Exploring University Teachers' and Students' Perceptions of English as a Medium of Instruction Experiences in Kazakhstan: Language Management, Language Practices and Language Ideology

Kymbat Yessenbekova

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Multilingual Education

Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education

May, 2021

Word count: 23,113

Author Agreement

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hereby accept the terms of the above Author Agreement.

Kymbat Yessenbekova

Author's signature:

28.05.2021

Date:

Declaration

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

Signed: *Kymbat Gassenbekova*
Date: 28.05.2021

Ethical Approval

NAZARBAYEV UNIVERSITY
Graduate School
of Education

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

Dear Kymbat Yessenbekova,

This letter now confirms that your research project entitled: "Exploring University Teachers' and Students' Perceptions and Experiences of English as a Medium of Instruction: Language Management, Ideology, and Practices" 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

Bridget Goodman

Bridget Goodman

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

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

CITI Training Certificate

Completion Date 02-Aug-2020
Expiration Date N/A
Record ID 37715922

This is to certify that:

Kymbat Yessenbekova

Has completed the following CITI Program course:

CITI Conflicts of Interest (Curriculum Group)
Conflicts of Interest (Course Learner Group)
1 - Stage 1 (Stage)

Under requirements set by:

Nazarbayev University

Not valid for renewal of certification through CME. Do not use for TransCelerate mutual recognition (see Completion Report).

CITI
Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative

Verify at www.citiprogram.org/verify/?w4f5dbd45-b345-4c32-893f-5e6ae3e98d79-37715922

Acknowledgements

This thesis becomes a reality with the kind support and help of many individuals. First of all, I would like to express my special gratitude to my supervisor Professor Bridget Goodman for imparting your knowledge and expertise in this study by giving me honest feedback. My research voyage in writing this thesis was a rather challenging experience due to the pandemic period, but you, being my academic mama, gave me words of encouragement to keep me motivated. You have always gone above and beyond the expectations of a great professor.

I also owe a debt of gratitude to Professor Miriam Sciala for the hard work you put into the academic writing course that was helpful for me. I would like to extend sincere thanks to all GSE professors and my group mates for creating a great environment in which to learn and improve my skills. Мені әрқашан қолдап, барлық мүмкіндіктер жасайтын және өмірімді қуанышқа толтыратын отбасыма, соның ішінде папа, мама, Қанатбек пен Айшолпанға алғысым шексіз.

Abstract

Exploring University Teachers' and Students' Perceptions of English as a Medium of Instruction Experiences in Kazakhstan: Language Management, Language Practices and Language Ideology

English as a medium of instruction (EMI) in higher education has become a widespread phenomenon in non-English speaking countries during our era of globalization. Hence, during the past decade, Kazakhstan has developed a strategic goal to implement an EMI policy, despite English being a foreign language in the country. Accordingly, as EMI is a considerably new approach in Kazakhstan, the aim of this study was to explore teachers' and students' perceptions of their EMI experiences by focusing on the interplay between language management (LM), language practices (LP) and language ideology (LI) framed as a tripartite theory by Spolsky (2004). A qualitative case study design employing semi-structured interviews and document analysis was adopted for this research. Four teachers and six undergraduate students of EMI programs from the Department of Natural Sciences of one Kazakhstani national university participated in this research. Moreover, information from the official website and policy documents from the university were used for document analysis of EMI policy. The findings reveal that participants had positive LI by valuing EMI as a beneficial tool for language development and supporting English-only practices. However, they encountered challenges during LP because of their low mastery of English and the university administrators neglected the participants' linguistic difficulties which mean they lacked an appropriate LM system in the EMI environment. Therefore, to conduct LP, teachers used transglanguaging methods to support students' insufficient English levels for comprehension purposes. Meanwhile, students reported that continuing LP in EMI and teachers' emotional support contributed to their English-language development. Overall, even though LI conflicted with LP as English-only beliefs

mismatched with translanguaging and LM neglected LP challenges, LI about benefits of English matched with students' language enhancement in LP. Ultimately, this study suggests improving the quality assurance of the EMI policy for administrators and conducting further research on the LM system of institutions.

Аңдатпа

Оқу құралы ретіндегі ағылшын тілі тәжірибесі туралы университет оқытушылары мен студенттерінің көзқарастарын зерттеу: тілдік менеджмент, тілдік практика және тілдік идеология

Ағылшын тілі жоғары оқу орнында оқыту тілі ретінде (EMI) жаһандану дәуірінде ағылшын тілінде сөйлемейтін елдерде кең таралды. Демек, ағылшын тілі Қазақстанда шет тілі болғанымен, соңғы онжылдықта бұл елде стратегиялық мақсатты - EMI саясатын жүзеге асыру арқылы халықаралық аренада бәсекелес болуды дамыту көзделді. Тиісінше, EMI қазақстандық контекстте айтарлықтай жаңа білім беру тәсілі болғандықтан, бұл зерттеудің мақсаты оқытушылар мен студенттердің EMI тәжірибесіне көзқарастарын тілдік менеджментті (LM), тілдік практиканы (LP) және тілдік идеологияны (LI) өзара әрекеттесуіне баса назар аудара отырып зерттеу болып табылады. Бұл тілдік компоненттерді Спольский (2004) үш жақты теория деп тұжырымдаған. Осы зерттеуді жүргізу үшін жартылай құрылымды сұхбаттар мен құжаттарды талдауды қолдана отырып, сапалы кейстерді зерттеу дизайны қабылданды. Респондент ретінде Қазақстанның ұлттық университеттерінің бірінің жаратылыстану ғылымдары факультетіндегі EMI бағдарламасының төрт оқытушы және алты студенті қатысты. Сонымен қатар, EMI бағдарламалық құжаттарына талдау жасау үшін университеттің ресми сайтындағы ақпарат және университет әкімшілерінен алынған бағдарламалық құжаттар пайдаланылды. Нәтижелер көрсеткендей, респонденттер EMI-ді тілді дамытудың пайдалы құралы ретінде бағалап және тек қана ағылшын тілін қолданудағы практиканы қолдап, оң LI-ге ие болды. Алайда, LP кезінде олар ағылшын тілін жетік білмегендіктен, тіл проблемаларына тап болды. Нәтижелер сонымен қатар университет әкімшілігі қатысушылардың тілдік қиындықтарын ескермегендігін көрсетті. Бұл олардың

тиімді EMI ортасы үшін тиісті LM жүйесі жоқтығын білдірді. Сондықтан LP үшін оқытушылар translanguaging әдісін қолданды, бұл студенттерге түсіну үшін қазақ және орыс тілдерінің көмегімен ағылшын тілінің жеткіліксіз деңгейін сақтауға мүмкіндік береді. Сонымен бірге, барлық респонденттер, тілдік проблемаларына қарамастан, EMI-дегі LP және мұғалімдердің эмоционалды қолдауы студенттер үшін ағылшын тілін жақсартуға көмектесті деп хабарлады. Жалпы, LP-дегі translanguaging тек қана ағылшын тіліндегі LI-ге сәйкес келмесе де, және LM LP-дегі қиындықтарын ескермесе де, студенттердің LP-дегі тілді жақсартуы ағылшын тілінің артықшылықтары туралы LI-мен сәйкес келді. Қорыта келгенде, бұл зерттеу әкімшілерге арналған EMI саясатының сапалық қамтамасыз етілуін және білім беру ұйымдарының LM жүйесі бойынша әрі қарай зерттеулер жүргізу ұсыныстарының қажеттілігі ұсынады.

Аннотация

Изучение представлений преподавателей и студентов университетов об опыте английского языке как средстве обучения в Казахстане: языковой менеджмент, языковые практики и языковая идеология

Английский язык как средство обучения (EMI) в высшем образовании стал широко распространенным явлением в неанглоязычных странах в эпоху глобализации. Следовательно, в течение последнего десятилетия Казахстан также разработал стратегическую цель - конкурировать на международной арене путем реализации политики EMI, хотя английский язык является иностранным языком в этой стране. Соответственно, поскольку EMI в казахстанском контексте представляет собой значительно новый образовательный подход, цель данного исследования - изучить восприятие преподавателями и студентами опыта EMI с упором на взаимодействие языкового менеджмента (LM), языковой практики (LP) и языковой идеология (LI), сформулированная Спольски (2004) как трехсторонняя теория. Для проведения этого исследования был принят дизайн качественного тематического исследования с использованием полуструктурированных интервью и анализа документов. В качестве респондентов интервью приняли участие четыре преподавателя и шесть студентов программ EMI факультета естественных наук одного из национальных университетов Казахстана. Кроме того, информация с официального сайта университета и программные документы, полученные от администраторов университета, были использованы для анализа документов политики EMI. Результаты показывают, что респонденты имели положительный LI, ценив EMI как полезный инструмент для развития языка и поддерживая практику использования только английского языка. Однако во время LP они столкнулись с языковыми проблемами из-за низкого уровня владения английским языком.

Результаты также показывают, что администрация университета игнорировала языковые трудности участников, что означало, что у них не было соответствующей системы LM для эффективной среды EMI. Поэтому для проведения LP преподаватели использовали метод translanguaging, позволяющий студентам поддерживать свой недостаточный уровень английского языка с помощью казахского и русского языков для понимания. В то же время все респонденты сообщили, что LP в EMI и эмоциональная поддержка преподавателей, несмотря на их языковые проблемы, были полезны для улучшения английского языка студентам. В целом, даже, несмотря на то, что LI противоречил LP, поскольку убеждения только в английском языке несовместимы с translanguaging, и LM игнорировала проблемы LP, LI о преимуществах английского языка соответствовала повышению уровня владения английским языком в LP. Наконец, это исследование предполагает необходимость улучшения обеспечения качества политики EMI для администраторов и рекомендацию о проведении дальнейших исследований системы LM учебных заведений.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction

Background Information

Socio-economic demands to learn English are forcing many countries to implement English as a medium of instruction (EMI) in higher educational institutions (HEIs) (Shamim et al., 2016). Zhao and Dixon (2017) explained that EMI is an educational method where academic subjects are taught through English and they are not language subjects. Moreover, Macaro (2018) defined EMI as being used to teach subjects in countries where most people do not speak English as their first language. Non-anglophone countries offer programs that are similar to anglophone countries' HEIs to sustain the goal of becoming globally competitive (Margic & Vodopija Krstanovic, 2017). Furthermore, the widespread introduction of EMI could be motivated at the individual, institutional and governmental levels (Margic & Vodopija-Krstanovic, 2017).

Generally, due to the rapid increase of the EMI phenomenon in different countries, Tsuneyoshi (2005) outlines such possible challenges of EMI stakeholders as being linguistic, cultural and structural. As each EMI practice is context-dependent, there is major importance in empirical research on the opportunities and challenges in different countries (Barnard, 2018). For example, an analysis of international scholars' research of the EMI stakeholders' perceptions in the non-English speaking countries shows mixed experiences concerning the use of EMI. According to the research from East Asian and Southeast Asian countries, Malaysian, Japanese and Chinese EMI teachers expressed concerns about their English skills and admitted to having challenges in organizing discussions in the classrooms (Bradford, 2016; He & Chiang, 2016; Othman & Saat, 2009). In the Taiwanese context, students believed that they could improve their English abilities through EMI, specifically their listening skills; however, it was difficult for them to understand the content of the subjects (Chang, 2010).

In Kazakhstan, the first steps for introducing EMI were undertaken through the cultural project "Trinity of Languages". The first president announced this project in 2006, emphasizing its purpose to produce a cadre of highly educated people (Astafyeva & Zhumagulova, 2018). This goal was also embedded within the strategy "Kazakhstan – 2050" to join the thirty most competitive countries in the world (Nazarbayev, 2012); also, in the reform called "The Plan of the Nation: 100 Concrete Steps", a gradual transition to EMI at the secondary and tertiary education levels was highlighted (Adilet, 2015). Moreover, in 2011, Kazakhstan, having become a member of the Bologna Process, allowed its HEIs to take advantage of cooperation with international partners (Turumbetova, 2014) by developing multilingual education with the requirement of acquisition of English besides Kazakh and Russian through English courses and programs (Jumakulov & Ashirbekova, 2016). Therefore, the aim of the implementation of EMI is to enhance the inbound and outbound mobility potential of the educational sector and create a competitive environment for university graduates (Adylet, 2015). In accordance with these ideas, 42 universities have formed special student groups that conduct training in Kazakh, Russian and English (Yrsaliyev et al., 2017). Overall, as the studies on EMI across contexts show that EMI might be a complex phenomenon and it also has been introduced in Kazakhstan, it should be more thoroughly considered in the case of Kazakhstan.

Problem Statement

Some researchers stated that EMI in Kazakhstan is associated with a number of problems (Karabay, 2017; Seitzhanova et al., 2015). These problems might be particularly related to (a) the alignment of government policy goals with the purpose of EMI as a concept, (b) English language issues in the country, and (c) lack of research on EMI in the Kazakhstani context. Each of these problems is elaborated on in the following paragraphs.

Firstly, according to Briggs et al. (2018), Brown and Bradford (2014) and Polenova (2016), the method of delivering the content of a subject in EMI is generally not to improve a student's language skills, but rather the use English as a tool of instruction. At the same time, the previously mentioned goal of the Kazakhstani reform to develop students' English skills does not correspond with the goals of EMI to deliver content without necessarily teaching the language. Nonetheless, in practice, the situation could be different and there can be some effective management of EMI which has already been directed to the improvement of participants' linguistic abilities.

Secondly, despite some possible considerations of language improvement adjustments in the EMI policy, the most complicated issue in Kazakhstan is English proficiency (Zhilbayev et al., 2019) as people use this language as a third or foreign language (MoES, 2011). One observation of the quality of EMI programs demonstrates that only 12% of teachers are advanced in English (C1-C2 levels); whereas 97% of polylingual group students have insufficient language levels (A1-A2) (Yrsaliyev et al., 2017). Hence, there could still be insufficient levels of English proficiency for teaching and learning in EMI.

Furthermore, in Kazakhstan, there are few useful studies for educational authorities on the challenges and benefits of EMI experiences (Prilipko, 2017) because it is a novel phenomenon in the country (Shmidt, 2018). For the record, no research conducted in the Kazakhstani context has been found to critically analyze teachers' and students' EMI experiences and policy-related documents through the prism of language management, language practices and language ideology. Macaro (2018) claimed that the usefulness of Spolsky's framework for understanding EMI is that it can reveal in-depth understanding of the phenomenon because it allows the exploration of language management (LM), language practices (LP) and language ideology (LI) characteristics. For example,

universities might not have the LM system to align their policy goals in response to language proficiency issues and EMI participants might not be able to adjust their LP and have different LI about EMI and English-only practices.

Therefore, taking into account the existence of the above-mentioned problems in Kazakhstan and the scope of Spolsky's (2004) language components in studying language policy, exploring teachers' and students' perceptions to better understand their EMI experiences by focusing on the interplay of LM, LP and LI seems to be necessary. Regarding the respondents of the current study, it should be mentioned that teachers are professors and students are undergraduates of the department of natural sciences in one Kazakhstani university that are participating in the EMI program.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative study is to explore whether teachers and students in one Kazakhstani university perceive EMI programs as a challenging experience through the lens of language management, language practices and language ideology.

Research Questions

1. How do Kazakhstani university teachers and students perceive their EMI experience?

a) Which efforts of institutional language management are reflected on EMI courses?

b) What are teachers' and students' practices in teaching and learning in English in EMI courses?

c) What ideologies do Kazakhstani university teachers and students have regarding EMI?

Significance of the Study

The findings of this research of EMI participants' perceptions about their experience in a particular university can be an example for other universities that are

planning to implement EMI programs in Kazakhstan and help them and policy-makers as well to uncover possible policy challenges. Moreover, the current work could be a source for outside researchers to become more familiar with the Kazakhstani EMI experience. Finally, in addition to interviews, the policy documents studied in this research might reveal possible mismatches between participants' perceptions of EMI and policy measures, and be useful findings for administrators to identify issues concerning different teachers' and students' language skills, teachers' workloads, resourcing and multilingual practices. Overall, this study might contribute to the present knowledge of EMI through the lens of LM, LP and LI, and for all EMI stakeholders to understand this educational phenomenon by recognizing teachers' and students' voices.

Outline of the Study

This thesis consists of six chapters. This introductory chapter presents background information, some general policy challenges in the international context and the relevance of this research on EMI in the Kazakhstani context. The second chapter describes the review of the literature on medium of instruction, English, characteristics of EMI, elaborates on Spolsky's theoretical framework that is applied for this research by defining the components and exemplifying different studies within this framework in order to depict the portrayal of the language components in EMI, and expands the understanding of contextual issues on EMI in Kazakhstan. In Chapter Three, the methodology of the current study, including a discussion of the research design, data collection and data analysis procedures, and ethical considerations is reflected on. Chapter Four is dedicated to the presentation of the findings. In Chapter Five, the main findings are discussed in accordance with the research questions of this study. Finally, in the Sixth Chapter, all the results concerning the research purpose and research questions are summarized with emphasis on

the limitations of the study, and providing implications and recommendations for future research.

Chapter 2: Review of Literature

This study aims to explore one Kazakhstani university teachers' and students'

perceptions of EMI experience through the lens of LM, LP, and LI. This part of the

research considers the important themes needed to understand the topic in-depth. Overall

this chapter is organized into three main sections: 1) an elaboration of the concept of EMI;

2) the theoretical framework for the study and a review of empirical literature which uses

this framework; and 3) an overview of the EMI policy and research on EMI in the

Kazakhstani context.

EMI

Medium of Instruction Policy

To elaborate on the conceptualization of EMI, firstly, it is important to explain the

term medium of instruction (MOI), which is defined as a policy which regulates through

what language content or a language itself will be taught (Cooper, 1989; Hornberger, 2003;

Tollefson & Tsui, 2004 as cited in Goodman, 2014). There may be debates about a

language choice for a MOI because the language chosen as a tool of instruction directly

influences the quality of education (Tollefson & Tsui, 2010). The contextual perspectives

of managing a MOI are associated with the goals, outcomes and processes of a particular

language use (Hamid et al., 2013). For instance, political and economic demands in society

could force people to choose a certain dominant language as the MOI (Tollefson & Tsui,

2010). In contrast, according to Fishman and Fishman (2000), a MOI might be very

significant for the maintenance, revitalization and transmission of disadvantaged languages

from generation to generation.

English

According to Kachru's (1985) conceptualization, there are three types of countries

around the world where English is differently used across contexts. In the first Inner Circle

countries, English is used by the domain as a norm-providing native language (e.g., the USA and, the UK); the second Outer Circle involves countries formerly colonized by Britain and they use English as a norm-developing second language (e.g., India and, Pakistan); and the third Expanding Circle describes countries that use English as a norm-dependent or non-official foreign language (e.g., Russia and, China) (Gerritsen et al., 2014). Despite this categorization of countries, English has become necessary everywhere because its power associated with the USA and the UK's (the Inner Circle countries) political, economic and cultural authority around the world (Pilard, 2002) and it is a means of the economic advancement of individuals and societies from Kachru's Outer and Expanding Circles (Pan & Block, 2011). Moreover, English has also become a global language of technology, science, business, commerce and global trade (Redhu, 2014; Ricento, 2012). On the other hand, Philipson (2000) called this phenomenon of the widespread popularity of English as a linguistic neoimperialism in which one language discriminates against other languages due to its supremacy and dominance. Nevertheless, in spite of these debates around English, the localization of English varieties can balance out the ownership of this language. Crystal (2016) asserted that since English has become a lingua franca for global purposes, non-English speaking countries have simultaneously adapted it as a language that expresses their local identity and used it for internal purposes.

Defining Characteristics of EMI

The evolution of English in EMI was chronologically summarized by Jahan et al. (2013) and consists of three phases: early modern, modern and post-modern. Thus, they named Europe's colonization of Asia and Africa as the earliest period of "colonial MOI" (Jahan et al., 2013, p. 144); the official decolonization period of Asia and Africa was represented as the modern period with a high priority given to indigenous languages

alongside English; and the unofficial arrival of colonial English in the form of a global language was labeled as the post-modern "appropriated MOI" (Jahan et.al, 2013, p. 145).

When English is used as a MOI in educational settings, the acronym EMI is applied as a method of teaching an academic subject in English. However, it is important to highlight the fact that there is a jungle of acronyms depicting English taught programs which differ from each other in their functional features. Such programs taught in English include "EMI, Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), Integrating Content and Language in Higher Education (ICLHE), Content-Based Instruction (CBI), English for Specific Purposes (ESP), English for Academic Purposes (EAP), English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)" and others (Richter, 2019, p.14). Macaro (2018) identified the differences between these programs. For example: ESP, EAP and EFL denote language-dominant objectives, EMI refers to content-dominant objectives, while ICHLE, CLIL and CBI refer to both content and language dominant objectives (Macaro, 2018). Consequently, Macaro's (2018) classification demonstrates that only EMI is a content-driven program.

By definition, Dearden (2014) stated that "EMI is the use of the English language to teach academic subjects in countries or jurisdictions where the first language (L1) of the majority of the population is not English" (p.2). This method of delivering the content of a subject in EMI is not aimed at a student's language improvement, as English is just a tool of instruction (Polenova, 2016). Goodman (2014) asserted that although EMI policies and programs are widespread phenomena all over the world, due to contextual differences of countries, there are constructed particular EMI goals and forms. Nevertheless, EMI programs are mostly used in tertiary education rather than in secondary education (Briggs et al., 2018) and participants of EMI classes are required to have high levels of academic vocabulary, writing skills, communicative skills in English and pragmatic competencies (Margic & Vodopija-Krstanovic, 2017).

In tertiary education, the number of EMI programs has dynamically increased over the past decades as English has been recognized as the language of both research and academia (Corrales et al., 2016). For example, the number of European bachelor degrees in EMI programs increased 1000 times and master degrees from 725 to 8089 from the period between 2001 and 2014 (Wachter & Maiworm, 2014). Nonetheless, the implementation of EMI policy and its management is a challenging process because it might be initiated as a top-down approach and/or inevitable prospects triggered by internationalization (Barrios et al., 2016). In general, globalization triggered the internationalization of tertiary education which has become a prerequisite of the implementation of EMI courses (Margic & Vodopija-Krstanovic, 2017). According to Wilkinson (2013), this tendency can be articulated by economic perspectives at the individual, institutional and governmental levels and according to Dearden (2014), the reason for the introduction of EMI could be different based on countries' "contextual, geographical, historical and political" (p.14) features. For instance, while in Europe, the EMI policy is proclaimed by the European Union and Council of Europe to establish plurilingualism and multilingualism that is complemented through the Bologna process in HEIs (Coleman, 2006), in Asian societies, the introduction of EMI is a response to globalization which is carried out by educational policies (Hamid & Nguyen, 2016).

To sum up, the roles of MOI and English seem to be crucial and at the same time controversial. By definition, EMI is explained as a method of teaching through English whereby participants have already acquired sufficient language abilities. However, considering EMI in the countries from Kachru's Expanding and Outer Circles, it is expected that the experiences of acquisition, expansion and functioning of English (Xiaoqiong & Xianxing, 2011) and the reasons for this policy implementation can vary across contexts. Hence, the present study will investigate the appropriateness of the above-

mentioned statements about the conceptualization of EMI and acquisition and functioning level of English in a particular educational case in Kazakhstan.

Theoretical Framework

This section defines Bernard Spolsky's language policy framework which is applied as the theoretical framework for the current research, and considers study results on EMI on the basis of this framework. In this regard, an effective way to understand whether a new educational reform such as introducing EMI in Kazakhstani HE has policy challenges is the consideration of the dynamic interplay of the three interrelated components as "language beliefs (LB), language practice (LP) and language management (LM)" conceptualized by Spolsky (2004, p. 5). In particular, LB is also interchangeable with language ideology (LI) (Hu & Lei, 2013; Spolsky, 2009). By definition, the first component, LB, is about attitudes and assumptions towards language choice within a community; the second component, LP, is about people's language behavior in use; and the last component, LM, means explicit attempts directed toward influencing an individual's practices and beliefs (Huttner et al., 2013).

Moreover, Spolsky (2004) conceptualized that while, on the one hand, LM can be a written language policy aimed to regulate a linguistic situation, on the other hand, it can be a non-written language policy that is derived from the study of language beliefs and language practices. He also conceived of LI or LB as generally formed values and prestige about certain aspects of the used language (Spolsky, 2004). LI might be influenced by or appear from language practices (Spolsky, 2004). Regarding LP, Spolsky (2004) referred not only to grammar, words and sounds but also to the appropriateness of the form of speech in particular situations. Particularly, in a multilingual context, the rules for the capacity of the language for communication in a domain are implied by LP (Spolsky, 2004), which plays the most impactful role among components (Spolsky, 2009). Spolsky

(2009) contended that LP is a prerequisite for language choice; consequently, Hu and Lei (2014) claimed that teachers and learners facilitate both subject and language learning during LP. LM influences language choice-making beliefs and practices and could be presented in "laws, governmental policies, institutional rules (e.g. university entry requirements) and official guidelines (e.g. those outlined in HEI websites)" (Baker & Hűttner, 2019, p. 4). In general, this tripartite policy framework is helpful for critically analyzing EMI (Hu & Lei, 2013). Hűttner et al. (2013) explained that, with the help of these three components, a researcher can discover whether LB, LP and LM fit together or there is a contradiction between them.

In addition, Spolsky (2004) identified contextual factors that influence LI such as political, social, cultural, economic, and religious whereas Curdt-Christiansen (2009) positioned LI influential macro factors as political, socio-cultural, economic and linguistic. Furthermore, taking into account the above-mentioned factors, Kambatyrova (2020) applied political, economic, social, cultural factors and an additional educational factor as a framework for her study of parents' LI toward trilingual education in Kazakhstan. She conceptualized educational LI as an opportunity to improve language proficiency and study in higher education (HE) based on the MOI of secondary schools; social and cultural LI as access to social mobility through English but with the consideration of the importance of mother tongue usage; economic LI for financial benefits through career advancement; and political LI in the alignment or misalignment of national initiatives with an individual's ideology (Kambatyrova, 2020). In relation to these factors, her analyses showed that even though parents' economic and social LI considered English as an opportunity for "employment, education, communication and travelling" (p.127), their educational LI was associated with the problem that not all students might be able to study science subjects through this language; and although their political LI was positive as they

perceived all three languages necessary in education, they had a cultural LI that bilingualism or trilingualism might lead to the loss of their heritage language (Kambatyrova, 2020). With this in mind, the influence of these factors might also be predicted in this study of the university teachers' and students' LI towards EMI in Kazakhstan, and be used appropriately to categorize the research results.

Lastly, as this study explores language perspectives of EMI in the Kazakhstani context through university teachers' and students' perceptions of their EMI experience within the Spolsky's framework, even though Spolsky (2004) presented LB and LI as the same synonymous concept, I have used the term LI. Silverstein (1979) described LI as representing an array of beliefs based on users' rationales and proved perceptions of language practices (Woolard, 1998). Thus, LI is a broader notion in the understanding of the nature of language. By and large, this research is focused on the interpretation of the interplay of the three language components in EMI in a particular Kazakhstani context. However, first, it is important to analyze the context of EMI practices within the framework of Spolsky's theory which is discussed in the next section.

Previous Studies of EMI based on Spolsky's Language Policy Framework

This section presents some recent studies on EMI guided by Spolsky's framework conducted in Taiwanese (Chang, 2019), Bangladeshi (Rahman et al., 2019), Thai, Austrian and UK (Baker & Hűttner, 2019), as well as Chinese (Hu & Lei, 2013; Zhang, 2018) contexts. They were analyzed with relevant and contradictory aspects related to EMI in order to investigate the effectiveness and applicability of Spolsky's theory as a research framework for the current study. As the studies aimed to uncover the teaching and learning process (LP), the system of ideas (LI), the taken measures (LM) in EMI by investigating teachers, students, and policy documents from the websites, some complexities and misalignments in the interplay of Spolsky's three components were revealed.

Regarding the connection of LI and LP, multiple studies show a misalignment between stakeholders' views about English-only requirements (LI) and their multilingual classroom practices (LP). Hu and Lei (2013), Rahman et al. (2019) and Zhang (2018), in both Chinese and Bangladeshi EMI contexts, found that although teachers and students held positive beliefs about the role of English, they faced linguistic challenges during EMI courses due to low mastery of English. Similarly, according to the results of Chang (2019), "a tension between translingual practices and monolingual ideologies in HE classroom" (p. 36) was found in Taiwan. Thus, Taiwanese teachers perceived translanguaging as unusual because of English-only ideologies, although it was used in their usual practices because of the different language proficiency levels. In Baker and Hűttner's (2019) study, interview analysis demonstrated the differences in the English-only ideologies among teachers and students from Thailand, Austria and the UK. While students believed that proficiency is not important in evaluating the outcomes of content learning and multiple languages should be used in EMI, teachers thought this to be detrimental to English language practices. Seemingly, both monoglossic language ideologies with the perspectives of monolingual norms (Blair et al., 2018) and heteroglossic language ideologies with the perspectives of dynamic bilingual practices (Cummins, 2017) are found in the above-mentioned studies. Overall, Kirkpatrick (2014) asserted that multilingual practices in the form of translanguaging are frequent practice in EMI because learning in a first language is easier than in English. Wei (2018) defines translanguaging as follows:

> Translanguaging is not conceived as an object or a linguistic structural phenomenon to describe and analyze but a practice and a process—a practice that involves dynamic and functionally integrated use of different languages and language varieties, but more importantly a process of knowledge construction that goes beyond language(s). (p.15)

Hence, it could be summarized that translanguaging is practiced in different contexts despite stakeholders' negative beliefs towards it because of its utility as a process for knowledge construction.

Considering the relation of LM and LP, studies in other contexts show ineffective measures of LM that directly led to challenges in LP. Rahman et al.'s (2019) research displayed that one of the Bangladeshi universities did not have an effective management system for implementing the EMI policy due to the admission of students and recruitment teachers with insufficient English levels, and the absence of any professional support for teaching staff. Consequently, EMI participants in Bangladesh faced language difficulties. However, Hu and Lei (2013) and Zhang (2018) found that even though Chinese policymakers adopted certain measures to address language issues considering the limitations of EMI participants, they were ineffective in practice. For example, applicants were required to pass a language test; this test, according to Chinese policy, is called the National Matriculation English Test (NMET) and helps university representatives make inferences about applicants' English skills (Cheng & Qi, 2006). Nevertheless, the requirement of passing this entry test was not appropriate to evaluate potential students' language skills as they faced language challenges in practice. Moreover, as a part of LM, the university provided students with extra language courses beyond EMI subjects and teachers with EMI lectures and symposiums. Nonetheless, according to the interviews conducted by Hu and Lei (2013), those measures were also limited and not useful for teachers because their communicative abilities in English were insufficient and they were unable to deliver the content in English. In this respect, Zhang (2018) agreed with Spolsky's (2009) assertion that "language behavior is determined by proficiency" (p.5). Therefore, ineffective entry language tests, language courses, other pedagogical activities designed for students and teachers, as in the case of China, should be thoroughly

considered in order to avoid negative consequences. Otherwise, when teachers with insufficient language skills are unable to teach flexibly without ready-made linguistic units (Vinke et al., 1998) and students with low language levels face challenges in studying through English (Çankaya, 2017), they hinder the achievement of both English practices and content learning in EMI (Jiang et al., 2019). In addition, there might other LM reasons for such language challenges defined by different researchers, such as teachers' busy schedules due to high workload (Vu & Burns, 2014) and the time-consuming nature of preparation for EMI lessons (Çankaya, 2017) that limit their extra educational activities oriented towards self-development and supporting students, inadequate resourcing with educational needs (i.e., inappropriate human resources, digital learning facilities, and classroom conditions) and insufficient teacher training in EMI (Baldauf et al., 2011; Lin & Lo, 2018). Accordingly, it is seen that ineffective measures of LM directly influence LP resulting in inappropriate language use.

In conclusion, the reviewed studies demonstrated that teachers and students encounter language challenges in EMI while also having positive LI about English. This interplay of LI and LP might be interpreted as a misalignment between these components. Moreover, it was mentioned about the failure of LM measurements and measures (e.g., entrance tests, language courses for students, and EMI lectures and symposiums for teachers) on a par with additional predicted necessary measures (e.g., sufficient resourcing, teacher training programs and supports for students). The practices of translanguaging and its role were also considered as an effective approach to overcome language difficulties in EMI. Nevertheless, comparing LP and LI interrelation, it might be stated that translanguaging goes against the ideology of English-only environment. Finally, the analysis demonstrates a gap between policy goals, practices in EMI and stakeholders'

beliefs. Regarding the interplay of the three language components, it is shown that they influence each other and indicate both pros and cons of EMI.

Overview of the EMI Context in Kazakhstani HEIs

In this overview section, the process of the implementation of EMI, language proficiency levels and research on EMI in Kazakhstan are described in order to expand the understanding of EMI in HEIs.

Kazakhstan is a multilingual country with more than 130 nationalities (Baitileyova, 2018). However, only two languages are declared as official in this country - Kazakh as the state language and Russian as the interethnic communication language (Law on Languages of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 1997). English has been taught as a foreign language in Kazakhstan since 1990 and was not implemented as MOI in education at the beginning (Gerfanova, 2018). Nevertheless, the importance of learning English has increased over the last decade due to the government's perception of its vitality in the modernization and development of Kazakhstan (Zhetpisbayeva et al., 2016). Hence, it is stated in policy that there is a need for the establishment of a highly skilled plurilingual nation that is proficient not only in Kazakh and Russian but also in English (Ayazbayeva, 2017).

As noted in the introduction chapter, the government supported the ideas of the development of English alongside the reform in the educational sector, which was named "Trilingual Education" (Yrsaliyev et al., 2017). It aims to strengthen the use of Kazakh, preserve the use of Russian, and improve English competence (Dearden, 2014). This reform was documented showing its implementation stages in the program "the State Program of Education and Science Development in the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2016-2019" (MoES, 2016) that was extended to 2025 (MoES, 2019). The trilingual education model at the school level implies the implementation of teaching "The History of Kazakhstan" in the Kazakh language and "World History" in Russian or Kazakh, which

began in 2020 (MoES, 2016). Moreover, four subjects of the natural-mathematical cycle (physics, chemistry, biology, and computer science) were identified for being conducted in English, with transition phases to this MOI policy continuing from 2017 to 2023 (MoES, 2016). In addition, Nazarbayev Intellectual Schools (NIS) were established as the flagship institutions with EMI courses that would help to reform school education (Karabassova, 2021). NIS has been adopted as an agent of change that practices multilingual education (Nazarbayev, 2010).

At the tertiary educational level, EMI has been introduced for polylingual groups within programs. In particular, since 2016, all universities implementing trilingual education have adopted the "50:20:30" model that implies 50% of subjects taught in the first language (Kazakh/Russian), 20% taught in the second language (Kazakh/Russian) and 30% taught in the third language (English) (Yrsaliyev et al., 2017). For example, Prilipko (2017) studied one state university that has the practice of offering 30% of courses in EMI in the department of science and humanities. However, Yessenamanova et al. (2014) argued that instead of allocating 30% for courses taught in a foreign language, another state university has been allocating only 7% of total credits for courses taught in a foreign language in polylingual groups for specialties such as ecology, physics and mathematics. The reason for such a small number of courses was that only 10% of students had sufficient language proficiency to study in English, and that did not allow for an increase in the number of EMI courses. Regarding the distribution of EMI courses by semesters, there are two models used in the universities. The first model was launched by Karaganda State University named after Buketov in which EMI starts from the second semester and, over the course of time, the number of courses increases while the second model implies the practices of EMI from the first semester until graduation (Aubakirova et al., 2019).

Considering the labelling of this multilingual education program in HE as one that is polylingual, there are some researchers in Kazakhstan who explain that the goal of the government's three-language policy is to form a national polylingual personality (Nurzhanova et al, 2018). Ospanova et al. (2016) stated that the most fundamental concept for the Kazakhstani context is polylingual education and this is synonymous with multilingual education. Furthermore, the Kazakhstani linguist Zhetpisbayeva defined a specific definition of polylingual education as it is "a purposeful, organized, normalized triune process of training, education and development of an individual as a poly-language personality on the basis of simultaneous acquisition of several languages as a "fragment" of the socially significant experience of mankind embodied in the language knowledge and abilities, language and speech activity as well as in the emotional-and-valuable relation to languages and cultures" (p. 20, as cited in Aubakirova & Mandel, 2018). In general, the difference between the polylingual format in HE and the trilingual education format in secondary schools is that, according to Yessenamanova et al. (2014) and Yrsaliyev et al. (2017), only selected students with a basic English level can participate in the polylingual program whereas at secondary school all students in a class have to participate in the trilingual education program.

In addition, the adoption of the three-cycle model, which resulted from joining the Bologna Process, in 2010, has impacted the increase of EMI programs in HE in Kazakhstan (Seitzhanova et al., 2015). The principles of the Bologna Process, such as the inclusion of standardized levels of HE for the members of the European Area of Higher Education (EAHE), academic mobility and the European Credit Transfer System have allowed Kazakhstan to become part of the international community (IAAQ, 2010). Thus, the westernization of education has become one of the factors driving EMI policy (Tampayeva, 2016) because this program is perceived as beneficial for both universities

and students (Seitzhanova et al., 2015). Lastly, Nazarbayev University (NU), which has been introduced as the international research institution offering world-class education (Katsu & Saniyazova, 2018) has become a benchmark of EMI practices in the country (Koch, 2014).

Overall, universities in Kazakhstan have the opportunity to attract more students by offering EMI in partial or full polylingual groups within the framework of trilingual education to those applicants who value studying in English for more promising future success and wish to participate in student mobility programs. At the same time, NU and NIS promote EMI practices in the country as the new reform's leading educational hubs. Therefore, there seems to be variability within the country in the implementation of the EMI policy depending on the forms of educational institutions.

Research on EMI in Kazakhstan

This sub-section introduces research on EMI in Kazakhstan because they revealed policy challenges such as proficiency issues, LP and LM problems, and LP benefits that resulted in language improvements. For example, according to researchers, the most significant problem of universities implementing EMI is teachers' and students' low English levels (Karabassova, 2020) and due to this, these stakeholders cannot always participate in, for example, Bologna mobility programs (Yergebekov & Temirbekova, 2012). In particular, the research of undergraduate students' language proficiency in Kazakhstan shows that over 60% (out of 165) of students face linguistic challenges through a lack of grammatical knowledge and communicative competencies (Yeshengazina, 2018). Yeshengazina (2018) related this problem to the lack of monitoring of English learning outcomes since school education period. Regarding teachers' levels of English, a study analysis of 19 universities conducted by the "Information-Analytical Centre" in 2017 demonstrated that one-third of all faculty members who teach in English

have only A1-A2 levels. Seitzhanova et al. (2014) emphasized that teachers' insufficient English proficiency is the factor that declines the effectiveness of EMI. Thus, the potential reason for problems of English language levels might be a failure of the teacher training programs (Karabassova, 2020). Moreover, another reason for teachers' low proficiency, considering the fact that almost 30% of the contingent of HE teaching staff are older than 40 years (IAC, 2017) could be challenges related to teaching through English at an older age. Oralova (2012) stated that the older generation of teaching staff in HEIs are not able to teach in English and, therefore, do not support the development of EMI. Regarding teachers' resistance to EMI, some scholars have also claimed that "Soviet is used as an imaginary quality standard, somewhat similar to a universal golden standard, against which anticipated changes, for example, the introduction of the new curriculum, are compared and fiercely opposed" (Fimyar & Kurakbayev, 2016, p. 98). Consequently, Soviet generation teachers might have an unwillingness to accept the new policy to teach in English. By and large, it could be summarized that challenges related to the level of English proficiency among teachers and students exist in Kazakhstan.

Furthermore, research on EMI in one of the national universities from the south of Kazakhstan conducted by Kanatkhanova (2020) reveals that there are mixed views of LP that show both its benefits and challenges. For example, in interviews, EMI teachers responded that during presentations, students mix two languages (English and Russian) because they face difficulties speaking English-only. According to students' responses, it is stated that in EMI they significantly expanded their vocabulary in English by learning industry-related words which would be useful in their professional careers. Generally, the above-mentioned results as translingual practices and learning outcomes can be also compared with the findings of this research on EMI which is conducted in another national university in the north of the country.

Aitzhanova's (2020) study about students' perceptions towards multilingual practices in EMI at two Kazakhstani universities (one is an entirely English taught university and the other is a multilingual university) demonstrate other problems related to LP in EMI. For instance, regarding the English-only requirements, while some students replied that there was a strict English-only speaking rule in classrooms, others claimed that they did not have any written rules regarding language choice in classrooms and they often used all three languages in EMI because they could not speak fluently in English. Noticeably, in the first EMI university, most teachers came from overseas whereas in the second university with EMI groups, teachers were local. From this example, it is seen that the diversity in practices and management depend on the types of universities and their faculty. Nevertheless, the main finding of the research revealed that, although participants have monolingual ideologies, they practice translanguaging, and some of them noticed its confidence building effect. Therefore, conducting research at a new site which is also a multilingual university with EMI groups could allow the development of further implications to improve the situation of EMI in Kazakhstan.

Another study conducted by Karabay (2017) shows that regional students of EMI at an international university in Kazakhstan faced linguistic problems that hindered their disciplinary knowledge despite the international status of their university. Moreover, the students perceived their international professors' accents and their methods of delivering the content challenging for comprehension (Karabay, 2017). In general, despite the fact that this international university has more opportunities to organize quality education in English hiring highly paid and qualified international instructors, and selecting students with high language proficiency, it is seen that it still has language problems. Therefore, there is a question about the situation of EMI in non-international universities in Kazakhstan.

In addition, a study conducted by Prilipko (2017) about the management of the implementation of EMI in Kazakhstani HEIs demonstrate that, overall, one of the state Kazakhstani universities had an effective management practice to support its EMI faculty. It provided English training, assistance with publishing, an optimal workload, and a certain degree freedom in curriculum development. However, there were some difficulties in the administration of the EMI program, such as the admission of students with low qualifications, differences in students' language proficiency in one group and a considerable number of students in another group. The interviewed staff also felt that they were not prepared for EMI because of a shortage of qualified EMI teachers and a lack of teaching materials in English. Consequently, the analyses of Prilipko's (2017) study raise a question about the preparedness of the EMI participants. Therefore, the current research allows the investigation of language management system similarities of state and national universities within the country complementing the results with practices and ideologies.

To conclude, guided by the findings of research on EMI in Kazakhstan, it might be assumed that generally, student's LP in EMI is constructed with a mix of multiple languages due to the necessity of Kazakh and Russian for meaning-making. Students' LI depends on the quality of instruction in English as even teachers' accents and the way they interconnect with students negatively impact their understanding of the subject. Moreover, LM is one of the sensitive and complex issues in the Kazakhstani EMI policy. Specifically, an English proficiency level among teachers and students has been researched as a problematic aspect of EMI in Kazakhstan. According to the above-mentioned research, an inappropriate organization of EMI groups with different language levels and insufficient provision of teaching resources and teaching staff are the problems that exist. Despite these challenges, Macaro (2015) stated that EMI is "an unstoppable train" (p.7) adopted rapidly in non-English Asian universities, which means that there is a need in research to meet the

demands of EMI policy conceptualization. These results have led me to formulate another critical investigation that will build one more qualitative explanation of EMI through the lens of the three language components within the Kazakhstani national university context.

Conclusion

Summing up, it might be concluded that Spolsky's tripartite theory in which the interplay of LM, LP and LM is analyzed is useful for studying the EMI policy, especially in the case of Kazakhstan where English is a foreign language. In particular, both international and Kazakhstani research shows policy challenges related to language proficiency, LP and LM. Moreover, some of the studies also demonstrated positive LI towards EMI as well as language improvement results in LP. Nevertheless, the current study might fill the gap of the previous studies by exploring each language component separately and then focusing on their interplay in the Kazakhstani context.

Chapter 3: Methodology

This study aims to explore university teachers' and students' experiences of EMI in one of the Kazakhstani universities focusing on LM, LP and LI. In general, EMI is a considerably new concept in the field of education with a limited amount of research in this country (Karabay, 2017). Therefore, the better approach to exploring challenges and developing a detailed understanding of a central phenomenon (Creswell, 2014) is a qualitative method. This chapter presents the following methodological components which constituted this qualitative approach: research design, sampling, research methods, data collection procedures, data analysis, and ethical considerations.

Research Design

For the current study, the qualitative research was designed in the form of a case study. According to Yin (2009), "a case study is empirical research that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in-depth and within its real-life context" (p. 18). Louis Smith, one of the pioneers of the ethnography in education, defined any case as "a bounded system" (p.2) where people and processes are central cases (as cited in Stake, 1995). Moreover, a unit of analysis such as an individual, a community, artifacts, and interactions among individuals can be used to conduct a case study (Stake, 1995). Yin (2009) emphasized that a simple case might involve not only one but several units of analysis. Thus, an embedded design of a single case study was applied in the current research because it involves three units from the same site: interviews with two different subgroups of people, and documents.

Sampling

In the current study, a purposeful sampling strategy was applied for intentionally selecting participants and focusing on certain people or sites to learn the central phenomenon (Creswell, 2014). Two groups of participants were interviewed, namely,

teachers and students, and all of them were aged above 18. According to the sampling criteria, all participants had to be Kazakhstani citizens who are experiencing EMI at the same national university and in the same department of natural science. Moreover, certain sampling characteristics for each group were set. Particularly, four teachers had to (a) be working in one of the Kazakhstani national universities; and (b) have had at least three years of experience of teaching EMI. Additionally, two of the teachers had to have some experience of studying abroad and two of them had to have experience of studying at only domestic universities. In particular, that the two that went abroad might have stronger English skills; therefore, it is important to focus on teachers' two different educational background. Six students had to (a) be studying in one of the Kazakhstani national universities; (b) be undergraduate degree students; (c) be third or fourth year students who have been studying on the EMI course for at least two years.

The reason for choosing one particular national university in the north of Kazakhstan as the site of the research is that it is one of the universities which first implemented EMI programs pursuing the government's policy related to multilingual education (Attiya, 2016). The details of the university will be presented in the findings chapter as part of the results of the document analysis. Moreover, I defined the minimum years of the involvement of subgroups into the EMI course because they are supposed to reflect a high level of knowledge of the themes explored. I chose only undergraduate students because the study conducted by Yrsaliyev et al. (2017) on undergraduate first- and fourth-year students' showed no progress in their English improvements during EMI courses, and therefore, this research can be useful in understanding undergraduate students' perceptions about EMI gained until the moment of the research in the third or fourth year. As for the rationale for selecting natural science faculty, this faculty has its

own terminology which is understandable only to scientists of this field (Illnerova, 2004)

and can show the role of participants' linguistic repertoire.

Table 1 illustrates the recruited participants' key characteristic required for the

research. Generally, both teachers and students were identified as trilingual speakers of

Kazakh, Russian and English.

Table 1

Participants' Background Information

№	Participants	Educational background		Experience in polylingual education
		Country/type of school	Medium of Instruction	
	Subgroup 1			
1	Teacher R	Spain	English	6 years
2	Teacher C	The UK/The USA	English	8 years
3	Teacher Z	Kazakhstan	Russian/Kazakh	More than 3 years
4	Teacher K	Kazakhstan	Russian	More than 3 years
	Subgroup 2			
5	Student G	School for gifted children	Kazakh	2 years (4th year)
6	Student R	Lyceum	Kazakh	2 years (4th year)
7	Student O	Daryn School	Kazakh	2 years (4th year)
8	Student B	Public School	Kazakh	2 years (4th year)
9	Student P	NIS	English	2 years (3rd year)
10	Student W	Public School	Kazakh	2 years (3rd year)

The participants were recruited with the help of a gatekeeper who guided me in

approaching them. In qualitative research, Creswell (2014) stated that the role of a

gatekeeper is vital, as this person can help a researcher to obtain permission to research

from a particular site and identify potential participants. My gatekeeper advertised the

research via WhatsApp messages that contained my contact and then teachers and students

could contact me directly if they wished to participate voluntarily. Then, I sent an informed

consent form with the explanation of the procedures of the research to the potential participants.

For document analysis, I used the university's official website to find the information on EMI policy and admissions requirements. However, since I could not obtain detailed information on EMI policy on the website, I also followed Creswell's (2014) guideline and requested them from the university administrators. Following the purposeful approach, I identified necessary university policy documents for both the website and the request to administrators which might provide important information to answer my research questions (Creswell, 2014). In particular, I focused on the information about LM in EMI that is relevant to interview questions such as EMI participants' selection criteria, selection procedures, resourcing and additional administrative support for both teachers and students.

Research Instruments

The instruments of qualitative research used in this case study were an interview and document analysis because collecting information from multiple sources is one of the characteristics of qualitative data collection (Creswell, 2014). In fact, according to Yin, there are six sources of qualitative evidence in a case study, which are "documentation, archival records, interviews, direct observation, participant observation, and physical artifacts" (p. 245 as cited in Paré, 2004). However, I chose only two out of all methods due to their usefulness to combine evidence of multiple cases shaping the theoretical framework of the research that focuses on the three language components.

Interview

An interview is used to ask questions to respondents and record their answers (Creswell, 2014). It is also a useful means of access in collecting information for a type of research such as understanding participants' perceptions and how they deal with a certain

phenomenon (Berg & Lune, 2012). Therefore, I specifically chose a semi-structured one-on-one interview in this design because it includes open-ended questions with "pre-prepared questions and prompts" (p.136) that allows the further elaboration of questions to gather detailed answers (Dörnyei, 2007). I constructed interview questions (Appendix A) for each subgroup of respondents after reading Spolsky's theory and the other studies guided by his theory. The questions were divided into three subsections about LM, LP and LI within the framework of Spolsky's tripartite theory and I also used additional warming up and closing questions. The interview questions were provided in the relevant languages, i.e., Kazakh, Russian and English, considering respondents' preferences. In particular, open-ended questions and close-ended questions in the format of Likert scales (from 1 to 10) were also applied and followed in both cases with probe questions to obtain more in-depth answers. The interview data was recorded on a digital audio recorder and transcribed using a word-for-word approach for analysis (Creswell, 2014).

COVID-19-related adjustments to research. In addition, as many countries introduced size limits for group gatherings in public places due to the global spread of the COVID-19 Pandemic, such measures also affected the normal functioning of secondary and tertiary education institutions (OECD, 2020). School and university closures have impacted 96% of the world's student's population and only 1% of low and middle-income countries (United Nations, 2020). The government of Kazakhstan declared the transition to remote education in March 2020 (Bayetova & Karsakbayeva, 2020). Accordingly, because this education format continued in the Fall 2020 semester in Kazakhstan, in the planned period of data collection, forms of electronic methods for reaching the participants were considered in my research. Interviews via Skype or Zoom were applied in such circumstances, following the original format of sampling planned for one-on-one interviews. This type of interview is called mobile methods which alters traditional

research data collection during COVID-19 (Burke & Patching, 2020). Burke and Patching's (2020) experience with research interviews conducted in a virtual platform showed that it was convenient for participants. Moreover, the authors emphasize that they obtained ethics approval with security measures such as locked meetings in Zoom with mandatory password protection, waiting rooms for each meeting, and using Dictaphone to audiotape the interviews but not recording the interview in Zoom to ensure participants' confidentiality (Burke & Patching, 2020). This option of conducting research was applied in my study with the consideration of the security features of interviews in virtual platforms.

Document Analysis

Document analysis was taken as a procedure that supports an embedded case study whereby the researcher sees the interplay of units from the same site. Creswell (2014) asserted that, "documents provide a researcher with a rich source of information" (p. 245). Furthermore, within Spolsky's theoretical framework, LM consists of different documents that aim to change LP (Hűttner et al., 2013). Therefore, document analyses were used to examine explicit policy measures that may impact LP. In the next section, I will explain in more detail the types of documents analyzed and the means of obtaining them.

Data Collection Procedures

In the beginning, the interview protocols were piloted. According to Bell (2005), careful piloting of sample questions is a crucial part of the research that can prevent any errors in the interviewing process as the wording of questions is a complicated process. Moreover, Bell (2005) suggested that piloting sample questions helps to test interview duration, and define unusable questions as well as the clarity of the questions. Thus, I tested my interview questions in both Russian and Kazakh languages with two peers. They gave me feedback on the correct interpretation of some words in Kazakh and Russian

languages in questions and suggested that I use more probe questions to clarify the answers. Overall, they felt that the questions were logically constructed and connected to the research questions. Considering the duration of the interview, Jamshed (2014) suggested that an interview is conducted only once, and that its duration is no more than an hour. The duration of my piloted interviews was approximately 25-30 minutes, which did not run beyond the scheduled time.

The participants were selected voluntarily and finally, we resolved the time and online platform issues, and started the process of interviewing. One important stage during the selection of the participants was that I asked pre-screening questions to them before setting up the interview to identify whether they fit my sampling criteria related to teachers' studies both overseas and at domestic universities and the amount of EMI teaching experience they have acquired. As mentioned in the participants' section, pre-screening questions include the information about teachers' and students' departments, the number of years teaching or studying in EMI, and teachers' educational background. Also, it is important to mention that the interviews with students were via Zoom and WhatsApp video call, but interviews with teachers were via telephone due to their preferences.

For the data collection of documents, I archived seven pages from the website and administrators. To be specific, from the website, I found the information about language requirements for students whereas the administrators provided me with extracts from their multiple officially written guidelines about the LM measures that I noticed in the sampling section.

Data Analysis Procedures

According to Creswell (2014), to analyze data in a case study, a researcher should scrutinize the conducted data and then code it and develop the themes. First, for the analysis of data collected through interviews, I transcribed in the original language

(Kazakh and Russian) and categorized findings after translating them into English for further development (Creswell, 2014). Transcribed and translated examples of one of the interviews are shown in Appendix B. Then, a procedure of coding was conducted which was "segmenting and labeling the text to form descriptions and broad themes in the data" (Creswell, 2014, p. 267). Examples are also presented in Appendix C. In the course of the process, I used two types of coding: descriptive coding, which summarizes the basic topic of a response by short code, and in vivo coding, which directly quotes respondents' words, and reflects the behavior of an actor to the central problem and helps a researcher to preserve the interviewer's voice (Saldaña, 2015). Moreover, Liamputting and Ezzy (2005) suggested using three columns to format codes. The first column includes interview transcripts and documents, the second column is named preliminary codes and contains notes, and the third column contains the final codes. Hence, I used this strategy of three columns. After coding, it was important to build descriptions and themes because they answer the main research questions and provide a detailed understanding of the central phenomenon (Creswell, 2014). Therefore, I distributed the final codes by the three categories referring to the theoretical framework of this research by LM, LP and LI.

For the document analysis, as documents do not need transcription and are ready for analysis (Creswell, 2014), I used this information directly for coding. Furthermore, Creswell (2014) suggested that there are several ways of document analysis such as taking notes and scanning the documents. In my case, I obtained information from the website as screenshots and excerpts of the official documents as scanned documents; consequently I performed only preliminary coding referring them to the LM category.

Eventually, these directly coded data organized within LM, LP and LI categories were used in the next chapters to present and discuss the findings by their interconnectedness and interplay to reveal possible policy challenges.

Ethical Considerations

Blaxter et al. (2006) stated that "research ethics is about being clear about the nature of the agreement you have entered into with your research subject" (p. 158). Therefore, I followed all general steps of conducting interviews defined by Creswell (2014) being careful in organizing the procedures listed in the research design, sampling, research methods, data collection procedures and data analysis in accordance with the consideration of ethical issues.

Prior to undertaking the investigation, ethical clearance was obtained from the Graduate School of Education Ethics Committee for approval of the current study to conduct research (Nazarbayev University, 2019). There was no need to send the application form for review to the university's Institutional Research Ethics Committee because my respondents were not under the age of 18 (Nazarbayev University, 2019).

After I obtained the approval from GSE Ethics Committee, consent forms were provided for the participants (Appendix D). I strictly carried out Creswell's (2014) principles of informed consent, being respectful to norms and rules of the Kazakhstani culture and taking into account the code of ethics. I understood that one of the most important factors of ethical research is the construction of the consent form that clearly explained the purpose of my tasks and procedures of the study, and described expected benefits and possible risks (Belova, 2017). Cohen et al. (2013) asserted that a consent form is a form of "the subjects' right to freedom and self-determination" (p. 52). Hence, when composing a consent form I was guided by the Master's Thesis Guidelines approved by the Graduate of School of Education for Multilingual Education, 2020, and included the above-mentioned necessary information for the introduction of the research conditions. Before interviews, I required participants to read and show their understanding of the

research but did not force them to send their signature to me. Finally, all participants gave their agreement via WhatsApp text messages.

Expected Benefits and Possible Risks

The expected benefit of the research for stakeholders is that the obtained knowledge can be useful to assess the practicability of the EMI policy through the lens of the language components. Moreover, it can help to increase the understanding of possible issues for future adjustments by recognizing teachers' and students' voices.

The possible risks of the research were that the participants may (a) feel some questions are too sensitive for them, (b) not speak about all issues that they have, and (c) be concerned about the distribution of the interview recordings to others thinking that their participation will affect their study and job. Therefore, I undertook the following steps: reminded the participant that they could refuse to answer uncomfortable questions; told them that I will protect their confidentiality; and gave them the power to withdraw from the research at any time. Before the interviewing process, I asked the permission of the respondents to audio-record and reminded them about the confidentiality of the recording itself. Additionally, I informed the respondents that I will label their answers to conceal names to prevent their unwillingness to share information and dishonesty due to concerns about their confidentiality (Creswell, 2014).

In addition, Dörnyei (2007) stated that the storage of data collected (audio and video recording and their transcripts) is one particular threat to confidentiality. Thus, in my research, no person has had access to the data collected besides me and my supervisor. My personal computer is protected by a password in order to prevent abuse of the storage of data and finally, the data will be deleted after a period of one year.

Positionality

A researcher's positionality might be reflected during the research process as one of the additional ethical considerations (Hopkins, 2007). According to Hopkins (2007), identity and personal experience of a researcher are possible aspects of positionalities that help to negotiate with participants as a reflexive person. In my case, my personal experience of learning English as a foreign language, working as a teacher of English language, and participating in EMI as a student drives me to conduct this research. My journey of English language acquisition and its use as a MOI has been full of ups and downs. Specifically, in terms of LP, I often faced personal challenges with language use in oral practice; regarding LI, I still believe that this language is crucial for the modern generation, and my language learning approaches were purposefully planned which shows my decisions related to LM. My role in this study was as an insider because I have similar experience to students and have worked as a teacher in schools and with teachers at the department of education. Hence, it was interesting for me to understand what their experiences are and how they perceive English in EMI. Throughout the interviews, the participants were very open and talkative about their stories which might be because of my position as an insider.

To sum up, this chapter presented the process of the research that included research design, sampling, research methods, data collection and analysis procedures and ethical considerations. The methodological and ethical aspects of the inquiry are described corresponding to the main research questions that intended to study policy challenges in EMI.

Chapter 4: Findings

The purpose of this research is to explore how teachers' and students' in one Kazakhstani university perceive their EMI program experience through the lens of LM, LP and LI. The qualitative research design was applied in the current study, in which the data collection methods were semi-structured face-to-face interviews and document analysis. Four university teachers and six third- and fourth- year undergraduate students of EMI programs from the department of natural sciences were recruited. Furthermore, to investigate LM of the EMI policy at a university, the information was searched on the university's official website and policy documents were requested from the university administration. In addition, the interview data was also considered to analyze the LM conditions.

In this chapter, the findings of the collected data are presented in a paraphrased summary with reference to the respondents' own explanations. During the data analysis, the findings were classified according to the three categories identified by Spolsky's tripartite language theory. Overall, the chapter answers the sub-questions of the research in the following order: LM in order to explore the context of EMI; LP in order to investigate how stakeholders use languages; and LI in order to understand the respondents' beliefs about EMI.

Language Management

This section comes from official website information, requested institutional policy documents that were provided as excerpts, and interview data. The main subthemes of the section are: 1) EMI policy rules, 2) resources, 3) methodological support for teachers, and 4) educational support for students.

Administrative EMI Policy Rules

The analysis shows that the EMI education format is named as a *polylingual program*. The aim of the program is to train competitive youth, expand the scope of a foreign language, as well as develop communication skills and the ability to think critically (translated from Russian from the official website). The department "Polylingual Education and Academic Resources" manages this program and its functions are formation of polylingual groups, regulation of teaching, selection of teachers and students' testing system, organization and invitation of professional English speakers to improve teachers' academic writing skills, monitoring, and giving recommendations for practitioners.

According to the official documents' excerpts, the polylingual program differs from the full EMI program which starts from the first year of undergraduate study. In accordance with the rules, polylingual groups are usually formed in the second year of undergraduate study. The formation depends on the number of students and teachers, and students cannot leave a polylingual program for one year. Moreover, the policy documents present that as this program starts from the second year, EMI courses are only connected to the specialization related subjects and the amount of its distribution depends on the availability of EMI teachers in the department. In particular, the interview data demonstrate that third-year students moved to a polylingual group in the second year and currently have 3-4 EMI courses because of the number of available faculty. Third-year Student P explained the context of her polylingual education experience as follows:

Extract 1:

Basically, we wanted to study all courses in English but there was a lack of teachers. They are not fully proficient in biotechnology, so we have 3-4 lessons in English, the rest in Kazakh (November 16, 2020).

At the same time, fourth-year students entered a polylingual program only in the third year because the number of students was not enough. Student R stated that although they had a chance to study in a polylingual group from the second year as did the third-year students, they did not enter the program because of a lack of students with confidence in their capabilities to study in English.

Extract 2:

> In the beginning, we could not recruit students to a polylingual group because many students were afraid and did not want to study in English (Student B, November 14, 2020).

Thus, according to students P and R, it is seen that lack of teachers with language skills to conduct more courses in English and lack of students with language skills to create a polylingual group at an earlier year were issues. In this regard, the department might have recruitment challenges related to the providing enough class size and teaching staff for polylingual programs.

Moreover, to enroll in polylingual groups, undergraduate students are required to successfully pass a test for compliance with the necessary level of English proficiency. However, if a student has an IELTS certificate of at least 5.0 or a TOEFL certificate of at least 500 points, he/she is automatically exempted from testing. Regarding teachers, those who have higher test scores in IELTS (6.5) or TOEFL (550) than students or with an advanced international degree, are also exempted from tests and hired directly. According to the interview data, 5 participants (students G, R, B and teachers R, K) entered a polylingual program passing the university test, 4 participants (students O, P and teachers Z, C) have IELTS results while one student (W) entered with TOEFL results.

Considering the selection procedures, half of the teachers indicated the existence of issues related to admission (teachers R, Z). For example, Teacher Z explained that students

with very low levels of English could pass the selection criteria "only by introducing themselves in English and knowing some words after which test-takers think that they know the language well" (November 20, 2020). Consequently, they encounter difficulties during LP which are examined in the following subsection about professional supports for students.

Resources

The question "are you satisfied with the learning resources provided by the institution for EMI on a scale of 1 to 10?" was asked to explore the students' perception about resources. In response, Student R rated as three as she is not satisfied with resourcing; the main problem is in the equipment such as a computer, teaching aids, interactive boards and internet connection. Along with Student R, Student G emphasized that everything remains the same as it is a university of the post-Soviet period. Accordingly, she had to bring her own laptop that influence negatively to her health condition:

Extract 3:

> Unfortunately, our university is a real university of the post-Soviet period. Nothing has changed, the same desks, chalkboards. There are few classrooms where you can find an elementary interactive whiteboard. The only plus is that they continually give tasks that are available in gadgets, although in some places, the internet connection is bad, we cannot use it. In terms of teaching, there are no problems. All these inconveniences affect my health and I feel stress because, for example, when I forget my laptop or charging, I cannot work during lessons (Student G, November 19, 2020).

Another specific common problem that students noticed was unavailability of books (O, W, and P). In this respect, students W and P reported that they used electronic books or the

information sent by teachers and mostly never used hard copies. However, for Student B, the issue is that some teachers do not send her study materials; accordingly, she struggles by searching for information herself:

Extract 4:

> We have some teachers, who do not always prepare materials and have to look for everything by ourselves (Student B, November 14, 2020).

In contrast, two teachers are satisfied with the resources that the university provides (C, K). For example, Teacher C stated, "I rate it as 8, the university has everything and we only need to be ready for the lessons" (November 19, 2020). However, Teacher R responded that her specialty is very specific and the university does not have such materials. She claimed that she uses her own teaching aids:

Extract 5:

> I use my resources. The fact is that I teach a very narrow specialty, so I do not think that the university has something that I do not have. I provide everything myself. We have an online library, but I demonstrate the videos conducted during my experience (Teacher R, November 30, 2020).

Lastly, Student O revealed another problem related to resources, mentioning that their content materials were inadequate because they were not changed from course to course except their titles. By this, she indicated that the study content is underrepresented due to a lack of materials:

Extract 6:

> So 5 or 6. I'm not satisfied. We have been studying in a polylingual group for several years but we re-studied the same materials in several courses. For example, the topic 'National use of natural resources' was taught in one lesson and again slightly changing its title, it can be taught in the next course with the same remaining content.

In fact, it is not only in the English groups but also in the Kazakh groups. The reason maybe is that the ecology is not very developed in the country, I do not know other areas, but we have few materials (Student O, November 11, 2020).

These problematic findings of resources concerning technological advancements, books and course content materials influence respondents' efficiency in teaching and learning in EMI as they emphasized them as inconveniences. From the policy documents, it is clear that the university does not specify the provision of these resources except content materials for EMI program. However, these issues might be solved by the Ministry of Education on a macro-level as it allocates resources. With this in mind, Teacher Z concluded that the Ministry should provide adequate educational opportunities for stakeholders if English is strategically implemented to the educational system:

Extract 7:

In Kazakhstan, polylingual groups are required by the ministry, but to demand it is necessary to give opportunities by providing free courses for students and teachers and creating learning conditions (Teacher Z, November 20, 2020).

Methodological Support for Teachers

The document analysis demonstrates that different experience exchange workshops and conferences were organized at the university. For example, in 2018 the university won a grant to improve teachers' English proficiency in which participated 150 teachers. Furthermore, in 2018-2019, an academic writing course for teachers was managed by international specialists. Nevertheless, the interviews revealed that three teachers (R, K, and Z) were aware of such courses but only one teacher (K) out of four could participate in language courses for a year. The other two (R and Z) argued that their workload is heavy due to a lack of teachers and they do not have time for training courses. For instance, Teacher Z explained:

Extract 8:

> The university organized foreign language courses for teachers but I didn't
>
> participant because of the heavy load. We have a few EMI teachers, and the main
>
> load of the polylingual groups is given to us. Lessons are not scheduled; lesson may
>
> be at 8 am and even at 6 pm (November 20, 2020).

Moreover, the document analysis shows that polylingual teachers get methodological

support from professors of Philology department with good experience in teaching English

and international specialists monitor polylingual lessons. However, only one teacher out of

four mentioned that the department monitored her teaching practices by positively

assessing her EMI practices. Nevertheless she felt that her level of English is not

appropriate for teaching EMI and she needs some language support. The extract below

presents her comment:

Extract 9:

> I teach with my level of English proficiency and the department of a polylingual
>
> program evaluated me claiming that everything is well. I would like to increase my
>
> language level to be more fluent in English (Teacher Z, November 20, 2020).

Another teacher (R) noticed that when she was involved in the training courses it was all

about English skills not concerning methodological aspects of teaching in English. Hence,

she reported that it is important to conduct methodological courses of EMI:

Extract 10:

> I did not graduate a pedagogical university even though I am a natural science
>
> specialist. I think there should be some help for teachers in terms of teaching in
>
> English. In the courses that I attended, we were taught English as a language but we
>
> need to learn methods for teaching in English (Teacher R, November 30, 2020).

On the contrary, Teacher K responded that she does not need any methodological support because her 20-year teaching experience allows her to teach in EMI and methods are not different from others:

Extract 11:

> I do not need courses in teaching methods because I have been teaching more than 20 years. I do not believe that our methodology is fundamentally different from foreign methodology (Teacher K, November 20, 2020).

Comparing the above-mentioned results, it could be noticed that half of the teachers still wish to participate in language courses to improve their language skills. In addition, two interviewees responded that not only English courses, but also EMI methodological courses should be conducted for teachers. Interestingly, written policy documents highlighted the practices of methodological support offered by the department which was not mentioned by practitioners. Hence, this mismatch between what is written and what is said reveals that there is a gap between the department and the teaching staff regarding courses and support.

Educational Support for Students

The students' interview data reveal that four out of six students (R, G, O, and B) did not get any professional support from the department when they were struggling in studying through English, particularly, when half of them felt anxiety at the beginning of the EMI program. Students G, R, O, and B from the fourth year of the study commented that they encountered self-critique, fear to speak, an embarrassment to perform in English. The English-only environment was shocking for them and a language barrier hindered their ability to speak scientific words in English. Even some of the students wanted to go back to Kazakh groups because they were frustrated and unprepared for new learning practices that affected their self-esteem (Students O and M). These findings demonstrate that

although EMI is supposed to be an opportunity for using English as a language for learning, their poor English exposure did not allow them to be confident at the beginning of the program. From the extract below, there is seen one of the students' response about struggles:

Extract 12:

> Initially, when we were told that we would study in only English, it was a shock for us. We came to the lesson and there was no such thing as just "good morning", "sit down", "now I will speak in English and translate it". We thought about that and how we would learn without understanding anything. But the most important problem was a language barrier, we were afraid to speak, even if we knew. Our pronunciation was not the correct or vocabulary was not enough and we were afraid to embarrass ourselves (Student G, November 13, 2020).

As Student G reported, a language barrier caused anxiety that challenged effective teaching and learning practices in EMI. Teacher C also observed that, "All the students were afraid to speak, no matter how their language skills improved in a month, they were afraid" (November 19, 2020).

Consequently, as students felt anxiousness due to low levels of proficiency, it was necessary for them to get support which was not offered. For example, the extracts below demonstrate that even when students requested help from the dean of the department because one of the girls in a group was not able to study in EMI, although she passed the selection procedure, there was no assistance. It is reported that the only solution was helping each other:

Extract 13:

> After we moved to a polylingual program, it was very difficult for some of the girls, and as soon as we became a group, emotions were transferred to each other. For

example, girls confused some words, could not answer the questions and that made

me feel bad too. Then we went to the dean's office as one girl was in a complicated

situation; she did not understand at all. She moved to the English group, was able to

pass the test, but could not study. We requested that as the girl has a hard time, she

can either study Russian or move to the Russian group or if help is provided. No

one helped us and didn't care (Student O, November 11, 2020).

Nonetheless, while the administration neglected the students' anxiety by ignoring their

requests and not monitoring students' language practices, all student-respondents noticed

that some teachers emotionally supported them (O, G, R, W, P, B). This finding depicts

that teachers worried about their students' progress and their language management

strategies as support and encouragement in the in-class environment were pragmatic and

helpful for students. The extracts below depict the students' perceptions of their teachers'

support:

Extract 14:

There were several teachers who supported us; they said that everything would

improve. Emotional support helped us a lot (Student B, November 14, 2020).

Extract 15:

Most teachers tried to help to find information and to understand the subject.

Teachers thought about us and supported us (Student W, November 19, 2020).

Language Practices

In this section, the practical aspects of EMI, which are important to reveal language-

related challenges and outcomes, were analyzed. The main subthemes of this section are:

1) teaching and learning approaches; 2) proficiency and multilingual language practices in

EMI; and 3) the shift from linguistic challenges to positive outcomes during EMI.

Teaching and Learning Approaches

During the interviews, the teachers and students were asked to describe typical EMI lessons in order understand what approaches they use to teach and study in English. Two respondents (Students G and R) stated that generally, the lessons were systematized and organized well. Moreover, both students and teachers reported that presentations, group works, Q&A sessions, individual tasks, and videos were used in EMI lessons (Students G, R, and Teachers R, C, K). Particularly, in the extract below, Student G listed these main approaches that her teacher used in EMI:

Extract 16:

We usually choose a topic, make a presentation, prepare lecture questions and do individual tasks. One teacher knows his specialization very well, as well as English. Thanks to him, we have passed such systematization. During the lesson, a student has a choice of up to four categories of tasks (November 13, 2020).

From the teachers' perspectives, the participant Teacher C reported that applying different teaching approaches is effective, especially to improve students' input and output. Therefore, it is useful to spend more time interacting with students orally using certain speaking tasks, for example, discussion of videos and Q&A:

Extract 17:

Usually, I use different methods such as questions, discussions to improve students' perceptions, speech and listening skills. This is an opportunity to communicate with students. Then small videos are mandatory for the lesson for discussion. At the end of the lesson, I ask a couple of final questions (Teacher C, November 19, 2020).

Regarding the preparation of EMI lessons, one interviewee (Teacher C) stated that it takes much time in EMI and as the lessons are conducted in a foreign language he takes into

consideration linguistic aspects in order to work with the new words. He claimed that teaching in English requires huge efforts for each lesson:

Extract 18:

> Indeed, in polylingual education, there were times when I worked till 4-5 a.m. I learnt how to make presentations in the UK, and then also introduced the binary method at the University. This is not my native language that is why EMI courses are not easy. If there are five English lessons per week, then I have to prepare 10-15 new words for each lesson (Teacher C, November 19, 2020).

These extracts depict that various teaching approaches are used in EMI for creating a condition for LP. However, the issue related to teachers' preparation of teaching materials was prominent in the interview data. In general, the results show that teachers are able to teach through English which is justified by the findings related to their readiness to support emotionally and efforts to conduct quality lessons by considering lexical aspects and planning time for speaking activities.

From students' perspectives there are multiple approaches to understanding the lesson content. Students R, O and G apply approaches as using online translators (Yandex, Google translator) to understand scientific terms during the preparation for the lessons. It was also stated that it is easier to find information in English (Student P and O). Nonetheless, when the information in English was not available, Student B could use materials in Russian and then translated them into English. These findings demonstrate that for LP in EMI, translators are useful instruments and materials in Russian is another way for understanding the content by switching from one language to another as was reported by Student B as follows:

Extract 19:

Basically, when I am looking for information, access to some articles is prohibited,

and then I have to use the materials in Russian. Then I translate it from Russian into

English. If the information is available in English, I use them (November 14, 2020).

Additionally, it was mentioned that the students have to change their learning approaches

for each lesson in order to comply with the requirements of each teacher due to different

teaching styles (Students W and O). For instance:

Extract 20:

Each teacher has his own method of teaching. I was taught by teachers who explain

everything in English carefully and their demand was very high (Student W,

November 19, 2020).

For Students O and R, their teachers' approach of using synonyms or more simple words

was comprehensive in understanding the content. These results show that the more

requirements teachers have, the more students need to do to reach the expected learning

objectives in EMI. Hence, the students could adjust their learning approaches in English

depending on their teachers' methods of teaching which also might influence their

effective language practices.

     Online Education Practices. Considering the current format of education, Student

R noticed that online is better as it is easier to deliver presentations whereas Student P said

that online format is boring and for Student B it is inconvenient: "Now, in online, we

cannot present orally for a long time, so we mainly prepare a report and 10-12 pages

presentations" (Student B, November 14, 2020). However, from teachers' perspectives,

one respondent (Teacher R) lamented that taking into account the specificity of their

students' major which is hard to understand even in a first language, "especially in the

online format, learning is difficult" (November 30, 2020). A comparison of the negative

and positive comments about online format reveals that LP in online EMI are limited due

to the absence of space for natural interactions but for the students it is simple and they felt less responsible for the classroom participation.

Proficiency and Multilingual Language Practices in EMI

Students' Language Proficiencies and Translanguaging Practices. In order to understand teachers and students' LP in EMI, they were asked to evaluate each other's skills and tell about their use of multiple languages. From teachers' perspectives, the majority of them (Z, R, K) reported that generally their students have appropriate levels of English proficiency in EMI and rated their skills as seven out of ten. Especially third-year Student P, a graduate of NIS and Student W, who studied English for 7 seven years with tutors, also claimed that studying in EMI is not complicated for them. In this respect, Teacher C agreed that for such kind of graduates with better English learning experience, studying in EMI is easier:

Extract 22:

> Only students with good English study in polylingual groups, for example, graduates of NIS or honored graduates. Their levels are appropriately strong. (November 19, 2020).

Nevertheless, Teacher Z emphasized that some students have difficulties with pronunciation and understanding of English words:

Extract 23:

> Students encounter difficulties in understanding, transcription and pronunciation. We help and correct them, but overall, they have good intermediate levels (November 20, 2020).

Thus as the majority of the teachers were generally satisfied with their students' capability to perform in English, half of the students (W, P, G) reported that their teachers mostly require English-only when students interact with them. Student G stated that sometimes

even during informal settings, one teacher demanded to speak in English. By and large, the students' responses were similar in terms of teachers' requirement conducting lessons in English (Students G, W, P). For example, Student G reported, "Usually the lessons are conducted in English" (November 13, 2020).

Moreover, some teachers, requiring English-only practices, might neglect to recognize students' limited ability because they believed that students should know the language in a high level. For example, Student O claimed:

Extract 24:

> We speak only in English with a teacher. Every teacher has different approaches. If I answer in Kazakh, for example, he/she will not accept the answer, because it is in a different language. Some teachers do not pay attention when we do not understand English (November 11, 2020).

Nevertheless, although English-only practices are mentioned by Student O, all participants stated that sometimes it is an impossible strategy if students' language levels are different and they forget the words in English. In this regard, even though none of the respondents knew the term translanguaging, they reported that they have these language practices in EMI. For example, three students (O, P and G) noticed that some teachers allow and support the use of Kazakh or Russian among students as they understand that their English proficiencies are not in the same level and some students might struggle:

Extract 25:

> Well, teachers usually understand us... they say that it is better to completely understand each other, discuss, highlight those points that we need to discuss because not everyone speaks English fluently. We have a girl with a very low level of English, so in order to discuss with her, we speak in Kazakh, Russian, or English.

The main thing is to explain to the person and only after understanding we try to tell to a teacher in our weak English (Student O, November 11, 2020).

Similarly, Teachers Z and C reported that they regularly spoke in Russian and translated into English because students requested it when they did not understand anything. Interestingly, for Teacher Z, knowledge of content is more important than language skills. She claimed that if a student has content knowledge he/she could explain in any language:

Extract 26:

I can use Russian if it is more comprehensible. If a person knows he/she can speak in any language. I do not assess directly the language level, knowledge of the content is more important as it is still not a native language, and it is a "poly" lingual program that means different languages (Teacher Z, November 20, 2020).

Overall, the interview data demonstrate that teachers have translanguaging practices in their classrooms. It is explained that these practices are not avoidable when students are not able to participate in lessons due to their constraints on English.

In addition, when students interact with only group mates to discuss the tasks during lessons, five out of six students (G, O, P, B, and W) reported that they mix three languages. For instance, Student G stated:

Extract 27:

Sometimes we mix languages because we have girls from the South part and from the North part of the country; the lesson is held in English. It turns out that the southern part speaks more Kazakh, the northern part speaks Russian, the lesson is in English and there is a merger of languages. Therefore when we talk we can say "hey guys", "we can start", "kazir keledi olar", "let's tez turyndar". We mostly try to use English, but when we do not know the words we use Russian and Kazakh words (November 13, 2020).

Noticeably, according to the data, all student-participants are trilingual speakers who studied in Kazakh medium instructed schools, but in daily life can use Russian and study in English. Therefore, this kind of switching from first language to Russian and English example demonstrates that students accept multilingual practices in EMI as a normal situation that helps to communicate with each other as they have diverse language levels.

Teachers' Language Proficiencies. Considering teachers' language skills, the findings demonstrate that students evaluated them not below eight out of ten. For the majority of interviewed students (G, O, B, P and W), their teachers have adequate English proficiencies and competent to teach EMI courses. For instance, Student G said:

Extract 28:

We are very lucky with the teachers. We have a limited number of them at the university who speak English and this is, of course, sad. But those who acquired it are fluent. There are no complaints at all in terms of teaching content (November 13, 2020).

However, almost half of the interviewed students highlighted certain language aspects that their teachers lack in in-classroom practices such as pronunciation (Student B and R), accent (Student G, R), and limited vocabulary (Student O and W). For example, Student R responded:

Extract 29:

Each teacher is different, I rate it eight. Some teachers do not have enough vocabulary and their accents are a problem too. Each teacher puts different word stress. Accordingly, we did not know which word was pronounced correct. Sometimes I was surprised to find that the word was not correct (November 18, 2020).

Consequently, teachers' different language abilities make students confused with the words and their use. The existence of such diverse language levels might be explained considering teachers' educational background. Two teachers' (R and C) experience of studying in an EMI university and communicating with English speakers were effective for their LP. However, Teacher Z, who studied in Kazakhstan, attended language courses with native speakers for 3 years, and now working with foreigners, evaluated her language proficiency level as upper-intermediate. Teacher K, who learnt English for several years, stated, "During that studies I had to take courses on the level intermediate for several times" (November 20, 2020). Generally, in comparison to those teachers with international education, teachers T and Z had more worries about their English abilities in the EMI program. With this in mind, the following comment was given regarding Teacher K's language abilities to teach EMI where her self-perception of abilities directly shapes how she practices EMI. For example, she first writes in Russian and then translates in English:

Extract 30:

> I still don't consider myself as a good EMI teacher. Preparing for the lesson for me is quite difficult. I first prepare lectures in Russian and only then translate into English. I'm not looking for English literature firstly, it's easier for me to start with Russian. I translate my usual courses into English (Teacher K, November 20, 2020).

Moreover, Teacher Z described her own observation of other EMI teachers reporting that English levels of some teachers in her faculty are poor but they teach EMI. She claimed, "There were times when they themselves did not understand; nevertheless, as they used to teach in such a way and it remained so" (November 20, 2020). These findings reveal that the respondents recognized the problem of teaching staff's English use during classroom practices although the students generally praised their teachers' LP.

Generally, a common view amongst student-interviewees (G, R, B and W) was that making mistakes for teachers sometimes is affordable since they use English only for educational purposes in Kazakhstan and they are non-native speakers. Specifically, Student B claimed that:

Extract 31:

I would say that our teachers are all quite grown-up people all over 40 years old and given the fact that they have been in Kazakhstan for more than 10 years, their English is good. I would rate it eight, because they use the language only for teaching. The pronunciation is sometimes not so excellent, but in general, they can easily explain the topic in English, suggest and ask questions (November 14, 2020).

From the extract shown above, it should be additionally noticed that Student B's emphasis on the age of teachers is associated with the idea that older teachers may struggle teaching through a foreign language and have low language proficiencies. Regarding this idea, Student G mentioned that during their experiences in previous courses, especially older teachers faced difficulties and asked help from more proficient colleagues or even master's students.

By and large, even though teachers seem to have appropriate language proficiencies, their age and use of English inside and outside the classroom settings might influence their language capabilities. Moreover, teachers' language use sometimes confuses students due to different pronunciation skills.

Shift from Linguistic Challenges to Positive Outcomes during EMI

In this section, a negative aspect of LP such as teachers' and students' linguistic challenges during EMI is considered. At the same time, the positive outcomes of EMI practices on students' language skills are contrasted to show the effectiveness of English practices.

As the analysis of the previous section revealed, students relied on their teachers' emotional support given through the words of encouragement to keep practicing English. Nevertheless, there were also practical challenges during the study. For instance, in terms of content learning, the students noticed difficulties related to the use of specific words of natural sciences (Students P and O), whereas, in terms of different language proficiency levels, they highlighted a lack of reading (Student P), speaking (Students O and B) and listening (Students W and R) skills:

Extract 32:

> In the beginning.... it was difficult to speak. In the Kazakh group, it is easy, and in the English group, it is difficult to speak. The terms were difficult to understand and when we did not understand, teachers tried to speak in comprehensive English. Information was explained in a short and easy way (Student O, November 11, 2020).

Extract 33:

> I can't read the text because I read very slowly. In the classroom, we use only the words related to the specialization which also creates difficulties (Student P, November 16, 2020).

From these extracts, it might be seen that words related to specialization are challenging for them to comprehend and it impacts students' speaking and reading skills during EMI.

Furthermore, for Student R listening was problematic skill as before she learnt only grammar and did not pay attention to her vocabulary. Teacher C also noticed that even though students had sufficient IELTS results they could not speak because they learnt only grammar.

Extract 34:

Despite students' IELTS score 7.0, they had a barrier. To my surprise, those students

learnt only grammar, but not practiced speaking skills (Teacher C, November 19,

2020).

In contrast, Student B responded that she lacks grammar knowledge while speaking. She

commented:

Extract 35:

My skills are good, except speaking. Due to the fact that my knowledge of English

grammar is not in-depth, I use English on an intuitive level and sometimes do not

follow the grammatical rules. When I was very focused on grammar, it created a

barrier (Student B, November 18, 2020).

These findings show a paradoxical effect of students' grammar knowledge presence and

absence during LP in EMI. These examples of grammar knowledge can be also described

as stick sharpened at both ends that causes a situation where both students with and

without grammar knowledge equally struggle while practicing English in EMI.

Nevertheless, there were some positive aspects of teaching practice when they

reported the ultimate learning outcomes of English in EMI. Two students (R and G)

expressed that their speaking and listening skills were improved during English practices.

For example:

Extract 36:

The problem was listening. I only learned grammar, and I didn't pay attention to my

vocabulary. Teachers at the university taught very well in English and this helped to

improve my listening skills (Student R, November 18, 2020).

Extract 37:

All is a matter of time because when the lessons are always held in English and I continually heard this speech, I tried to say something and my skills improved (Student G, November 13, 2020).

Overall, when Student O shared experience about her difficulties at the beginning of their study in EMI, she also argued that these challenges are a matter of time and they are avoidable in constant English practices:

Extract 38:

Our enthusiasm for the lesson woke up since we had very professional teachers. Teachers explained well, did not translate, and now we understand everything (Student O, November 11, 2020).

Extract 39:

I taught second-year students, and now they are in the third year and I see progress. Of course, English taught courses are a very big contribution to their English development (Teacher R, November 30, 2020).

In particular, when students evaluated their English levels, most indicated dramatic improvement. For example, Student R reported that now she knows "60-70%" of English (November 18, 2020), while student G claimed "If earlier the understanding was up to 50%, now it is 70 or 80% (November 13, 2020). Accordingly, English practices in EMI, although they were accompanied by the practices of translanguaging that discussed in the section about multilingual practices, helped them to cross barriers over the course of time.

Besides that, Teacher R stated that studying through English develops a student's cognitive and critical thinking skills in comparison with a student in the Kazakh group who do not need to do much effort. This example reveals that students' English practices in EMI develop their intellectual abilities more than through the Kazakh language:

Extract 40:

I would say that students improve their critical thinking skills. For example, the

Kazakh group students do not search for information in English. But in polylingual

groups they have to do so. Some students do not need English and their knowledge is

excellent, but those who learn through English have different worldview, and their

thinking skills expand. English increases the cognitive perception (Teacher R,

November 30, 2020).

By and large, these results demonstrate that linguistic challenges during students' EMI

practices were prominent. However, despite they faced such difficulties at the beginning of

the EMI program, continuous language practices helped them to adapt themselves to study

through English. Consequently, this was effective for their language improvements. Lastly,

another additional perceived positive outcome of English in the EMI program was that it

develops students' intellectual ability more than in the Kazakh groups.

Language Ideology

In this section, the respondents' language ideologies are categorized as educational,

economic and political ideologies. They are analyzed in accordance with Kambatyrova's

(2020) framework and through consideration of an additional factor as practical language

ideology that was identified in this study.

Educational Language Ideologies

The interviewed data showed that the EMI participants held an educational LI that

studying through English increases their language proficiencies in the future. For example,

Student G reported:

Extract 41:

I thought like if others could, why could I not? In my society, there are a lot of

people who study abroad. When I participated in one course, there were Kazakh

people from other countries. I met those people who speak three languages and at

that moment I was disappointed in myself. I wanted to overcome my fear, I

understood what they were saying, but I couldn't answer them. It was a challenge to

me (Student G, November 13, 2020).

The other two third-year students (W, P) and two teachers (R, Z) responded that they

started to forget English not practicing this language. Therefore, these respondents'

educational LI was that they valued participation in the EMI program in order to maintain

their English levels by teaching and learning through it. For instance, Teacher R also

emphasized that she wanted regular practice of her English skills:

Extract 42:

Now I practice English in a polylingual group. I know English and the subject is

given only to those who can teach in English. This also helps me not to forget this

language (November 30, 2020).

Moreover, the majority of students (R, O, B, and P) specifically reported another two

important aspects of English in EMI. There are views that much information is available in

English rather than in Kazakh, and it is easier for the participants to understand their

specialization. For example, Student R stated:

Extract 43:

In general, there is little information in Kazakh in any field, but most of them are in

English because the world uses this language. Everything about environmental

disasters can be found on the internet and published in English. There are times when

I forget Kazakh words but not in English. English seems to be easier to study

(Student R, November 18, 2020).

One teacher also supported these students' beliefs commenting, "Videos in English in

MOOC are clearer and compact" (Teacher C, November 19, 2020). These results suggest

that the respondents have an educational LI that English is more useful in acquiring new knowledge rather than their native language.

Economic Language Ideologies

According to the data analysis, the teachers and students have an economic LI that English is a key for career success that brings economic advantages; thus, they should be able to use this language in their occupational field. For instance, fourth-year students (G, R, O, and B) associated EMI with high status and future employment opportunities. In the extract below, there is a comment of Student B about that:

Extract 44:

First of all, it is probably prestige and status. Our diploma will indicate that I studied in English and it will help me in my future employment (November 14, 2020).

Another comment of Student R indicates that she strongly believes that English might be a career springboard in her professional development as well as her brother and sister's experience learning in English and now working in prestigious companies.

In addition, two teachers (B and Z) indicated that they associated English with an additional payment (around 40 %) to the basic salary for those who can teach in EMI. Thus, all three examples demonstrate that participants had economic LI that English is a source of economic advantages that is accompanied by career advancement.

Political Language Ideologies

The next theme that emerged from the interview analysis was the respondents' perceptions of the EMI policy strategy in Kazakhstan as a factor that linked to their LI. On the one hand, the respondents indicated the disadvantages of the EMI policy which is related to low level of English proficiencies among the population that impedes the effective realization of the program. However, the advantages of global opportunities for the Kazakhstani people through the lens of the trilingual education, which include English

on a par with Kazakh, Russian as means of instruction, were also expressed by interviewees.

      Disadvantages of EMI Policy. According to the analysis, 6 out of 10 interviewees commented on the issue of people's low English proficiencies in Kazakhstan as being a disadvantage of EMI. In particular, Students G and W indicated that the level of English proficiency is insufficient in the country. Student G added that people still have post-Soviet way of thinking and do not wish to acquire English. She believed that English capability of some people from the Soviet-period generations remain low due to their non-positive attitudes towards new educational opportunities. This disadvantage of EMI is related to her pessimistic LI; she doubts the improvement of English proficiency in a society under this political approach. Student G's comment is presented in the extract below:

Extract 47:

> I think English policy is good, but, unfortunately, we probably do not have people who could introduce this system correctly, because we all have a little bit of post-Soviet ideas and some teachers somehow do not wish to learn English, thinking that everything was normal before. This needs to be eradicated because of the role of English around the world, but now this language level is not satisfactory in Kazakhstan, it is below average (November 13, 2020).

Advantages of EMI Policy. The advantage of EMI in Kazakhstan, according to Students P, W and Teacher C, is that it is a chance for the country's young generation to study abroad. For example, through the "Bolashak" program. Indeed, this program is oriented toward the development of human capital in the country that provides scholarship for individuals who wish to study in prestigious international universities abroad (MoES, 2010). This politico-educational program influenced participants' LI to believe that English in EMI enables them to be more privileged to study abroad and become

internationally-skilled citizens. From the extract of the comment of Student W, it is seen that English is necessary everywhere and provides a chance to study overseas. Her LI is also closely connected with the prospects not to be limited to one country that aligns the government's corresponding aim:

Extract 45:

> Well, I think English necessary for Kazakhstan. You cannot see yourself without English; it is needed everywhere and is more important than Russian. Even if you go to another country, you need to know English. Many people now study in different countries participating in the Bolashak program (Student W, November 19, 2020).

In addition, the above extract reveals that Student W values English more than Russian. Similarly, Student B described, noticing the status of languages in education, her vision of the benefits of EMI:

Extract 46:

> Polylingual practices are very necessary. In comparison with the Kazakh groups, the polylingual groups are more valued and considered prestigious as English plays an important role. I think all this should start with school because I didn't even know the basic words when we leave school. Now I noticed that schools practice 3 languages which help students in the future (Student B, November 14, 2020).

As can be observed, besides highlighting the idea that a polylingual group's student is considered to be better than a Kazakh or Russian group's student, Student B also mentioned the role of trilingualism in the country. It is true that the reform of trilingual education in Kazakhstan, which was discussed in the review of literature, is focused on developing the young generations' intercultural competence by implementing English as a third medium of instruction. Regarding this trilingual education, two other Students (G and P) also agreed with Student B reporting that its introduction from the first grade is a

pragmatic solution for improving English proficiency among citizens. They claimed that, according to their observation, their school brothers and sisters studying in a trilingual education format have the same language levels as they have now at the university.

From the given data, it might be seen that the respondents' political LI coincides with the government's priorities and initiatives and they felt that they involved into the system and shared the same political prospects related to the development through English. Moreover, they value this language more than Kazakh or Russian and specifically, believe that the trilingual education policy is a pragmatic strategy to expand the English acquisition in the country.

Overall, despite these both positive and negative English-related beliefs in Kazakhstan, 40% of participants believed that this new educational format is a prerequisite for the prosperous development of the country. Thus, their political LI are that through EMI, English will be practiced and it will be strategically beneficial for the country. In addition, even if Student W thought that as the majority of Kazakhstani citizens are Kazakhs, it is impossible to all people to know English, Teacher K responded that a group of individuals who is able to speak in English in specific spheres is needed for international relations:

Extract 48:

> We should have a certain category of students who could later integrate into the international economy and relations knowing special terminology in English. This is mandatory, even if not for everyone. I will not say that other specialists will be worse than that, no, they will not be worse, but this is a layer it should be aimed at some kind of exchange of experience than other students who will work at the national level. (Teacher K, November 20, 2020).

Hence, this respondent has an ideology that English is an instrumentally important element for Kazakhstan that needs to be practiced in a certain level in order to integrate into the international arena.

Practical Language Ideologies in a Multilingual Context

Beyond, educational, economic, and political language ideologies of participants, their beliefs of multiple language practices were analyzed additionally as they actually had such practices described in section about multilingual practices. According to their experiences, the participants' perceptions of whether English-only practices should be in EMI are discussed from two contradictory perspectives.

Three students (G, R, and O) and Teacher R responded that considering different students' language levels and as the polylingual program implies the use of three languages, multilingual practices should be allowed. However, three students (B, W, and G) and Teacher K strongly believed that only one language should be practiced in classrooms because mixing languages are not appropriate for the learning process. In this regard, they argued that both teachers and students should have high English proficiency in order to be in a polylingual program. For example, Student B claimed:

Extract 49:

> In general, I think if you know the language, you should not mix languages like shala Kazak; you need to be able to speak only one language (Student B, November 14, 2020).

Furthermore, teachers Z and R responded that sometimes it depends on students' cognitive abilities which are not related to language skills because some students cannot understand specific knowledge even in Russian. The extract below attributes the issue:

Extract 50:

Even knowing English, they may not understand the topic. Sometimes it is difficult for them to perceive even in Russian. Therefore it is crucial to be aware that students understand the content of the subject, especially if their language levels are different (Teacher R, November 30, 2020).

These results reveal that usually practices of three languages are prioritized in EMI due to the respondents' position that the main goal of the program is a comprehension of the content and students' different levels of language proficiency. Another important argument was that the term polylingual means the use of several languages. In contrast, the minority of the respondents did not want to mix languages in EMI practices, which can lead to half language acquisition or "Shala Kazakh" effect and non-quality lessons. Overall, it can be seen that the respondents' practical LI towards translanguaging is positive, even though some of them believed that English-only should be required in EMI practices.

Conclusion

This case study explored both university teachers' and student's perceptions of EMI and analyzed this policy LM. There are seven main themes that have come up after analysis of three language components: I) LM - administrative EMI policy rules, resources, methodological support for teachers, and educational support for students; II) LP - teaching and learning approaches, proficiency and multilingual language practices in EMI, and shift from linguistic challenges to positive outcomes during language practices; III) LI - educational language ideologies, economic language ideologies, political language ideologies, and practical language ideology in the multilingual context. Thus, seven main findings for corresponding themes are listed below and they will be discussed in relation to the literature and theory in the next chapter:

I. Language management

1. The data analysis reveals that there is a lack of teachers and students who are proficient in English in EMI.

2. The students were not satisfied with resourcing (i.e. advanced technological tools, learning materials) and language support while teachers could not participate in language courses because of the heavy workload.

II. Language practices

3. According to the data, the teachers reported that the preparation for the lessons in English was time-consuming and sometimes Russian is more convenient during preparation. In addition, they stated that the online format of education impedes LP with students.

4. The results demonstrate that the use of different languages in EMI courses during group discussions is allowed because English-only practice is impossible due to students' diverse language proficiencies.

5. The respondents reported that students have improved their language skills over the course of time because of LP and with the help of their teachers' emotional support despite teachers' particular educational and linguistic approaches (pronunciation).

III. Language ideology

6. The respondents' LI in EMI are associated with the beliefs that English improves their low language skills; maintains their high language skills; bring career success for individuals and prosperity for the country; and it is more privileged than Kazakh and Russian, although the expansion of English is not sufficient due to post-Soviet way of thinking.

7. Two participants believed that English-only policy should be practiced in order to avoid the same consequences as "shala Kazakh" issue while the others thought that multilingual practices have to be used as the name of the polylingual program means

studying in multiple languages, and students have different language levels and need

translanguaging.

Chapter 5: Discussion

According to the data analysis of the preceding chapter, seven major findings for three language components were identified from ten semi-structured interviews with Kazakhstani university teachers and undergraduate students participating in EMI and the university's policy document analysis. The purpose of the study was to investigate these participants' perceptions of their EMI experiences by focusing on the LM, LP and LI. The present chapter interprets these findings referring to the main and sub research questions based on Spolsky's tripartite language policy theory. In general, the research questions needed to be answered are:

1. How do Kazakhstani university teachers and students perceive their EMI experience?

a) Which efforts of institutional language management are reflected in EMI courses?

b) What are teachers' and students' practices in teaching and learning in English in EMI courses?

c) What ideologies do teachers and students have regarding EMI?

The answer to the main question is discussed lastly in order to analyze the interplay of the three language components mentioned above and show the context of the interrelation of language perceptions in EMI. Consequently, there will be four main subthemes to discuss the main findings in accordance with the previous studies on EMI, theoretical aspects and the context of the study.

Which Efforts of Institutional Language Management are reflected in EMI Courses?

This section is deemed to be crucial in the discussion of the findings related to the university management system, resourcing, methodological support for teachers and language support for students. In the literature review chapter, it was noted that EMI

participants have to have pragmatic English competencies (Margic & Vodopija-Krstanovic, 2017). However, for this university administration studied in this current research, as Kazakhstan is counted as being within Kachru's Expanding Circle where English is norm-dependent and is a foreign language (Gerritsen et al., 2014), the provision of a sufficient number of EMI teachers and students even for national aims might be problematic compared to Inner Circle countries. Therefore, the respondents in this study, as in previous studies, expressed their concern about low language proficiencies of some teachers and students in EMI (Baker & Hűttner, 2019; Chang, 2019; Hu & Lei, 2013; Karabassova, 2020; Zhang, 2018). On the other hand, EMI teachers' and students' low mastery of English might be explained by noting the university's recruitment challenges in which selection strategies are not thoroughly considered as was discussed by Prilipko (2017) in the literature. Hence, it might be inferred that the university did not prepare teachers and students to perform in English neither before nor during participation in EMI to solve the problems of a lack of participants and low language mastery.

The problems of the university resourcing and the inappropriate language support mentioned by students, and a lack of methodological support for teachers because they lack time for participating in training courses due to heavy workload, were also analyzed in Baldauf et al.'s (2011) study in which they defined these issues as potential "causes of failure" (p. 119). In particular, the reviewed study of EMI in the Vietnamese context (Vu & Burns, 2014) indicated similar needs as were reported by respondents of this study such as unavailability of advanced technological tools and learning materials, the absence of administrative support for students and workload challenges. For example, in this study, the language challenges of students were ignored by the administration at the beginning of the program and teachers were overloaded with no time for professional development by attending training courses. Interestingly, respondent G from this study associated

resourcing problems with the Soviet Union's educational system that remains a legacy which is an enduring educational condition. What is clear is that despite contextual differences, the factors such as resourcing, language support for students and teachers' time limitations are omissions of LM in EMI.

What are Teachers' and Students' Practices in Teaching and Learning in English in EMI Courses?

This section covers aspects of LP defined as the main findings related to this component: teaching approaches, proficiency and multilingual practices, and the shift from challenges to learning outcomes. First, some teachers were critical about their preparation for EMI and referring to the time-consuming nature, similar to the Turkish context researched by Çankaya (2017). One of the teachers even claimed that the use of Russian for preparation materials is more convenient. In this respect, the literature review shows that teachers' low proficiency and ability to teach only using linguistic units prepared in advance (Vinke et al., 1998) might result in ineffective teaching practices for students (Jiang et al., 2019). Consequently, the teacher-respondents who use their first language for preparation might encounter linguistic difficulties if they do not understand the materials directly in English. Furthermore, the teachers emphasized that the online format of education limits LP with and among students. With regards to the contextual disadvantage of the inconvenience of the online format of education in LP expressed by respondents, this problem is difficult to explain because online education is a new issue that needs more research in this specific field of the effect of LP. However, the studies demonstrate that as COVID-19 changed the traditional method of education around the world (Adnan & Anwar, 2020); a lack of interaction in distance education is problematic for classroom participants (Zhang & Fulford, 1994; Zhong, 2020). For instance, in the research of one Australian university, teachers acknowledged that "students in the online learning

environment may not learn at the same pace as students in physical teaching and learning settings" (Scull et al., 2020, p. 505). Thus, the concern of the current study respondents about online format might be anticipated.

Furthermore, the teachers and students confirmed the existence and utility of multilingual practices as well in studies conducted in Thailand, Austria, the UK (Baker & Hűttner, 2019) and Taiwan (Chang, 2019). According to those results, despite English officially being a tool of instruction in classrooms, translanguaging occurred because of students' different language levels, which was mentioned in previous studies (Baker & Hűttner, 2019, Chang, 2019, Prilipko, 2017, Rahman et al., 2019; Zhang, 2018). The teachers of the current study reported that a first language is used to understand the content and that content is more important than language abilities in learning through EMI (Kirkpatrick, 2014). Moreover, the research on EMI in Kazakhstan conducted by Kanatkhanova (2020) and Aitzhanova (2020) identified similar findings regarding the fact that although in some classroom practices there were rules requiring English-only, not mixing languages is impossible if a student lacks lexical knowledge. In addition, it was found that the students could freely mix languages in student-to-student interactions which were not restricted by their teachers for any reason. This means that the teachers of this study defined English-only rules only for their teacher-student interactions at the same time allowing students to create a multilingual environment among themselves. Therefore, this finding supports Aitzhanova's (2020) view that translanguaging practices exist in a university with EMI groups in the Kazakhstani context. Lastly, the students reported that teachers' particular educational and linguistic approaches (e.g., pronunciation) sometimes caused a specific difficulty that affected their comprehension and confused them as per findings that were analyzed by Karabay (2017). Although in Karabay's (2017) study, the university was fully EMI and teachers were from abroad and were thus more highly

proficient in English, there is similarity related to teachers' particular language skills. In the case of this study, these problematic language skills may also be the reason for teachers and students use of several languages in order to clarify correctness of the word.

Nevertheless, it seems to be that the students are tolerant to teachers' particular educational and linguistic approaches as they and also their teachers reported positive learning outcomes of EMI. As was reviewed in the literature, Hu and Lei (2014) stated that Spolsky's LP component implies not only disciplinary but also language learning. Furthermore, the national goal of implementing EMI within the framework of the trilingual education program in Kazakhstan is to increase the number of English speakers to promote the country's economic development (Yrsaliyev et al., 2017). Consequently, the fact that LP in EMI facilitated students' language enhancement was intended and expected. In this regard, there is a conflict of ideas between Spolsky's LP theory and Polenova's (2016) definition. For instance, Polenova (2016) argued that being just a tool of education, EMI is not supposed to improve English. Nevertheless, the student-respondents of the study emphasized that they widened their language knowledge in the specialization-related field (Kanatkhanova, 2020) simultaneously learning content. In addition, one of the contextual nuances related to the students' language improvement is connected with teachers' emotional support that helped them to adjust LP.

What Ideologies do Teachers and Students have regarding EMI?

Spolsky (2004) pointed out that in LI, language is highly valued as a beneficial phenomenon. Thus, this study revealed that such value of English exists among respondents. Particularly, they expressed their educational LI that practicing English improves and maintains their skills; economic LI that English brings them career opportunities which are associated with economic advancements; and political LI that perceives English as a language of instruction is necessary for the country's development.

These three ideologies coincide with Kambatyrova's (2020) conceptualization of ideological implications of these factors. Furthermore, Students B and W believed that studying in English is more prestigious and better than studying in Kazakh and Russian languages. In studies conducted by Hu and Lei (2013) and Rahman et al. (2019), stakeholders had similar positive LI about the privilege of English. However, two participants (G and W) had critical political LI because of low language levels among people that negatively affect the EMI policy. In particular, Student G believed that the post-Soviet way of thinking reflects teachers' low mastery of English which was also mentioned in the findings of LP. The existence of this belief is discussed by Fimyar and Kurakbayev (2016), as teachers from the Soviet period generation might have a little desire to change the traditional education system to the new trend. Accordingly, due to their attitudes towards English, older generation teachers might not be able to teach through sufficient language abilities (Oralova, 2012). With this regard, on the one hand, the teacher findings support these interpretations because the teachers in this study, who were also older, encountered language challenges in EMI in the beginning of their teaching experiences and some of them are still encountering challenges. On the other hand, the teacher findings offer a counterexample because they had positive educational, economic and political LI as was mentioned earlier.

In addition, some respondents of this study had practical LI in which they considered only the benefits of English-only practices in a multilingual context as a helpful approach to improve their proficiency and to avoid the same consequences as the "shala Kazakh" issue. This argument about the "shala Kazakh" effect describes people who are unable or semi-speakers of the Kazakh language mostly using the Russian language (Foster, 2017). Seemingly, Student R, while talking about this issue, believed that the same contextual effect of English might happen if languages would be mixed in EMI. However,

other respondents believed that the practical aspect of EMI in a multilingual context is in the use of translanguaging due to their different language levels (Chang, 2019) for meaning-making and the name of the polylingual program implies the use of several languages (Zhetpisbayeva, 2009). Moreover, some teachers' and students' belief about the rightness of conducting EMI classes through the mixing of languages coincides with Macaro's (2018) idea that EMI is content-driven rather than language-driven and Dearden's (2014) statement that it is about teaching non-English speakers whose English skills are different. Baker and Hűttner (2019), in their study, also showed that there could be both positive and negative beliefs regarding the implementation of English-only practices in EMI. Noticeably, in the current study, even though the respondents had monoglossic (Blair et al., 2018) and heteroglossic views (Cummins, 2017), these views do not link directly to the perception of students' proficiency or an explicit multilingual context because the other factors such as "Shala Kazakh" consequences and conceptualization of the polylingual program were also mentioned as arguments.

How do Kazakhstani University Teachers and Students Perceive Their EMI Experience?

The analysis of the current study show that even though LM does not influence LI directly, the participants own expectations and beliefs of EMI are high and result in improving outcomes in LP; whereas LI about English-only rules and LP with translanguaging are conflicting and inappropriate LM negatively impacting LP.

As noted in the literature review chapter, according to Baker and Hűttner (2019), LM influences language choice-making beliefs and practices. However, in the case of the current study, the participants, themselves, formed the ideology that they could enhance and practice their language skills, as well as take part in the realization of the government's initiatives through EMI. Moreover, some of the respondents highly valued studying in

English in comparison to Kazakh and Russian. With this in mind, teachers and students might have unintentionally neo-imperial views (Philipson, 2000) that appeared on the pretext of English being instrumentally necessary (Pan & Block, 2011). According to Smagulova (2019), the Kazakh language is already perceived as a less prestigious language than Russian among the young generation whereas English has become the most prestigious. This means that the inclusion of English in education may especially suppress the national language. Nevertheless, the respondents of this study did not express any concern about the status of local languages but only privileging English over them, which might be responded to in the future.

Moreover, there was found disconnect between LI and LP. Even though some participants held English-only beliefs in EMI due to Shala-Kazakh effects, their language proficiencies were insufficient for English-only practices (Rahman et al., 2019). Therefore participants had translanguaging practices for understanding purposes during EMI (Aitzhanova, 2020; Chang, 2019). Generally, this natural use of multiple languages may be caused by the fact that the participants are trilinguals and they are more focused on meaning-making. In addition, Spolsky (2004) stated that LP can influence LI which was found in this study too. For instance, respondents' LI that people's low levels of English are a disadvantage of EMI in Kazakhstan might have been developed because some teachers faced language challenges in preparation for the lessons and students had different language levels in LP.

These LP challenges may have occurred because the university's LM strategies considered only the selection and creation of the groups but did not identify any intervention with students during classrooms practices as the findings revealed that their language issues were not addressed adequately. The issue of teachers' heavy workload that restricted their participation in English language courses is in contrast to the university's

LM system that attempted to distribute load for teachers to provide EMI classes. Thus, this issue conflicted with these teachers' LP when they, being not fully proficient in English, spent much time teaching in EMI and for the preparation for the lessons but lost the opportunity to participate in offered LM activities (e.g. language training courses). Nevertheless, despite the above-mentioned misalignments between language components, respondents' LI that EMI supports students' language improvement was complemented by their responses about learning outcomes over the course of time during continuing LP and their teachers' emotional support.

Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter was to discuss the main findings in accordance with the previous studies on EMI, theories, and context of the study. In the discussion in the LM section, there were overlaps in the policy challenges related to teachers' and students' low mastery of English, resourcing, and teachers' workload, which correlated with the literature. In the LP section, there were contradictory findings because, despite the fact that the teachers experienced language difficulties during the preparation for the lessons and their pronunciation was not appropriate, LP was effective for students' language improvement over the course of time. Moreover, for the purpose of serving as a scaffold to support English in LP due to students' different language proficiencies, translanguaging was practiced as a useful method. These results are explained in the literature as a conceptual purpose of LP in EMI. Regarding LI, participants' educational, economic and political ideologies were strategic in terms of the benefits of EMI and aligned with Kambatyrova's (2020) explanation. There were also practical LI both about English-only views associated with the language improvement and prevention of Shala Kazakh effect, and translanguaging practices related to the integration of all participants' languages in EMI and conceptualization of the program. Finally, the interplay of the three components,

LM, LP and LI is reflected in the last section, in which the LM system overloaded teachers restricting their participation in necessary training programs affecting their LP and ignored students' language challenges in LP. Monoglossic LI conflicted with multilingual practices in LP. However, there were positive matches between expected language improvement beliefs (LI) and learning outcomes during LP over the course of time.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore how teachers and students in one Kazakhstani university perceive an EMI program through the lens of LM, LP and LI. Therefore, the data were collected from semi-structured interviews with four teachers and six undergraduate students of the department of Natural Science with an EMI program in one of the national universities in Kazakhstan along with university policy documents. This chapter presents the major conclusions of the discussed findings guided by the following research questions: (1) how do Kazakhstani university teachers and students perceive their EMI experience?; (a) which efforts of institutional language management are reflected in EMI courses? (b) what are teachers' and students' practices in teaching and learning in English in EMI courses?; (c) what ideologies do Kazakhstani university teachers and students have regarding EMI?. In addition, there are described implications for stakeholders and limitations and recommendations for future research.

Main Conclusions of the Study

In this study, a complex interplay of LM, LP and LI in one of the universities with EMI in the Kazakhstani context was found. The respondents perceived EMI as a value by pointing to the educational significance, financial benefits of this program, and their agreement with the government's political initiative. In particular, the student-respondents privileged studying in EMI groups than in Kazakh and Russian medium of instruction groups.

However, since the beginning of the program, there were language challenges during LP because of LM issues that did not appropriately address participants' different language proficiencies. The teachers' low language mastery caused difficulties in preparing for the lessons and it was time-consuming for some of them. For instance, one teacher preferred to plan her lessons in Russian and then translate them into English

because it is more convenient while students noted their teachers' particular linguistic approaches that sometimes confused them. Furthermore, even though these problems existed, the LM system of the university did not consider supporting stakeholders' educational needs; rather, it neglected the students' requests to help overcome language difficulties and overloaded teachers without giving them an opportunity for attending language training. Consequently, the students encountered difficulties in using English and the teachers were not able to have extra time to improve their language skills in training courses.

In light of these language challenges, to create a more favorable environment for LP, respondents used translanguaging. Although this practice did not align with some respondents' English-only LI, it was an effective solution to support LP. Moreover, the respondents had different contradictory practical LI regarding English-only practices in EMI. Some of them made an argument for monoglossic approach in EMI referring to the language improvement and "Shala Kazakh" consequences while others believed that heteroglossic approach appropriate for the Kazakhstani EMI context named polylingual education and due to language level differences. Nonetheless, all respondents referred to the presence of an unavoidable multilingual environment due to the various language levels among students. Hence, when students struggled to interact in English, teachers could use several languages and also encouraged students to freely mix languages in student-student interactions to understand the content. Moreover, despite the language challenges, all respondents confirmed that since the beginning of the program, some students could adjust their low language skills with the help of LP and their teachers' emotional support. Accordingly, the students improved their language skills which show the alignment between their LI about the purposes of EMI and the outcomes in LP.

However, in spite of positive language outcomes and effective translanguaging strategy, some respondents were generally concerned about the lack of resourcing in LM that created an educational condition similar to the Soviet period. Moreover, the online format of education that impacted LP by limiting classroom interactions were mentioned as negative sides of EMI. In addition, the participants noted insufficient English proficiency at the national level, emphasizing it as a disadvantage that might hinder successful implementation of EMI in Kazakhstan. Such insufficiency of language proficiency was related to post-Soviet teachers' unwillingness to teach in English subsequently to its low mastery.

To sum up, even though the respondents' positive LI towards EMI aligned with students' language improvements during continuing LP, at the beginning of the program, they encountered language challenges that are not considered by administrators appropriately and these difficulties still exist to some extent. Lastly, the respondents adopted an effective measure to overcome language difficulties through practicing translanguaging at the same time raising concern about EMI at the national level warning about insufficient language proficiency levels, resourcing and online education that is critical to making progress.

Implications for Stakeholders

This study results demonstrate potential policy challenges that stakeholders may face in the implementation of EMI. Though the results are not generalizable to all universities, they still offer some insights. First, especially administrators should manage beforehand the issues related to the low language levels by undertaking strategies for effective recruitment of students. As was mentioned in the previous chapters, the university accepts applicants with IELTS or TOEFL certificates as well as its entry test results which mean the admissions rely only on these results. Thereby, for example, universities might

establish two admission rounds that will include additional interviews with applicants to display applicants' language capabilities. Second, according to the findings, although it was written that one of their missions of the university is to monitor EMI practices, it seems to have low-quality assurance because the administrators ignored especially students' challenges in LP. In this case, I agree with Yrsaliyev et.al's (2017) suggestion for stakeholders to create internal and external monitoring system of the implementation process and Dearden's (2014) suggestion to create certain mechanisms for providing sufficient language proficiency in schools or universities (i.e., establishment of introduction phases and guidelines, and recognition of the readiness of institutions for the EMI reforms). The design of these mechanisms should involve administration, teachers and students in order to explore the possible issues that need monitoring and guidance. With this in mind, these implications might be valuable measures to consider in the Kazakhstani context as this study's results show policy difficulties that may lead to inefficiency of the EMI in the future. Third, I recommend choosing a coordinator with EMI knowledge responsible to monitor teachers' and students' LP and organize workshops with the opportunity to share concerns that can be helpful to meet their educational needs related to policy challenges. The problems can be similar to the findings of this study such as resourcing issues, teachers' workload and different language skills of participants. Fourth, it might be suggested for policy-makers to include the knowledge of purposeful translanguaging practices in the teacher training programs because there were mulitilingual practices in the current study but none of the respondents was aware of its conceptualization. This can be useful for strategic translanguaging practices in pedagogy as stated by Goodman and Tastanbek (2021). In addition, this study result about the interplay of three language components helps for outsider researchers to become familiar with

contextual policy issues and analyze the applicability of Spolsky's theory in the Kazakhstani context.

Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

First, as the sample size of the research is small, (4 teachers and 6 students), transferability of the results is impossible for the entire Kazakhstani context. Second, since the interviewed participants of this study were only teachers and students and the EMI policy documents were obtained in a form of extracts, the analysis of the language management system of the university was limited. The administrative representatives' voices were not considered as well as whole information of the official written policy lacked due to only received extracts.

Therefore, to provide better transferability of the findings, I suggest a sampling of a bigger population by additionally using quantitative methods on par with the qualitative method in future studies. Adapting observation as an instrument of the qualitative method also might help to capture the whole EMI classroom setting. In this regard, Mulhall (2003) claimed that while interviews are the pieces of the jigsaw, observation provides a whole picture of the process by recording the context. Furthermore, as this study has limitation in researching LM aspects of EMI, I recommend focusing more on universities' policy documents such as overall policy guidelines, curriculum, tasks of testing exams and interviewing the managers who are responsible for the realization of this program in order to explore in-depth the administrative context in Kazakhstan. Hence, the questions of what the administrative managers' perspectives towards EMI students and teachers are and to what extent they can support the participants' language issues are open for the new research. Lastly, the finding about the development of students' intellectual ability in EMI groups than in the Kazakh groups were mentioned as a positive outcome of this policy. Thus, this could also be a direction for further research on EMI.

Overall, I hope this research will contribute to the literature on the topic of EMI within the framework of LM, LP and LI although it is necessary to conduct more research in this field to define more contextual differences for further reform initiatives. As a result of the study, I was able to achieve research purposes by analyzing the data of teachers' and students' perspectives and policy documents finding both the interconnectedness of the three language components and existing discrepancies among them in one of the universities in the Kazakhstani context. Being simultaneously a researcher and a student of EMI was a perfect opportunity for me to combine practical insights to understand others' similar experiences.

References

Adnan, M., & Anwar, K. (2020). Online learning amid the COVID-19 pandemic: Students'

perspectives. *Journal of Pedagogical Sociology and Psychology*, *2*(1), 45-51.

https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED606496

Adylet (2015). План нации – 100 конкретных шагов [Theplan of the nation: 100

concrete steps]. http://government.kz/en/news/gosprogramma-razvitiya-

obrazovaniya-do-2025-goda-obnovlenie-uchebnyh-programm-podderzhka-nauki-i-

elektronnoe-ent

Aitzhanova, K. (2020). *Perceptions and attitudes of students towards multilingual*

practices in an EMI STEM classroom at two Kazakhstani universities [Master's

thesis, Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education].

https://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/4855

Attiya, A. (2016, May 6). *Достижения вуза – успех независимой страны [University*

achievements – success of an independent country]. Kazpravda.

https://www.kazpravda.kz/fresh/view/dostizheniya-vuza--uspeh-nezavisimoi-strani

Aubakirova, B. T., & Mandel, K. M. (2018). The concept of multilingualism. *Vestnik*, 16-

25. http://www.kgu.kz/sites/default/files/Documents

Aubakirova, B., Mandel, K. M., & Benkei-Kovacs, B. (2019). European experience of

multilingualism and the development of multilingual education in

Kazakhstan. *Hungarian Educational Research Journal*, *9*(4), 689-707.

https://akjournals.com/view/journals/063/9/4/article-p689.xml

Ayazbayeva, N. (2017). Language-in-education policy in multilingual education. *NUGSE*

Research in Education, 2(1), 12-15. http://nugserie.nu.edu.kz

Baker, W., & Hüttner, J. (2019). "We are not the language police": Comparing

multilingual EMI programmes in Europe and Asia. *International Journal of Applied*

Linguistics, *29*(1), 78-94. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/ijal.12246

Baldauf, R. B., Kaplan, R. B., Kamwangamalu, N., & Bryant, P. (2011). Success or failure

of primary second/foreign language programmes in Asia: What do the data tell us?

Current Issues in Language Planning, 12(2), 309-323.

https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14664208.2011.609715?c

Barnard, R. (2018). Setting the scene: EMI in Asian universities. In Z. Hasim & R.

Barnard (Eds), *English medium instruction programmes: perspectives from South*

East Asian universities (p.1-15). Routledge.

Barrios, E., López-Gutiérrez, A., & Lechuga, C. (2016). Facing challenges in English

Medium Instruction through engaging in an innovation project. *Procedia-Social and*

Behavioral Sciences, *228*, 209-214.

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042816309570

Başıbek, N., Dolmacı, M., Cengiz, B. C., Bür, B., Dilek, Y., & Kara, B. (2014). Lecturers'

perceptions of English medium instruction at engineering departments of higher

education: A study on partial English medium instruction at some state universities

in Turkey. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *116*, 1819-1825.

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/

Bayetova, N. & Karsakbayeva, M. (2020, August 17). "COVID-19 highlights

vulnerabilities in higher education". *University World news: The Global Window on*

HE. https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20200817085554822

Bell, J. (2005). *Doing your research: A guide for first-time researchers in education,*

health and social science (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=Uo9FBgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR 1&dq=Bell,+J.+(2005).+Doing+your+research

Belova, X. (2017). *Learners' language use in communication in a multilingual learning environment* [Master's thesis, Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education]. https://nur.nu.edu.kz/bitstream/

Berg, B. L., & Lune, H. (2012). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences.* Pearson Higher Ed. http://www.academia.edu/download/55902056/Ph17-Lune-QualResch9GE-wm.pdf

Blair, A., Haneda, M., & Bose, F. N. (2018). Reimagining English-medium instructional settings as sites of multilingual and multimodal meaning making. *TESOL Quarterly*, *52*(3), 516-539. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/tesq.449?casa_

Blaxter, L., Hughes, C., & Tight, M. (2006). How to research, (3rd ed). *Open*. http://abcreorg.weebly.com/uploads/9/9/8/2/9982776/how_to_research.pdf

Bradford, A. (2019). It's not all about English! The problem of language foregrounding in English-medium programs in Japan, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *40*(8), 707-720. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01434632.2018.1551402?

Brown, D. (2019). *Developing English-medium instruction programs in higher education in Japan: Lessons learned from program implementers* [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Birmingham]. https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/schools/edacs/index.aspx

Burke, T., & Patching, J. (2020). Mobile methods: Altering research data collection methods during COVID-19 and the unexpected benefits. *Collegian*. https://www.collegianjournal.com/article/S1322-7696(20)30105-0/pdf

Çankaya, P. (2017). Challenges in English medium of instruction from the teachers and students' eyes. *International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching*, *5*(4), 830-839. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED581573

Cenoz, J. (2012). Bilingual educational policy in higher education in the Basque Country. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *25*(1), 41-55. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07908318.2011.653057?casa

Chang, S. Y. (2019). Beyond the English box: Constructing and communicating knowledge through translingual practices in the higher education classroom. *English Teaching & Learning*, *43*(1), 23-40. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s42321-018-0014-4

Cheng, L., & Qi, L. (2006). Description and examination of the national matriculation English test. *Language Assessment Quarterly: An International Journal*, *3*(1), 53-70. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2013). *Research methods in education*. Routledge. http://dspace.utamu.ac.ug:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/

Coleman, J. A. (2006). English-medium teaching in European higher education. *Language teaching*, *39*(1), 1-14. http://oro.open.ac.uk/5189/

Corrales, K. A., Rey, L. A. P., & Escamilla, N. S. (2016). Is EMI enough? Perceptions from university professors and students. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning*, *9*(2). https://laclil.unisabana.edu.co/index.php/LACLIL/article/download/7094/pdf

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th Ed.). Pearson.

Crystal, D. (2016, August 8). *English – is it still one language?* Spotlight, *8*, 36-37. http://www.davidcrystal.com/Files/BooksAndArticles/-5217.pdf

Cummins, J. (2017). Teaching minoritized students: Are additive approaches legitimate? *Harvard Educational Review*, *87*(3), 404-425. https://meridian.allenpress.com/her/article/87/3/404/32213

Dalton-Puffer, C., & Smit, U. (2013). Content and language integrated learning: A research agenda. *Language Teaching, 46*(4), 545-559. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259436609_Content_and_Language_Integrated_Learning_A_research_agenda

Dearden, J. (2014). English as a medium of instruction - a growing phenomenon. *Educational Review*, 1–40. https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:4f72cdf8-b2eb-4d41-a785-4a283bf6caaa

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics.* https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl

Foster, H. L. (2017). *Imagining the shala-Kazakh: Codeswitching and satire in post-Soviet Kazakhstan* [Master's thesis, University of Texas Faculty of Education]. https://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/handle/2152/47167

Fishman, J.A. & Fishman, S. G. (2000) Rethinking language defense. In R.Philipson (Ed), *Rights to language: Equity, power and education* (pp.23-27). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. https://books.google.kz/books?hl=en&lr=&id=kLWRAgAAQBAJ&oi

Gerfanova, E. (2018). Foreign Language education of Kazakhstan: current trends and future perspectives. *People: International Journal of Social Sciences*, *4*(3), 735-745. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329784312_

Gerritsen, M., Van Meurs, F., Planken, B., & Korzilius, H. (2016). A reconsideration of the status of English in the Netherlands within the Kachruvian three circles model. *World Englishes*, *35*(3), 457-474. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12206

Goodman, B. A. (2014). Implementing English as a medium of instruction in a Ukrainian University: Challenges, adjustments, and opportunities. *International Journal of Pedagogies and learning*, *9*(2), 130-141. https://nur.nu.edu.kz/bitstream/handle/1

Goodman, B., & Tastanbek, S. (2021). Making the Shift From a Codeswitching to a Translanguaging Lens in English Language Teacher Education. *TESOL Quarterly, 55*(1), 29-53. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/tesq.571

Hamid, M. O., Nguyen, H. T. M., & Baldauf Jr, R. B. (2013). Medium of instruction in Asia: Context, processes and outcomes. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *14*(1), 1-15.
https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14664208.2013.792130

Hopkins, P. E. (2007). Positionalities and knowledge: Negotiating ethics in practice. *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies*, *6*(3), 386-394.
https://www.acme-journal.org/index.php/acme/article/view/787/646

Hu, G., & Lei, J. (2013). English-medium instruction in Chinese higher education: A case study. *Higher Education*, *67*(5), 551-567. https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/

Hüttner, J., Dalton-Puffer, C., & Smit, U. (2013). The power of beliefs: Lay theories and their influence on the implementation of CLIL programmes. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *16*(3), 267-284.
https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/

IAAQ (Independent Agency for Quality Assurance in Education) (2010, March 3). *Kazakhstan joined the Bologna Process*. https://iqaa.kz/en/news-eng/item/1333-kazakhstan-joined-the-bologna-process

Information-Analytical Centre (2018). *National report on the state and development of educational system of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2018*.

http://iac.kz/sites/default/files/0_nacionalnyy_doklad_za_2018_god_final_s_oblozhk
ami_na_sayt_compressed_0.pdf

Illnerova, H. (2004). *Sciences and humanities: Different worlds?* ALLEA Biennial
Yearbook (pp.111-113). https://allea.org/wp-
ontent/uploads/2016/02/Illnerova_Different_Worlds.pdf

Jahan, I., Hamid, M.O., & Islam, M. M. (2013). Medium of instruction policies and
language practices, ideologies and institutional divides: voices of teachers and
students in a private university in Bangladesh. *Current Issues in Language
Planning, 14*(1), 144-163.
https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14664208.2013.771417

Jamshed, S. (2014). Qualitative research method-interviewing and observation. *Journal of
Basic and Clinical Pharmacy*, *5*(4), 87.
https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4194943/

Jiang, L., Zhang, L., J. & May, S. (2019). Implementing English medium instruction (EMI)
in China: Teachers' practices and perceptions, and students' learning motivation and
needs. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *22* (2), 107-
119. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13670050.2016.1231166

Jumakulov, Z., & Ashirbekov, A. (2016). Higher education internationalization: Insights
from Kazakhstan. *Hungarian Educational Research Journal*, *6*, 35-55.
https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=548676

Kambatyrova A. (2020). *Parents' language ideologies in the context of trilingual education
policy in Kazakhstan* [Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Nazarbayev University
Graduate School of Education]

Kanatkhanova, A. (2020). *English medium instruction at a national university: Students',
teachers' and administrators' views* [Master's thesis, Nazarbayev University].
https://nur.nu.edu.kz/bitstream/handle/123456789/4854/

Karabay, A. (2017). *STEM and Social Sciences Students' language-oriented academic
challenges in English Medium Of Instruction (EMI) programs: the case of an
international university in Kazakhstan* [Master's thesis, Nazarbayev University
Graduate School of Education]. https://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/2557

Karabassova, L. (2020). Understanding Trilingual Education Reform in Kazakhstan: Why
Is It Stalled?. In E. Denise (Ed), *Education in Central Asia* A *Kaleidoscope of
Challenges and Opportunities* (pp. 37-51). Springer Nature.
https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-030-50127-3_3

Karabassova, L. (2021). English-medium education reform in Kazakhstan: comparative
study of educational change across two contexts in one country. *Current Issues in
Language Planning*, 1-21.
https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14664208.2021.1884436?

Katsu, S., & Saniyazova, A. (2018). A world-class experiment in Kazakhstan: Nazarbayev
university. *Accelerated Universities,* pp. 68-85. Brill Sense

Koch, N. (2014). The shifting geopolitics of higher education: Inter/nationalizing elite
universities in Kazakhstan, Saudi Arabia, and beyond. *Geoforum*, *56*, 46-54.
https://www.journal.elsevier.com

Kirkpatrick, A. (2014). The language(s) of HE: EMI and/or ELF and/or multilingualism?
The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics, *1*(1), 4–15.
http://caes.hku.hk/ajal/index.php/ajal/article/view/23

Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan on Languages (1997).
http://adilet.zan.kz/eng/docs/Z97000015

Liamputtong, P., & Ezzy, D. (2005). *Qualitative research methods (2ⁿᵈ Ed.)*. Oxford

University Press. http://www.health.gov.to/sites/default/files/Week%202%20-

%20Liamputtong%20&%20Ezzy,%20Chapter%201.pd

Lin, A.M.Y. & Lo, Y.Y. (2018). The spread of English medium instruction programmes:

Educational and research implications. In R.Barnard & Z. Hasim (Eds). *English

medium instruction programmes: Perspectives from South East Asian universities,*

(pp.87-104). Routledge.

Macaro, E. (2015). English medium instruction: Time to start asking some difficult

questions. *Modern English Teacher*, *24*(2), 4–7.

https://www.modernenglishteacher.com/media/5377/macaro.pdf

Macaro, E. (2018). *English medium instruction*. Oxford University Press.

https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=js5MDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PT

13&dq=Macaro,+E.+(2018).+English+medium+instruction.

Margic, D., & Vodopija-Krstanovic, I. (2017). *Uncovering English Medium Instruction:

Glocal Issues in Higher Education.* Peter Lang Ltd.

Masri, T. I. (2019). A critical examination of the arab undergraduate students' perceptions

of their academic Arabic proficiency in three EMI universities in the UAE. *English

Language Teaching*, *12*(4), 21-31. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1208462.pdf

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

of Education Development in the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2011– 2020.

https://planipolis.iiep.unesco.org/en/2012/state-program-education-development-

republic-kazakhstan-2011-2020-5506

MoES (Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan). (2011). *The

State Program for Education Development 2011-2020*. https://strategy2050.kz

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

    Program of Education and Science Development for 2016- 2019.

    http://control.edu.gov.kz/ru/gosudarstvennaya-programma-razvitiya-obrazovaniya-i-

    nauki-respubliki-kazahstan-na-2016-2019-gody

MoES (Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan). (2018).

    Реализация принципов Болонского процесса в Республике Казахстан

    [Implementation of the principles of the Bologna process in the Republic of

    Kazakhstan]. https://enic-kazakhstan.kz/uploads/additional_files_items/28/

MoES (Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan). (2019). *State*

    Program of Education Development until 2025: Updating curricula, supporting

    science and electronic UNT.

    https://research.nu.edu.kz/files/32042000/Appendix_A_manuscript_under_review

Mulhall, A. (2003). In the field: notes on observation in qualitative research. *Journal of*

    Advanced Nursing, *41*(3), 306-313.

    https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1046/j.1365-2648.2003.02514.x

Myrzakulova, G. (2019). *Graduate students 'perceptions of English medium instruction in*

    terms of their learning motivation, anxiety, and achievement [Master's thesis,

    Nazarbayev University]. https://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/4333

Nazarbayev, N. (2010). Decree of the president of the RoK No. 922 2010. www.akorda.kz.

Nazarbayev, N. (2012). *Address by the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Leader of*

        the Nation. Strategy Kazakhstan-2050: new political course of the established

        state.

        https://www.akorda.kz/en/events/astana_kazakhstan/participation_in_events/ad

        dress-by-the-president-of-the-republic-of-kazakhstan-leader-of-the-nation-

        nnazarbayev-strategy-kazakhstan-2050

Nazarbayev University (2019). *Institutional Research Ethics Committee.*

https://nu.edu.kz/research/office-provost/institutional-research-ethics-committee

Nurzhanova, M.N., Kanlybayeva, A., U., Serik, S., S. & Kanlybayeva, A., N. (2018). Poly-

lingual education: actuality and perspectives. *Россия в Европе: Связь Культуры и*

Экономики [Russia in Europe: The link between Culture and Economy], 122-124.

http://www.kgsha.ru/files/

Ospanova, B. R., Azimbayeva, Z. A., Timokhina, T. V., &Seydakhmetova, Z. K. (2016).

Theoretical-and-methodological substantiation of multilingual model activity in

Kazakhstan higher school education system. *International Journal of Environmental*

and Science Education, *11*(10), 3450-3466.

http://www.ijese.net/makale_indir/IJESE_535_article_579dd6f4b6f5c.pdf

Oralova, G. (2012). Internationalization of higher education in Kazakhstan: issues of

instruction in foreign languages. *Journal of Teaching and Education, 1*(2), 127-133.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259529213_

Othman, J., & Saat, R. M. (2009). Challenges of using English as a medium of instruction:

Pre-service science teachers' perspective. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher,*

18(2), 307-316. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Juliana_Othman/

OECD (2020). *Supporting the continuation of teaching and learning during the COVID-19*

Pandemic: Annotated resources for online learning.

https://www.oecd.org/education/Supporting-the-continuation-of-teaching-and-

learning-during-the-COVID-19-pandemic.pdf

Pan, L., & Block, D. (2011). English as a "global language" in China: An investigation

into learners' and teachers' language beliefs. *System*, 39(3), 391-402.

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0346251X11000972

Paré, G. (2004). Investigating information systems with positivist case research. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 13(1), 18. https://aisel.aisnet.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3237&context=cais

Pilard, G. (Ed.). (2002). English, lingua franca, cultural imperialism and dictionaries. *Euralex, 1*, 429-433. https://www.euralex.org/elx_proceedings/Euralex2002/

Polenova, A. Y. (2016). Английский язык как язык обучения в университетском экономическом образовании [English as a language of instruction in university economic education: problems and development prospects]. *Регулирование Экономики [Journal of Economic Regulation], 7*(3), 153-162. https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/

Philipson R. (2000). English in the new world order: Variations on a theme of linguistic imperialism and "world" English. In T. Ricento, (Ed.). *Ideology, politics and language policies: Focus on English* (pp.87-107). John Benjamins Publishing.

Philipson, R. (2018). Foreword. In Z. Hasim & R. Barnard (Eds). *English medium instruction programmes: perspectives from South East Asian universities,* (pp. 7-15). Routledge

Prilipko, A. (2017). M*anaging implementation of English medium of instruction in higher education in kazakhstan: practices and challenges* [Master's thesis, Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education]. https://nur.nu.edu.kz/bitstream/handle/

Rahman, M. M., Singh, M. K. M., Johan, M., & Ahmed, Z. (2020). English medium instruction ideology, management and practices: A case study of Bangladeshi private university. *English Teaching & Learning*, *44*(1), 61-79. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s42321-019-00036-z

Redhu, V. (2014). English: A global language and its usage for students. *International Research Journal of Management Sociology & Humanity (IRJMSH), 5*(11), 172-176. https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/36888657/2441.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press. https://books.google.com/books

Saldaña, J. (2015). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (2nd ed). Sage. http://emotrab.ufba.br/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/Saldana-2013-TheCodingManualforQualitativeResearchers.pdf

Seitzhanova, A., Plokhikh, R., Baiburiev, R., & Tsaregorodtseva, A. (2015). English as the medium of instruction: Modern tendency of education in Kazakhstan. *Perspectives of Innovations, Economics and Business*, 15(3), 113-117. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Roman_Plokhikh

Shamim, F., Abdelhalim, A., & Hamid, N. (2016). English medium instruction in the transition year: Case from KSA. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, *7*(1), 32-47. https://www.academia.edu/download/45177402/3.pdf

Smagulova, J. (2019). Ideologies of language revival: Kazakh as school talk. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *23*(3), 740-756. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1367006916684920

Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language policy*. Cambridge University Press. https://ezproxy.nu.edu.kz:2212/eds/

Spolsky, B. (2009). *Language management*. Cambridge University Press. https://ezproxy.nu.edu.kz:2212/eds/

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Sage. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=ApGdBx76b9kC&oi=fnd&pg=PA7&dq=Stake,+R.+E.+(1995).

Scull, J., Phillips, M., Sharma, U., & Garnier, K. (2020). Innovations in teacher education at the time of COVID19: an Australian perspective. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *46*(4), 497-506.

https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02607476.2020.1802701?

Ricento, T. (2012). Political economy and English as a 'global'language. *Critical Multilingualism Studies*, *1*(1), 31-56.

https://cms.arizona.edu/index.php/multilingual/article/view/11

Tampayeva, G. Y. (2016). *The implementation of the Bologna Process in Kazakhstan higher education: views from within* [Doctoral dissertation, Brunel University].

https://bura.brunel.ac.uk/handle/2438/13700

Tollefson, W., J. & Tsui, B.M.A. (2010). The centrality of medium-of instruction policy in sociopolitical processess. In W.J. Tollefson & B.M.A. Tsui (Eds). *Medium of Intsruction Policies: Which Agenda? Whose Agenda?* (pp. 1-21). Routledge.

Tsuneyoshi, R. (2005). Internationalization strategies in Japan: The dilemmas and possibilities of study abroad programs using English. *Journal of Research in International Education*, *4*(1), 65-86.

https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.1005.4021&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Turumbetova, L. (2014). Changes in the system of higher professional education in multiethnic Kazakhstan due to globalization. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *116*, 4889-4893. https://cyberleninka.org/article/n/352729.pdf

United Nations (2020). *Policy brief: education during COVID-19 and beyond.*

https://www.un.org/development/desa/dspd/wp-

Vinke, A. A., Snippe, J., & Jochems, W. (1998). English-medium content courses in non-English higher education: A study of lecturer experiences and teaching

behaviours. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *3*(3), 383-394.

https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1356215980030307?casa_token

Vu, N. T., & Burns, A. (2014). English as a medium of instruction: Challenges for

Vietnamese tertiary lecturers. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, *11*(3), 1-31.

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Anne_Burns6/publication/283083963_

Wachter, B., & Maiworm, F. (2014). *English-taught programmes in European higher*

education: The state of play in 2014. Lemmens.

https://www.lemmens.de/dateien/medien/buecher-

ebooks/aca/2014_english_taught.pdf

Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied*

linguistics, *39*(1), 9-30. https://academic.oup.com/applij/article-

abstract/39/1/9/4566103

Wilkinson, R. (Eds). (2013). English-medium instruction at a Dutch university: Challenges

and pitfalls. In A. Doiz, D. Lasagabaster, & J. Sierra. *English-medium instruction at*

universities: Global challenges (pp.3-27). Multilingual Matters.

Woolard, K.A. (Eds.) (1998). Introduction: language ideology as a field of inquiary. In B.,

B., Schieffelin, K., A., Woolard & P., V., Kroskrity. *Language ideologies: Practice*

and Theory. Oxford University Press.

https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=y

Xiaoqiong, B. H., & Xianxing, J. (2011). Kachru's three concentric circles and English

teaching fallacies in EFL and ESL contexts. *Changing English*, *18*(2), 219-228.

https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/1358684X.2011.575254

Yergebekov, M., & Temirbekova, Z. (2012). The Bologna Process and Problems in Higher

Education System of Kazakhstan. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *47*,

1473–1478. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.845

Yeshengazina, S. (2018). Teaching English for special purposes in Kazakhstan: content or skills? *Asia Pacific Institute of Advanced Research (APIAR),* 8-18. https://apiar.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/8_GCMAR_May2018_BRR737_Edu_8-18.pdf

Yrsaliyev, S., Karabasova, L., Muhametzhanova, A., Adil, A., Bekova, M. & Nurlanov, E. (2017). Teaching in three languages, international experience and recommendations for Kazakhstan. *Information – Analytic Center, 11* (5), 1-183.

Yessenamanova, M., Yessenamanova, Z., Abuova, A., & Karakenova, S. (2014). Implementation of poly-lingual programme in higher education in Kazakhstan. *Mezhdunarodny Zhurnal Eksperimentalnogo Obrazovania* [International journal of experimental education], *4*(2), 14-16. http://www.expeducation.ru/pdf/2014/4-2/5066.pdf

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research design and methods* (4th Ed). https://journals.nipissingu.ca/index.php/cjar/article/view/73

Zenkova, T., & Khamitova, G. (2018). English medium-instruction as a way to internationalization of higher education in Kazakhstan: an opinion survey in the innovative university of eurasia. *e-TEALS*, *8*(1), 126-158. https://content.sciendo.com/downloadpdf/journals/eteals/8/1/article-p126.xml

Zhang, S., & Fulford, C. P. (1994). Are interaction time and psychological interactivity the same thing in the distance learning television classroom?. *Educational Technology*, 58-64. https://www.jstor.org/stable/44428203

Zhang, Z. (2018). English-medium instruction policies in China: Internationalisation of higher education. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *39*(6), 542-555. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/

Zhao, J., & Dixon, L. Q. (Eds.). (2017). *English-medium instruction in Chinese universities: Perspectives, discourse and evaluation*. Taylor & Francis. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=E0QlDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg

Zhetpisbayeva, B. A., Shelestova, T. Y., & Abildina, S. K. (2016). Examining teachers' views on the implementation of English as L3 into primary schools: A case of Kazakhstan. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, *8*(4), 659-674. https://www.iejee.com/index.php/IEJEE/article/view/139

Zhilbayev, Z. O., Syrymbetova, L. S., Mukasheva, M. Y., Zhetpisbayeva, B. A., & Smagulova, G. T. (2019). Promotion of trilingual education in Kazakhstani schools: online monitoring results. *Journal of Siberian Federal University, Humanities & Social Sciences, 2*(2019 12), 285-301. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332034568_Promotion_of_trilingual_education_in_kazakhstan_schools_Online_monitoring_results

Zhong, R. (2020, March 17). *The coronavirus exposes education's digital divide*. Retrieved from The New York Times: https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/17/technology/china-schools-coronavirus.html

Appendix A

Interview Protocols in English, Russian, and Kazakh

Time of the Interview:
Date:
Place:
Researcher: Kymbat Yessenbekova
Participant: Teacher/Student

The Individual Semi-Structured Interview Questionnaire for Teachers
a) Warm-up:
    How are you? Are you ready for the interview?
b) Background questions:
    1. Where did you obtain your degree/s?
    2. What EMI program and year are you teaching?
c) Guiding questions about language practices
    3. When and how did you start learning English?
    4. What is a typical EMI lesson for you? What activities do you use?
    5. What challenges do you encounter in teaching EMI courses?
    6. How do you evaluate your students' writing, speaking, listening and reading skills in English in content learning? On a scale of 1 to 10, how would you rate their skills?
    7. Which language for classroom discussion and for meaning making in teaching content do you use?
d) Guiding questions about language ideologies
    8. What is your perception about the role of EMI in Kazakhstani universities?
    9. What are your motivations for teaching EMI courses?
    10. How necessary do you perceive English as being for your students' academic success and future success in the workplace? On a scale of 1 to 10, how would you rate the difference?
    11. How do you perceive the influence of EMI on students' English improvement and disciplinary learning? (adapted from Yeh, C-C, 2015)
e) Guiding questions about language management
    12. What methodological support did you get from your institution during your EMI teaching experience?
    13. How effective were EMI trainings for you? Specify any language or methodological course?
    14. Are you satisfied with the teaching resources provided by the institution for teaching EMI? On a scale of 1 to 10, how would you rate them?
f) Closing Question
    15. Is there anything else you would like to add?
g) Wrap up:
    Now, our interview has come to an end. I really appreciate the time you spent and your interest. I guarantee that your information will be used only for our study and guarantee confidentiality as well. Thank you very much!
    <u>Suggested probes:</u>
    a) Q3: Have you ever passed IELTS or other language tests?
    b) Q7: Do you know what translanguaging is and do you use it in classes?
    c) Q11: Do you believe that EMI should be taught only in English?

Индивидуальная полуструктурированная анкета для преподавателей

а) Организация:

Как ваши дела? Вы готовы к интервью?

б) Общие вопросы:

1. Где вы получили академическую степень / и?

2. По какой программе обучения на английском языке и какому курсы вы преподаете?

в) Наводящие вопросы о языковой практике:

3. Когда и как вы начали изучать английский язык?

4. Какой для вас типичный урок с обучением на английском языке? Какие виды деятельности вы используете?

5. С какими трудностями вы сталкиваетесь при преподавании курсов с английским языком обучения?

6. Как вы оцениваете навыки письма, разговорной речи, аудирования и чтения ваших студентов на английском языке при изучении содержания предмета? Как бы вы оценили их навыки по шкале от 1 до 10?

7. Какой язык для обсуждения в классе и для понимания учебных материалов вы используете?

г) Наводящие вопросы о языковых идеологиях:

8. Как вы оцениваете роль обучения на английском языке в казахстанских университетах?

9. Каковы ваши мотивы преподавания курсов на английском языке?

10. Насколько, по вашему мнению, английский язык необходим для академической успеваемости и будущего успеха ваших студентов на рабочем месте? Как бы вы оценили разницу по шкале от 1 до 10?

11. Как вы воспринимаете влияние обучения на английском языке на улучшение английского языка и дисциплинарное обучение студентов? (адаптировано из Yeh, C-C, 2015)

д) Наводящие вопросы про языковой менеджмент:

12. Какую методическую поддержку вы получали от вашего учебного заведения во время преподавания на английском языке?

13. Насколько эффективны были для вас курсы по обучению на английском языке? Укажите какой-либо языковой или методический курс?

14. Удовлетворены ли вы учебными ресурсами, предоставляемыми учреждением для обучения на английском языке? Как бы вы их оценили по шкале от 1 до 10?

е) Заключительный вопрос

15. Есть еще что-нибудь, что вы хотели бы добавить?

ж) Завершение:

Наше интервью подошло к концу. Я очень ценю время, которое вы провели, и ваш интерес. Я гарантирую, что ваша информация будет использована только для нашего исследования, а также гарантирую конфиденциальность. Большое спасибо!

Предлагаемые вопросы для исследования:

а) Q3: Вы когда-нибудь проходили IELTS или другие языковые тесты?

б) B7: Знаете ли вы, что такое перевод (translanguaging), и используете ли вы его на занятиях?

c) Q11: Считаете ли вы, что обучение на английском языке следует проводить только на английском языке?

Оқытушыларға арналған жеке жартылай құрылымдалған сауалнама

а) Ұйымдастыру:

Сіздің жағдайыңыз қалай? Сіз сұхбатқа дайынсыз ба?

б) Жалпы сұрақтар:

1. Сіз қай жерде академиялық дәреже / дәрежелеріңізді алдыңыз?

2. Қандай ағылшын тілінде оқу бағдарламасы бойынша және қандай курстарқа сабақ бересіз?

в) Тілдік тәжірибе туралы жетекші сұрақтар:

3. Сіз ағылшын тілін қашан және қалай үйрене бастадыңыз?

4. Сіз үшін ағылшын тілінде оқытатын әдеттегі сабақ қандай? Сіз қандай оқыту тәсілдерін қолданасыз?

5. Ағылшын тілінде оқытатын курстарды оқытуда қандай қиындықтарға тап боласыз?

6. Пәннің мазмұнын оқу кезіндегі студенттердің ағылшын тіліндегі жазу, сөйлеу, тыңдау және оқу дағдыларын қалай бағалайсыз? 1-ден 10-ға дейінгі шкала бойынша дағдыларын қалай бағалайсыз?

7. Сыныпта талқылау және оқу материалдарын түсіну үшін қандай тілді қолданасыз?

г) Тілдік идеология туралы жетекші сұрақтар:

8. Сіз қазақстандық университеттерде ағылшын тілінде оқытудың рөлін қалай бағалайсыз?

9. Сіздің ағылшын тіліндегі курстарды оқытуыңыздың себептері қандай?

10. Сіздің ойыңызша, ағылшын тілі, сіздің студенттеріңіздің академиялық үлгерімі мен жұмыс орнындағы болашақ табысы үшін қаншалықты қажет? 1-ден 10-ға дейінгі шкала бойынша айырмашылықты қалай бағалайсыз?

11. Ағылшын тілінде оқытудың студенттердің ағылшын тілін жетілдіруіне және пәндік оқуларына әсерін қалай қабылдайсыз? (Yeh, C-C, 2015 бойынша бейімделген)

д) Тілдік менеджмент туралы жетекші сұрақтар:

12. Ағылшын тілінде сабақ беру кезінде оқу орныңыздан қандай әдістемелік қолдау алдыңыз?

13. Ағылшын тілінде оқыту курстары сіз үшін қаншалықты тиімді болды? Кез-келген тілдік немесе әдістемелік курсты көрсетіңіз?

14. Сіз ағылшын тілінде білім беру үшін оқу орны ұсынатын оқу ресурстарымен қанағаттанасыз ба? 1-ден 10-ға дейінгі шкала бойынша қалай бағалайсыз?

е) Қорытынды сұрақ:

15. Сіз қосқыңыз келетін тағы бір нәрсе бар ма?

ж) Аяқтау:

Біздің сұхбатымыз аяқталды. Мен сіздің өткізген уақытыңыз бен қызығушылығыңызды өте бағалаймын. Сіздің ақпаратыңыз тек біздің зерттеуіміз үшін пайдаланылатынына және құпиялылыққа кепілдік беремін. Үлкен рахмет!

Зерттеуге ұсынылатын сұрақтар:

а) Q3: Сіз IELTS немесе басқа тілдік сынақтардан өттіңіз бе?

б) B7: Сіз аударма (translanguaging) деген не екенін білесіз бе және оны сабақта қолданасыз ба?

с) Q11: Сіз ағылшын тілінде оқыту курсын тек ағылшын тілінде жүргізу керек деп ойлайсыз ба?

The Individual Semi-Structured Interview Questionnaire for Students

a) Warm-up:
    How are you? Are you ready for the interview?

b) Background questions:
1. In what kind of schools (specialized or public) did you study?
2. What is your major and the year of study?

c) Guiding questions about language practices
3. When and how did you start learning English?
4. What is a typical EMI lesson for you? How do you prepare for EMI courses?
5. What challenges do you encounter in EMI courses?
6. How do you evaluate your teachers' in English skills in content teaching? On a scale of 1 to 10, how would you rate their skills?
7. Which language for classroom discussion and for meaning making in learning content do you use?

d) Guiding questions about language ideologies
8. What is your perception about the role of EMI in Kazakhstani universities?
9. What are your motivations for studying in EMI courses?
10. How necessary do you perceive English as being for your academic success and future success in the workplace? On a scale of 1 to 10, how would you rate the difference?
11. How do you perceive the influence of EMI on your English improvement and disciplinary learning?

e) Guiding questions about language management
12. What language support did you get from your institution during your EMI experience?
13. Are you satisfied with the learning resources provided by the institution for EMI? On a scale of 1 to 10, how would you rate them?

f) Closing Question
14. Is there anything else you would like to add?

g) Wrap up:
    Now, our interview has come to an end. I really appreciate the time you spent and your interest. I guarantee that your information will be used only for our study and guarantee confidentiality as well. Thank you very much!

Suggested probes:
a) Q3: have you ever passed IELTS or other language tests?
b) Q6: Do you think teachers should be highly proficient in English to teach EMI?
c) Q7: How do you think what skills you could improve?
d) Q12: Do you believe that EMI should be taught only in English?

Индивидуальная полуструктурированная анкета для студентов

а) Организация:

Как ваши дела? Вы готовы к интервью?

б) Общие вопросы:

1. В каких школах (специализированных или государственных) вы учились?

2. Какая у вас специальность и год обучения?

в) Наводящие вопросы о языковой практике:

3. Когда и как вы начали изучать английский язык?

4. Какой для вас типичный урок с обучением на английском языке? Как вы готовитесь к курсам с обучением на английском языке?

5. С какими трудностями вы сталкиваетесь на курсах с английским языком обучения?

6. Как вы оцениваете уровень владения английским языком вашими преподавателями в области обучения содержания предмета? Как бы вы оценили их навыки по шкале от 1 до 10?

7. Какой язык для обсуждения в классе и для понимания учебных материалов вы используете?

г) Наводящие вопросы о языковых идеологиях:

8. Как вы оцениваете роль обучения на английском языке в казахстанских университетах?

9. Каковы ваши мотивы обучения на курсах с английским языком обучения?

10. Насколько необходимым вы считаете английский язык для вашего академического успеха и будущего успеха на рабочем месте? Как бы вы оценили разницу по шкале от 1 до 10?

11. Как вы воспринимаете влияние обучения на английском языке на ваше улучшение английского языка и дисциплинарное обучение?

д) Наводящие вопросы об управлении языком:

12. Какую языковую поддержку вы получили от своего учебного учреждения во время вашего опыта на курсах с английском языком обучения?

13. Удовлетворены ли вы учебными ресурсами, предоставляемыми учреждением для обучения на английском языке? Как бы вы их оценили по шкале от 1 до 10?

е) Заключительный вопрос:

14. Есть еще что-нибудь, что вы хотели бы добавить?

ж) Завершение:

Наше интервью подошло к концу. Я очень ценю время, которое вы провели, и ваш интерес. Я гарантирую, что ваша информация будет использована только для нашего исследования, а также гарантирую конфиденциальность. Большое спасибо!

Предлагаемые вопросы для исследования:

а) Q3: Вы когда-нибудь проходили IELTS или другие языковые тесты?

в) Q6: Считаете ли вы, что преподаватели должны очень хорошо владеть английским языком, чтобы преподавать курсы с английском языком обучения?

б) Q7: Как вы думаете, какие языковые навыки вы могли бы улучшить?

г) Q12: Считаете ли вы, что курсы с английским языком обучения следует преподавать только на английском языке?

Студенттерге арналған жеке жартылай құрылымдалған сауалнама

а) Ұйымдастыру:

Сіздің жағдайыңыз қалай? Сіз сұхбатқа дайынсыз ба?

б) Жалпы сұрақтар:

1. Сіз қай мектептерде (мамандандырылған немесе мемлекеттік) оқыдыңыз?
2. Сіздің мамандығыңыз және курстағы оқу жылыңыз қандай?

в) Тілдік тәжірибе туралы жетекші сұрақтар:

3. Сіз ағылшын тілін қашан және қалай үйрене бастадыңыз?
4. Сіз үшін ағылшын тілінде оқытатын әдеттегі сабақ қандай? Ағылшын тілінде оқытатын курстарға қалай дайындаласыз?
5. Ағылшын тілінде оқытатын курстарда қандай қиындықтарға тап боласыз?
6. Пәннің мазмұнын оқытуда сіздің оқытушыларыңыздың ағылшын тілін меңгеру деңгейін қалай бағалайсыз? 1-ден 10-ға дейінгі шкала бойынша дағдыларын қалай бағалайсыз?
7. Сыныпта талқылау және оқу материалдарын түсіну үшін қандай тілді қолданасыз?

г) Тілдік идеология туралы жетекші сұрақтар:

8. Сіз қазақстандық университеттерде ағылшын тілінде оқытудың рөлін қалай бағалайсыз?
9. Сіздің ағылшын тіліндегі курстарды оқуыңыздың себептері қандай?
10. Сіздің ойыңызша, ағылшын тілі, сіздің академиялық үлгеріміңіз бен жұмыс орнындағы болашақ табысыңыз үшін қаншалықты қажет? 1-ден 10-ға дейінгі шкала бойынша айырмашылықты қалай бағалайсыз?
11. Ағылшын тілінде оқытудың сіздің ағылшын тілін жетілдіруіңізге және пәндік оқуларыңызға деген әсерін қалай қабылдайсыз?

д) Тілді басқару туралы жетекші сұрақтар:

12. Ағылшын тілінде оқыту курстарындағы тәжірибеңіз кезінде оқу орнынан қандай тілдік қолдау алдыңыз?
13. Сіз ағылшын тілінде білім беру үшін оқу орны ұсынатын оқу ресурстарымен қанағаттанасыз ба? 1-ден 10-ға дейінгі шкала бойынша қалай бағалайсыз?

е) Қорытынды сұрақ:

14. Сіз қосқыңыз келетін тағы бір нәрсе бар ма?

ж) Аяқтау:

Біздің сұхбатымыз аяқталды. Мен сіздің өткізген уақытыңыз бен қызығушылығыңызды өте бағалаймын. Сіздің ақпаратыңыз тек біздің зерттеуіміз үшін пайдаланылатынына және құпиялылыққа кепілдік беремін. Үлкен рахмет!

Зерттеуге ұсынылатын сұрақтар:

а) Q3: Сіз IELTS немесе басқа тілдік сынақтардан өттіңіз бе?

б) Q6: Ағылшын тілінде оқыту курстарын оқыту үшін оқытушылар ағылшын тілін өте жақсы білуі керек деп ойлайсыз ба?

в) Q7: Сіз қандай тілдік дағдыларды жетілдіру керек деп ойлайсыз?

г) Q12: Сіз ағылшын тілінде оқыту курстарын тек ағылшын тілінде оқыту керек деп ойлайсыз ба?

Appendix B

Transcription Sample of Interview 1 in English and Kazakh

The Individual Semi-Structured Interview Questionnaire for Students
   a) Warm-up:
Researchers: How are you? Are you ready for the interview?
Student: I am fine and ready for the interview
   b) Background questions:
Researcher:
   1. In what kind of schools (specialized or public) did you study?
.Student: .. in general, I studied in 2 schools, at the beginningit was a specialized school s. Then in the 9th grade, I moved to the Daryn school gymnasium oriented to physics and mathematics.
   2. What is your major and the year of study?
Student: Faculty of Natural Sciences, Ecology, I study in the 4th year.
c) Guiding questions about language practices
   3. When and how did you start learning English?
Student: I became interested in English from the 5th grade, and I took courses from time to time. After I went to high school, my English teacher taught me a very good, and then I began to learn English. After entering the university, I began to pay more attention to English. In general, I moved to a polylingual group just occasionally learning English. I look carefully at the method of teaching which depends on a teacher. A teacher in the university who taught us was very knowledgeable.
   4. What is a typical EMI lesson for you? How do you prepare for EMI courses?
Student: Mmm.... to be honest, the lessons were different. The first time was hard in a polylingual group. The teacher knew the lesson well, but we were not ready, as if we had been told and it was difficult to prepare for the lessons. The fault was only with us, and I have nothing to say to the teachers. A... then some teachers themselves did not speak English. It was like a game where teachers know English, we don't know it, and vice versa. But in these 3-4 courses, I do not know if the teachers met well, our enthusiasm for the lesson woke up. All the information we've got were connected to the environment, it was easy to find. Teachers explained well, did not translate, but even then we understood everything. When I make mistakes in pronunciation, I read the text first and translate it learning the new words. The teacher focused on the reading of the word. Then I tried to translate special terms, writing difficult words. In 3-4 years, there is no great difficulty, now I am studying the material and understand them.
   5. What challenges do you encounter in EMI courses?
Student: At the beginning.... it was difficult to speak. In the Kazakh group, it is easy, and in the English group, it is difficult to speak. The term was difficult to understand. In case of misunderstanding, the teacher tried to speak in comprehensive English. Information was explained in a short and easy way.
   6. How do you evaluate your teachers' in English skills in content teaching? On a
      scale of 1 to 10, how would you rate their skills?
Student: There is a professor and for him its 9, because he speaks English well. He teaches and gives lectures, tasks well, and has a good vocabulary. Each material is given in an interesting way. Before, it was sometimes difficult to understand, for example, to read a 40-page lecture. But this person can write 2 sentences in 36 fonts, for example, in a presentation, but depending on the subject that is easy to understand. We had one teacher, whose knowledge in terms of material is 9, but it was difficult in terms of conducting

classes.

7. Which language for classroom discussion and for meaning making in learning content do you use?

Students: Girls, among friends, sometimes use English and speak Russian. Some teachers require only English when we are studying. If you answer a teacher in Kazakh, for example, he does not seem to understand the answer. Because it's a different language. Some teachers pay attention to the level of students' English and explain in Russian. Then we can go on talking in Russian. This happens sometimes.

d) Guiding questions about language ideologies

8. What is your perception about the role of EMI in Kazakhstani universities?

Student: I think that it is very necessary to study in a polylingual group or open such groups in different parts of Kazakhstan, because we are trained as professionals and we need to be quality taught. Not only do we know Kazakh and Russian terms, but we also know them in English. For example, we studied international laws related to the environment, and the material is more in English. It is useful for me to collect interesting material, to consolidate thoughts in English. I'm not saying that we should study only in English; it's useful to study by mixing.

9. What are your motivations for studying in EMI courses?

Student: ... in fact, my main goal is the opportunity, because teaching 3 languages seemed new to me. I was interested in future employment, general improvement of English. It is better in the future to graduate in English.

10. How necessary do you perceive English as being for your academic success and future success in the workplace? On a scale of 1 to 10, how would you rate the difference?

Student: … very important in general 10 points. For example, if I speak English, I think I am better than a Kazakh-speaking student and then it is very convenient because all the material is in English.

11. How do you perceive the influence of EMI on your English improvement and disciplinary learning? (adapted from Yeh, C-C, 2015)

Student: Basically..... Since we moved to this group, when we worked with a group, we have learned grammar. It is noticeable what mistakes we make when we speak and these circumstances helped a lot. In my head, I could not speak, I could forget the words, I could not think. People say that you must use English naturally without translating it in your head, and that's what I have now, I speak more easily. The same grammar and speech have improved.

e) Guiding questions about language management

12. What language support did you get from your institution during your EMI experience?

Student: There was no support. After we started to study, it was very difficult for some of the girls, and as soon as we became a group, our emotions were transferred to each other. If someone was upset, then me too. For example, they confused some words, could not answer some questions. At that time, the girl's mood was given to me. Then we got together and went to the dean's office. One girl was in a very difficult situation as she did not understand English. She moved to the English group, was able to pass the test, but did not read, did not speak. We said that since the girl has a hard time, she could either study Russian or move to the Russian group, or if help would be provided. However, no one helped us, and said like they didn't care. We helped each other and that is it.

13. Are you satisfied with the learning resources provided by the institution for EMI? On a scale of 1 to 10, how would you rate them?

Student: 5-6. I'm not satisfied at all. We have been studying in a polylingual group since

the 3rd year, and the material has been repeated. What we read, We did not understand completely but had that material in the next course. For example, the title of the topic 'National use of natural resources' changed slightly in the next course, but the content was completely the same. In fact, it is not only in the English group, but also in the Kazakh group. Maybe because the ecology is not very developed, I do not know other areas, but we have few materials.

f) Closing Question

14. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Student: In fact, I am very happy to study in this group. At first there was fear, but we have improved not only English skills, but also our worldview has changed. Kazakh language is easy to study but here it was really necessary to work, the motivation for the lesson was aroused. We had an opportunity to study in this group from the 2nd year, but no one passed the test and was afraid.

g) Wrap up:

Now, our interview has come to an end. I really appreciate the time you spent and your interest. I guarantee that your information will be used only for our study and guarantee confidentiality as well. Thank you very much!

Suggested probes:

e) Q3: have you ever passed IELTS or other language tests?

Student: In fact, students with IELTS results passed, but I passed the university test. It was supposed to be 5 points on the score and without speaking task. My level was evaluated as C1 but between in a group the levels of girls were B1, B2.Our rating was mixed, not all of us were at the same level.

f) Q6: Do you think teachers should be highly proficient in English to teach EMI?

Student: It will be a little strange if a teacher does not know the English well, because he/she is a professional in front of us. But still, it's not our native language.

g) Q7: How do you think what skills you could improve?

h) Q12: Do you believe that EMI should be taught only in English?

Student: I think we have different levels of girls in the group. I don't think anything will happen in the lesson if I use Kazakh to understand the subject, because we are a polylingual group. I think it is the goal of teachers to conduct in several languages.

1-ші сауалнама транскрипциясының үлгісі 1 (Түпнұсқа)

Студенттерге арналған жеке жартылай құрылымдалған сауалнама

а) Ұйымдастыру:
Зерттеуші: Сіздің жағдайыңыз қалай? Сіз сұхбатқа дайынсыз ба?
Студент: Иа дайынмын және келісемін.
б) Жалпы сұрақтар:
    1. Сіз қай мектептерде (мамандандырылған немесе мемлекеттік) оқыдыңыз?
Студент; ... жалпы өзім 2 мектепте оқығам, басында жалпы мамандырылған мектепте, сосын 9 сыныпта Дарын мектеп гимназиясына көштім.Онда көбінесе бағдар физ-матқа болды..
    2. Сіздің мамандығыңыз және курстағы оқу жылыңыз қандай?
Студент: Жаратылыстану ғылымдар факультеті, экология, 4 курста оқимын.
в) Тілдік тәжірибе туралы жетекші сұрақтар:
    3. Сіз ағылшын тілін қашан және қалай үйрене бастадыңыз?
Студент: Жалпы, ағылшынға деген қызығушылығым 5 сыныптан бастап пайда болды, үзіп –үзіп курстарға қатыстым.Гимназияға өкшкеннен кейін, ағылшын тілі мұғалімі жақсы берді, содан кейін ағылшын тілін үйрене бастадым.Сосын университетке түскеннен кейін, ағылшын тіліне көп назар аудара бастадым.Жалпы солай полиязға көштім.Мұғалімге байланысты, сабақ оқытуына, жүргізу тәсіліне қараймын. Университетте мықты мұғалім берді.
    4. Сіз үшін ағылшын тілінде оқытатын әдеттегі сабақ қандай? Ағылшын тілінде оқытатын курстарға қалай дайындаласыз?
Студент: .... шыны керек сабақтар әр түрлі өтетін. Ең бірінші осы топқа көзкен кезде, қиын болды. Мұғалім сабақты жақсы білді, бірақ біз дайын емес болдық, уровень деген сияқты.Басында дайындалу қиын болды.Кінә тек қана бізден болды, мұғалімдерге еш айтарым жоқ.... сосын кейбір мұғалімдер өздері ағылшын тілін білмейтін. Солай горка сияқты, не мұғалімдер ағылшын тілін біледі, біз білмейміз и керісінше.Бірақ осы 3-4 курста мұғалімдер жақсы кездесті ма білмеймін, сабаққа деген ынтамыз оянды.Барлық информацияны алдық экологияға байланыст, табу оңай.Мұғалімдер жақсы түсіндіреді, аудармайды, бірақ соның өзінде бәрін түсінеміз. Дайындалған былай, ағылшынды дұрыс қайталабағандықтан, тексты бірінші оқимын аударамын, сөздердің оқылуын қайталаймын. Мұғалім соған баса назар аударады сөздің оқылуына.Сосын арнайы терминдерді аударуға тырысатынмын, қиын сөздерді жазып отырдым.
    5. Ағылшын тілінде оқытатын курстарда қандай қиындықтарға тап боласыз?
Студент: Басында.... сөйлеу қиын болды. Қазақ группасында жеңіл, ал ағылшын группасында сөйлеу жағынан қиын.Термин сөздерді түсіну қиын болды.Түсінбеген жағдайда мұғалім ағылшын тіліндегі жеңіл сөздермен айтуға тырысатын.Информацияны жинақтап, жеңілін айтып беретін.
    6. Пәннің мазмұнын оқытуда сіздің оқытушыларыңыздың ағылшын тілін меңгеру деңгейін қалай бағалайсыз? 1-ден 10-ға дейінгі шкала бойынша дағдыларын қалай бағалайсыз?
Студент: Бір ағай бар бізге беретін, ол кісіге 9 балл беремін, себебі ағылшын тілін жақсы меңгерген. Сабақ берген кезде лекциясы, тапсырмалары жақсы беріледі, сөздік қоры жақсы. Әр материал қызы беріледі.Болдаы кейде мысалы, 40 бет лекцияны оқу, түсіну қиын беріледі, бірақ бұл кісі презентацияда мысалы 36 шрифтпен 2 сөйлем жазуы мүмкін, бірақ нақта тақырыпқа байланысты.Түсіну жеңіл. Бір мұғалім болған, білім материал жағынан білім 9, бірақ сабаұты жүргіу жағынан қиын болды.

7. Сыныпта талқылау және оқу материалдарын түсіну үшін қандай тілді қолданасыз?

Студент: Қыздар, достар арасында, кейде, ағылшын қолданамыз, орысша сөйлесеміз. Мұғалім берген тапсырма тек ағылшын тілінде сөйлейміз, топта отырған кезде.Кейбір мұғалімдердің шарттары әр түрлі.Бір мұғалімге мысалы қазақша жауап берсеңіз ол жауап бермейді түсінбеген сияқты. Себебі ол басқа тіл.Кейбір мұғалімдер, ол кісілерге бәрібір, түсінбей жатсан. Қыздардың деңгейлері әр түрлі, солкезде кейбңр мұғалімдер орысша түсіндіріп береді және бізде әрі қарай орысша сөйлеп кетеміз.Сондай кейде болып тұрады.

г) Тілдік идеология туралы жетекші сұрақтар:

8. Сіз қазақстандық университеттерде ағылшын тілінде оқытудың рөлін қалай бағалайсыз?

Студент: Иа, менің ойымша, полиязда оқу немесе полияз группаларын ашу Қазақстанннның әр түрлі бөліктерінде өте керек. Себебі бізді маман ретінде дайындайды ғой, сол кезде біздің дүниетаным жан-жақты дамиды.Тек қана қазақша, орысша терминдерді ғана білмей оларды ағылшын тілінде де білсек. Мысалы біз халықаралық заңдарды өтеміз экологияға байланысты, және материал ағылшын тілінде көп. Маған қызық, материалды жинау, ой бекіту ағылшын тілінде пайдалы. Тек ағылшын тілінде оқу керек деп айтпаймын, араластырып оқыған пайдалы.

9. Сіздің ағылшын тіліндегі курстарды оқуыңыздың себептері қандай?

Студент: ... негізі менің басты мақсатым ол мүмкіндік. Себебі 3 тілде оқыту маған қызық сияқты болып көрінді. Болашақ жұмысқа орналасуға, ағылшын тілін жалпы жақсартуға деген қызығушылығым болды.Ағылшын тілінде бітірген ол да болашақта жақсы.

10. Сіздің ойыңызша, ағылшын тілі, сіздің академиялық үлгеріміңіз бен жұмыс орнындағы болашақ табысыңыз үшін қаншалықты қажет? 1-ден 10-ға дейінгі шкала бойынша айырмашылықты қалай бағалайсыз?

Студетн: .. жалпы өте маңызды. Мысалы мен ағылшын білсем, қазақша сөйлейтін студенттен артықпын деп ойлаймын. Сосын барлық материал ағылшын тілінде болғандықтан өте ыңғайлы.

11. Ағылшын тілінде оқытудың сіздің ағылшын тілін жетілдіруіңізге және пәндік оқуларыңызға деген әсерін қалай қабылдайсыз? (Yeh, C-C, 2015 бойынша бейімделген)

Студент: Негізі..... осы полиязға көшкеннен бері, біз топпен жұмыс істеген кезде грамматикадан қателесміз, сөзді ұмытып кетеміз. Сөйлегенде ол байқалады қандай қателік жіберіп жатқанымыз, сол жағдайлар қатты көмектесті. Қазір дұрысталды.Сосын басында сөйлеуге қиын болатын, сөздерді ұмытып қалам, көп ойланамын. Сөздерді аударуға болмайды дейді ғой, ол өзі шығу керек, ал қазір менде басқаша оңай аударамын және сөйлеймін. Сол грамматика және сөйлеу дұрысталды, дамыды.

д) Тілді басқару туралы жетекші сұрақтар:

12. Ағылшын тілінде оқыту курстарындағы тәжірибеңіз кезінде оқу орнынан қандай тілдік қолдау алдыңыз?

Студент: Көмек жағынан негізі қиын болды. Осы топқа ауысқаннан кейін кейбір қыздарға өте қиын болды, бір топ болғаннан кейін, олардың эмоциялары бір – бірімзге берілді, егер олар реңжіп, қиналып жатса. Мысалы ол қыздар тек қана 5ке оқып келген, сосын ағылшын группасына көшкеннен кейін олар кейбір сөздерді шатастырады, кейбір сұрақтарға жауап бере алмайды. Сол кезде қыздардың көңіл күйі маған берілді.Сосын біз өзіміз жиналып деканатқа бардық. Бір қыздың жағдайы өте қиын болды, ол мүлдем түсінбеді.Ағылшын тобына көшті, тест тапсыра алды,

бірақ оқығандатүсінбеді, сөйлемеді.Біз ол қызға қиын болғаннан кейін мүмкін ол орысша оқиыды немесе орыс группасына көшсін, немесе көмек берілсе деп айттық. Бізге ешкім көмек берген жоқ, біз бәрібір деген сияқты болды. Бір-бірімізді алып шықтық

13. Сіз ағылшын тілінде білім беру үшін оқу орны ұсынатын оқу ресурстарымен қанағаттанасыз ба? 1-ден 10-ға дейінгі шкала бойынша қалай бағалайсыз?

Студент: 5-6 солай. Негізі қанағаттанбаймын мүлдем. Біз полиязда 3 курстан бастап оқып жатырмыз ғой, материалдын бәрі қайталана берді. Не оқысақта біз материалды толық, нақты нүктесіне жетпейміз, сосын келесі курста сол материалды қайта оқимыз. Мысал «National use of natural resources», сосын сол сабақ келесі курста кішкене өзгереді, бірақ мазмұны толықтай бірдей. Негізі, ол тек ағылшын группасында ғана емес, қазақ группасында да солай. Мүмкін экология қатты дамымағандықтан шығар, басқа салаларды білмеймін, бірақ бізде материал аз.

е) Қорытынды сұрақ:

14. Сіз қосқыңыз келетін тағы бір нәрсе бар ма?

Студент: Негізі, осы группада оқығаныма өте қуаныштымын. Басында қорқыныш болды, бірақ тек қана ағылшын тілін ғана жақсарған жоқ, болашаққа деген көзқарас өзгерді. Еңбеңқорлығым өсті. Себебі қазақша оқу оңай ғой сөйлей берасін, ойыңды айтасын. Ал мында шынымен еңбектену керек болды, сабаққа деген ынтам оянды. Негізі 2 курстан көшуге болушы еді, бірақ тест ешкім тапсырмады, біз қорықтық.

ж) Аяқтау:

Біздің сұхбатымыз аяқталды. Мен сіздің өткізген уақытыңыз бен қызығушылығыңызды өте бағалаймын. Сіздің ақпаратыңыз тек біздің зерттеуіміз үшін пайдаланылатынына және құпиялылыққа кепілдік беремін. Үлкен рахмет!

Зерттеуге ұсынылатын сұрақтар:

а) Q3: Сіз IELTS немесе басқа тілдік сынақтардан өттіңіз бе?

Студент: Жоқ былай болды, негізі айлтс бар барлар өтті, ал жоқ балалар тест тапсырдық. Балл бойынша 5 балл болу керек болды, бірақ сөйлеу бөлімі болған жоқ. Тест тапсырғанда С1 тапсырдық, бірақ арамызда деңгейіміз В1, В2 болады.Рейтингіміз аралас, барлығымыздікі бірдей емес.

б) Q6: Ағылшын тілінде оқыту курстарын оқыту үшін оқытушылар ағылшын тілін өте жақсы білуі керек деп ойлайсыз ба?

Студент: Негізі, алдымызда профессионал болғандықтан,ағылшынша бере тұра, өзі дұрыс білмей тұрса кішкене қызық болады.Бірақ дегенмен өз туған тілі емес екенін ескеру керек.

в) Q7: Сіз қандай тілдік дағдыларды жетілдіру керек деп ойлайсыз?

г) Q12: Сіз ағылшын тілінде оқыту курстарын тек ағылшын тілінде оқыту керек деп ойлайсыз ба?

Студент: Негізі, бізде менің ойымша, группада қыздардың деңгейі әр түрлі. Сабақта түк түсінбей отырғанша, қазақша түсіндіргеннен ештеңе кетпейді деп ойлаймын. Себебі біз полияз группасымыз ғой, өзі аты айтып тұрғандай бірнеше тілде жүргізу мұғалімдердің мақсаты деп ойлаймын.

Appendix C

Coding Process of Teachers' and Students' Interviews

The Individual Semi-Structured Interview Questionnaire for Teachers	Preliminary Codes	Final Codes	Categories	
I studied German at school, but after entering the university they wanted to send me back to the German group, but I did not want to and decided to start with English. Basically, I was self-taught and then went to the Americans for 2 years to take courses, I studied independently at the university. Specialists from North America came and I also attended their courses for 9 months and received a certificate. Then I applied for Bolashak, I was invited to England, but it was difficult for me to get the appropriate score in the IBT TOEFL. At that time, we took this test in Tashkent (Uzbekistan) and in general I did not score 90 points. Therefore, I entered a Kazakh university, attending various courses, discussion clubs. Now at work, I work with foreigners (with the heads). My personal level is upper-intermediate /pre-advanced.	At school - German At Uni - English Self-taught 2 year courses with Americans 9 months courses with native speakers (certified) Now work with foreigners Level is upper-intermediate/pre-advanced	**Influence of English on students proficiency** See progress course by course Do not force all, but who wants Support multilingual groups Polylingual group students knowledge is average (Russian 1, Kazakh 3) Some groups are weak, some are highly enthusiastic Sometimes English is not the probleam of weakness, it is about desire If a person knows, he will explain at least in one language	**6 codes**	**Language managment**
You know, I learned German at school and at university. I started studying English after graduating from university, because there was such a strong need I didn't study it as so seriously. I studied it over the years as little by little. There were some paid courses, then independently, then resumed training. It happened that I got on the same course several	At school - German At Uni - English Learnt English little by little Language courses	**Support** Courses are organized No time Workload	**Education** 2 - abroad (English) 2 - Kazakhstan (Russian, Kazakh)	
In fact, although I graduated from high school with a gold medal, I think English was the foundation of my school days, but I don't care. But while studying at the same university, there was a situation when a competition was held and good students had the opportunity to go to America. In the same 1 month, I prepared and won the competition. But as I look at it now, my education at the time was one that could only be used at the home level. Then I developed the language a little in America for 1 year, but after entering the 3,4,5 course, the language was not needed. I studied in a Russian group, it was not necessary. Then, after receiving the work, everything was in Russian. When I defended this candidate, the minimum requirement was English, I quickly learned the language and passed it. Then, when I heard about the Future program, I prepared very carefully, went through all the stages and studied in the UK. We studied the language there for 6 months, and then for 1 year there were no problems. At that time, IELTS was 6.5. Then, consciously, I started teaching in 2013. Indeed, in multilingualism, you prepare yourself, there were times when you sat down at 4-5 O'clock in the evening. I studied all the presentations of the same UK, and then introduced the binary method at the University. It's good. These multilingual	At school - English At Uni - participated in 1 exchange program in the USA Bolashak program IELTS 6.5 Teach since 2013 Prepared for the lesson till 4-5am. English level improved during 7 years of teaching Every single class was challenging	**EMI cources effectiveness** 8-9 as courses for those who needs Discussion clubs, language practicing courses are needed Low presentational, oratorical skills Afraid to speak in of audience 8, there is everything	**Learning English** At school and uni - German 2-language courses Didn't study English specifically 2-At school - German 2-At Uni - English Self-taught 2 year courses with Americans 9 months courses with native speakers (certified) Learnt English little by little being a teachers attended courses At school - English At Uni - participated in 1 exchange program in the USA	

The Individual Semi-Structured Interview Questionnaire for Students	Preliminary Codes	Final Codes	Categories	
So I studied in an ordinary secondary school with orientation to biology and chemistry.	Mainstream school Orientation biology and chemistry	**Language proficiency** English - 60-70% Now understand everything	**5 codes**	**Language ideology**
2. What is your major and the year of study?		**Online and offline differences** Online easier "Cannot present orally" Offline is better No difference between online and offline study In Online, I am lazy In online, just copy but not learn	**Motivation** 2-Parents insisted, desire Prestige of English Interesting tasks, freedom in choice Enthusiasm because of teachers Sense of competition I know many people studying abroad I met people speak three languages fluently 2- overcome my fear, barriers I could not answer them but understood Brother and sister learnt English	
So, I'm in the 4th year, specialty ecology.	year 4	**Advantages** 2-easy to find information	**The role of English** A big bonus and advantage 9 as it helped me a lot Little information in Kazakh Publishing about Ecology is in English English seems to be easier in comparison to Kazakh in reading texts	
4th year student, Bachelor's degree	year 4	**Disadvantages** No academic English 2-Lack of teachers is sad Only some courses are in English Wanted to study in full polylingual group	**Only English beliefs** Not only in English speaking with little errors until it is clear is ok Not only in English, we are not native speakers	
Faculty of Natural Sciences, Ecology, I study in the 4th year.	year 4	**Necessary of EMI in HE in KZ** 3- International language, everywhere Trilingualism is important. Do not have people who could introduce the system English level is not satisfactory in KZ below average	**Necessary of EMI in HE in KZ** 3- International language, everywhere Trilingualism is important. Do not have people who could introduce the system English level is not satisfactory in KZ below average	
4th year, specialty ecology.	year 4	**Ideology and beliefs**	**Ideology and beliefs**	
Specialty "biotechnology", 3rd year	year 3	**The role of English**	**6 codes**	**Language management**
Biotechnology, 3rd year. Multilingual training began in the 2nd year. In principle, when you study in a multilingual group, there is nothing complicated, only some subjects are in English. And materials are easier to find than in Kazakh. Taught only 2-3 courses, so here.	year 3 Nothing is complicated in a multilingual group Only 2-3 courses in English	**Influence of EMI to English** Improved speaking and listening Not much to write General English and professional English cources helped a lot Learnt only grammar not the words in English courses	**Learning English** 5-Mainstream schools since 5th grade 1- NIS 3 - Learned with tutor from 4th, 8th grades 1- pre-intermediate level 1- competent school teacher	

Appendix D

Consent Form in English, Russian and Kazakh

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

(For students)

Exploring University Teachers' and Students' Perceptions and Experiences of English as a Medium of Instruction: Language Management, Ideology, and Practices

DESCRIPTION: You are invited to participate in a research study on your perceptions of the English language role in English taught courses that will help the study to understand students'experiences in these courses. You will be asked to participate in a face-to-face online interview via WhatsApp video call or ZOOM containing 10-15 questions in English, Russian or Kazakh depending on your choice. If you express your agreement, the interview will be tape-recorded. Your name and your institution name will be changed and anonymous in all stages of the research. All the electronic informed consent forms and recordings will be kept on the personal computer of the researcher and will be secured by the password. All the written and printed documents will be kept in a secure place. Finally, after one year, all the obtained electronic materials will be deleted from the researcher's computer and hard copies will be physically destroyed.
TIME INVOLVEMENT: Your participation will take approximately 30-45 minutes.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: The risks associated with this study, which are minimal, might be fear of sharing personal information with others; and absence of confidentiality and anonymity. To avoid these possible risks of the study the name of the institution will be unknown; your name will be concealed with initials in the transcript and a pseudonym used in the writing of the thesis. Interview recordings will be stored in a protected place. Information obtained from the interviews will not be shared with the university professors and administration. The comfortable time of the interviews will be negotiated with you and it will not disrupt your study. Your decision whether or not to participate in this study will not affect your grades and status.

The benefits which may reasonably be expected to result from this study are revealing new insights about the direct stakeholders' perceptions of the English language in English taught programs.

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 Master's Thesis Supervisor for this student work, Associate Professor Bridget Goodman at bridget.goodman@nu.edu.kz

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

Please sign this consent 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.
According to the law of the Republic of Kazakhstan an individual under the age of 18 is considered a child. Any participant falling into that category should be given the Parental Consent Form and have it signed by at least one of his/her parent(s) or guardian(s). In addition, the child must give assent to participate in the research. Both parent consent and child assent scripts should be included with this application.

ФОРМА ИНФОРМАЦИОННОГО СОГЛАСИЯ

Изучение представлений преподавателей и студентов университетов об опыте английского языка как средстве обучения: языковой менеджмент, идеология и практики

ОПИСАНИЕ: Вы приглашены принять участие в исследовании вашего восприятия роли английского языка на курсах с английским языком обучения, который поможет исследованию понять опыт студентов участвующих в данной программе. Вам будет предложено принять участие в очном онлайн-интервью с помощью видеозвонка WhatsApp или ZOOM, которое содержит 10-15 вопросов на английском, русском или казахском языках в зависимости от вашего выбора. Если вы выразите свое согласие, интервью будет записано на диктофон. Ваше имя и название вашего университета будут изменены и анонимными на всех этапах исследования. Все электронные формы информационного согласия и аудиозаписи будут храниться на персональном компьютере исследователя и будут защищены паролем. Все письменные и печатные документы будут храниться в надежном месте. По прошествии определенного времени, все полученные электронные материалы будут удалены с компьютера исследователя, а бумажные копии будут физически уничтожены.

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

РИСКИ И ПРЕИМУЩЕСТВА:

Риски, связанные с этим исследованием, которые минимальны, могут заключаться в страхе, поделиться личной информацией с другими; и отсутствие конфиденциальности и анонимности. Чтобы избежать этих возможных рисков исследования, название учебного заведения будет неизвестно; ваше имя будет скрыто инициалами в стенограмме и псевдонимом, используемым при написании тезиса. Записи интервью будут храниться в защищенном месте. Информация, полученная в ходе интервью, не будет передана профессорам и администрации университета. Комфортное время проведения собеседований оговаривается с каждым участником и не мешает учебе участников. Ваше решение участвовать или не участвовать в этом исследовании не повлияет на вашу оценки и статус.

В качестве ожидаемых преимуществ в результате исследования можно рассматривать результат этого исследования, который поможет раскрыть новые взгляды на восприятие английского языка в программах с преподаванием на английском языке непосредственными заинтересованными сторонами в Казахстане.

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 руководителям магистерского тезиса исследователя: Ассоциированный Профессор Бриджет Гудман, bridget.goodman@nu.edu.kz

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

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

- Я внимательно изучил представленную информацию;
- Мне предоставили полную информацию о целях и процедуре исследования;
- Я понимаю, как будут использованы собранные данные, и что доступ к любой конфиденциальной информации будет иметь только исследователь;
- Я понимаю, что вправе в любой момент отказаться от участия в данном исследовании без объяснения причин;
- С полным осознанием всего вышеизложенного я согласен принять участие в исследовании по собственной воле.

Подпись: _____   Дата: _____

ЗЕРТТЕУ ЖҰМЫСЫ КЕЛІСІМІНІҢ АҚПАРАТТЫҚ ФОРМАСЫ

Оқу құралы ретіндегі ағылшын тілі тәжірибесі туралы университет оқытушылары мен студенттерінің көзқарастары зерттеу: тілдік менеджмент, идеология және практика

СИПАТТАМА: Сіз ағылшын тілінде оқытатын курстардағы ағылшын тілінің ролін қабылдауды зерттеуге бағытталған зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға шақырылып отырсыз. Осы тақырып аясында зерттеу студенттердің осы курстарға деген түсінігін анықтауға тырысады. Сізге қатысу ұсынылады. қатысуға шақырамыз. Сізге WhatsApp немесе ZOOM бейнеконференциясы арқылы сіздің таңдауыңызға байланысты ағылшын, орыс немесе қазақ тілдерінде 10-15 сұрақтары бар бетпе-бет онлайн сұхбаттасуға қатысу ұсынылады. Сұхбат диктофонға сіз келісім берген жағдайда жазылатын болады. Зерттеудің барлық кезеңдерінде сіздің атыңыз бен сіздің университетіңіздің аты өзгертіліп, жасырын болады. Ақпараттық келісім мен аудиожазбалардың барлық электрондық түрлері зерттеушінің жеке компьютерінде сақталады және парольмен қорғалған болады. Барлық жазылған және басылған құжаттар қауіпсіз жерде сақталады. Белгілі бір уақыттан кейін барлық алынған электронды материалдар зерттеушінің компьютерінен жойылады, ал қағаз көшірмелері физикалық түрде жойылады.

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

ЗЕРТТЕУ ЖҰМЫСЫНА ҚАТЫСУДЫҢ ҚАУІПТЕРІ МЕН АРТЫҚШЫЛЫҚТАРЫ:

Зерттеу жұмысына қатысудың қауіптері минималды. Олар жеке ақпаратты басқалармен бөлісуден қорқуына байланысты; және құпиялылық пен анонимділіктің болмауынан болуы мүмкін. Зерттеудің ықтимал қауіптерін болдырмас үшін оқу орнының атауы белгісіз болады; сіздің атыңыз транскрипциядағы бас әріптермен және тезис жазу кезінде қолданылатын бүркеншік атпен жасырылады. Сұхбат жазбалары қауіпсіз орында сақталады. Сұхбат барысында алынған ақпарат университет профессорлары мен әкімшілік құрамына берілмейді. Сұхбат өткізуге қолайлы уақыт әр қатысушымен келісіледі және қатысушылардың оқуына кедергі болмайды. Зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға келісім беруіңіз немесе бас тартуыңыз Сіздің бағаларығызға немесе мәртебеңізге еш әсерін тигізбейді.

Зерттеу жұмысына қатысуыңыздың келесідей артықшылықтары болуы мүмкін: осы зерттеудің нәтижесі Қазақстандағы ағылшын тілінде оқытылатын бағдарламаларына тікелей қатысушылардың ағылшын тілін қабылдауы туралы жаңа көзқарастарды ашуға көмектеседі.

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. Қауымдастырылған Профессор Бриджет Гудман, bridget.goodman@nu.edu.kz

ДЕРБЕС БАЙЛАНЫС АҚПАРАТТАРЫ: Егер берілген зерттеу жұмысының жүргізілуімен қанағаттанбасаңыз немесе сұрақтарыңыз бен шағымдарыңыз болса, Назарбаев Университеті Жоғары Білім беру мектебінің Зерттеу Комитетімен көрсетілген байланыс құралдары арқылы хабарласуыңызға болады: электрондық поштамен gse_researchcommittee@nu.edu.kz

Зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға келісіміңізді берсеңіз, берілген формаға қол қоюыңызды сұраймыз.

- Мен берілген формамен мұқият таныстым;
- Маған зерттеу жұмысының мақсаты мен оның процедурасы жайында толық ақпарат берілді;
- Жинақталған ақпарат пен құпия мәліметтерге тек зерттеушінің өзіне қолжетімді және мәлім болатынын толық түсінемін;
- Мен кез келген уақытта ешқандай түсініктемесіз зерттеу жұмысына қатысудан бас тартуыма болатынын түсінемін;
- Мен жоғарыда аталып өткен ақпаратты саналы түрде қабылдап, осы зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға өз келісімімді беремін.

Қолы: _____   Күні: _____

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

(For teachers)

Exploring University Teachers' and Students' Perceptions and Experiences of English as a Medium of Instruction: Language Management, Ideology, and Practices

DESCRIPTION: You are invited to participate in a research study on your perceptions of the English language role in English taught courses that will help the study to understand teachers' experiences in these courses. You will be asked to participate in a face-to-face online interview via WhatsApp video call or ZOOM containing 10-15 questions in English, Russian or Kazakh depending on your choice. If you express your agreement, the interview will be tape-recorded. Your name and your institution name will be changed and anonymous in all stages of the research. All the electronic informed consent forms and recordings will be kept on the personal computer of the researcher and will be secured by the password. All the written and printed documents will be kept in a secure place. Finally, after one year, all the obtained electronic materials will be deleted from the researcher's computer and hard copies will be physically destroyed.

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

RISKS AND BENEFITS: The risks associated with this study, which are minimal, might be fear of sharing personal information with others; and absence of confidentiality and anonymity. To avoid these possible risks of the study, the name of the institution will be unknown; your name will be concealed with initials in the transcript and a pseudonym used in the writing of the thesis. Interview recordings will be stored in a protected place. Information obtained from the interviews will not be shared with the university professors and administration. The comfortable time of the interviews will be negotiated with each participant and it will not disrupt participants' work. Your decision whether or not to participate in this study will not affect your employment and status.

The benefits which may reasonably be expected to result from this study are receiving new insights about the direct stakeholders' perceptions about the English language in English taught programs in Kazakhstan.

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 Master's Thesis Supervisor for this student work, Associate Professor Bridget Goodman at bridget.goodman@nu.edu.kz

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

Please sign this consent 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.
According to the law of the Republic of Kazakhstan an individual under the age of 18 is considered a child. Any participant falling into that category should be given the Parental Consent Form and have it signed by at least one of his/her parent(s) or guardian(s). In addition, the child must give assent to participate in the research. Both parent consent and child assent scripts should be included with this application.

ФОРМА ИНФОРМАЦИОННОГО СОГЛАСИЯ

Изучение представлений и опыта преподавателей и студентов университетов об английском языке как средстве обучения: управление языками, идеология и практики

ОПИСАНИЕ: Вы приглашены принять участие в исследовании вашего восприятия роли английского языка на курсах с английским языком обучения, который поможет исследованию понять опыт преподавателей участвующих в данной программе. Вам будет предложено принять участие в очном онлайн-интервью с помощью видеозвонка WhatsApp или ZOOM, которое содержит 10-15 вопросов на английском, русском или казахском языках в зависимости от вашего выбора. Если вы выразите свое согласие, интервью будет записано на диктофон. Ваше имя и название вашего университета будут изменены и анонимными на всех этапах исследования. Все электронные формы информационного согласия и аудиозаписи будут храниться на персональном компьютере исследователя и будут защищены паролем. Все письменные и печатные документы будут храниться в надежном месте. По прошествии определенного времени, все полученные электронные материалы будут удалены с компьютера исследователя, а бумажные копии будут физически уничтожены.
ВРЕМЯ УЧАСТИЯ: Ваше участие потребует около 30-45 минут.

РИСКИ И ПРЕИМУЩЕСТВА:

Риски, связанные с этим исследованием, которые минимальны, могут заключаться в страхе, поделиться личной информацией с другими; и отсутствие конфиденциальности и анонимности. Чтобы избежать этих возможных рисков исследования, название учебного заведения будет неизвестно; ваше имя будет скрыто инициалами в стенограмме и псевдонимом, используемым при написании тезиса. Записи интервью будут храниться в защищенном месте. Информация, полученная в ходе интервью, не будет передана профессорам и администрации университета. Комфортное время проведения собеседований оговаривается с каждым участником и не мешает работе участников. Ваше решение участвовать или не участвовать в этом исследовании не повлияет на вашу работу и статус.

В качестве ожидаемых преимуществ в результате исследования можно рассматривать результат этого исследования, который поможет раскрыть новые взгляды на восприятие английского языка в программах с преподаванием на английском языке непосредственными заинтересованными сторонами в Казахстане.

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 руководителям магистерского тезиса исследователя: Ассоциированный Профессор Бриджет Гудман, bridget.goodman@nu.edu.kz.

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

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

- Я внимательно изучил представленную информацию;
- Мне предоставили полную информацию о целях и процедуре исследования;
- Я понимаю, как будут использованы собранные данные, и что доступ к любой конфиденциальной информации будет иметь только исследователь;
- Я понимаю, что вправе в любой момент отказаться от участия в данном исследовании без объяснения причин;
- С полным осознанием всего вышеизложенного я согласен принять участие в исследовании по собственной воле.

Подпись: _____   Дата: _____

ЗЕРТТЕУ ЖҰМЫСЫ КЕЛІСІМІНІҢ АҚПАРАТТЫҚ ФОРМАСЫ

Оқу құралы ретіндегі ағылшын тілі туралы университет оқытушылары мен студенттерінің көзқарастарын және тәжірибелерін зерттеу: тілдік менеджмент, идеология және практика

СИПАТТАМА: Сіз ағылшын тілінде оқытатын курстардағы ағылшын тілінің ролін қабылдауды зерттеуге бағытталған зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға шақырылып отырсыз. Осы тақырып аясындағы зерттеу оқытушылардың осы курстарға деген түсінігін анықтауға тырысады. Сізге қатысу ұсынылады. қатысуға шақырамыз. Сізге WhatsApp немесе ZOOM бейнеконференциясы арқылы сіздің таңдауыңызға байланысты ағылшын, орыс немесе қазақ тілдерінде 10-15 сұрақтары бар бетпе-бет онлайн сұхбаттасуға қатысу ұсынылады. Сұхбат диктофонға сіз келісім берген жағдайда жазылатын болады. Зерттеудің барлық кезеңдерінде сіздің атыңыз бен сіздің университетіңіздің аты өзгертіліп, жасырын болады. Ақпараттық келісім мен аудиожазбалардың барлық электрондық түрлері зерттеушінің жеке компьютерінде сақталады және парольмен қорғалған болады. Барлық жазылған және басылған құжаттар қауіпсіз жерде сақталады. Белгілі бір уақыттан кейін барлық алынған электронды материалдар зерттеушінің компьютерінен жойылады, ал қағаз көшірмелері физикалық түрде жойылады.

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

ЗЕРТТЕУ ЖҰМЫСЫНА ҚАТЫСУДЫҢ ҚАУІПТЕРІ МЕН АРТЫҚШЫЛЫҚТАРЫ:

Зерттеу жұмысына қатысудың қауіптері минималды. Олар жеке ақпаратты басқалармен бөлісуден қорқуына байланысты; және құпиялылық пен анонимділіктің болмауынан болуы мүмкін. Зерттеудің ықтимал қауіптерін болдырмас үшін оқу орнының атауы белгісіз болады; сіздің атыңыз транскрипциядағы бас әріптермен және тезис жазу кезінде қолданылатын бүркеншік атпен жасырылады. Сұхбат жазбалары қауіпсіз орында сақталады. Сұхбат барысында алынған ақпарат университет профессорлары мен әкімшілік құрамына берілмейді. Сұхбат өткізуге қолайлы уақыт әр қатысушымен келісіледі және қатысушылардың жұмысына кедергі болмайды. Зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға келісім беруіңіз немесе бас тартуыңыз Сіздің жұмысыңызға немесе мәртебеңізге еш әсерін тигізбейді.

Зерттеу жұмысына қатысуыңыздың келесідей артықшылықтары болуы мүмкін: осы зерттеудің нәтижесі Қазақстандағы ағылшын тілінде оқытылатын бағдарламаларына тікелей қатысушылардың ағылшын тілін қабылдауы туралы жаңа көзқарастарды ашуға көмектеседі.

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**.** Қауымдастырылған Профессор Бриджет Гудман, bridget.goodman@nu.edu.kz.

ДЕРБЕС БАЙЛАНЫС АҚПАРАТТАРЫ: Егер берілген зерттеу жұмысының жүргізілуімен қанағаттанбасаңыз немесе сұрақтарыңыз бен шағымдарыңыз болса, Назарбаев Университеті Жоғары Білім беру мектебінің Зерттеу Комитетімен көрсетілген байланыс құралдары арқылы хабарласуыңызға болады: электрондық поштамен gse_researchcommittee@nu.edu.kz.

Зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға келісіміңізді берсеңіз, берілген формаға қол қоюыңызды сұраймыз.

- Мен берілген формамен мұқият таныстым;
- Маған зерттеу жұмысының мақсаты мен оның процедурасы жайында толық ақпарат берілді;
- Жинақталған ақпарат пен құпия мәліметтерге тек зерттеушінің өзіне қолжетімді және мәлім болатынын толық түсінемін;
- Мен кез келген уақытта ешқандай түсініктемесіз зерттеу жұмысына қатысудан бас тартуыма болатынын түсінемін;
- Мен жоғарыда аталып өткен ақпаратты саналы түрде қабылдап, осы зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға өз келісімімді беремін.

Қолы: _____   Күні: _____