осы кейбір кезде сабақтың барысында айтып өтем. Қызық әрине, бірақ енді мен ойлаймын, грамматика жағы ол қиындау әрине...қиындау ол...орфография мен орфоэпия деп жаңа айтып отырмыз ғой, ол әрине сразу...өйткені ол сананы өзгерту керек, олар бірінші күлді, екінші рет айтқанда олар как бір сана сезімі...естілгеннен кейін екніші рет, қабылдады.

R: Келесі сұрақ: Жаңа әліпбидің емлесін білетініңізге сүйене отырып, өзіңіздің соны үйретуге дайындығыңызды қалай бағалар едіңіз?

I: Жоқ, әлі дайын емеспін. Дайын емеспін, айта алмаймын жүз пайыз немесе елу пайызға дайынмын деп. Өйткені ол үлкен-үлкен дайындықты қажет ететін нәрсе. Ол, мен айтпаймын, қазір мен осыған дайынмын, мен осыны білемін...даже білмеймін...

R: Алдыңғы курс (дайындық курс) және қазір де өзгерсітер енгізіліп жатыр ғой, сондықтан да, иә?

I: Иә, әлі де нақтыланған жоқ.

Әлі де ізденіс керек, әлі де енді нақтылау керек. Бұл әлі не главное, тек қана ойбай көшу керек деп...осылай көшіп кетуге болмайды.

R: Жалпы енді, білім беру жоспарына осыған, Латынға негізделген емлені оқыту жайлы, яғни, жеке сағат қосу жайлы не ойлайсыз?

R: Is that because there are changes being made from the time of the previous training course?

I: Yes..it hasn't been decided yet..

It still needs some further clarifications and amendments. And it is not even the main problem, because you cannot just switch to the Latin alphabet in one day if they told so…

R: In general, now, what do you think about an extra course on the curriculum for preparing students how to use the new orthography effectively?

I: I think it is necessary. I don't actually have to teach [focus only on] the Latin alphabet during my classes, but because I have this patriotic feeling for the Kazakh language, I try to integrate it in my classes for students' to learn little by little. Especially, the ninth, tenth and eleventh grade students sometimes ask me what I think about the transition to the Latin alphabet. And then we start writing in Latin, I explain it when the students ask. I'm not just to end the discussion saying "no, you don't need it", right? In fact, it is the topical issue today, yes. Therefore, I provide explanations and demonstrate it in an appropriate manner. So, I think that the additional hour should allocated.

R: You say students show interest, right?

I: Absolutely, they have an interest, yes. Mostly the higher grade students, eighth-ninth graders, ask me and beg saying "Let's write in the Latin alphabet…let's learn to write in it"…

R: And the last question: What do you think of learning materials being changed into Latin script? To what extent do you think they will be comprehensible in Latin script?

a.How do you think the literacy skills will transfer from Cyrillic to Latin?

I: To what extent…how are we supposed to teach without teaching [introducing] the

I: Керек, керек. Міндетті түрде керек деп ойлаймын. Біз сабақ барысында мен оны, мен міндетті емеспін оларға Латын әліпбиін...бірақ та менің өзімнің қазақ тілінде өткеннен кейін енді мен кішкене патриоттық не ғой, балалар үйрене берсінші кішкене болса да, әсіресе менде үлкен сыныптар жаңағы жоғары сыныптар - тоғыз, он-он бірлер маған айтады: осыны, латын әрпіне көшу қалай, ойыңыз қалай? Сол кезде басталып кетеді ғой, сол кезде жаңағы жазу барысы, бәрін көрсетіп, түсіндіріп өтем енді. Жауып тастамаймын ғой енді, иә, ол сендерге қажет емес деп. На самом деле, ол шынымен де қазіргі қоғамда болып жатқан үлкен мәселе. Иә. Сондықтан да түсіндіру жаңағы, жазу барысы барлығы да өтеді. Мен ойлаймын, сағат міндетті түрде керек, бөліну керек.

R: Демек, оқушылардың өздері қызығушылық танытады, иә?

I: Әрине, қызығушылығы бар, бар. Сұрайды менен жоғары сынып оқушылары көбінесе, сегіз-тоғызыншы сыныптар, "жазайықшы Латын несінде...жазып, үйренейікші" деп талпынады.

R: Енді соңғы сұрақ: Оқу құралдарының жазба тілін латынға ауысатынын айтып кеттіңіз, иә? Соны, оқушыларға, яғни мәтіді түсіну, оның оқу жылдамдығына, мысалы әсер етуі мүмкін, иә. Оны қалай...не ойлайсыз ол жайлы?

I: Оны қалай енді, әліпбиді үйретпей біз оны қалай үйрете аламыз? Негізі менің ойымда жүрген сол кішкене бір...мен негізі бір топ құрғам, сол топпен жұмыс жасап жатырмын жаңағы әліпбиді, осы Латын әліпбиін үйретіп, содан кейін бір-бір жаңағыдай интеллектуальный бір ойын өткізіп жаңағы мәтіндерді тез оқыту, оқып үйрену деген сияқылды. Мысалы, немесе, фильмнен бір үзінді жаңағы латын қарпінде өздері істей алса

alphabet first? It was in my plans, actually, to do a…I established a team and am now working with them, teaching the Latin alphabet. We occasionally conduct intellectual games where they have to speed read texts, learn to read and so on, as an example, or they write the subtitles in Latin for an excerpt from a film. For the purpose of learning….

R: Great idea! I wish you good luck in realizing such ideas.

I: Thank you!

R: Thank you for participating in the interview. Thank you!

деген сияқылды жаңағы. Сондай бір мақсатта.. **R: Керемет идея. Сәттілік тілеймін сізге идеяңызды іске асыруыңызға.** I: Рахмет! **R: Сұхбатқа қатысқаныңыз үшін алғысымды білдіремін. Рахмет сізге.**	

Appendix D

INFORMED CONSENT FORM
The Latinization of the Kazakh Alphabet: Kazakh Language Teachers' Perceptions and Readiness

DESCRIPTION: You are invited to participate in a research study on exploring Kazakh language teachers' perceptions about shifting from the Cyrillic to the Latin script and their readiness to teach through the new alphabet at mainstream schools. You will be asked to take part in the interview-based study and answer a number of questions (12-15) in your own way. The interview is conducted face-to-face, and will be audio-recorded and some written notes of your responses will be taken during the interview. The researcher ensures anonymity and confidentiality of all your data. Identifiable personal information will be replaced with pseudonyms or removed from all documents, transcripts, final reports and electronic copies. Information about your participation and your responses will be protected from disclosure in and outside of the school setting. All the notes and audio recordings will be kept for three years' period in a password-protected laptop or a locked drawer accessible only for the researcher. After that, all the hard and electronic copies will be completely destroyed. The findings of the research might be used in scientific forums and educational conferences, articles, and project papers.

TIME INVOLVEMENT: Your participation will take approximately 20-25 minutes.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: The risks associated with this study are minimal. First, we would like to remind you that your participation in the interview is voluntary and you can withdraw from the study at any time. If you feel discomfort in answering a certain question you may skip it. Second, considering your working schedule and possible work overload, there is a risk that the time spent on the interview might become additional burden and add stress. In order to minimize this risk, we offer you to decide yourself on the convenient time and venue for the interview. No other risks are to be expected from this research. The benefits which may reasonably be expected to result from this study are the possibilities to broaden your understanding of the Latinization as part of language planning and modernization. You will be also given an opportunity to observe and reflect on the advantages and disadvantages of using the new Latin-based alphabet. Along with that, by identifying the significance of Latinization in teaching and popularization of the Kazakh language, you can make an important contribution in the field of education and language planning. 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 your participation is voluntary and you have the right to withdraw your consent or discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. The alternative is not to participate. You have the right to refuse to answer particular questions. The results of this research study may be presented at scientific or professional meetings or published in scientific journals.

CONTACT INFORMATION:

Questions: If you have any questions, concerns or complaints about this research, its procedures, risks and benefits, contact the by the Master's Thesis Supervisor for this student work by the following information:
Mukul Saxena, mukul.saxena@nu.edu.kz.

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

independent of the research team at +7 7172 709359. You can also write an email to the NUGSE Research Committee at gse_researchcommittee@nu.edu.kz
Please sign this consent from if you agree to participate in this study.

- I have carefully read the information provided;
- I have been given full information regarding the purpose and procedures of the study;
- I understand how the data collected will be used, and that any confidential information will be seen only by the researchers and will not be revealed to anyone else;
- I understand that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time without giving a reason;
- With full knowledge of all foregoing, I agree, of my own free will, to participate in this study.

Signature: _____   Date: _____

The extra copy of this signed and dated consent form is for you to keep.

ЗЕРТТЕУ ЖҰМЫСЫ КЕЛІСІМІНІҢ АҚПАРАТТЫҚ ФОРМАСЫ
Қазақ Әліпбиін Латындандыру: Қазақ Тілі Мұғалімдерінің Қабылдауы мен Дайындығы

СИПАТТАМА: Сіз ортабілім беретін мектеп мұғалімдерінің қазақ әліпбиін Кириллицадан Латын қарпіне көшуін қалай қабылдайтыны туралы және олардың қазақ тілін жаңа әліпби көмегімен оқытуға қаншалықты дайын екенін зерттеуге бағытталған зерттеу жұмысына шақырылып отырсыз. Сізге тақырыпқа сай сұхбатқа қатысу және бірнеше сұрақтарға (12-15) жауап беру ұсынылады. Сұхбат бетпе-бет өткізіледі және жазу құрылғысына жазылып отырады, сонымен қатар әңгіме барысында кейбір қолжазбалар жасалуы мүмкін. Зерттеуші сізден алынғын барлық мәліметтің анонимді және конфиденциалды түрде сақталатынына кепілдік береді. Жеке басты танытатын ақпарат барлық құжаттардан, транскрипт, есеп беру құжаттарынан және электронды көшірмелерден толығымен алынып тастайды және псевдонимдермен алмастырылады. Сіздің бұл зерттеуге қатысуыңыз және берген жауаптарыңыз туралы мәлімет мектеп ішінде және мектептен тыс жерде жария болмайтынына зерттеуші кепілдік береді. Барлық дыбыстық файлдар мен қағазға түсірілген жазбалар үш жылға дейін зерттеушінің ғана қолы жетімді, қауіпсіз жерде және құпиясөзі бар компьютерде сақталады. Содан кейін олар толығымен жойылады. Зерттеудің нәтижелері кейін ғылыми форумдар мен конференцияларда, мақалалар мен жинақтарда қолданылуы мүмкін. Барлық жеке басты анытқаушы атаулар псевдонимдермен өзгертіледі немесе жойылады.

ӨТКІЗІЛЕТІН УАҚЫТЫ: Сіздің қатысуыңыз шамамен 20-25 минут уақытыңызды алады.

ЗЕРТТЕУ ЖҰМЫСЫНА ҚАТЫСУДЫҢ ҚАУІПТЕРІ МЕН АРТЫҚШЫЛЫҚТАРЫ:
Зерттеу жұмысына қатысудың қауіптері – минималды: біріншіден, Сіздің қатысуыңыз ерікті болып саналады, сондықтан зерттеуге қаьысудан кез-келген уақытта бас тарта аласыз. Егер де қандай да бір сұраққа жауа беру қиын деп тапсаңыз, ол сұрақты өткізіп жіберуіңізге болады. Екіншіден, Сіздің жұмыс кестеңізді және жұмыстағы ықтимал жұмыс жүктемесін ескере отырып, интервью өткізумен байланысты қосымша ауыртпалық пен қажетсіз стресс туындауы мүмкін. Осы қауіптердің алдын алу үшін Сізге өзіңізге қолайлы сұхбат жүргізу уақытын және орнын анықтауды ұсынамыз. Зерттеудің нәтижесінен күтілетін артықшылықтар ретінде Сізге Латинизацияның тілді қайта жандандыру және тілдік жоспарлаудың бір бөлігі жайлы түсінігіңізді кеңейтуге мүмкіндік беретінін ескеруге болады. Сондай-ақ, Латын қарпіне негізделген жаңа алфавиттің артықшылытары мен кемшіліктерін атап өтуіңізге болады. Сонымен қатар, Сіз білім беру мен тілдік жоспарлау саласына елеулі үлесіңізді қосып, Латын әліпбиіне көшудің білім берудегі және қазақ тілінің қолдану аясын кеңейтудегі маңыздылығын анықтай аласыз. 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,қаупі мен артықшылықтары туралы сұрағыңыз немесе шағымыңыз болса, келесі байланыс құралдары арқылы зерттеушінің магистрлық тезисі бойынша жетекшісімен хабарласуыңызға болады**.**

Мукул Саксена, mukul.saxena@nu.edu.kz

ДЕРБЕС БАЙЛАНЫС АҚПАРАТТАРЫ: Егер берілген зерттеу жұмысының жүргізілуімен қанағаттанбасаңыз немесе сұрақтарыңыз бен шағымдарыңыз болса, Назарбаев Университеті Жоғары Білім беру мектебінің Зерттеу Комитетімен көрсетілген байланыс құралдары арқылы хабарласуыңызға болады: +7 7172 70 93 59 электрондық пошта gse_researchcommittee@nu.edu.kz.

Зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға келісіміңізді берсеңіз, берілген формаға қол қоюыңызды сұраймыз.

- Мен берілген формамен мұқият таныстым;
- Маған зерттеу жұмысының мақсаты мен оның процедурасы жайында толық ақпарат берілді;
- Жинақталған ақпарат пен құпия мәліметтерге тек 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: _____

Форманың бір данасы Сізде қалады

ФОРМА ИНФОРМАЦИОННОГО СОГЛАСИЯ
Латинизация Казахского Алфавита: Восприятия и Готовность Учителей Казахского Языка

ОПИСАНИЕ: Вы приглашены принять участие **в исследовании по** изучению того, как учителя воспринимают переход алфавита с Кириллицы на Латиницу и насколько они готовы преподавать казахский язык с помощью нового алфавита. Вам будет предложено принять участие в интервью и ответить на ряд вопросов (12-15) в свободной для Вас форме. Интервью будет проводиться один на один и будет записываться на диктофон. Исследователь может также делать некоторые письменные записи во время разговора. Исследователь предоставит анонимность и конфиденциальность всех ваших данных. Ваши персональные будут заменены псевдонимом и удалены из всех документов, записей, отчетов и электронных копий. Информация о вашем участии и ваших ответах будут защищены от разглашения как в школе, так и за ее пределами. Все аудиофайлы и письменные записи будут храниться в защищённом паролем компьютере и в безопасном месте в течение трех лет. По истечении этого срока, они будут полностью уничтожены. Результаты данного исследования могут быть использованы в дальнейшем на научных форумах и конференциях, а также в научных статьях и сборниках.

ВРЕМЯ УЧАСТИЯ: Ваше участие потребует около 20-25 минут.

РИСКИ И ПРЕИМУЩЕСТВА: Риски, связанные с исследованием минимальны: Во-первых, напоминаем Вам, что Ваше участие – добровольное, и если Вы почувствуете, что Вам трудно или тяжело Вы можете отказаться от участия в любое время. В случае, если Вам трудно отвечать на какой-либо вопрос, Вы можете пропустить его. Во-вторых, учитывая Ваш рабочий график и возможную загруженность на работе, возможен риск дополнительной нагрузки и лишнего стресса, связанный с потраченным на интервью временем. Во избежание данных рисков, мы предлагаем Вам самим выбрать удобное для Вас место и время интервью. В качестве ожидаемых преимуществ в результате исследования можно рассматривать то, что вы расширите своё понимание Латинизации как часть планирования и модернизации языка. Вы также можете отметить преимущества и сложности использования нового алфавита на основе Латинской графики. Наряду с этим, вы сможете внести значительный вклад в сферу образования и планирования языка определив значимость Латинизации в преподавании и популяризации казахского языка. 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 по следующим данным:

Мукул Саксена, mukul.saxena@nu.edu.kz

Независимые контакты: Если Вы не удовлетворены проведением данного исследования, если у Вас возникли какие-либо проблемы, жалобы или вопросы, Вы можете связаться с Комитетом Исследований Высшей Школы Образования Назарбаев Университета по телефону +7 7172 70 93 59 или отправить письмо на электронный адрес gse_researchcommittee@nu.edu.kz

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

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

Одна копия данной формы остается у Вас