

Running head: STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS AND USAGE OF TRANSLANGUAGING

**Russian-Dominant and Kazakh-Dominant Students' Perceptions and Usage of
Translanguaging: A Case with a Rural Kazakh-Medium Instruction School**

Assel Shakuliyeva

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Multilingual Education

Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education

May 2023

Word Count: 21 293

Author Agreement

By signing and submitting this license, I *Assel Shakuliyeva* (the author) 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. *Shakuliyeva*

Author's signature:

Date: 23.05.2023

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 acknowledgment 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: Shakuliyeva

Date: 15.05.2023

Ethical Approval

Dear Assel,

On **20/10/2022**, after the full board review of your application, subsequent revisions, and supporting documents, Nazarbayev University Institutional Research Ethics Committee (NU-IREC) approved the submission [615/29092022](#) "Russian Dominant and Kazakh Dominant Students' Perceptions on Translanguaging: A Case with a Rural Kazakh Medium of Instruction School". **Please note that the approval for this protocol will lapse on 19/10/2023.**

This approval is based on the information contained in the documents submitted by the PI. If there is any deviation from the approved protocol or any adverse event, **it is the PI's responsibility to inform NU-IREC immediately.** Please note that:

1. **It is the PI's responsibility to submit a signed hard copy of the application within three weeks of its approval. If the documents are not submitted in a timely manner, the project will be automatically considered as SUSPENDED by NU-IREC*.**
2. If the period of data collection must be extended, please complete "Appendix F: Request for Continuing IREC Approval Form" 4 to 6 weeks before the expiration of this approval.
3. If the protocol must be amended, complete "Appendix G: IREC Protocol Amendment Form".
4. If an event needs to be reported to NU-IREC please complete "Appendix H: Reportable Events Form".
5. It is a PI's responsibility to provide updated CITI training certifications for all team members prior to the expiration date.

The above forms are available at: <https://orci.nu.edu.kz/irec>

Please retain this email as evidence of approval in your study file.

***Please bring your signed application form to C4/650 within three weeks of approval.**

Kind regards,
Dilara



Dilara Sarbassova | Head, Office of
Research Compliance and Integrity
| Nazarbayev University | Office of Provost
| Phone: [+7 \(7172\) 70-91-05](tel:+77172709105)
| Cell ph: [+7-705-644-77-82](tel:+77056447782)
| Email: resethics@nu.edu.kz |
| Website: orci.nu.edu.kz/irec
| Address: 53 Kabanbay Batyr Avenue, Astana,
[Kazakhstan](#)
| Office: Block C4, room 650

CITI Training Certificate



Completion Date 21-Nov-2021
Expiration Date 20-Nov-2024
Record ID 46096760

This is to certify that:

Assel Shakuliyeva

Has completed the following CITI Program course:

Not valid for renewal of certification through CME.

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

Under requirements set by:

Nazarbayev University



Verify at www.citiprogram.org/verify/?wf4b1d109-ef11-4c6c-b0f2-3b9380a2d80d-46096760

Acknowledgment

This Master thesis is the culmination of my language transformation from half-Kazakh to polylingual person, as during these two years of studying, a term “Shala Kazakh” from being derogatory has transformed to a multilingual practice of translanguaging for me. Now, I know that constant translanguaging is evidence of an emerging multilingual repertoire which should be enhanced not criticized.

I want to express gratitude to all GSE MA professors who contributed to this transformation, specifically to Bridget Goodman, who helped me to shape my research interest. I want to give special credit to my supervisor Sulushash Kerimkulova, who skillfully helped me to find, analyze and then present all the findings and to reflect the local context of translanguaging practices in the Kazakhstani context.

I would also like to express my gratitude to Dr. Ainur Almukhambetova and GSE Instructor Jeremy Richard Spring for their support and help with academic writing and formatting the thesis. I want to thank Serikbolsyn Tastanbek for bringing the local phenomenon Shala Kazakh in academia, which inspired me to do this research in such a pair of languages as Kazakh - Russian languages, thereby extending research on translanguaging from English medium instruction to another pair of languages. It is great to realize that it is possible to bridge academia with the local community and by studying a local phenomenon to present people's understanding of it through the lens of research.

Abstract**Russian-Dominant and Kazakh-Dominant Students' Perceptions and Usage of Translanguaging: A Case with a Rural Kazakh-Medium Instruction School**

Following trilingual education policy in Kazakhstan, students' whole linguistic repertoire has been involved in classrooms by employing a translanguaging approach. However, absence of studies on translanguaging besides the English medium instruction context, raises questions about students' perceptions and usage of translanguaging in other contexts. The purpose of this qualitative study is to explore and compare the seventh - tenth grade Russian -dominant (RDSs) and Kazakh-dominant (KDSs) students' perceptions and usage of translanguaging in a rural school with the Kazakh-medium instruction in the North Kazakhstan Region.

Research questions explore KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging and identify similarities and/or differences between them based on the dominant language. Ruiz's (1984) conceptual framework of language orientations with language as a right, resource, and problem was employed in the study. The study used a qualitative research approach with case-study design and semi-structured interviews as a data collection instrument. The maximum variation purposeful sampling was used to recruit ten KDSs and RDSs for one-on-one online interviews. Findings showed that 70% of KDSs and RDSs participants were positive about translanguaging and reported using it as a right and/or resource in studying and communication processes. However, 30% of participants perceived translanguaging negatively as a problem due to feelings of disrespect to the mother tongue or non-acceptance but still acknowledged using it. It implies that students' awareness about translanguaging should be raised, and they should be provided with linguistic support. There were also more similarities than differences found between participants' perceptions and usage of translanguaging which implies that if students are supported by teachers, translanguaging may be used more effectively for multilingual education development.

Аңдатпа**Орыс Тілді және Қазақ Тілді Студенттердің Транслингвизмді Қабылдауы:****Қазақ Тілінде Оқытатын Ауыл Мектебінің Кейсі**

Үш тілді білім беру моделі енгеннен кейін, білім беру жүйесінде транслингвистикалық тәсілді қолдана бастағаны белгілі. Алайда, ағылшын тілінің контекстінен тыс транслингвизм бойынша зерттеулердің болмауы оқушылардың транслингвизмді басқа тілдік контексттерде қабылдауы мен қолдануы туралы сұрақтар туа бастады. Осыған байланысты біздің зерттеуіміздің басты мақсаты, Солтүстік Қазақстан облысындағы ауыл мектептеріндегі қазақ тілінде сөйлейтін (ҚТ) және орыс тілінде сөйлейтін (ОТ) 7-10 сынып аралығында оқитын оқушылардың транслингвизмді қабылдауы мен пайдалануы зерделеу және салыстыру болып табылады. Зерттеу сұрақтары ОТ және ҚТ сөйлейтін оқушылардың транслингвизмді қабылдауы мен қолданылуын және олардың арасындағы ұқсастықтар мен айырмашылықтарды зерттеуге бағытталады. Зерттеуде Руистің (1984) концептуалды тұжырымдары мен теориясы негізге алынды. Ғалымның тілдік бағдар туралы тұжырымдамалық теориясы негізге алынып, тіл-құқық, ресурс және мәселе деген пайымы бағдар болды. Зерттеу барысында жартылай құрылымдалған сұхбат тәсілі қолданылды. Зерттеудің мақсатын жүзеге асыру үшін ОТ және ҚТ сөйлейтін 10 оқушыдан онлайн сұхбат алынды. Нәтижесінде Солтүстік Қазақстан облысында қазақ тілінде оқитын ауыл мектебінің ОТ және ҚТ сөйлейтін оқушылардың 70 % (жетпіс пайызы) транслингвизмді құқық немесе ресурс ретінде қабылдайтынын және пайдаланатынын анықталды. Мұның себебі бұл бағдарлаулар оларға күнделікті білім алуда және коммуникациялық үдерістерде көмектесетін айтты. Дегенмен, талдау барысында ОТ және ҚТ оқушылардың 30% транслингвизмге мәселе ретінде қарайтынын анықталды. Олар транслингвизм ана тілді құрметтемеуге әкеледі деген сияқты мәселелерді алға тартты. Бірақ аталған 30% оқушы транслингвизмді қолданатынын

айтты. Бұл оқушылардың транслингвизм туралы білімін арттыру және оларға лингвистикалық қолдау көрсету қажет дегенді білдіреді. Сонымен қатар зерттеу барысында қатысушылардың транслингвизмді ұсынуы мен қолдануы арасындағы айырмашылықтардан гөрі ұқсастықтар бар екені анықталды. Егер оқытушылар оқушыларға транслингвизмді тиімді қолданудың үлгісін көрсетсе, онда транслингвизм көптілді білім беруді дамыту үшін тиімді болады деп ойлаймыз.

Аннотация

Трехязычная образовательная модель стала толчком для активизации и использования всего лингвистического репертуара студентов посредством транслингвистического подхода. Однако отсутствие исследований по транслингвизму вне контекста английского языка, приводит к вопросам о восприятии и использовании учащимися транслингвизма в других языковых контекстах. Целью данного исследования является изучение и сравнение восприятия и использования транслингвизма казахоговорящими (КГ) и русскоговорящими (РГ) учащимися с седьмого по десятый классы в сельской школе с казахским языком обучения в Северо-Казахстанской области. Данное исследование направлено на изучение восприятия и использования транслингвизма КГ и РГ учащимися, а также определяют сходства и различия между ними на основе доминирующего языка. В данном исследовании была использована концептуальная теория о языковых ориентациях Руиса (1984), включающая такие ориентации как: язык как право, ресурс и проблема. В рамках исследования использовался качественный подход, при котором в качестве инструмента были использованы полу структурированные интервью. Для набора десяти КГ и РГ учащихся в индивидуальных онлайн интервью был использован целевой отбор с рядом критериев. Результаты исследования показали, что семьдесят процентов РГ и КГ учащихся сельской школы с казахским языком обучения в Северо-Казахстанской области воспринимают и используют транслингвизм как право или как ресурс, который помогает им в обучении и коммуникационных процессах. Тем не менее, тридцать процентов РГ и КГ учащихся воспринимают транслингвизм как проблему, в основном из-за чувства неуважения к родному языку или из-за неприятия его, вызванных использованием транслингвизма, хотя эти же учащиеся признались, что используют транслингвизм. Это означает, что необходимо повышать осведомленность учащихся о транслингвизме и оказывать им лингвистическую поддержку. Кроме того, было выявлено больше сходств, чем

различий между представлениями и использованием транслингвизма участниками исследования что означает, что если бы преподаватели поддерживали учащихся в использовании транслингвизма, то транслингвизм мог бы более эффективно использоваться для развития многоязычного образования.

Table of Contents

Author Agreement.....	ii
Declaration.....	iii
Ethical Approval.....	iv
CITI Training Certificate.....	v
Acknowledgment.....	vi
Abstract.....	vii
Аңдатпа.....	viii
Аннотация.....	x
Table of Contents.....	xii
List of Tables.....	xv
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Personal Experience: My Language Transformation.....	1
Problem Statement.....	4
Purpose of the Study.....	5
Research Questions.....	6
Significance of the Study.....	6
Outline of the Study.....	6
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	8
Key Concepts.....	8
The Concept of Perceptions.....	8
The Concept of Multilingual Education.....	10
The Concept of Translanguaging in Multilingual Education.....	10
Multilingual Education in the International Context.....	12
The Shift From Monolingual to Bi-/Multilingual Education.....	12
Translanguaging in Multilingual Education.....	14
Translanguaging in the US Context.....	15
Translanguaging Practices in the Arabic/Southeastern Asian Contexts.....	15
Approaches in the Kazakhstani Context.....	16
Monolingual Approach.....	16
Students' perceptions of Challenges Within the Monolingual Approach.....	18
Perceptions and Usage of Translanguaging in the Kazakhstani Context.....	19
Translanguaging Practices in the Arabic/Southeastern Asian Contexts.....	18
Conceptual Framework	22
Conclusion.....	24

Chapter 3: Methodology.....25

 Research Approach and Design..... 25

 Sampling.....26

 Research Site..... 28

 Data Collection Instruments.....28

 Data Collection Procedures.....29

 Data Analysis Approach.....31

 Ethical Considerations.....32

 Conclusion.....32

Chapter 4: Findings..... 34

 KDSs' and RDSs' Perceptions of Translanguaging.....34

 KDSs' and RDSs' Perceptions of Translanguaging as a Legacy From the Past.....34

 Translanguaging as a Sign of Emerging Multilingualism.....36

 Translanguaging as the Right for People With Different Language Backgrounds Living
 in a Multinational Country..... 37

 Comfort of Translanguaging..... 37

 Translanguaging to Practice Foreign Languages..... 40

 Translanguaging as a Problem..... 40

 Feelings of Disrespect to the Mother Tongue.....41

 Non-Acceptance of Translanguaging.....41

 Usage of Translanguaging.....43

 Using Translanguaging as a Meaning-Making Language Practice for Learning Purposes.... 43

 Using Translanguaging for the Ease of Information Transmission and Better
 Understanding..... 43

 Translanguaging to Make New Terms/Content Clearer at Subjects..... 44

 Technology-Based Translanguaging for Pedagogical Purposes..... 45

 Using Translanguaging asa meaning-Making Language Practice for Communication
 Purposes.....46

 Translanguaging to Adjust to Communicators' Dominant Language..... 46

 Technology-Based Translanguaging for Communication Purposes During the Breaks.....48

 Similarities and Differences Between KDSs' and RDSs' Perceptions and Usage of
 Translanguaging.....49

 Conclusion.....52

Chapter 5: Discussion.....53

 RQ1: How do Students Perceive Translanguaging in a Rural KMI School?.....53

 Finding 1..... 53

Finding 2.....	54
Finding 3.....	55
RQ2: How do Students Use Translanguaging in a Rural KMI School?.....	58
Finding 4.....	59
Finding 5.....	60
RQ3: What are Similarities and/or Differences Between KDSs' and RDSs' Perceptions and Usage of Translanguaging in a Rural KMI School?.....	62
Finding 6.....	62
Finding 7.....	64
Conclusion.....	65
Chapter 6: Conclusion.....	66
Main Conclusions of the Study.....	66
Limitations and Recommendations for Further Research.....	68
Key Insights.....	70
References.....	71
Appendix A.....	82
Appendix B.....	83
Appendix C.....	86
Appendix D.....	88
Appendix E.....	90

List of Tables

Table 1. KDSs' and RDSs' Profiles	12
Table 2. Similarities and Differences Between KDSs' and RDSs' Perceptions and Usage of Translanguaging	31

Chapter 1: Introduction

Nowadays, most countries are linguistically diverse (Helot, 2012), and this situation teaches us to coexist peacefully. The reason explaining the existing language diversity is mainly related to globalism caused by migration within and outside countries due to which multilingualism has become more visible. However, multilingualism is mainly acknowledged on a societal level but not in the educational sector as the latter still uses a monolingual approach (Helot, 2012). And even though one can find the presence of several languages within the school curricula now, this primarily reflects the diversification of languages rather than multilingualism (Schissel et al., 2021; Helot, 2012).

Recently, however, evidence suggests that there has been a gradual shift from a monolingual approach, which implies the sole usage of the medium instruction, to a multilingual approach the involvement of students' first languages, even if they differ from the medium instruction (Garcia & Wei, 2014; Yilmaz & de Jong, 2020). Translanguaging may be highlighted as one of the approaches within multilingual education that involves students' first languages in classroom practices. Translanguaging within education was first defined by Williams (1994) as a trigger to switch between languages in classroom practice. Since then, the translanguaging approach has been researched in many countries (Aka, 2020; Canajarah, 2011; Garcia et al., 2014). One common reason why the translanguaging approach is gaining popularity within multilingual education in different countries is its ability to bridge community-language practices, i.e., students' first languages, with school language practices, which usually use only the medium of education and do not involve other languages. Additionally, studies on translanguaging have proved its effectiveness within formal education and outside it (Canajarah, 2011; Garcia et al., 2014; Yilmaz & de Jong, 2020), and more and more countries are trying to involve it as a pedagogical approach within schools.

Personal Experience: My language Transformation

I chose this research topic because I want to help other people like me, people who need to undergo a language transformation and make it as much as possible without stress. I have grown up in the North Kazakhstan Region which is mainly a Russian-dominant region (Gumarova, 2017). Its geographical position, the closest border to the Russian Federation, certainly affects students' sociolinguistic perspectives and learning process. While living in the North Kazakhstan Region, I experienced difficulties answering questions or expressing my opinion in Kazakh due to my low proficiency in Kazakh as the language we spoke at home and that I used with my friends was Russian.

The first time, I heard the term “*Shala Kazakh*” (half-Kazakh), which is considered a derogatory term and refers to people who cannot speak their mother tongue properly (Akanova, 2017; Tastanbek, 2019), was when I was communicating with my Kazakh-dominant cousins who lived in South Kazakhstan. I was offended by being called half-Kazakh and asked them to stop using that term. I justified my request by stating that being Kazakh did not only mean speaking Kazakh fluently but also meant one's willingness to learn the language and one's ability to value the culture and traditions of a nation. It helped me to convince my cousins. However, starting from that moment I realized the first feelings of my half-identity, and whenever I spoke Kazakh, I was afraid to hear the accusation of being *Shala Kazakh*, especially from the older generation. Moreover, I felt conflicted about my accent in Kazakh and my determination to speak it fluently and correctly, which complicated my process of learning and speaking in it.

I never thought to see the term “*Shala Kazakh*” in the academic context, but how big was my surprise when Bridget Goodman, my first professor, who taught Foundation of Multilingualism, mentioned Tastanbek's (2019) research and highlighted his interest in researching the term half Kazakh within translanguaging. Immediately after class I found Tastanbek's (2019) research and analyzed it. Even though Tastanbek explored pre-service

teachers' beliefs on translanguaging in the English as a foreign language (EFL) context, not in terms of the Kazakh-Russian context, he skillfully emphasized the fact that translanguaging practices in the Kazakhstani context are common. For example, Tastanbek (2019) stated that "'Shala Kazakh' is a derogatory term used about the translanguaging practices on the part of those unable to speak 'pure' Kazakh" (p. 11). The way he replaced the offending term "Shala Kazakh" with the common academic term "translanguaging" helped me finally to overcome my half-Kazakh feelings. I understood that my translanguaging practices, which may be mocked by people who speak pure Kazakh, are natural for other people except me and even though I mix languages I still can express my ideas clearly by using my whole linguistic repertoire. Moreover, after taking more courses within my Multilingual Education program, I more clearly realized that the society that condemns people who cannot speak languages purely can be biased by the monolingual view. Hence, instead of trying to reach native-like proficiency in one language by criticizing yourself or others, it is more worthwhile to raise society's awareness about translanguaging practices within multilingual education.

While analyzing assigned readings within the master's program, I also realized that the concept of a half speaker like Shala Kazakh is found in other countries as well. For example, the term "half-Hispanic" is used to refer to Spanish who speak English well but do not know their mother tongue and due to it are mocked by their Spanish speaking students (Yilmaz, 2021).

It is important that people who are called half-Kazakhs and those who call other people Shala Kazakhs should understand the historical and sociopolitical factors like the Russification policy in Kazakhstan that strongly affected the language situation in the country (Fierman, 2006; Smagulova, 2008). Society should understand that it is not a person's unwillingness that limits their proficiency but the absence of conditions to learn it.

My language identity has transformed from half to poly, mainly because of professors, especially my advisor Sulushash Kerimkulova, who raised my awareness about multilingualism and plurilingualism. Finally, my language transformation happened due to my engagement with young but prominent Kazakhstani researchers who work on translanguaging and contributing to the literature. These personal experiences pushed me to choose this topic to research and see how other Russian or Kazakh-dominant students perceive and use translanguaging.

Problem Statement

The research problem highlights that little attention has been paid to translanguaging in the Kazakhstani context, particularly to students whose first language (L1) is Russian but who study in Kazakh-medium instruction (KMI) rural schools. Most studies in Kazakhstan have focused only on teachers' or university students' beliefs on translanguaging within the EFL context (Akhmetova, 2021; Amaniyazova, 2020). Even though previous studies showed that students studying through the English medium instruction used translanguaging (Kuandykov, 2021; Ospanova, 2017; Tastanbek, 2019), it is not feasible to generalize these results. This is mainly because English is a foreign language for most Kazakhstani students, whereas RDSs' and KDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging in the Kazakh -Russian language pair may be different.

Another issue that emphasizes the importance of research is the geographical and historical situations in Kazakhstan. The analysis shows that Kazakhstan has been strongly Russified after becoming a Soviet republic due to its close location to Russia. Russification, which lasted for almost seventy years, led to a dramatic increase in the number of schools with Russian medium instruction (RMI), while schools with Kazakh-medium instruction, on the contrary, decreased sharply (Fierman, 2006; Smagulova, 2008). Russification in education only ended after Kazakhstan gained independence. Under President Nazarbayev's

new trilingual policy, schools implemented a new multilingual language policy with the Kazakh language, with some minority languages like Uighur and Kyrgyz as medium instructions and mixed schools with Kazakh and Russian medium instructions (IAC, 2014). As a result, more and more Russified Kazakh families started to give their children to KMI schools to maintain their children's mother tongue knowledge (Tenbay, 2021).

However, teachers in KMI schools are still reluctant to use languages other than Kazakh mainly to support Kazakh language maintenance and due to standardized tests, which are held and assessed monolingually (Akhmetova, 2021; Kuandykov, 2021; Tenbay, 2021). This determination to maintain the Kazakh language and monolingual assessment, in their turn, may affect classroom practices by excluding languages other than the medium instruction (Schissel et al., 2021; Tastanbek, 2019). Additionally, translanguaging may be viewed as scaffolding only in primary schools (Garcia, 2009; Tastanbek, 2019), but may not be employed in secondary or high school because students are supposed to become more proficient in a target language by then.

Finally, Russian-dominant, and Kazakh-dominant students' perceptions and usage of translanguaging may be affected by their language ideologies and monolingual approach bias. Such students may think that using languages other than the medium instruction may hinder the learning of the target language, i.e., Kazakh. For example, Tenbay (2021) showed that students in a KMI school had problems with reading comprehension that resulted in academic underachievement and negative relation towards the medium instruction if they were not allowed to use translanguaging. Therefore, the problem refers to exploring and comparing the RDSs' and KDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging, specifically for the Kazakh-Russian language pair in a rural KMI school in Northern Kazakhstan.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative study is to explore and compare the seventh to tenth-grade RDSs' and KDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging in a rural school with the KMI in the North Kazakhstan Region.

Research Questions

1. How do KDSs and RDSs in a rural KMI school perceive translanguaging?
2. How do KDSs and RDSs in a rural KMI school use translanguaging?
3. What are the similarities and/or differences between RDSs' and KDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging in a rural KMI school?

Significance of the Study

The significance of the proposed qualitative research is that it contributes to the research literature on translanguaging in the post-Soviet countries, which faced the issue of mother tongue loss during Sovietization followed by attempts to revitalize and maintain it since independence. Various stakeholders may benefit from the study. Firstly, Kazakhstani policymakers like Education Department inspectors, and school principals may grasp Russian-dominant and Kazakh-dominant students' perceptions of translanguaging in a Kazakh-medium instruction school. They may collaborate with curriculum developers to find possible implementational spaces for translanguaging within the curriculum if necessary. Secondly, teachers in turn can think of having some changes in teaching practices to enhance the teaching and learning processes. Thirdly, students may become more aware of translanguaging practices in Kazakh-medium instruction schools, and they can undergo their language transformation from Shala Kazakh to polylingual person as happened to me during my study at Nazarbayev University. Students may also see how language dominance and medium instruction may affect students' perceptions and usage of translanguaging as the study compared the Russian - dominant and Kazakh-dominant students.

Outline of the Study

This chapter provided information on multilingual education development with a focus on translanguaging as one of the approaches within it and on personal language issues, which led to the choice of the topic. Moreover, it presented the problem statement, the purpose of the study, the research questions, and the significance of the study.

The second chapter in this thesis is the literature review chapter. Five significant bodies of literature are critically reviewed: (a) key concepts, (b) theoretical framework, (c) multilingual education in the international context, and (d) approaches in the Kazakhstani context. Critical research gaps are identified and presented in the conclusion section.

The methodology chapter presents the research design, provides the rationale for choosing the researched sample, and site, and gives a detailed description of data collection and analysis. Finally, this chapter presents the ethical considerations, which is important as the sample of seventh-tenth-grade students represents the vulnerable population.

The fourth chapter shows the main findings followed by a discussion chapter through the lens of the conceptual framework chosen for the study and literature presented in the second chapter.

The final chapter is devoted to the conclusions in the study and highlights the implications for the following studies and provides recommendations to stakeholders.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

This chapter presents the analysis and synthesis of the literature that was critically reviewed for the study to answer the following research questions:

1. How do KDSs and RDSs in a rural KMI school perceive translanguaging?
2. How do KDSs and RDSs in a rural KMI school use translanguaging?
3. What are the similarities and/or differences between KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging in a rural KMI school?

The purpose of the study is threefold. First, it helps to add to the knowledge of students' perceptions and usage of translanguaging by exploring Kazakh-dominant and Russian-dominant students' (KDSs/RDSs henceforth) perceptions and usage of translanguaging in a rural KMI school in the North Kazakhstan Region. Second, it helps to compare KDSs and RDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging to identify if there are any similarities/differences between them. Finally, the research is built upon Ruiz's (1984) conceptual framework on language orientations viewing translanguaging (a) as a resource, (b) as a right, (c) as a problem, and if there is any contradiction between KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and usage of it.

Four significant bodies of literature were critically reviewed and are presented in the sections below: (a) key concepts, (b) theoretical framework, (c) multilingual education in the international context, and (d) the approaches in the Kazakhstani context. Critical research gaps were identified and presented in the conclusion section.

Key Concepts

This section presents the main concepts that are employed in the study: perceptions, multilingual education, and translanguaging. As there are different definitions of these concepts across countries and different contexts and scholars also define them differently, it is important to identify a definition of each concept that fits the study better.

The Concept of Perceptions

It is important to define the concept of perceptions because they are based on participants' own cognitive interpretations referring to their experiences and beliefs. And as each participant's experience and beliefs may vary, it is rational to see how much an individual and group's perceptions differ and why they differ. Moreover, as the concept of perception is used in many various fields, such as psychology, science, and philosophy (Gregory, 1980; Huttner et al., 2013; Matthen, 2015; Pickens, 2005; Tuan, 1990), it is extremely important to examine the definition of perceptions for the study to present participants' perceptions in this study more completely. For example, Fish (2021) defined the concept of perceptions in the philosophical sphere and claimed that the concept of perceptions is linked with conscious experiences that are mentally constructed by the brain analyzing the situations and experiences which an individual or a group has gone through. Because each individual or group of people has unique experiences and cognitive abilities, one and the same situation can be perceived differently. In psychology, it is believed that an individual's and/or group's perceptions can change with time (Griggs, 2010; Stanley et al., 2016). Gibson and Pick (1963), for example, stated that as people grow up, they can experience the same situation a few times but by using the previous experience and lessons learned from last time, people may perceive it differently. Finally, in science, the concept of perceptions refers to cognitive experiences that change with time (Goldstone et al., 2010). Unlike skills like speaking or writing, which need instruction-based approaches and are usually thoroughly trained within formal education, perceptions are formed naturally by being exposed to stimuli. Based on this brief analysis of the concept of perceptions in science, philosophy, and psychology, the definition that was chosen for the study is "perceptions are linked with conscious experiences that are mentally constructed by the brain analyzing the situations and experiences which an individual or a group has gone through" (Fish, 2021).

The Concept of Multilingual Education

The concept of multilingual education also has different definitions in different contexts. In some contexts, multilingual education can mean the presence of more than one language in a curriculum, mainly as language subjects (de Jong, 2011). In other contexts, multilingual education refers to the usage of more than one language as a medium of instruction in schools. Usually, these languages are either regional, national, or international languages like English, which are different from students' home languages (Heugh et al., 2019; Hornberger & Johnson, 2007; Liddicoat, 2013; Lo Bianco, 2010; Johnson, 2013) and do not provide social justice within formal education. However, Cenoz (2013) and Hornberger (2002) highlighted the importance of social justice within multilingual education. For example, Cenoz (2013) stated that multilingual education should involve languages with a status weaker than other languages either due to a small number of speakers (Frisian) or due to their limited roles in communication processes (Quechua). Helot (2012) extended the definition of multilingual education and claimed that it should not be limited to the number of languages in the curriculum since it mainly reflects the diversification of languages but not the diversity. In contrast, Helot (2012) stated that multilingual education should guarantee that students may use their whole linguistic repertoire and that teachers should support them in it. So, based on the analysis of definitions of multilingual education, Helot's (2012) definition of multilingual education was chosen for the study as it fully includes the principles of multilingual education without limiting it to the number of languages or language status.

The Concept of Translanguaging in Multilingual Education

Translanguaging is one of the practices within multilingual education that help to activate a student's linguistic resources both within formal education and in the community. The origins of translanguaging go back to 1994 in Wales, when Cen Williams, used the word

trawsiethu in the Welsh educational context. The Welsh concept of translanguaging focused on using and examining the potential of translanguaging practices in the educational domain to strengthen the position of the Welsh language and help Welsh students to learn and speak their mother tongue alongside the English language. After some time, the Welsh word *trawsiethu* was first converted into *translinguifying* in English and then to translanguaging (Lewis et al., 2012).

Since then, more and more scholars worldwide have started to use the concept of translanguaging in their studies and a lot of definitions of this concept have appeared. For example, scholars in the USA suggest that translanguaging is not merely code-switching between different languages in one's linguistic repertoire but language practice that happens naturally during communication without any language boundaries (Hornberger & Link, 2012; Otheguy et al., 2015). Garcia and Wei (2014) extended the definition of translanguaging further by claiming that translanguaging helps students to activate their whole linguistic repertoire and value all their languages which helps to promote multilingualism. Garcia and Otheguy (2020) argue that translanguaging says that translanguaging can act as scaffolding, especially in foreign language learning or when students' dominant languages differ from the medium instruction (Garcia & Otheguy, 2020). In the Kazakhstani context, Tastanbek (2019) stated that translanguaging is not only associated with the students' perceptions of how teachers strategically use it, rather, students associate translanguaging with their own usage of it for various purposes like "strategically used translanguaging in instances similar to giving instructions, group discussions, or when they struggled to remember words in a certain language" (Tastanbek, 2019, pp. 47-48). Hence, translanguaging in this study is viewed as the language practice within multilingual education helping students to use their whole linguistic repertoire, as well as promoting multilingualism, and helping students value their languages (Garcia & Wei, 2014).

Multilingual Education in the International Context

This section has two parts and presents the main concepts of the study. First, it shows how language educational programs have changed their focus from monolingual to bilingual programs over time in different countries followed by the current shift to multilingual education. Second, it moves to translanguaging practice within multilingual education.

The Shift from Monolingual to Bi-/Multilingual Education

Language has a dynamic nature and can change with time. Moreover, some languages can become dominant majority languages, while others may experience language loss. All these changes in language affect language education, which needs to adapt to new situations quickly. The historical analysis of language development shows that language education was initially characterized by the sole employment of a monolingual approach, which resulted in the strict separation of languages in the educational domain. It is worth noting that politics in many countries influenced those beliefs trying to persuade the main educational stakeholders that languages other than the official/national ones or the medium of instruction jeopardized national prosperity. For example, Roosevelt in 1914 stated “We must have but one language. The greatness of this country depends on the swift assimilation of the aliens she welcomes to her shores” (de Jong, 2011, p. 39), which clearly shows the attempt to affect peoples’ views to exclude immigrants’ or other minority languages within the country in every domain. However, it should always be remembered that such statements refer to socio-political categorization rather than linguistic practices.

Later, there was a partial shift from monolingual to bilingual education “referring specifically to two languages” (Cenoz, 2013, p. 2), which gradually gained popularity in educational institutions, although it was occasionally biased by a monolingual approach as languages were still taught separately. In 1974, schools in Canada started using French for Anglophone children (Garcia & Otheguy, 2020) to help them learn a new language faster and

such language programs were called immersion programs. Immersion programs involved the learning of new languages by constant exposure to the newly learned second languages in and outside schools and were of three types: early starting from the age of five, middle from nine years old, and late from eleven years. The main advantage of immersion programs compared to traditional second language acquisition programs was that the new language was learned much faster, and learners may have more contact with it on and out of school topics (Swain, 2000). However, immersion programs were also affected by monolingual bias as they used subtractive bilingualism where a new second language excludes the students' first language if it differs from the medium instruction. Consequently, the learners may lose fluency in it.

Currently, language education is shifting to multilingual education, a model of education where every language should be valued (Cenoz, 2013). Multilingual education helps students strengthen their academic knowledge and recognize themselves as plurilingual speakers whose language identities are valued and not marginalized. The shift to a multilingual lens emphasizes the necessity to use new language practices and approaches to find extra-curricular spaces for languages that have been marginalized for a long time and to use them as a scaffold to help learners to improve their academic achievement. One of the language practices within multilingual education which has gained popularity both to develop community multilingualism and multilingualism in the educational domain is translanguaging. Research on translanguaging is growing in many European countries (Cenoz & Gorter, 2020; Fallas Escobar & Dillard-Paltrineri, 2015; Jones, 2017), especially after the European Union Language Policy "mother tongue plus two foreign languages" was launched (Heugh et al., 2019). The main advantage of translanguaging as one of the language practices within multilingual education is that it employs students' entire linguistic repertoire. Translanguaging may be used spontaneously in communication processes to transmit and make the meaning of the messages during communication and as a pedagogical approach,

specifically as a scaffold, to help learners to get academic content better. A more detailed review of translanguaging is presented in the sub-section below.

Translanguaging in Multilingual Education

At the outset, it is worth noting that currently there is a certain shift from code-switching, switching between two separate language codes to the translanguaging lens in multilingual education which has been justified by certain differences between these two concepts. Particularly, it is considered that code-switching presents a bilingual's language system as a system with many codes, monolanguages, separated from each other with certain borders (Lopez and Gonzalez-Davies, 2015), while translanguaging presents a bilingual's language system as one whole linguistic repertoire where there are no separate codes (Garcia & Wei, 2014, Garcia et al., 2017). Moreover, some scholars claim that research on code-switching started from the focus on switching between two languages in the community and only later moved to formal education, whereas research on translanguaging first focused on the school environment and only later was extended to community practices (Garcia, 2009; Otheguy et al., 2015). One more interesting difference between code-switching and translanguaging is their functions, i.e., while code-switching presents languages as separate entities and upholds their certain hierarchy, translanguaging views language practices as a way to combat these structural inequalities and fights against the domination of one language over another as it views language practices as fluid and dynamic with no grammar boundaries between the named languages but still recognizes socio-political boundaries between them (Garcia, 2009; Goodman & Tastanbek, 2020). Finally, translanguaging can act not only as a scaffold unlike code-switching but also as a language practice to transmit and make the meaning of the messages during communication and to help bi-/multilinguals to form their linguistic identities (Garcia, 2009). With these differences in mind, the present study focuses on translanguaging to show how translanguaging is used in different contexts.

Translanguaging in the US context. Translanguaging in the US context is of particular interest to this study because the USA like Kazakhstan, is a multilingual country with many minoritized languages, and the USA has been one of the first countries trying to use translanguaging to give voice to minority students (Garcia et al., 2017). Hornberger and Link 2012, and Yilmaz (2021) highlighted that the dominant language of the USA (American English) may be learned not only through subtractive bilingualism but with planned integration of students' first language through translanguaging. They also claimed that by using translanguaging in the educational domain to support immigrants, assessments can be made fairer for all students and provide social justice. Another study by Cenoz and Gorter (2020) provides an explanation for using translanguaging to help American education to become multilingual, as it happened with Catalonia, Basque, and Friesland. This idea of developing dominant language speakers' multilingualism by using minority languages is supported by other researchers who claim that translanguaging practices do not pose a threat to the English language but, on the contrary, provide the opportunity to reinforce English and indigenous/minority language learning (Hornberger, 2002; Cenoz, 2013). More and more US scholars state that a monolingual approach where languages are separated to guarantee native-like proficiency usually does not work because students do not really get proficient in the newly learned language and may not use it fluently (Garcia & Otheguy, 2020; Garcia & Wei, 2014). Translanguaging in multilingual countries like America or Kazakhstan not only provides social justice but also minimizes the negative influence of using a monolingual approach.

Translanguaging Practices in Arabic/South-East Asian Contexts. In Arabic and South-East Asia, particularly in Saudi Arabia, Japan, Indonesia, and China, translanguaging has practical usage as a scaffold in learning languages and reading (Abdulaal 2020; Aka, 2020). Many studies on translanguaging in these contexts, where it is used as a scaffold or to

understand academic content better, show that students have positive results (Bin-Tahir et al., 2018; Namrullah & Nasrullah, 2020). Moreover, there is a focus on the mobilization of translanguaging in these contexts, specifically how translanguaging may activate students' language and cultural learning through different digital platforms in the communication process. It is claimed that this new focus on translanguaging through the lens of digitalization can help to understand how students may extend their autonomy and improve their multilingualism. According to Wei (2018) and Zhang (2018), the mobilization of translanguaging not only provides social mobility and initiates self-learning but also helps students to adapt their language practices to the digital environment they interact with. Hence, translanguaging in the Arabic and Southeast contexts is used mainly for academic contexts and recently its functions have been studied through digitalization.

The Approaches in the Kazakhstani Context

This section focuses on the Kazakhstani context in three parts. The first sub-section outlines the employment of the monolingual approach within formal education. The second section highlights the challenges that the monolingual approach causes to Kazakhstani students. The third section presents findings from research done on translanguaging as an approach within multilingual education.

Monolingual Approach

The analysis of the literature revealed that the monolingual approach is widely applied within Kazakhstani formal education. The general definition of this approach describes it as the approach where the target language should be applied without using any other languages (Lee, 2016). In the Kazakhstani research community, the monolingual approach is also viewed as the approach where students' language proficiency in one language is simply replaced by proficiency in another (Tastanbek, 2019). Such strict separation of languages may lead to the exclusion of languages other than the medium of instruction and minority

languages from the educational domain. The reasons for using a monolingual approach vary. Firstly, the monolingual approach is widely used in KMI schools due to the language-in-education policy addressed to solve the issue of language revitalization and maintenance. After Kazakhstan gained independence, more and more students choose schools with Kazakh-medium instruction (Smagulova, 2008a; 2019b). Mainly it happened due to students' wish to learn their mother tongue. Students became the leading group of the population who represented the new generation and who were supposed to maintain the Kazakh language learning after its loss during Sovietization (Fierman, 2006). KMI schools, therefore, became the main platforms to implement this new language policy and considered the usage of the monolingual approach as the best strategy to support Kazakh language maintenance. Moreover, they justified the usage of the monolingual approach by the fear that the Kazakh language, which experienced severe language loss, can be threatened by the usage of languages other than the medium of instruction (Ospanova, 2017; Smagulova, 2021). However, students' wishes to learn the mother tongue in schools stemming from their national identity cannot guarantee that schoolchildren automatically become competent speakers of the target language, especially if their dominant language of communication at home differs from the medium of instruction and their first languages are not involved in the learning process. For instance, Tenbay (2021) found that RDSs studying in a KMI school experienced learning challenges while studying through Kazakh-medium instruction as their first language (Russian) was not used as a scaffold in reading tasks. So, they either remained silent or read ten times. These findings indicate that the sole usage of the medium of instruction within the monolingual approach does not help to maintain the learning of academic content but, on the contrary, hinders the learning of and through the medium of instruction. Secondly, the monolingual approach is applied in language teaching, especially in the EFL context. Studies done in the Kazakhstani context on studying English or studying

through English show that students report cases when they were not allowed to use their first languages when they by themselves perceived translanguaging as a problem hindering the learning of English and/or when they were not banned directly by the teachers still; there was no intentional usage of their first languages as a scaffold (Kassym, 2021; Ospanova, 2017; Tastanbek, 2019). These findings indicate that although Kazakhstan tries to develop multilingualism within formal education, monolingual bias still dominates.

Students' Perceptions of Challenges Within the Monolingual Approach

While the number of KMI schools dramatically increased after Kazakhstan gained independence, which is a positive change in terms of the Kazakh language revitalization and maintenance, this boom of KMI schools has been accompanied by several challenges. One such challenge is students' insufficient command of the Kazakh language or students' heterogeneous language proficiency. Gumarova (2017) defined students' heterogenic language proficiency within the Kazakhstani context as "varied and unevenly developed skills in the second language personally and within one grade" (p. 43). Both students and teachers claim that due to students' heterogenic proficiency in Kazakh, it is impossible to learn all the content for the assigned lesson time, which influences the whole learning process (Akhmetova, 2021; Amaniyazova, 2020; Kuandykov, 2021).

Another challenge reported by students is the creation of new terms for already existing ones. The creation of new terms in turn may result in differences between cognitive/academic language proficiency (CALP) and basic interpersonal communicative skills (BICS) (Cummins, 1981). Cummin's study results showed that the learners performed poorly in academic tasks in the second language, which was learned as a foreign language, even though the same learners had no problems communicating in that language. Cummins emphasized that these differences between BICS and CALP should be considered, significantly if the language which is the medium of instruction differs from students'

dominant language. In Kazakhstan, the first attempts to show the differences between the BICS and CALP in the Kazakh language caused by the creation of new terms for already existing ones were made in 2018 by the former president of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev (MoES, 2018). In his annual address, he said that the “Kazakh language should be updated without excessive terminology” to avoid specific differences between the Kazakh language used by most of the population daily and the Kazakh language taught in schools. Then, he gave examples of excessive terminology like “galamtor” [Internet], and “koltyrauyn” [crocodile] in Kazakh, which he called “ridiculous” as they complicated Kazakh language learning. Moreover, the results of Amaniyazova’s (2020) and Tenbay’s (2021) studies also found differences between the everyday Kazakh language and the Kazakh language taught in schools like the extensive usage of new historical or literary terms, which seriously complicated the content comprehension for students.

Perceptions and Usage of Translanguaging in the Kazakhstani Context

In Kazakhstan, a few studies have already been done on translanguaging (Akhmetova, 2021; Yakshi, 2022). These studies mainly focused on translanguaging in the context of EFL and showed specific progress in Kazakhstani education, particularly the gradual move from a monolingual approach to translanguaging. If in the past EFL teachers mainly perceived translanguaging as an obstacle to teaching through the medium instruction that also hindered students’ learning of English and strongly objected to using it, now their perceptions of translanguaging have been transformed (Tastanbek, 2019). Particularly, EFL teachers’ perceptions of translanguaging indicate that they either started to use it spontaneously during the lesson but still do it subconsciously and do not acknowledge its usage, in rare cases, try to use translanguaging during the lesson as a scaffold and perceive it positively (Amaniyazova, 2020). These shifts in EFL teachers’ perceptions and usage of translanguaging indicate steady changes from monolingual to multilingual education in the Kazakhstani context at least

among EFL teachers. Moreover, it is worth noting that if there are changes in EFL teachers' perceptions and usage of translanguaging, it can be an indicator of potential changes in other teachers' perceptions and usage of it.

Moving on to studies done on students' usage and perceptions of translanguaging in the Kazakhstani context, there are fewer in comparison with studies done with teachers. A possible explanation can be the time factor as Kazakhstani researchers have only recently started to explore translanguaging practices, as the first study was done in 2019. One of the few studies which analyzed students' not teachers' perceptions of translanguaging was done by Ospanova in 2017 with nine university students in the EMI program. However, Ospanova focused on code-switching as the term translanguaging was quite a new concept in Kazakhstan and justified it by stating that "Code-switching is defined more as a natural phenomenon that happens among bi/multilingual, whereas translanguaging is a teaching method. Thus, the current research is shifting towards exploring translanguaging; however, there is no such study within the context of Kazakhstan" (p. 22). As can be seen from the extract, the term translanguaging is defined as a teaching method by Ospanova (2017) that may be used only by teachers. However, as was shown in many international and a few Kazakhstani studies, translanguaging can be used by students intentionally to get the academic content better or spontaneously to make and transmit the meaning of their messages during communication (Garcia, 2009; Kassym, 2021; Schissel et al., 2021; Wei, 2018). Moreover, students can have their own perceptions of it as a boundary-crossing mechanism or as a scaffold (Tenbay, 2021; Yilmaz & de Jong, 2020). In the Kazakhstani context, however, no studies have been conducted on school students' perceptions and usage of translanguaging.

Another indicator that Kazakhstani students may use translanguaging on their own and perceive it differently is the phenomenon of Shala Kazakh. The phenomenon of Shala

Kazakh is mentioned in Tastanbek's (2019) study and attributed to an ethnic Kazakh person who has an accent, does not speak Kazakh well and can feel ashamed while speaking it due to disapproval from other ethnic Kazakh speakers who speak Kazakh fluently. The Shala Kazakh phenomenon is considered to stem from the Russification policy. Fierman (2006) cited the words of the Kazakhstani poet Medetbekov showing the situation "The Kazakh language space has receded more than the Aral Sea and its atmosphere has been more destroyed and polluted than a uranium production site after a bomb blast. Expanding the domain is just as difficult as purifying the atmosphere" (p. 99). These words prove that the Kazakh language experienced a severe language loss back in the Soviet time. Consequently, many Kazakhs, particularly those who lived in North Kazakhstan were strongly Russified and associated themselves with Russian culture and language due to their proximity to Russia (Gumarova, 2017). Later after independence, the proportion of KMI schools increased. For example, 66% of children studied in KMI schools in 2017-2018, and nearly 65% of students studied through KMI in higher education (Smagulova, 2021). The main reason for such an increase is family language ideology, as many Kazakh families want their children to learn their mother tongue, leading to successful language revitalization (Tenbay, 2021). However, despite these positive changes in the Kazakh language, children who grow up with Russian-dominant parents but who attend KMI schools are accused of speaking Shala Kazakh (Kassym, 2021; Tenbay, 2021), and may be mocked by other ethnic Kazakh classmates whose language proficiency in the national language or medium instruction is high and who disapprove of any accent or limited language knowledge (Tastanbek, 2019). This local phenomenon of Shala Kazakh has a lot of features of translanguaging, i.e., bilingual students speaking Shala Kazakh use Kazakh and Russian words simultaneously in their speech activating their whole linguistic repertoire as a single linguistic system. Such perceptions of

Shala Kazakh among Kazakh-dominant students can affect perceptions and usage of it by Kazakh-dominant and Russian-dominant students studying in KMI schools.

Conceptual Framework for the Study

This study employs Ruiz's (1984) conceptual framework. It involves three language orientations: language as a problem, language as a right, and language as a resource. Although Ruiz (1984) used three language orientations as a conceptual framework for language planning, the framework is also appropriate for the present study. There are two reasons to adopt this framework. Firstly, Ruiz's (1994) conceptual framework focuses on multilingualism witnessed in society and plurilingualism witnessed at the personal level. Similarly, the central concepts in this study are students' translanguaging practices within multilingual education and at the personal level. So, Ruiz's (1984) framework can help to unpack bi-/multilingual KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions of translanguaging through the lens of three orientations. Moreover, as the perceptions of each participant can differ from each other because perceptions are built on personal cognitive experience that can change with time, Ruiz's (1984) framework can frame their perceptions either as translanguaging as a right, as a resource or translanguaging as a problem. Secondly, the adapted conceptual framework helps not only to unpack participants' perceptions and usage of translanguaging but also to compare them critically. By comparing KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and cases of using translanguaging within Ruiz's (1984) conceptual framework, it is possible to identify how translanguaging is perceived and if participants' perceptions contradict or align with their usage of translanguaging.

The first orientation within the adapted framework, translanguaging as a problem, can include participants who perceive languages other than the one used as the medium of instruction as obstacles hindering the learning of the target language and do not use them or minimize their usage (Ruiz, 1984). Participants with this position can be biased by the idea of

purity of languages or the national identity, and object against exposure to other languages (Amaniyazova, 2021; Ospanova, 2017). Moreover, translanguaging as a problem within the adapted orientation should not be equated with social problems like under-resourced schools or low academic achievement, especially in a multilingual society (Ruiz, 1984). On the contrary, false solutions like subtractive bilingualism, which suggests that linguistic minorities learn the dominant language of the society because their languages are positioned as a problem that causes divisions within society, should be rejected as they undermine the ideas of bi-/multilingual society and contribute to monolingualism.

The second orientation refers to translanguaging as a right, where students might use languages other than the medium of instruction but where these languages are not purposefully embedded in the curriculum and classroom practices (Ruiz, 1984). Participants having such a language orientation may independently involve their first languages during the communication process, regardless of a school policy (Tenbay, (2021). Additionally, translanguaging as a right acknowledges one's human right to learn the dominant language of society or the medium of instruction at school as well as maintain minority languages. The maintenance of minority languages can happen either among the specific individual or groups in certain domains or also be supported by international treaties and/or national language-in-education policies.

The final orientation refers to translanguaging-as-resource, where students not only use languages other than the medium of instruction but where these languages are purposefully involved in classroom practices (Ruiz, 1994). In Kazakhstan, schools although there is no official school policy claiming that they use translanguaging in Kazakhstani schools, students may do so and some teachers also admitted the efficiency of translanguaging practices at school (Akhmetova, 2021; Tastanbek, 2019; Wen et al., 2022). It is also worth noting that translanguaging as a resource perceives minority languages to avoid

xenophobia by raising awareness of linguistic and cultural diversity, providing social justice and improved academic achievement for minority students, and helping dominant language speakers to become bi-/multilingual. Therefore, the present study employs and adapts Ruiz's (1984) conceptual framework to examine and compare KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and use of translanguaging in a rural KMI school.

Conclusion

This literature review chapter presented concepts of perceptions, multilingual education and translanguaging chosen for the study. It also presented a critical analysis of monolingual approach in education and the current shift towards multilingual education with a focus on the translanguaging approach internationally and in the Kazakhstani context specifically. It is also discussed about the usage of the monolingual approach in Kazakhstan and students' perceptions of challenges within the monolingual approach, i.e., insufficient command of the Kazakh language and creation of Kazakh neologisms to replace loanwords for technical terms. Ruiz's (1984) conceptual framework adapted for the study was also presented in the chapter. The literature review revealed that, although translanguaging has been extensively researched, there are some notable gaps in knowledge. In particular, the literature review showed that Kazakhstani research on translanguaging has focused on the EFL context to examine teachers' perceptions and usage of translanguaging. In contrast, there is no research done to examine students' perceptions and usage of translanguaging in the Kazakh - Russian language pairing, especially in a KMI context. To address these gaps, the present study aims to examine and compare KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging within the school context.

Chapter 3: Methodology

This chapter describes the study's research methodology that explored and compared KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging in a rural Kazakh- medium instruction (KMI) school. The research questions in the study were:

1. How do KDSs and RDSs in a rural KMI school perceive translanguaging?
2. How do KDSs and RDSs in a rural KMI school use translanguaging?

3. What are the similarities and/or differences between KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging in a rural KMI school?

The following sections of the chapter include (a) research approach and design, (b) sampling, (c) methods of data collection, (d) data collection instrument, (e) analysis of data, and (f) ethical considerations. The final section of the chapter presents the conclusion.

Research Approach and Design

To answer the research questions posed in the study, the qualitative approach was chosen. The qualitative approach helps to explore and to build an in-depth understanding of participants' answers based on their experience (Denzin & Lincoln, 2013). Moreover, as this research is aimed at a specific group of participants, particularly KDSs and RDSs in a rural KMI school, the qualitative approach allows the researcher to analyze their specific experiences (Merriam, 1988). Denzin and Lincoln (2013) also claimed that the qualitative approach helps to study "the qualities of entities, processes, and meanings that are not experimentally examined or measured in terms of quantity, amount, intensity or frequency" (p.17). And as the central phenomena of the study are perceptions and usage of translanguaging, which are not easily measured, the qualitative approach helps to use participants' words to comprehend their understanding of translanguaging in a rural KMI school and get rich data on the explored phenomena.

The study also adopted a case-study design as the most suitable one to collect, analyze, and then present findings from a small sample (Creswell, 2014). A case study design is a "procedure of inquiry" that helps to obtain rich data by providing diverse perspectives (Creswell, 2014 p. 493) and allowing for making comparisons and finding similarities (Hamilton & Corbett-Whittier, 2012; Shkedi, 2005), which was the of the particular focus of research question three. Moreover, the case study design helps to explore real participants' cases and provides their insights into the central phenomena. Therefore, a qualitative research

approach with a case-study design, where a case was represented by a rural KMI school, was adopted to explore and compare seventh-tenth grade KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging.

Sampling

The population for the study was all students studying in grades seven to ten at the chosen KMI school in the North Kazakhstan Region. The sampling comprised ten students, five KDSs and five RDSs from grades seven to ten, which according to Hennink et al., (2011) is practical in qualitative research. To recruit the participants the maximum variation purposeful sampling was used. The main advantage of maximum variation purposeful sampling was that it did not demand recruiting a massive sample to get insights instead it allowed the recruitment of a small number of purposefully picked participants with maximized diversity among them to see how they perceived and used translanguaging (Creswell, 2014). Maximum variation sampling also helped to get a holistic view of how translanguaging was perceived and used from two standpoints, KDSs and RDSs (Creswell, 2014). The criteria within maximal variation sampling included: (a) recruitment of the participants from the North Kazakhstan Region; (b) selection of participants from KMI classes ranging from grades seven to ten; (c) selection of both Kazakh-dominant and Russian-dominant students. Criterion one referred to the site as all the participants had to be from rural KMI classes in the North Kazakhstan Region. It was done to see if the participants in these rural KMI classes in the North Kazakhstan Region were predominantly Kazakh-dominant as it is widely believed that the Russification policy mainly affected urban areas but less rural ones (Smagulova, 2008; Gumarova, 2017). The second criterion referred to the grades as selections of participants from Grades seven to ten provided not only informative answers to open-ended questions due to participants' longer and richer experience of studying in a KMI school but also a diversity of answers in terms of central phenomena. These two

criteria were met after getting permission from the gatekeeper to recruit participants in the rural KMI school located in the North Kazakhstan Region. The final criterion referred to the dominant language of the participants to see if the dominant language of participants affected their perceptions and usage of translanguaging or not.

After the gatekeeper provided each class teacher's contact information in a personal WhatsApp chat, they were sent a recruitment letter (attachment A) which they then forwarded to their students in WhatsApp group chats. Overall, ten KDSs and RDSs were chosen based on the criteria in research and their agreement to take part in interviews. There were only participants from grades seven to ten as there were no students studying in grade eleven. A small number of participants was enough for a qualitative approach (Merriam, 1988), and moreover, the previous studies done on translanguaging with the same number of participants succeeded to provide rich data (Osanova, 2017; Tastanbek, 2019). Table 1 presents information on the recruited participants in a table way.

Table 1

KDSs' and RDSs' Profiles

Participant (pseudonyms)	Place of Living and Studying	Grade	Language of Dominance
Participant 1	NKR	7	RD
Participant 2	NKR	7	RD
Participant 3	NKR	7	KD
Participant 4	NKR	9	RD
Participant 5	NKR	9	RD
Participant 6	NKR	9	RD
Participant 7	NKR	10	KD
Participant 8	NKR	8	KD
Participant 9	NKR	8	KD
Participant 10	NKR	7	KD

Notes: NKR North Kazakhstan Region; RD – Russian-dominant; KD Kazakh-dominant

Research Site

As a site for research, KMI classes in a rural mixed school located in North Kazakhstan were chosen. This rural school was founded in 1957. The students in the school are divided into KMI and RMI classes. And even though rural schools in Kazakhstan are

known to be Kazakh-dominant (Gumarova, 2017), my personal experience showed that rural schools might be Russian-dominant. Russian dominance of some schools may be explained by their close location to the Russian border, which in turn affected the dominant language of the residents, especially during the Russification policy (Smagulova, 2008). While living and studying in the North Kazakhstan Region I saw students who were Russian-dominant like me but who studied in KMI schools and used both Kazakh and Russian in their communication. Hence, the observed language situation in this region suggested that the geographical position of the school may affect students' sociolinguistic perspectives and learning process and make participants different from other students in different regions, especially from Kazakh - dominant regions.

Data Collection Instrument

To collect data one-on-one, an online semi-structured interview was chosen as the main data collection instrument for the study (see Appendix B). In the semi-structured interviews, there are open-ended questions which according to Marton (1986) allow participants certain flexibility of choosing the part of questions they want to answer. There are also open-ended questions and probes as well as there is the chance to ask follow-up questions in the semi-structured interviews that gives a chance to get richer data from participants (Creswell, 2014). The interview questions in the study explored how RDSs and KDSs felt about and used languages other than the medium instruction (Kazakh). Additionally, the interview questions included the extract from Cummin's (2010) "Identity Texts" where translanguaging was used in multilingual classrooms. Including this extract in the interviews and asking participants to share their thoughts on it helped to examine the participants' ideas which they had spontaneously on the spot (Griffie, 2012). Additionally, the presence of such an extract gave students more chances to reflect on their own experiences of using translanguaging for different purposes and for the researcher to have the

chance to track and identify students' perceptions of translanguaging without asking them direct questions. Before recruiting the participants, the data instrument was piloted with fellow students from Nazarbayev University the Graduate School of Education. The piloting process showed that some of the questions were repetitive, so they were eliminated, and some other interview questions were adjusted.

The format of interviews was individual to provide confidentiality and anonymity of the participants. Also, one-on-one online interviews helped to get rich data form each participant. The interview questions were sent and later asked by the researcher on WhatsApp and Zoom based on the respondents' choices and each interview lasted between twenty and thirty minutes. The chance to have online interviews was comfortable as it provided real time communication with eye contact while being in geographically different regions (Webber, 2020). The language to participate in individual online interviews was based on the respondents' choice, which in all cases was the Russian language.

Data Collection Procedures

This section provides information on data collection procedures starting from getting approval and finalizing with participants' recruitment and preparing data for data analysis. First, the researcher submitted the application form to NU IREC as the sample in the research was represented by participants under eighteen who are a vulnerable population. After getting permission from NU IREC to collect data, a gatekeeper was contacted to grant access to the site two weeks before the data collection procedure started. Then the gatekeeper was asked to provide seventh to eleventh-grade teachers' contacts. However, the gatekeeper said that there was no eleventh grade at school in the 2022-2023 academic year. It was decided to contact only seventh to tenth-grade class teachers to request them to distribute information about the study by sending a recruitment letter written by the researcher in WhatsApp group chats in each of their grades on behalf of the researcher (Attachment A).

Students, who decided to participate in the study, contacted the researcher directly by mobile phone number on WhatsApp channel. When potential participants contacted the researcher for the first time, they were introduced to the purpose of the study, the risks, and benefits, and their rights and were told that participation in online individual interviews was voluntary. After getting the students' oral agreement, they were sent assent and consent forms (see Appendices C and D) via WhatsApp as it was the main channel of communication chosen by the participants. Even though initially there were thirteen students who volunteered to take part in interviews, only ten can make it. Three participants did not get their parents' consent forms and had to withdraw from the study. After getting signed assent forms from students and signed consent forms from their parents, participants were suggested to choose the time that was convenient for them to have twenty-thirty-minute individual online interviews either through Zoom or WhatsApp depending on their preferences. Nine out of ten participants chose Zoom, while one of the participants preferred WhatsApp. By arranging online individual semi-structured interviews, participants had the chance to stay at home which was comfortable for them. Before the interviews, the researcher again explained the purpose of the research, participants' rights, and risks/benefits and also reminded them that participation is voluntary, and they may withdraw at any time with no consequences for them. During the data collection, the participants were also explained that they had the right not to answer sensible questions. Additionally, the researcher reminded participants about the issues of anonymity. To provide anonymity, the researcher did not ask participants to give their real names, instead, the researcher assigned pseudonyms to them and to the site where the research was done. To provide confidentiality, all data were coded during the collection process and were kept on the researcher's personal computer protected with a password during the data analysis process. In general, well-planned, and organized data collection

procedures helped to meet ethical requirements, minimize potential risks, and meet the data collection deadline successfully.

Data Analysis Approach

When the data was collected, the process of data analysis based on Creswell's (2014) six steps of analysis started. First, the audio-recorded interviews were transcribed and put in folders referring to each participant and group, i.e., KDSs or RDSs. Afterward, all the transcribed interviews were read by employing the deductive data analysis approach, where codes and themes were predetermined from the literature that helped to digest data and get the overall meaning of it (Streefkerk, 2019). Next, the coding process started, during which participants' responses were categorized and labeled followed by coming up with themes. During the coding process and theme extraction, in addition to the deductive data analysis approach, I also utilized an inductive data analysis approach to understand the researched phenomenon better (Creswell, 2014). The inductive approach refers to "coding by narrowing the data into a few ordinary/unexpected/hard-to-classify/major and minor themes or patterns" (Creswell, 2014, p. 260), and later makes it possible to put them into a comparison table to make the analysis. This way of coding aligned with the data presentation process as I selected specific data to use and disregarded other data that did not expressly provide evidence for the themes (Creswell, 2014). Then, I selected narrative passages from interviews which were later used to present the central phenomenon within Ruiz's (1984) framework. Finally, I tried to interpret the findings and asked myself about the insight I gained. In general, qualitative research employing a case study design and semi-structured online interviews helped to get rich data on the study.

Ethical Considerations

Measures were taken by the researcher to ensure ethical considerations, anonymity, and confidentiality throughout the whole research process: data collection, analysis, and

reporting. Prior to the start of the study, the researcher took the CITI training certificate and received approval from NU IREC Ethics Committee to conduct research. To provide confidentiality during the recruitment process, the researcher provided personal contact information and asked class teachers to share it with participants so that they can contact the researcher directly without teachers' involvement. When participants contacted the researcher, the researcher explained the purpose of the study, the risks, and the benefits, as well as reminded them about the voluntary nature of participation. During the data collection process, the researcher assigned pseudonyms to participants and the name of the site was also not revealed. To provide confidentiality, the researcher arranged one-to-one online interviews. During interviews, the researcher stayed in a quiet room at home with no other people present in the room and asked participants to do the same to have a more confidential, friendly, and safe atmosphere. After data collection, the data were coded and stored on the researcher's personal computer secured with a password that only the researcher knew. During the whole process, the researcher treated the data as confidential and never shared it with other participants or anyone outside the study (Creswell, 2014). Data reporting is presented in aggregated and anonymized form. Thus, the researcher tried to minimize the potential risks associated with confidentiality and anonymity to ensure participants' willingness to share their perceptions and usage of translanguaging.

Conclusion

The chapter provided the methodological basis of the study on KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging in a rural KMI school. A qualitative case study approach was employed, and the online semi-structured interviews were chosen as the main instrument for data collection. Five KDSs and five RDSs from seventh to tenth grades were recruited from a rural KMI school in North Kazakhstan by employing the maximum variation

purposeful sampling. Ethical approval from NU IREC Research Committee was received and ensured that participants' rights and other ethical considerations were met.

Chapter 4: Findings

This chapter unpacks the findings from ten online individual semi-structured interviews. The purpose of the study was to examine KDSs and RDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging in a rural KMI school in the North Kazakhstan Region. The research questions posed in this study were:

1. How do KDSs and RDSs in a rural KMI school perceive translanguaging?
2. How do KDS and RDS in a rural KMI school use translanguaging?
3. What are the similarities and/or differences between KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging in a rural KMI school?

The following sections of this chapter present six broad themes that emerged from the data analysis. Particularly, three diverse themes: (1) translanguaging as-a-legacy from the past, (2) translanguaging as a sign of emerging multilingualism, (3) translanguaging as a problem. The next two themes reflect how KDSs and RDSs used translanguaging, (4) as a meaning-making language practice for learning purposes, and (5) as a meaning-making language practice for communication purposes. The final theme presents (6) similarities and differences between KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging.

KDSs' and RDSs' Perceptions of Translanguaging

This preview is opening the section presenting KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions of translanguaging. Three themes were categorized: (a) translanguaging as-a-legacy from the past; (b) translanguaging as-a-sign of emerging multilingualism, and (c) translanguaging as a problem. While in the two first themes, translanguaging was perceived normally and/or positively, the final theme showed that a minority of students perceived it negatively.

KDSs' and RDSs' Perceptions of Translanguaging as a Legacy from the Past

The data analysis revealed that the majority of KDSs and all RDSs perceived translanguaging as a bridge between home and school languages, which through the lens of Shala Kazakh stemmed from their parents' Soviet past. Particularly, due to the Russification

policy most of their parents had to attend RMI schools which made them Russian-dominant speakers. Thus, Shala Kazakh was perceived by them as a bridge between the medium of instruction and the home language. It was vividly observed when participants were sharing their perceptions of using more than one language during the interaction at home, which they referred to as Shala Kazakh and as they highlighted, they perceived neutrally. The extract below can show it:

Parents...as...they studied in RMI schools...well...in the past, there were only Russian medium instruction schools, they mainly speak Russian...They started to mix the Kazakh language at home when I started to study at a KMI school. ...I have a neutral perception of Shala Kazakh. (RDS 3)

This finding shows us that participants' perceptions of translanguaging were based on their translanguaging practices with Russian-dominant parents whose Russian language stemmed from their Soviet past but who tried to use the Kazakh language with their children who study in a rural KMI school. Moreover, it shows that participants perceived such a mixture of languages neutrally and named it Shala Kazakh, which they either defined as "...using Kazakh words in Russian sentences" (KDS 1) or "...mixing the Kazakh language with Russian to understand each other" (RDS 2).

One RDS participant also stated that at home there were two different languages of communication, Kazakh and Russian, but while Kazakh was the main language of communication with the grandmother, with parents this participant mainly practiced translanguaging "*...well, at home... with my mum and dad, well, in Shala Kazakh. They graduated from RMI schools...my father can start in Kazakh but finish in Russian (laughs). It is ok, the main thing is we get the information*" (RDS 5). It is worth noting that this respondent felt positive while sharing these moments of translanguaging with family members and even joked, providing some examples, and stating that perceives Shala Kazakh positively if it helps to transmit the message and the partner understands the expressed idea. Likewise, similar situations were highlighted by another RDS, "I have a neutral perception of

Shala Kazakh" (RDS 4) was the way she expressed her perceptions of Shala Kazakh based on her own usage of it due to the difference between languages used at home and at school.

Interestingly, this perception of treating Shala Kazakh as a legacy from the past also emerged from the answers of most KDSs as well. For example, one of the participants expressed this idea in the following way:

Well...at home...let's say...we speak like this...sometimes in Kazakh, sometimes in Russian, I feel normal about it. I don't even know... many in my family speak Russian, they studied in RMI schools. But our mother sent us, children, to Kazakh school, and because of it somehow, she started to learn and speak Shala Kazakh.
(KDS 1)

Overall, participants perceived these cases of using some Russian in Kazakh speech or vice versa as a normal process and named it Shala Kazakh, which reflected their fluid and flexible language practices. The participants also stressed that they perceived Shala Kazakh as a bridge between the home language with the participants' medium of instruction at school.

Translanguaging as a Sign of Emerging Multilingualism

The next theme reflects the findings identified among the majority of KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions of translanguaging grouped under the category "translanguaging as a sign of emerging multilingualism" with three sub-themes, (1) translanguaging as the right for people with different language backgrounds living in a multinational country, (2) the comfort of translanguaging, (3) translanguaging to practice foreign languages. These findings show that participants perceived translanguaging to practice not only languages in the curriculum, but also other foreign languages not involved in formal education as they can enhance their future academic achievements. Moreover, the majority of KDSs and RDSs perceived translanguaging as a language practice acknowledging the value of every language in the multilingual country, which also helped to adapt to a new language community and provided comfort during the interaction.

Translanguaging as the Right for People with Different Language Backgrounds Living in a Multinational Country

Another finding that presents the majority of KDSs and RDSs' perceptions of translanguaging reflected their acknowledgment of people's rights with different language backgrounds to translanguage. This acknowledgment seems to be natural for most of the participants because they live in a multinational country. One of the participants stressed "I think there is nothing bad in it [translanguaging] because we live in a multinational country" (KDS 3). This participant also highlighted the presence of many nationalities on the territory of the country and noted that this is one of the reasons why she perceives translanguaging normally. Other participants said:

...for example, we have a classmate...she is Tatar... her father is Tatar well, sometimes, she can speak the Tatar language like...mixing a few Tatar words with Kazakh words, I perceive it normally. She was born in Kazakhstan, but her father is a Tatar. (RDS 2)

There are such people who are Russians but study in a Kazakh-medium instruction school. In our class, there are no such people, but at school there are. And if they translanguage from Kazakh to Russian, for me, it is ok, they, ...well, it is their mother tongue, they have rights. (RDS 4)

Overall, the similarity between the above-shown extracts of the participants' perceptions of translanguaging as a right show that they are tolerant of other people speaking their national languages in a multinational country like Kazakhstan.

The Comfort of Translanguaging

One more finding reflects KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions of translanguaging as an approach to providing comfort during the communication process. For example, more than half of those interviewed KDSs and RDSs stressed their own and classmates' translanguaging practices as normal if the speakers felt comfortable. The extract below supports this finding:

it [using other languages during lessons] depends on their comfort... if they feel more comfortable speaking Russian, they can use some Russian with Kazakh. I also mix Kazakh and Russian sometimes, it is normal. (KDS 1)

This quote above reveals the responses of other KDSs and RDSs perceiving translanguaging as normal practice creating comfortable conditions for speakers. Moreover, 20% of KDSs perceived translanguaging as an approach providing comfort caused by their sensitivity to a dominant language of a person they speak to. Particularly, when they were asked their preferred language for the interviews, they chose the Russian language, though in fact, as was found later, they were more KDSs, who preferred to speak Kazakh. It was found that they translanguaged to the Russian language, which was not so comfortable for them, just because they sensed that the interviewer herself talked to them in Russian in their previous communications. Moreover, when they were asked to rate each language in their repertoire on a scale from one (very low) to ten (very high) the Kazakh language was assessed a bit higher than the Russian language. They also named Kazakh as the dominant language of communication at home and with classmates as well as the language which was more comfortable for them to express their thoughts in and study through. "Because in Kazakh class, it is clearer...for me ...it is clearer compared to Russian, perhaps. I cannot study in an RMI class" (KDS 5). When the question "Why did you choose the Russian language for the interview?" was asked by the interviewer, the answers of these two KDSs unanimously indicated their sensitivity to the dominant language of an interviewer. Specifically, one of them said.

"...mmm, I don't even know. It seems to me that when you first wrote (chuckles) you started a dialogue in Russian and I thought that Russian would be more comfortable for you." (KDS 1)

In a similar vein, the issue of sensitivity was traced in another KDS interview "Well, I just thought it would be comfortable for you in Russian" (KDS 5). This finding showed that they perceived translanguaging as an approach to show respect to the communicator, which resulted in choosing the language more comfortable to the communicator.

The majority of KDSs and RDSs also perceived translanguaging through the perceptions of comfort as it helped to use all the languages in their repertoires. The overall response to the question “And how would you feel if someone used another language during lessons?” was positive and indicated that if someone felt comfortable while translanguaging through the Kazakh-Russian-English languages (languages which were learned and spoken by most students), then the RDSs and KDSs perceived it as language practice providing comfort. The following extracts can prove it: “Well, if it’s [using the whole repertoire] comfortable for a person, then he has a right. Well, if most students speak these languages, then I perceive it normally....” (RDS 4) or “if the first language is a language that other students know, then how...it [using the whole repertoire] is possible, ok, ... if it is comfortable for all” (KDS 1).

It is also worth noting that the majority of KDSs and RDSs perceived translanguaging as an approach providing comfort during the adaptation period to a new language environment. This finding was vividly observed through the responses of participants when they read the extract from “Identity Texts” by Cummins (2010) during the interview (Appendix A). In particular, when participants were reading and sharing their ideas about a Hebrew student who moved to America and started to study in a school with English medium instruction, which was a new language for him, the majority of KDSs’ and RDSs’ answers reflected unanimous support the learner’s usage of Hebrew while living and studying in an English-speaking country and school as it was comfortable for him during the adaptation period.

I think it [translanguaging] is the right thing because the child just started to study at this school and cannot for example, ... for him, it was more comfortable and better to learn new content in his mother tongue that’s why I think it is ok (KDS 3).
It seems to me, it [translanguaging] is ok...because a student just came from his homeland, he does not know English and it would be more comfortable for him that like... yes if he was explained in his mother tongue (KDS 4).

Overall, the participants perceived translanguaging as an approach providing comfort for communication in three different situations: a) while speaking to people whose dominant language they know well; b) when translanguaging helps them to use their whole linguistic repertoires; and/or c) while adapting to a new language environment.

Translanguaging to Practice Foreign Languages

Data analysis revealed that 20% of RDSs perceived translanguaging to practice foreign languages. One participant, for example, perceived translanguaging with family members not only to practice Russian and/or Kazakh languages but also the Turkish language which was a newly learned foreign language for the participant. This theme came up as an example in discussions of languages being spoken with siblings “.....well, even though my mother tongue is Kazakh when my sister comes, we speak a little Turkish and mix it with Kazakh, I know Turkish a little and I need to practice it. I think it is normal” (RDS 2). As was demonstrated in the extract above, this respondent's perceptions of her own translanguaging in more than two languages, even if one of the languages is a foreign language that is not well-known, was perceived normally as it was the usual and natural practice helping to excel speaking skills in the Turkish language.

Another participant commented that also practices translanguaging in Kazakh and Turkish languages but with the Kazakh language teacher.

I learned a bit of the Turkish language last year. It is simpler to learn it when you know Kazakh. I use Kazakh and Turkish with my Kazakh teacher... I feel ok about it (RDS 3).

Overall, the responses of this 20% of RDSs indicated that they had neutral perceptions of translanguaging as it helped to practice these newly learned languages.

Translanguaging as a Problem

In contrast to previous findings in the two sections above, where translanguaging was perceived positively, there was one dissimilar finding which emerged from the minority of RDSs and KDSs. This finding shows that translanguaging was perceived negatively as a

problem through the lens of participants' (1) feelings of disrespect to the mother tongue, and (2) non-acceptance of translanguaging.

Feelings of Disrespect to the Mother Tongue

This finding revealed that 30% of KDSs and RDSs perceived translanguaging through feelings of disrespect for their mother tongue and/or discomfort for using translanguaging.

Data analysis of KDSs' and one RDSs' responses to the question "What do YOU feel when you speak languages other than Kazakh while studying in a KMI school?" revealed this sense of disrespect. "I feel a bit uncomfortable when I cannot express my idea purely in Kazakh...because I think I do not know Kazakh well enough, sometimes" (KDS 2) was the way this participant expressed the negative feeling. Another participant stressed:

Well, we live in Kazakhstan, and I do not want to add Russian, I want to speak pure Kazakh, but it is sometimes difficult. Well, perhaps, I feel not well done (giggles).
... one should either speak only Kazakh or Russian (KDS 4).

These two interviewed KDSs highlighted the idea of language purism, which is rooted in monolingualism ideology that strongly affected their perceptions of their own translanguaging and led to discomfort.

Interestingly, one RDS also reported having a mixed or even negative perception of their own translanguaging practices, especially in Kazakh classes:

...perhaps, normal [perceived translanguaging normally]. But sometimes when I use Russian words during Kazakh subject ...it is somehow not ok as if I do not respect ...as if, how to say... (translanguages from Russian to Kazakh) "**Мен өз тілімді құрметтемеймін**" do not respect my mother tongue [bold text is original Kazakh] (RDS 2).

This respondent pointed out that she perceived translanguaging normally but concluded that it feels as if by doing so she disrespects the mother tongue. So, the findings revealed the perception of translanguaging through the feelings of or disrespect to the mother tongue caused by the monolingual ideology.

Non-Acceptance of Translanguaging

Another finding reflecting negative perceptions of translanguaging showed that 40% of KDSs and RDSs did not accept translanguaging at all either due to strong national identities or due to languages involved in translanguaging. For example, one respondent said that it is better to speak the Kazakh language and not to translanguage to other languages to strengthen the position of the Kazakh language in the social domain “we are Kazakhs and we should be role models for other nationalities in the country to show them it is necessary to learn Kazakh” (RDS 3) or “if someone translanguages in class, I do not approve it at all. I will have a question such as “Why do they study in a KMI school?” if they use Russian words and speak Russian more often” (KDS 2). Based on these KDSs’ and RDSs’ answers, it may be seen that the feeling of national identity and the importance of knowing the mother tongue, especially in a school with Kazakh-medium instruction, not only by the current but also future generations cause non-acceptance of translanguaging.

Interestingly, the same non-acceptance of translanguaging was identified in respondents’ answers to the question “How do you perceive translanguaging through languages other than Kazakh/Russian/English?” 20% of RDSs’ and KDSs’ perceptions of translanguaging through languages that were not known showed their non-acceptance of translanguaging. According to participants’ statements, the languages which were involved in translanguaging played an important role. For example, some participants, whose perception of translanguaging through familiar languages was positive, did not accept translanguaging if it was held through unknown languages.

But if it is the language, for example, Tatar or Kyrgyz, I don’t know, then it seems to me it is better to explain in that language which every student understands and not to use other unknown languages. (KDS 1)

If languages are unknown, I think I do not accept using the Kazakh language with such languages because I do not understand them. (RDS 3)

So, based on these findings, it may be highlighted that less than half KDSs and RDSs did not accept translanguaging due to strong national identity, particularly if translanguaging

happened during the classes in KMI school or if languages used in translanguaging were unknown. This assumes that the languages of the minority that are not taught at school and that are not known by the students were not accepted by these students.

Usage of Translanguaging

This preview opens the section presenting KDSs' and RDSs' usage of translanguaging. The findings show that even though KDSs and RDSs had different perceptions of translanguaging, they still used it as a meaning-making language practice for two purposes: learning and communication.

Using Translanguaging as a Meaning-Making Language Practice for Learning

Purposes

During the data analysis on how KDSs' and RDSs' used translanguaging, the following theme emerged as a meaning-making language practice for learning purposes with the three sub-themes: a) using translanguaging for the ease of information transmission and better understanding, b) making new terms/subject content clearer at humanitarian subjects, c) technology-based translanguaging for pedagogical purposes in classes.

Using Translanguaging for the Ease of Information Transmission and Better

Understanding

This finding was identified in more than half of RDSs' and KDSs' answers when they were asked about using translanguaging and showed that they used translanguaging to transmit and get information during the classes. It is worth mentioning that the transmission of the message during the class mainly happened between the classmates and the reasons were either a) to transmit simpler answers and/or b) to understand more. Specifically, 70% of KDSs and RDSs claimed that they used translanguaging with classmates to provide simpler shorter information:

When classmates do not understand, they usually ask classmates in Russian. Because a teacher sometimes can give a long and not clear answer, when we ask classmates, we get a simple and short answer (RDS 1).

Well, first we explain to each other [to classmates] in Kazakh and then add some words in Russian. Well, I explain, for example, to the person sitting with me at one desk and she explains to me if there is something unclear for me because **мұғалім** [the teacher] can explain a bit harder, while we are classmates, anyway, and we have common topics, and we can understand more in this way (KDS 5) [bold text is originally Kazakh].

So, the common usage of translanguaging was that it makes the communication process between peers during the classes more effective by involving students' first languages that were employed to make and transmit the meaning of the information simpler, i.e., translanguaging as a meaning making practice.

Translanguaging to Make New Terms/Content Clearer at Subjects

Another finding showed that almost all KDSs and RDSs used translanguaging with teachers as well. These participants stated that during such subjects as Kazakh Literature, History, or Language classes, they were translanguaging more often compared to Mathematics, Physics, or Chemistry. The majority of those who responded to the question of why humanitarian subjects involved more translanguaging, stated that translanguaging helped to make the content, i.e., new topics and terms, clearer. The following extract below shows the dependence of the translanguaging use on the subject:

Interviewer: Ok, good, clear. And when speaking about the lessons, do you use languages other than Kazakh during the lessons?

RDS 5: It depends on the lesson. They are more likely **Қазақ әдебиеті, тарих** [Kazakh Literature/History], such subjects [Bold text is original Kazakh].

Interviewer: Mh, and how do you think why? Is it because you have new words which appear or why?

RDS 5: Not because of new words if we speak about History, we need such words like, how to say, ancient and it turns out that we have not heard such words yet.

Interviewer: And in Physics, for example?

RDS 5: Aa, well, we speak in the Kazakh language at Physics.

The response of this participant was like other KDSs' and RDSs' answers, i.e., using translanguaging in humanitarian subjects was more common to make new terms and content clearer than in Physics.

Additionally, the majority of RDSs and KDSs also stated that language classes exerted some effect on their usage of translanguaging as it helped to clarify the academic content.

In Russian language classes, yes, the content is clear. But sometimes some words are unclear and then the teacher must explain them in Kazakh, or we ask each other to use the Kazakh and Russian languages. In English class English teachers speak in English but if we have a new unclear word, then teachers or our classmates explain it in Kazakh (KDS 5).

It was also found that students get the chance to expand their answers and to find the right answer while responding to the question by using translanguaging in language classes:

Most of the time we translanguage from English to Russian because in Russian we can provide more examples and it will be even easier, but again it depends on the lesson. If it is a Kazakh language subject, then a student can first say an idea in his/her first language and then if (s)he is asked to switch to a medium instruction, then the class can help her/him. Teachers understand the Russian language, but well, it is desirable for them that we speak in Kazakh, that's why using students' first language can help to direct them to the answer but then you can finish in Kazakh (RDS 5).

So, these findings show that participants used translanguaging intentionally in humanitarian subjects more often than in technical subjects such as Physics/Mathematics. Moreover, they got support from teachers who did allow them to translanguage, especially when the terms/content related to subject terminology were treated as a barrier to making the meaning of the content. Although some teachers can make students switch to the medium of instruction, students anyway switch to other languages, thus using translanguaging as a resource that helped to acquire the content better.

Technology-Based Translanguaging for Pedagogical Purposes in Classes

Finally, the findings reveal the pedagogical use of translanguaging reflected in the responses of the majority of KDSs and RDSs who said that there was technology-based

translanguaging in this rural KMI school. The use of technologies when students were shown the video in one language but discussed it in another language revealed the pedagogical use of translanguaging by some teachers.

We watch videos on interactive boards in the Kazakh language mainly but when teachers cannot find videos in the Kazakh language, then they show videos in the Russian language. Sometimes they prepare slides/presentations with bullet points in the Kazakh language based on the Russian language videos we watch. After watching the videos, we discussed them in Kazakh. For me, it is comfortable, I know two languages. (KDS 4)

This finding shows that teachers used translanguaging for pedagogical purposes and most participants involved in this pedagogical translanguaging found it comfortable.

However, the findings also revealed that it sometimes might be challenging for some students, especially in cases when the video was used for pedagogical purposes in the Russian language, but the examination and assessment were conducted in another language, which caused certain challenges for students.

Q: And do you like it when you watch a video not in Kazakh during the class but discuss in other languages?

A: If it is History, then I think I would prefer only the Kazakh language because after watching the video in the Russian language, we need to take a Summative Assessment for the Term in the Kazakh language. (RDS 3)

So, as it can be seen from these findings, using technology-based translanguaging for pedagogical purposes may be either a resource or a problem.

Using Translanguaging as a Meaning-Making Language Practice for Communication

Purposes

The data analysis also showed that all KDSs and RDSs used translanguaging as a meaning-making language practice for communication purposes with the two sub-themes: a) using translanguaging to adjust to communicators' dominant language; b) technology-based translanguaging for communication purposes during the breaks.

Translanguaging to Adjust to Communicators' Dominant Language

Translanguaging was found to be used to adjust to communicators' dominant language during the communication by all ten participants. For example, two KDSs, who just recently started to study in the rural KMI school and either had to live in the boarding school facilities or move and settle with the family in the village, used translanguaging to adjust to a new bilingual community.

At home, my parents, I, and my siblings speak only the Kazakh language. At our previous KMI schools, we spoke only Kazakh. In this KMI school, well, if out of 100%, then we speak Kazakh about 60% and Russian 40%. Well, Russian we use when with other classes and sometimes speak about the lessons. Well, I can say that I speak the Russian language at school due to my classmates, but I like it. I need to adapt to speaking Russian to communicate with students (KDS 4).

Another KDS participant who also just moved to the village besides stressing the usage of translanguaging with classmates outlined that people in the village also were mixing the Russian and Kazakh languages.

In our village, we had more Kazakhs than Russians or other nationalities. At school, during the breaks, and in the village, we spoke only the Kazakh language. Here people speak both the Kazakh and Russian languages. Now, I have already gotten accustomed to it (KDS 2).

It is also worth noting that the rest of the KDSs and RDSs, 80%, stressed that they used translanguaging flexibly in their interactions to adjust to the communicators' dominant languages. When the participants were asked the question "In what cases do you use the Russian language and in what cases do you use the Kazakh language during the breaks?" there was such an answer:

If I speak to a person who knows Russian, I mainly speak Russian with some Kazakh words. And if to a person who speaks only Kazakh, then I mainly speak Kazakh but can also add some Russian words (RDS 1).

This finding shows that many of the participants of the study being bilinguals used translanguaging as a resource and used it flexibly.

It was also found that the majority of RDSs and KDSs noted that there was an influence of dominant language in communication for the choice of languages for translanguaging. For example, it was pointed out:

We have a classmate, who just joined us this year. She is new and she mainly speaks Kazakh, but we tried to adjust to her manner, to speak more in Kazakh. But as she heard a lot of Russian speech, she, well, has learned Russian for two terms (chuckles). Now she translanguages from the Kazakh language to Russian more often (RDS 5).

So, as can be seen from these findings, the participants as bilinguals do not use only one language during communication, but they also use their second language as a linguistic resource flexibly. Moreover, the bigger number of participants speaking one and the same dominant languages in communication with other speakers who are less in number affects the choice of which language they would finally interact in more.

Technology-Based Translanguaging for Communication Purposes During the Breaks

Another finding showed that all KDSs and RDSs used technology-based translanguaging to interact with peers or other students during the breaks. Mainly, participants outlined that they used translanguaging to discuss common interests after watching films and/or videos in the Russian language. The following answers may show it as the participants highlighted that used translanguaging while sharing their opinion about the content they watched by using technologies:

We use languages other than Kazakh to communicate with classmates during breaks, to discuss some sports, songs, or other interests, well, the content we watch on YouTube or other sites in the Russian language. As we do not have so much content in Kazakh, we watch it in Russian and then discuss it in Russian and in Kazakh (RDS 5).

We mainly speak both Russian and Kazakh when we speak on different topics when we speak about our own topics like films, and videos (KDS 3).

So, based on these findings, it can be assumed that the usage of technology-based translanguaging for communication can happen due to the lack of digital entertaining content in the Kazakh language that created the extra space for using translanguaging for both KDSs

and RDSs. Even though the language of schooling is Kazakh, during the breaks, students were found to use Kazakh and Russian languages to discuss the information they got from digital resources in the Russian language.

Similarities and Differences between KDSs' and RDSs' Perceptions and Usage of Translanguaging

This section presents the findings revealing the similarities and differences found between KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging based on data analysis. The table below shows the spotted similarities and differences through the prism of findings presented above.

Table 1

Similarities and Differences between KDSs' and RDSs' Perceptions and Usage of Translanguaging

Perceptions of Translanguaging		
<i>As a Legacy from the Past</i>	KDSs	RDSs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shala Kazakh as a bridge between the medium instruction and home language 	+	+
<i>As a Sign of Emerging Multilingualism</i>	KDSs	RDSs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TL as right for people with different language backgrounds living in a multinational country the comfort of TL TL to practice foreign languages. 	+	+
	+	+
	-	+
<i>As a Problem</i>	KDSs	RDSs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> guilty about TL non-acceptance of TL 	+	±
	+	±
Usage of Translanguaging		
<i>As a Meaning-Making Language Practice for Learning Purposes</i>	KDSs	RDSs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TL for ease of information transmission and better understanding making new terms/content clearer at subjects technology-based TL for pedagogical purposes in classes 	+	+
	+	+
	+	+
<i>As a Meaning-Making Language Practice for Communication Purposes</i>	KDSs	RDSs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TL to adjust to communicators' dominant language for communication purposes. Technology-based TL for communication purposes during the breaks 	+	+
	+	+

The findings showed that there were more similarities than differences between KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging. Specifically, the majority of RDSs and KDSs perceived translanguaging positively based on their personal experiences of translanguaging practices at school as well as at home. The following quote "*at school and at home we speak in Kazakh, sometimes in Russian, sometimes we mix them, I feel normal about it*" (KDS 3). Moreover, KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions of translanguaging revealed that KDSs and RDSs perceived Shala Kazakh, which they identified as "mixing the Russian language with the Kazakh language" (KDS 5) neutrally, i.e., between positively and negatively, and that Shala Kazakh served them as a resource to make the meaning of their or other speakers' information during the interaction. Another similarity related to the majority of KDSs' and RDSs' positive perceptions of translanguaging referring to one's right to translanguage in a multinational country as it helps to adjust and practice new languages. Even more, similarities were identified between KDSs and RDSs in findings reflecting the use of translanguaging. All KDSs and RDSs stressed that they used translanguaging to interact with classmates during classes for meaning making and that teachers supported their translanguaging practices. All KDSs and RDSs used translanguaging at break time to discuss entertaining digital content they watched, which shows that even though students were taught through Kazakh-medium instruction, outside the school they still had close contact with languages other than Kazakh, which influenced their language practices within the educational domain.

However, alongside the similarities, the findings revealed some differences in KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging. For example, more KDSs than RDSs perceived translanguaging as a practice that conflicted with their national identities and as a result led to more negative perceptions of it causing the feeling of guilt. Such a perception

may be treated as perceiving translanguaging use as a problem. Moreover, 20% of RDSs compared to no KDSs perceived translanguaging as a resource to practice foreign languages.

The findings from this chapter can be summarized in the following way:

1. The majority of KDSs and RDSs perceived translanguaging positively as a linguistic legacy stemming from the Soviet past, through the lens of Shala Kazakh serving as a bridge between the home language and the medium instruction at school.
2. More than 80% of KDSs and RDSs perceived translanguaging as a comfortable resource and opportunity for learning foreign languages, all reflecting signs of emerging multilingualism. Moreover, almost half of KDSs and RDSs perceived translanguaging as a practice to acknowledge rights of people with different language backgrounds.
3. Some KDSs and RDSs were found to have negative perceptions of translanguaging with some of them accepting translanguaging but experiencing feelings of discomfort/disrespect to their mother tongue. Other KDSs and RDSs did not accept translanguaging at all.
4. Despite various perceptions of translanguaging, all KDSs and RDSs used translanguaging as a meaning-making language practice for learning purposes, including its use for the ease of information transmission and better understanding, for making new terms and/or content clearer, and for intentional use of technology-based translanguaging employed for pedagogical purposes.
5. All KDSs and RDSs used technology-based translanguaging for communication purposes. First, participants used it to adjust to communicators' dominant language. Second, KDSs and RDSs used translanguaging to interact with peers or other students during the breaks, mainly to discuss entertainment content.

6. More similarities than differences were found between KDSs and RDSs. The majority of KDSs and RDSs perceived translanguaging positively as it helped to bridge the medium instruction and the home language, to acknowledge people's language rights in a multinational country, and to feel comfortable. Additionally, the majority of KDSs and RDSs claimed that they used translanguaging to transmit information better, to make new terms clearer in subjects, and to study, and communicate more effectively.
7. A few differences were found between KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging. More KDSs than RDSs, perceived translanguaging as a problem due to the feeling of disrespect to the mother tongue and/or non-acceptance of it.

Conclusion

The data analysis revealed that even though KDSs and RDSs from the rural KMI school in the North Kazakhstan Region had various perceptions of translanguaging, all ten participants still used it. The majority of KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging may be categorized either as neutral since they perceived it as a bridge between home and school languages or positive since translanguaging helped to acknowledge different language backgrounds which caused language sensitivity to one's dominant language, provided comfort during communication and adaptation processes. Nevertheless, some KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging were negative as they did not accept translanguaging as it caused feelings of discomfort, guilt and/or disrespect to the mother tongue. All the findings presented in the chapter are discussed within the conceptual framework and empirical and theoretical studies in the next Discussion chapter.

Chapter 5: Discussion

This chapter presents the discussion of the qualitative data within Ruiz's (1984) conceptual framework and literature reviewed in the study. The purpose of the study was to examine and then compare perceptions and usage of translanguaging by ten KDSs and RDSs studying in a rural KMI school in the North Kazakhstan Region. The three research questions were:

1. How do students in a rural KMI school perceive translanguaging?
2. How do students in a rural KMI school use translanguaging?
3. What are the similarities and/or differences between KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging in a rural KMI school?

The following sections of this chapter are devoted to the discussion of the three research questions posed in the study. Firstly, three findings showing KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions of translanguaging are discussed in relation to research question one followed by findings four and five to present the usage of translanguaging in relation to research question two. Finally, the differences and similarities are discussed through findings six and seven to answer research question three.

RQ1: How do Students Perceive Translanguaging in a Rural KMI School?

This question was aimed at exploring KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions of translanguaging in a rural KMI school. Three major findings emerged from data analysis, i.e., translanguaging as a legacy from the past, translanguaging as a sign of emerging multilingualism, and translanguaging as a problem.

Finding 1. The majority of KDSs and RDSs perceived translanguaging positively as a linguistic legacy stemming from the Soviet past, through the lens of Shala Kazakh serving as a bridge between the home language and the medium of instruction at school. Particularly, translanguaging as a legacy from the past related to the historical situation in the country, i.e., the Russification policy, which lasted for more than half a century in Soviet Kazakhstan and led to the migration of Slavic settlers and spread of the Russian language in the country (Fierman, 2006; Smagulova, 2019). It is also worth noting that the majority of KDSs and all RDSs called such translanguaging practices Shala Kazakh, i.e., mixing Russian into the Kazakh language, which they perceived as a bridge between their parents' dominant language (Russian) and their parents' wish to help the children to maintain the Kazakh language, which is the medium instruction, at home. The finding on the perception of Shala Kazakh as the bridge between school and home languages contradicts the previous research done by Tenbay (2021) and Tastanbek (2019) in which Shala Kazakh practices were found as disparaging by some participants. The finding about Shala Kazakh in this study may be a possible indicator that more and more young Kazakhstani people perceive Shala Kazakh language practices as a language bridge rooted in the country's historical past and stop perceiving it as one's language deficiency. When considered through Ruiz's (1984) framework this finding can be interpreted as translanguaging as a resource to value linguistic and cultural diversity that serves national unity. So, finding about Shala Kazakh as a bridge can indicate that Kazakh people's mentality of respect for other people is rooted in their historical past and multilingual society which resulted in the majority of KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions of translanguaging as a resource.

Finding 2. More than 80% of KDSs and RDSs perceived translanguaging as a comfortable resource and opportunity for learning foreign languages, all reflecting signs of emerging multilingualism. Moreover, almost half of KDSs and RDSs perceived

translanguaging as a practice to acknowledge rights of people with different language backgrounds. For instance, when the participants were asked to read the extract from Cummin's (2010) "Identity Texts" (Appendix B), the majority of KDSs and RDSs claimed that they perceived translanguaging to adapt to a new language environment and learning through a new foreign language. Within Ruiz's (1984) framework, translanguaging as one's linguistic right in a multinational country may be viewed as a resource to enhance one's academic achievement and help a linguistic minority to support their linguistic identity. Moreover, 30% of the participants said that they acknowledged linguistic diversity in a multinational country like Kazakhstan. More specifically, those participants claimed that having Tatar classmates or Russian students studying in a rural KMI school helped them to perceive translanguaging as such students' human right to maintain their mother tongue both at home and within the school. This acknowledgment of one's linguistic right may be a potential indicator of social and linguistic justice providing equity between the dominant language of the public and language minorities (Garcia & Wei, 2014; Hornberger, 2002), which may be present, and which may be strong among young KDSs and RDSs. One such international study done by Yilmaz (2021) also showed that translanguaging helped minority students to support their national and linguistic identities while living in a multinational country with the majority language being different from their mother tongue. This KDSs' and RDSs' sense of social and linguistic justice, in turn, may help minority students to practice speaking their languages and as a result, maintain them. It was also evident when 20% of KDSs chose Russian as the language for the interview and explained their choice by creating comfort for the interviewer having noticed that her dominant language is Russian. This finding might reflect their respect for the interlocutor and empathy. So, the finding that translanguaging was perceived as a sign of emerging multilingualism can be interpreted as a resource and as a right within Ruiz's (1984) framework that helps to value, support, and

develop cultural and linguistic diversity. However, to support minority languages like Tatar or Kyrgyz within formal education, it is necessary that the teachers' community also perceive translanguaging as a resource and as a right.

Finding 3. Some KDSs and RDSs were found to have negative perceptions of translanguaging with some accepting translanguaging but experiencing feelings of discomfort/disrespect for their mother tongue, while others totally did not accept it. This finding showing that some KDSs and RDSs have negative perceptions of translanguaging is partially in alignment with the results of Tastanbek's (2019), Amaniyazova's (2020), and Tuskeyeva's (2022) studies as the participants there also perceived translanguaging negatively because of their feelings of guilt it caused.

The alignment between these studies can indicate that the sense of discomfort/disrespect to the mother tongue or guilt caused by translanguaging related to national identity issues. Moreover, such negative perceptions can be felt both by schoolchildren like in this study, by university students like in Tastanbek's (2019) study, and by in-service teachers (Amaniyazova, 2020, Tuskeyeva, 2022). Moreover, even though the participants in all these studies had the feeling of "guilty translanguaging" or "conflict with national identity", they still acknowledged using it as sometimes they experienced difficulties expressing the ideas or recalling some words in the Kazakh language. This contradiction between the participants' perceptions of translanguaging as a problem and their usage of it as a resource can stem from the educational domain where pedagogy of compromise (Manan et al., 2018) prevails. More specifically, while teachers compromise between the monolingual assessment and curriculum to fit the teaching standards, they de-vocalize some of the students, especially those whose dominant languages like RDSs or speakers of minority languages like Tatar differ from the medium instruction. This raises the question of whether it is necessary to have such a compromise if the multilingual students feel guilty in using

translanguaging to activate their whole linguistic repertoire and may lack behind their peers, which causes inadequate proficiency in the medium instruction.

Moreover, some KDSs and RDSs who had negative perceptions of translanguaging, did not accept it at all, especially if it happened during the lesson and through minority languages like Tatar or Kyrgyz, which were not known by most of the participants. Through the prism of Ruiz's (1984) conceptual framework, these participants' negative perceptions of translanguaging may indicate that translanguaging is a problem where languages other than the medium instruction were perceived as a threat demanding the majority language speakers to take extra effort to learn those languages. Conversely, Cenoz and Gorter (2020), de Jong (2011), Garcia and Otheguy (2019), and Rosa and Flores (2017) pointed out the specific features of translanguaging to help to de-colonize minoritized language communities, to fight linguistic and racial inequalities. For example, de Jong (2011) stressed that translanguaging can fight structural and linguistic inequalities and substitute them with flexible dynamic use of all languages in the repertoire, while Rosa and Flores (2017) highlighted the importance of fighting against racial and linguistic inequalities to form more just communities. So, students' perceptions of translanguaging as a problem should not create a new dominance of once-colonized languages, as happened to the Kazakh language that was almost eradicated by Russian, over other still minority languages. Instead, students perceive translanguaging as a right or as a resource helping to get higher academic achievements, developing multilingualism, and promoting national unity.

This finding also showed that sensitivity to the interviewer's dominant language pushing participants to speak in the Russian language also stemmed from the past legacy, when Kazakh-dominant people were forced to translanguage to Russian to communicate their message during the interaction.

This finding is likely to indicate that these KDSs perceived translanguaging as a resource “for everyone, not only for linguistic minorities and their communities” (Ruiz, 1984 as cited in Hult & Hornberger, 2016, p. 33). Even though KDSs were representing the official language, they showed respect and sensitivity to the Russian-dominant interviewer by choosing the Russian language for the interview. This finding can also indicate that KDSs use translanguaging as a resource to practice all the languages in their repertoire and to develop their own multilingualism.

This finding is in line with the international studies on translanguaging which highlight effectiveness of translanguaging in activating one’s full linguistic repertoire and making the communication process more effective in terms of transmitting and making meaning of one’s messages during the interaction (Cummins, 1981a; 2002b; Garcia et al., 2017; Cenoz & Gorter, 2020; Wei, 2018). For example, Wei (2018) provided a case of a Chinese Singaporeans dialogue where speakers translanguaged naturally and used a mix of the official language with local varieties to communicate effectively. However, even though many international researchers highlighted the effectiveness of translanguaging as a resource for developing bi-/multilingualism, there were no findings showing that due to past legacy one can become sensitive to other speakers’ dominant language.

In general, these three findings: a) translanguaging as-a legacy from the past; b) translanguaging as-a-sign of emerging multilingualism, and c) translanguaging as a problem, answered research question one and showed that KDSs’ and RDSs’ perceptions of translanguaging may range from positive to negative. With many participants perceiving translanguaging positively as a resource and as a right (Ruiz, 1984), it can imply that translanguaging may act as an effective approach in studying and communication processes. However, there is still much to be done so that negative perceptions of translanguaging as a problem caused by feelings of disrespect to the mother tongue or non-acceptance of it would

change. It implies eradicating the difference between monolingual assessment and multilingual classroom practices in formal education that can help students to value their multilingual repertoire.

RQ 2: How Do Students Use Translanguaging in a Rural KMI School?

This research question was posed to examine how KDSs and RDSs used translanguaging in a rural KMI school. Two major findings emerged from the data analysis: (a) using translanguaging as a meaning-making language practice for learning purposes; (b) using translanguaging as a meaning-making language practice for communication purposes.

Finding 4. Despite various perceptions of translanguaging, all KDSs and RDSs used translanguaging as a meaning-making language practice for learning purposes, including its use for the ease of information transmission and better understanding, for making new terms and/or content clearer, and for intentional use of technology-based translanguaging employed for pedagogical purposes. This usage of translanguaging in turn extends the usage of translanguaging from being merely a scaffold to a language practice that activates KDSs' and RDSs' whole linguistic repertoire without any language hierarchy (de Jong, 2011; Garcia, 2009).

Half of KDSs and RDSs said that they used translanguaging for learning purposes like to make the meaning of some professional/new terms more in humanitarian classes than in physics or mathematics. It may be a likely indicator of a strategic and conscious use of translanguaging. However, Goodman and Tastanbek (2020) stated that translanguaging can be not always conscious. It is also worth mentioning that the more frequent usage of translanguaging in classes where readings and discussions of texts are the key tasks supports the findings of Tenbay (2021), who examined RDSSs' challenges and strategy use in an urban KMI school, where participants claimed that they experienced a lot of challenges with reading tasks. Using translanguaging for meaning making for learning purposes may possibly

indicate the need for Kazakhstani teachers to enhance students' translanguaging practices and involve translanguaging as a pedagogical approach.

The majority of KDSs and RDSs also stated that they used translanguaging because of teachers' intentional use of technology-based translanguaging for pedagogical purposes. Partially, participants said that teachers used videos in the Russian language to show some lesson material but after watching this video material they discussed it in the Kazakh language. This finding aligns with studies done in the Eastern Asian context where translanguaging is presented as a resource activating students' language and cultural learning through different digital platforms and helping students to adapt their language practices to the digital environment they interact with (Wei, 2018; Zhang, 2018). Wen et al., (2022), who also researched technology-based translanguaging in the Greater Bay Area (GBA) of China consisting of Guangdong, Hong Kong, and Macau, stated that a dynamic and fluid language practice, such as translanguaging in a technological hub like GBA, helps to bridge monolingual assessment with multilingual classroom practices and narrow the cultural gap. However, the findings also reflected the cases when the participants did not want to use translanguaging because the formal assessment still employs a monolingual approach. Schissel et al., (2021), for example, claimed that even though students mainly perceive and use translanguaging as-resource, they still can object to its usage because if they and teachers use it as classroom practice, translanguaging is still not used in the assessment process. Based on this, one can claim that if multilingual education advocates for social justice and fluid and dynamic usage of students' first language (Hornberger, 2002; Garcia & Wei, 2014), it is necessary to do it holistically, i.e., throughout the curriculum from the level of classroom practice to the formal assessment process.

Finding 5. All KDSs and RDSs used technology-based translanguaging for communication purposes. First, participants used it to adjust to communicators' dominant

language. Second, KDSs and RDSs used translanguaging to interact with peers or other students during the breaks, mainly to discuss entertainment content. Ruiz's (1984) conceptual framework may unpack this finding as language as a resource used to socialize.

All ten KDSs and RDSs used translanguaging either to adapt to a new bilingual community or to adjust to speakers' dominant languages. For example, there was such a phrase "If I see that a person's dominant language is Russian, then I speak Russian" (RDS 1), where the phrase "if I see" can involve the conscious analysis of a speaker's dominant languages. This finding indicates that KDSs and RDSs may have two linguistic identities. Moreover, they use these two identities depending on the people involved in the interaction, which is in alignment with Wei's (2014) and Yilmaz's (2021) studies. For example, Wei (2014) researched ethnic Chinese students in the UK and found that the participants' multilingual identities were emerging while they were dynamically translanguaging between Chinese and English to transmit the message effectively. Yilmaz (2021) also stated that translanguaging helped language-minoritized students to generate their new linguistic identities and easily adapt to new communication situations. This finding also agrees with studies done in the USA, where translanguaging is used to develop dominant language speakers' multilingualism by using minority languages like Spanish, Chinese, or Tagalog to make Americans bi-/multilingual (Hornberger, 2002; Garcia & Otheguy, 2020; Cenoz, 2013). According to Hornberger's (2002) continua of biliteracy, oppressed minority languages get new possibilities and may be viewed as resources for developing multilingualism and national ideology. In other words, these ten KDSs and RDSs perceive translanguaging not as a threat to their Kazakh language proficiency language but as a language practice to provide the opportunity to enforce Russian language learning, develop their own bilingualism, and adapt to the new language community.

All RDSs and KDSs also claimed that they used technology-based translanguaging for communication purposes during the breaks to discuss their interests. Viewed through Ruiz's (1984) framework, this technology-based use of translanguaging enhances KDSs and RDSs' socialization, and their usage of translanguaging represents their right and their personal linguistic freedom.

Therefore, these two findings: a) using translanguaging as a meaning-making language practice for learning purposes and b) as a meaning-making practice for communication purpose helped to answer research question two about the use of translanguaging well. With almost all the KDSs and RDSs using translanguaging as a resource and as a right (Ruiz, 1984), the findings can imply that students may effectively negotiate their multilingual identities to transmit meaning depending on learning or communication situations. Additionally, those students who perceive translanguaging negatively but still use it should be helped to realize the conflict between their monolingual perceptions and multilingual practice and help to eradicate it. To do it, schools need to shift to multilingual education principles where the usage of languages other than the medium instruction is viewed to activate students' whole linguistic repertoire and to develop their learning and communication skills.

RQ 3: What are Similarities and/or Differences Between KDSs' and RDSs' Perceptions and Usage of Translanguaging in a Rural KMI School?

This question aimed at comparing KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging in a rural KMI school and to see if there are any similarities or differences between them. A comparative analysis of the findings showed that there were more similarities than differences between KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging.

Finding 6. The majority of KDSs and RDSs perceived translanguaging positively as it helped to bridge the medium instruction and the home language, to acknowledge people's language rights in a multinational country, and to feel comfortable. Additionally, the majority of KDSs and RDSs claimed that they used translanguaging to transmit information better, to make new terms clearer in subjects, to study and communicate more effectively. If viewed through Ruiz' (1984) framework, almost all participants perceived and used translanguaging as their linguistic right and resource, which mediated the dominance of the Russian language. Moreover, translanguaging helped participants to learn the Kazakh language and support their national identity during the classes and/or breaks with classmates, teachers, and family members, which finally resulted in such a language practice as Shala Kazakh. 60% of KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and usage of Shala Kazakh align with Tastanbek (2019), who found that "there is no Shala Kazakh because it is just my language and nothing about it is Shala (clumsy and half-done)" (p.15). Moreover, Shala Kazakh language practices were defined by KDSs and RDSs in this study as a right/resource (Ruiz, 1984) to use Kazakh and Russian languages to support their language identities, develop bilingualism, and improve their academic achievement. This corresponds to the definition of translanguaging selected for the study. Particularly, it is said that translanguaging is the language practice within multilingual education that helps students to use their whole linguistic repertoire without any boundaries between the languages, promotes multilingualism, and helps students value their languages (Garcia & Wei, 2014). These cross-sections between the local definition of Shala Kazakh language practices and the international definition of translanguaging in multilingual education can indicate that local contexts may use translanguaging but name it with the term which is clear for them. What is also worth noting is that Shala Kazakh as well as translanguaging is also being transformed from being perceived as a problem hindering the learning of one language and/or derogatory practices showing how clumsily a person speaks

one language, to one's rights and/or resources. In other words, the similarities between KDSs and RDSs outweighed the differences, and most of them perceived and used translanguaging as their right/resource (Ruiz, 1984). This finding can indicate that regardless of the dominant language, whether it is a majority or minority language, speakers perceive and use translanguaging in communication and learning processes. So, teachers should support students bi/multilingual practices based on translanguaging if it helps to enhance the academic process and raise multilingual students.

Finding 7. A few differences were found between KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging. More KDSs than RDSs perceived translanguaging as a problem due to the feeling of disrespect to the mother tongue and/or non-acceptance of it. This finding is partially in alignment with previous research on translanguaging in the Kazakhstani context with teachers and university students, who had maximal beliefs within Macaro's (2001/2014) framework, where maximal beliefs refer to having the feeling of guilt but still using translanguaging in their language practices (Akhmetova, 2021; Amaniyazova, 2020; Tastanbek, 2019). The finding in this study only partially aligns with previous Kazakhstani studies because KDSs in this study, even though feeling guilty, still realized that they used translanguaging strategically. More specifically, they said that the Kazakh language was the language of their nation and they felt guilty that sometimes they cannot express their ideas purely in Kazakh but still realized that they needed to use translanguaging to adapt to a new bilingual community after starting to study in a new school. This indicates that they did it pragmatically.

Another difference showed that more RDSs than KDSs used translanguaging to practice a new foreign language (Turkish) to enhance their future academic achievements. Within Ruiz's (1984) framework, this finding may be defined as translanguaging as a resource, which may help to develop metalinguistic awareness between learned languages

and lead to a much easier learning of new languages (Abdulaal, 2020; Vaish, 2019). Using translanguaging as a resource to develop metalinguistic awareness between learned languages is also in alignment with the situation happening within US formal education. While native English speakers studying through English medium instruction are usually monolingual with a limited command of foreign languages, minority or immigrant students studying through English which may not be their dominant language usually are multilingual and may have better developed metalinguistic awareness (Cummins, 1981a; 2002b).

So, based on finding seven it is necessary to confront language pragmatics by the principles of multilingual education. Specifically, it is necessary to raise students' awareness that every language possesses value in terms of constructing language and national identity. Policymakers and teachers should focus on developing societal and personal multilingualism with a focus on social justice and justice in education (Manan et al., 2018).

Conclusion

This chapter discussed the main findings of the research in relation to the literature reviewed for the study and Ruiz's (1984) conceptual framework. The findings showed that most KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions of translanguaging are positive and that there are more similarities than differences between their perceptions and usage which is consistent with international and local studies. Most of the participants also outlined the phenomenon of Shala Kazakh in the local context to support multilingualism in the country, while the similar phenomenon in previous Kazakhstani studies was mainly perceived negatively. It can indicate the positive shift from monolingual lens to emerging multilingualism. However, a minority of participants had a conflict between their monolingual perceptions of translanguaging as a problem and their multilingual practices when they used translanguaging as a right and/or resource. This conflict was also stressed in the previous studies done on translanguaging in Kazakhstan. It in utrn can reflect imperfect educational policy in formal

education, which in turn may hinder the process of raising multilingual students who value their whole linguistic repertoire and negotiate their multilingual identities effectively depending on situations. Unless students become aware of translanguaging in education, they would feel uncomfortable and guilty.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

The discussion of the main findings from ten online individual semi-structured interviews with KDSs and RDSs from a rural KMI school in the North Kazakhstan Region was presented in the previous chapter. This chapter is aimed at presenting the conclusion of this qualitative study, which was focused on examining and then comparing KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging within Ruiz's (1984) framework adapted for the study. The study posed three research questions:

1. How do students in a rural KMI school perceive translanguaging?
2. How do students in a rural KMI school use translanguaging?
3. What are the similarities and/or differences between KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging in a rural KMI school?

The following sections of this chapter present the main conclusions, followed by limitations and recommendations for further research, policy, and practice. Finally, key insights drawn from this study are provided.

Main Conclusions of the Study

Data analysis of research question one showed that many participants perceived translanguaging positively for four main reasons. These determinants were *bridging home and school languages, practicing foreign languages, acknowledging the rights of people with different language backgrounds living in a multinational country, and feeling the comfort of translanguaging*. These reasons for using translanguaging are in alignment with international studies (Garcia & Wei, 2014; Yilmaz & de Jong, 2020; Yilmaz, 2021) and it is believed that the commonalities root from the shift to multilingual education that is gradually helping educational domain to minimize the gap between community and classroom practices (Helot, 2012). However, there was still a minority of KDSs and RDSs who perceived translanguaging negatively. This monoglossic ideology may be caused by the idea of supporting Kazakh language maintenance (Tenbay, 2021). It also implies the need to raise

students' awareness about translanguaging approach within formal education in the next few years.

Research question two showed that all KDSs and RDSs used translanguaging regardless of the negative perceptions of some participants. Firstly, the participants used translanguaging in the learning process *for the ease of information transmission and better understanding, for making new terms/subject content clearer at subjects, for pedagogical purposes in classes with the involvement of technologies*. Specifically, all KDSs and RDSs stressed the effectiveness of translanguaging for having better academic achievements and improving their subject knowledge. The present researcher also showed that activating the whole linguistic repertoire was an important determinant for KDSs and RDSs to use translanguaging which aligns with previous studies on translanguaging (Garcia et al., 2017; Hornberger, 2002; Wei, 2018). Secondly, all KDSs and RDSs used translanguaging in the communication process *to adjust to communicators' dominant language and/or for communication purposes during the breaks with the involvement of technologies*. Interacting with each other and peers as well as watching and discussing internet content were listed by the participants as factors that encouraged them to negotiate their multilingual identities. Moreover, multilingual community practices which are not as rigid as classroom practices infiltrate the educational domain and help students to value every language (Schissel et al., 2021). Taken together, these findings stress the necessity to involve more dynamic language use in the school curriculum at Kazakhstani schools, to develop students' multilingualism and cultural openness for personal development.

Finally, the data analysis showed that there were more similarities between the KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging in a rural KMI school, which answered research question three. Specifically, the similarities reflected that many participants perceived and used translanguaging as a resource and/or as a right (Ruiz, 1984),

which helped them to succeed academically and socially. Hence, these results highlight the need to provide educational and social equality for students whose first language differs from the medium of instruction as well as encourage majority language students to enrich their language repertoire to extend their communication and cultural knowledge (de Jong, 2011). Differences between participants showed that more KDSs than RDSs perceived translanguaging as a practice that conflicted with their national identities, which is consistent with some prior research in the local context (Amaniyazova, 2020; Tastanbek, 2019; Tenbay, 2021). It also provides some insights in understanding participants' struggles, which can be caused by the severe Kazakh language loss in the past (Smagulova, 2008) and the wish to maintain it now. Consequently, KDSs' national identity may conflict with their multilingual language identity, which implies that teachers should raise such students' awareness about ecological coexistence of languages within multilingual education, where all languages are represented as continua (Hornberger, 2002). Additionally, differences between participants indicated that 20% of RDSs compared to no KDSs perceived translanguaging as a resource to practice foreign languages. This finding showing RDSs' preference for their dual language identity may be justified by their developed strategies on how to learn a new language and study in it, while being RDSs in a KMI school. The participants were positive about translanguaging and categorized it as a resource enhancing their chances to study abroad (Ruiz, 1984).

Limitations and Recommendations for Further Research

There are several limitations in this study namely the small sample and one research site. To begin by, as there were only ten KDSs and RDSs in this study, it is impossible to generalize the findings within either Kazakhstani or international contexts. Moreover, all the participants were from the same rural KMI school and as the sample was small, it is impossible to claim that their perceptions and their usage of translanguaging reflect the whole

school, village, or North Kazakhstan Region perceptions and usage of translanguaging.

Consequently, while this study can be used as a background study, it is necessary to have a bigger sample and involve more sites from different schools in the North Kazakhstan Region as well as from other regions to examine and compare KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging to get insights into students' struggles and motives of using or not using translanguaging.

Several recommendations to various stakeholders may be given in terms of policy and practice. Policymakers like Education Department inspectors, school principals, and curriculum developers should pay attention to KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging within multilingual education for learning purposes. Currently, even though translanguaging may be used as a resource or a right within some multilingual classroom practices, there is still an insufficient representation of multilingual assessment in school curriculums. Consequently, it may create a gap in the way content is learned and the method knowledge is assessed. Moreover, it is necessary to raise students' awareness about the role and value of minority languages in formal education, so students do not perceive them as a problem.

Teachers in turn can think of having some changes in teaching practices to enhance the teaching and learning processes. While KDSs and RDSs reported that teachers did not tell them off for translanguaging and even though they can translanguage by themselves, there still were only a few reported cases of pedagogical translanguaging, which mainly happened in humanitarian subjects. It can be an indicator that even though teachers try to embrace the principles of multilingual education, they still do it mainly intuitively and less strategically.

Most importantly, students should become more aware of translanguaging practices in schools. It may help them to negotiate their multilingual identities without having any struggles and increase their chances of learning foreign languages easier which can help them

to study abroad in the future. Additionally, it may help them to value minoritized languages, which are rarely represented in schools.

Key Insights

While doing this research, I got some insight in terms of different perceptions and usage of translanguaging. As translanguaging is being actively researched in many countries, it is important to identify its main features and be ready to spot it in the local contexts due to historical backgrounds, it can be called differently in different countries. Moreover, based on KDSs' and RDSs' perceptions and usage of translanguaging for learning and communication processes in a rural school, I realized that the young generation in Kazakhstan can be more open to multilingualism and does not perceive someone's translanguaging practices as language deficiency but as a resource to enhance academic achievements and as a right to combat linguistic inequalities caused by historical and socio-political situations. It is also worth noting that while doing my thesis, I improved my research skills. I had a chance to conduct research from the beginning and undergo all major steps like choosing the topic, analyzing the importance of it and problem it brings, getting ethical approval from the IREC committee, where I have learned a lot about confidentiality, anonymity of data, getting in contact with gatekeepers and sample, collecting and analyzing data. My academic writing skills also had excelled with the help of my thesis supervisor and academic English instructor. What is also important, I developed a habit to proofread and do corrections, which improved the quality of my thesis.

References

- Abdakimov, A. (1994). History of Kazakhstan (from ancient times to the present day).
Almaty: Almaty.
- Aka, N. (2020). Incidental learning of a grammatical feature from reading by Japanese learners of English as a foreign language. *System, 91*, 102250.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102250>
- Akhmetova, I. (2021). *Practitioners' Views on Translanguaging in Kazakhstani Classrooms* [master's thesis, Nazarbayev University]. Nazarbayev University Repository.
<http://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/5623>
- Amaniyazova, A. (2020). *Kazakhstan Teachers' Beliefs on Translanguaging: Evidence from a Trilingual Context* [master's thesis, Nazarbayev University]. Nazarbayev University Repository. <http://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/4328>
- Amantay, A., Myrzabayeva, A., & Karabay, A. (2017). "Kazakhs should speak Kazakh": Language Policy Realization in Urban Kazakh Families. *NUGSE Research in Education, 2*(2), 13-20.
- Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(1), 9-32.
- Abdulaal, M. A. A. D. (2020). A Shift from a Monoglossic to a Heteroglossic View: Metalinguistic Stego -Translanguaging Lens Approach. *Arab World English Journal, 11*(4), 461-473. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol11no4.29>
- Ayazbayeva, N. (2017). Language-in-education policy in multilingual education. *NUGSE Research in Education, 2*(1), 12-15.
- Balu, K. (2009). Perceptions and attitudes at work. In L. Matthewman, A. Rose, & A. Hetherington (Eds), *Work psychology: An introduction to human behavior in the workplace* (pp. 74–94). New York: Oxford University Press

- Bin-Tahir, S. Z., Saidah, U., Mufidah, N., & Bugis, R. (2018). The impact of the translanguaging approach on teaching Arabic reading in a multilingual classroom. *Ijaz Arabi Journal of Arabic Learning*, 1(1).
- Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 401-417.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x>
- Cenoz, J. (2013). Defining multilingualism. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, 33, 3-18.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2020). Teaching English through pedagogical translanguaging. *World Englishes*, 39(2), 300–311. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12462>
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian modern language review*, 57(3), 402-423.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Person Education, Inc.
- Cummins, J. (1981). The Role of Primary Language Development in Promoting Educational. *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework.*, 16.
- Cummins, J. (2002). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(2), 221-240.
<https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/CJAL/article/view/19743/21428>
- Cummins, J., & Early, M. (2010). *Identity texts: The collaborative creation of power in multilingual schools*. Trentham Books Ltd. Westview House 734 London Road, Oakhill, Stoke-on-Trent, Staffordshire, ST4 5NP, UK.
- de Jong, E. J. (2011). *Foundations of multilingualism in schools: From policy to practice*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- Denzin, N.K & Lincoln, Y.S. (2013). *Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. The Landscape of qualitative research* (4th ed.). Sage.

- Fallas Escobar, E., & Dillard-Paltrineri, E. (2015). Professors' and students' conflicting beliefs about translanguaging in the EFL classroom: Dismantling the monolingual bias. <https://doi.org/10.15517/rlm.v0i23.22355>
- Fierman, W. (2006). Language and education in post-Soviet Kazakhstan: Kazakh-medium instruction in urban schools. *The Russian Review*, 65(1), 98-116.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9434.2005.00388.x>
- Fish, W. (2021). *Philosophy of perception: A contemporary introduction*. Routledge.
- García, O. (2009). Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century. In *Social justice through multilingual education* (pp. 140-158). Multilingual Matters.
- García, O., Johnson, S. I., Seltzer, K., & Valdés, G. (2017). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2021.1930804>
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Language, bilingualism and education* (pp. 46-62). Palgrave Macmillan UK. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12171>
- García, O., & Otheguy, R. (2020). Plurilingualism and translanguaging: Commonalities and divergences. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 23(1), 17-35.
- Gibson, J. J., & Pick, A. D. (1963). Perception of another person's looking behavior. *The American journal of psychology*, 76(3), 386-394.
- Goldstone, R. L., Landy, D. H., & Son, J. Y. (2010). The education of perception. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 2(2), 265-284.
- 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.

- Gorter, D., Aiestaran, J., & Cenoz, J. (2012). *The revitalization of Basque and the linguistic landscape of Donostia-San Sebastián* (pp. 148-163). Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Gregory, R. L. (1980). Perceptions as hypotheses. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. B, Biological Sciences*, 290(1038), 181-197.
- Griffiee, D. (2012). *An introduction to second language research methods: Design and data*. University of California: TESL-EJ Publications.
- Griggs, C. (2010). Community nurses' perceptions of a good death: a qualitative exploratory study. *International journal of palliative nursing*, 16(3), 140-149.
- Gumarova, L. (2017). *Challenges Teaching in Kazakh as L2*. [Master's thesis, Nazarbayev University]. Nazarbayev University repository. <http://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/2565>
- Hamilton, L., & Corbett-Whittier, C. (2012). *Using case study in education research*. Sage.
- Hélot, C. (2012). Linguistic diversity and education. In *The Routledge handbook of multilingualism* (pp. 231-248). Routledge.
- Hennink, M. M., Hutter, I., & Bailey, A. (2011). *Qualitative research methods*. SAGE.
- Heugh, K., French, M., Armitage, J., Taylor-Leech, K., Billingham, N., & Ollerhead, S. (2019). Using multilingual approaches: moving from theory to practice. *British Council: London, UK*.
- Hornberger, N.H. (2002). Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: An ecological approach. *Language Policy*, 1, 27-51.
- Hornberger, N. H., & Johnson, D. C. (2007). Slicing the onion ethnographically: Layers and spaces in multilingual language education policy and practice. *Tesol Quarterly*, 41(3), 509-532.

- Hornberger, N. H., & Link, H. (2012). Translanguaging in today's classrooms: A biliteracy lens. *Theory into practice, 51*(4), 239-247. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2012.726051>
- Hult, F., & Hornberger, N. (2016). Revisiting Orientations in Language Planning: Problem, Right, and Resource as an Analytical Heuristic. *The Bilingual Review/La Revista Bilingüe, 33*(3), 30-49. Retrieved from https://repository.upenn.edu/gse_pubs/476
- Hüttner, J., Dalton-Puffer, C., & Smit, U. (2013). The power of beliefs: Lay theories and their influence on the implementation of CLIL Programs. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 16*(3), 267-284.
- Information-Analytic Center (IAC) (2014), OECD Review of Policies to Improve the Effectiveness of Resource Use in Schools: Country Background Report for Kazakhstan, Information-Analytic Center of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Astana, www.oecd.org/edu/school/schoolresourcesreview.htm
- Johnson, D. C. (2013). *Language policy* (pp. 291-291). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jones, B. (2017). Translanguaging in Bilingual Schools in Wales. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 16*(4), 199 - 215. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2017.1328282>
- Kakenova, A. (2017). *The State Language Policy and Its Influence on Ethnic Minorities' Employment and Education Opportunities* [master's thesis, Nazarbayev University]. Nazarbayev University Repository. <http://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/3888>
- Kapashev, D. (2020). Language Attitudes and Choices of Students for Learning Purposes in Multilingual Higher Education Environment.

- Karabassova, L. (2018). Teachers' conceptualization of content and language integrated learning (CLIL): evidence from a trilingual context. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*.
- Kassym, Zh. (2021). *History of Kazakhstan through Kazakh as a Medium Instruction (KMI: Russian Speaking University Students Perceptions of Their Experience Studying in Nazarbayev Intellectual Schools (NIS))*. [Master's thesis, Nazarbayev University]. Nazarbayev University Repository. <http://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/5597>
- Klamer, A. (2010). A Pragmatic View on Values in Economics. *Journal of Economic Methodology*, 10(2), 191-212, <https://doi.org/10.1080/1350178032000071075>
- Kuandykov, A. (2021). *EFL Teachers' translanguaging Pedagogy and Development of Beliefs about Translanguaging* [master's thesis, Nazarbayev University]. Nazarbayev University Repository. <http://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/5608>
- Lee, J. H. (2016). Exploring non-native English-speaking teachers' beliefs about the monolingual approach: Differences between pre-service and in-service Korean teachers of English. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 37(8), 759-773.
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualization and contextualization. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), 655–670. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718490>
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2013). *Language-in-education policies: The discursive construction of intercultural relations* (Vol. 153). Multilingual matters.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2010). The importance of language policies and multilingualism for cultural diversity. *International Social Science Journal*, 61(199), 37-67.
- Lopez, C. C., & Gonzalez-Davies, M. (2015). Switching codes in the plurilingual classroom. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 70(1), 67-77. doi: 10.1093/elt/ccv056

- Macaro, E. (2001). Analyzing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *The modern language journal*, 85(4), 531-548.
- Macaro, E., Barnard, R., & McLellan, J. (2014). Overview: Where should we be going with classroom code switching research? *Code Switching in university English-medium classes: Asian perspectives*, 10-23.
- Manan, S., David, M. & Channa, L. (2018). Opening Ideological and implementational spaces for multilingual/plurilingual policies and practices in education: a snapshot of scholarly activism in Pakistan, *Current Issues in Language Planning*, (pp. 1–23). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2018.1543162>
- Marton, F. (1986). Phenomenography: A research approach to investigating different understandings of reality. *Journal of Thought*, 21 (3), 28–49.
- Matthen, M. (Ed.). (2015). *The Oxford handbook of philosophy of perception*. OUP Oxford.
- Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. JosseyBass.
- MoES (Ministry of Education and Science). (2018). *On the approval of standard curricula in general subjects, elective courses, and electives for general educational organizations*. Ministry of Education and Science. <https://nao.kz/loader/fromorg/2/25>
- Nazarbayev Intellectual Schools Autonomous Educational Organization [NIS AEO]. (2018). *2030 development strategy*. [СТРАТЕГИЯ ENG 04.04. 2018.indd \(nis.edu.kz\)](https://nao.kz/loader/fromorg/2/25)
- Nurbayev, Zh. (2020, May 21). *Why Did Kazakhstan Fail the International PISA Assessment?* CABAR.Asia. <https://cabar.asia/en/why-did-kazakhstan-fail-the-international-pisa-assessment>
- Ospanova, S. (2017). *University students' perceptions of and experience with codeswitching in a program with English-medium instruction* (master's thesis, Nazarbayev

University, Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan). Retrieved from

<https://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/2577>

- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(3), 281-307.
- Pickens, J. (2005). Attitudes and perceptions. *Organizational behavior in health care*, 4(7), 43-76.
- Namrullah, Z., & Nasrullah, A. (2020). Enhancing reading comprehension through translanguaging strategy. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 11(6), 970-977.
- Rosa, J., & Flores, N. (2017). Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in society*, 46(5), 621-647.
- Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE journal*, 8(2), 15-34.
- Shkedi, A. (2005). *Multiple case narrative: A qualitative approach to studying multiple populations* (Vol. 7). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Schissel, J. L., De Korne, H., & López-Gopar, M. (2021). Grappling with translanguaging for teaching and assessment in culturally and linguistically diverse contexts: Teacher perspectives from Oaxaca, Mexico. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 24(3), 340-356.
- Shohamy, E. (2011). Assessing multilingual competencies: Adopting construct valid assessment policies. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 418-429.
- Smagulova, J. (2008). Language policies of Kazakhization and their influence on language attitudes and use. *International journal of bilingual education and bilingualism*, 11(3-4), 440-475. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050802148798>

- Smagulova, J. (2019). Ideologies of language revival: Kazakh as school talk. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 23(3), 740-756. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006916684920>
- Smagulova, J. (2021). When language policy is not enough. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2021(267–268), 265–269. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2020-0101>
- Stake, R. E. (2013). *Multiple case study analysis*. Guilford press.
- Stanley, I. H., Hom, M. A., Rogers, M. L., Hagan, C. R., & Joiner Jr, T. E. (2016). Understanding suicide among older adults: a review of psychological and sociological theories of suicide. *Aging & mental health*, 20(2), 113-122.
- Streefkerk, R. (2019). Inductive Vs. Deductive Research Approach (With Examples). Scribbr.
- Swain, M. (2000). French immersion research in Canada: Recent contributions to SLA and applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 20, 199-212.
- Tastanbek, S. (2019). *Kazakhstani Pre-Service Teacher Educators' Beliefs on Translanguaging* [master's thesis, Nazarbayev University]. Nazarbayev University Repository. <http://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/4328>
- Tenbay, S. (2021). *Understanding Challenges and Strategy Use of Russian-Dominant Kazakhs Studying in Kazakh-Medium Schools: A Qualitative Inquiry*. [Master's thesis, Nazarbayev University]. Nazarbayev University Repository. <http://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/5606>
- Tuskeyeva, A. (2022). *Perceptions on Translanguaging from EFL Teachers with Different Linguistic Backgrounds in Kazakhstan* [master's thesis, Nazarbayev University]. Nazarbayev University Repository. <http://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/6558>
- Tuan, Y. F. (1990). *Topophilia: A study of environmental perception, attitudes, and values*. Columbia University Press.

UNESCO. (2008). Education for all by 2015–Will we make it? EFA Global Monitoring Report.

Vaish, V. (2019). Translanguaging pedagogy for simultaneous biliteracy struggling to read in English. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 16(3), 286-301.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2018.1447943>.

Webber, L. (2020). Researching with children using Skype interviews and drawings: methodological and ethical issues explored. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 18(4), 339-353

Wei, L. (2014). Translanguaging knowledge and identity in complementary classrooms for multilingual minority ethnic children. *Classroom Discourse*, 5(2), 158-175.

Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9-30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039>

Wen, Z., Han, L., Hu, G., & Teng, M. F. (2022). Rethinking language policy and planning in the Greater Bay Area of China: insights from translanguaging theory. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 7(1), 42.

Williams, C. (1994). *Arfarniad o ddulliau dysgu ac addysgu yng nghyd-destun addysg uwchradd ddwyieithog*. Bangor University (United Kingdom).

Yakshi, S. (2019). *Translanguaging in EFL Classrooms: Teachers' Beliefs and Purposes in Kazakhstan* [master's thesis, Nazarbayev University]. Nazarbayev University Repository. <http://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/6588>

Yilmaz, T. (2021). Translanguaging as a pedagogy for equity of language minoritized students. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 18(3), 435-454.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2019.1640705>

Yilmaz, T., & de Jong, E. (2020). Translanguaging as a Boundary Crossing Mechanism: A Turkish-American Youngster and Her Linguistic Negotiation of Three Discursive

Spaces. *Australian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(1), 11-25.

<https://doi.org/10.29140/ajal.v3n1.284>

Zhang, L. (2018). *The relationship between online translanguaging practices and Chinese teenagers' self-identities* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Leeds).

Appendix A

Recruitment Letter

Have you ever dreamt about participating in real scientific research? Do you want your voice to be heard?

If you answered yes, then you have a chance to participate in such research.

My name is Assel Shakuliyeva. I am a master's degree candidate at the Graduate School of Education of Nazarbayev University. My research is on *the use of languages other than Kazakh in schools with Kazakh as the medium instruction*. Your voice is extremely important, and your participation will be highly appreciated.

You will be requested to take part in a 40 - 50-minute interview that will be conducted at a convenient time and place for you. Your participation will be *beneficial for you as your voice will be heard and you will be allowed to reflect on the use of languages in your studies*. I also want to emphasize that participation in the study is *voluntary, and you have the right to participate in it or not and withdraw from the study at any time with no penalty!* The information you provide in the interview will be treated as confidential and will not reveal your identity. No one will know your name and that you participated in this research (except for your parents). I will use pseudonyms instead of your name.

In case you experience discomfort while answering some questions, you can choose not to answer them. You will not be identified by teachers or classmates; you will be invited to have online individual interviews and will have direct contact with me. The time for the interview will be chosen so that it does not distract you from the school process or have an impact on marks.

If you agree to participate and/or have any questions or concerns, please, **CONTACT ME DIRECTLY** at my phone number or email address.

Tel: + 7 775 535 76 35. Email: Assel.shakuliyeva@nu.edu.kz

Thank you for your time and attention! Looking forward to your responses!

Best regards,

Assel Shakuliyeva

Master of Multilingual Education Candidate

Graduate School of Education

Nazarbayev University

Appendix B

Interview Protocol

Categories	Interview Questions	Интервью сұрақтары	Вопросы интервью
Background	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can you tell me what grade are you from? 2. How many years have you been studying in this school? 3. What language(s) do you know and speak most (prefer to use most)? 4. How would you evaluate your knowledge of each language you speak on a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 (very low) and 10 (very high)? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Айтыңызшы, сіз қай сыныптан? 2. Сіз бұл мектепте қанша жыл оқисыз? 3. Сіз қай тілді білесіз және қай тілде сөйлейсіз (ең көп қолданғанды жөн көресіз)? 4. Сіз 1-ден 10-ға дейінгі шкала бойынша сөйлейтін әр тіл туралы біліміңізді қалай бағалайсыз, мұнда 1 (өте төмен) және 10 (өте жоғары)? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Скажите, из какого вы класса? 2. Сколько лет вы учитесь в этой школе? 3. Какой язык(и) вы знаете и на каком языке(ах) вы говорите больше всего (предпочитаете использовать больше всего)? 4. Как бы вы оценили свое знание каждого языка, на котором вы говорите по шкале от 1 до 10, где 1 (очень низкий уровень) и 10 (очень высокий)?
Studying Process	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do you like your school (studying through the Kazakh-medium instruction)? 2. What languages do you use during classes and breaks at 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Сізге мектебіңіз ұнай ма (қазақ тілінде оқыту)? 2. Сабақ, үзіліс кезінде қандай тілдерді қолданасыз? Қандай жағдайларда? 3. Үйде қай тілді қолданғыңыз келеді? Неліктен? 4. Мұғалімдер өз пәндерін оқытуда қандай тілді 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Нравится ли Вам Ваша школа (обучение на казахском языке)? 2. Какие языки вы используете во время уроков, перемен? В каких случаях? 3. Какой язык(и) вы предпочитаете использовать дома? Почему? 4. Какой язык используют преподаватели при

<p>school? In what cases? 3.What language(s) do you prefer to use at home? Why? 4.What language do teachers use when teaching their subjects? Do teachers use languages other than Kazakh in their teaching? In what cases? 5.How much do you think language(s) other than Kazakh should be used in classes? Why? In what cases? 6.What do you think of students mixing/using language(s) other than Kazakh in class? 7.I will give you the case to read and ask you to share your thoughts on it. Do you approve of the teacher's actions or not? Why (not)? (Extract of the</p>	<p>қолданады? Оқытушылар өз оқуларында қазақ тілінен басқа тілдерді қолдана ма? Қандай жағдайларда? 5. Сіздің ойыңызша, сыныптарда қазақ тілінен басқа тіл(дер) ді қаншалықты пайдалану керек? Неліктен? Қандай жағдайларда? 6. Сыныпта қазақ тілінен басқа тілдерді араластыратын/қолданатын студенттер туралы не ойлайсыз? 7. Мен сізге бір кейс оқып беруге беремін. Сіз оған қатысты ойларыңызбен бөлісе аласыз ба? Сіз мұғалімнің әрекетін мақұлдайсыз ба, жоқ па? Неге (иә/жоқ)? (кейстің үзіндісі төменде келтірілген) 8. Бұл кейста сізге не ұнайды немесе ұнамайды? Неліктен? 9. Сіз осылай бағаланғыңыз келе ме? Неге (иә/жоқ)? 10. Сіз қосқыңыз келетін тағы бір нәрсе бар ма?</p>	<p>преподавании своих предметов? Используют ли преподаватели в своем обучении языки, помимо казахского? В каких случаях? 5. Насколько, по вашему мнению, в классах должен/ны использоваться другой(ие) язык(и) помимо казахского? Почему? В каких случаях? 6. Что Вы думаете о студентах, смешивающих/использующих в классе другие язык(и) кроме казахского? 7. Я дам вам прочитать один кейс. Можете ли вы поделиться своими мыслями относительно него? Одобряете ли вы действия учителя или нет? Почему (да/нет)? (отрывок кейса прилагается ниже) 8. Что вам нравится или не нравится в этом случае? Почему? 9. Хотите ли вы, чтобы вас оценивали таким образом? Почему (да/нет)? 10. Есть ли что-нибудь еще, что вы хотели бы добавить?</p>
---	---	---

	case is attached below) 8.What do you or not like in this case? Why? 9. Would you like to be assessed in this way? Why (not)? 10.Is there anything else you would like to add?		
--	---	--	--

A case (retrieved from Cummins & Early (2010). Identity Texts. *The Collaborative Creation of Power in Multilingual Schools*, p. 49. Trentham Books Ltd, Chester, printed in Great Britain by 4 edge Limited, Hockley):

Inclusion and Assessment - When Tomer entered my class last year, much of the work he produced was in Hebrew. Why? Because that is where his knowledge was encoded, and I wanted to make sure that Tomer was an active participant in my class. It was also a way for me to gain insight into his level of literacy and oral language development. As I watched him carry out various writing tasks, it became clear to me that Tomer had very strong literacy skills in his first language. For example, when I asked him to do a creative writing piece based on three pictures that he himself can select, his pencil did not stop moving, there was little hesitation, and it was apparent that his ideas flowed easily. Next, I had him read aloud to me (in Hebrew) what he had written and there I saw the fluency, intonation, and the ease with which he read. I was also able to relate his oral language and literacy skills to the English language development rubric that I follow for assessing student progress.

Thank you for your participation.

Appendix C

Assent Form for Students

Russian-dominant and Kazakh-dominant Students' Perceptions on Translanguaging: A Case with a Rural Kazakh-Medium Instruction School

My name is Assel Shakuliyeva. I am a Multilingual Education Program Master student from the Graduate School of Education at Nazarbayev University. I am doing a research study, and I want to ask if you will be part of it.

What is a research study?

A research study is when people like me collect a lot of information about a certain thing to find out more about it.

This letter tells you about my study so you can decide if you want to be in it. Before you decide, you can talk about it with your parents or anyone else you like. If you have any questions about the research, just ask me.

Why am I doing this study?

I am doing this study to find out more about how children use languages at school. This study is not part of your schoolwork, and you will not get grades on it.

Why am I talking to you about this study?

I am asking a lot of children your age if they would like to help. I am inviting you to take part because you are studying in Grades 7 - 11 in a rural school with a Kazakh-Medium Instruction.

What will happen if you are in this study?

If you agree to be in the study and your parents say it is okay, I will ask you to:

- to participate in an individual online interview.
- to choose the date/time comfortable for you.
- to choose Skype/Zoom/cell phone.
- to answer questions about languages you use at school.
- to audio record your answers during the interview but only with YOUR PERMISSION.

Total time: The whole study will take about 40 - 50 minutes.

Will good things happen from being in this study?

Being in this study will not really change anything for you. But I hope that what I find out from this research will help children in the future to learn languages and subjects.

Are there things you might not like about being in the study?

You might get bored or tired and decide that you do not want to answer some questions or finish the study activities. If this happens, just tell me you want to stop.

Who will know that you are in the study?

You, your parents, and me as the researcher are the only ones who will know the details of your being in the study. If I ever use the information from this study in my future research, I

will not use any real names of people who were in it. I will just talk about what I learned from all the results put together.

Will you get paid for being in the study?

No, you will not be paid for being in this study.

Do you have to be in the study?

No, you do not! Research is something you do only if you want to. Nothing bad will happen if you do not want to be in the study. Just tell me. Whether you decide to participate or not, either way will have no effect on your grades at school. And remember, you can always change your mind later if you do not want to be in the study anymore.

Do you have any questions?

You can ask questions about this study at any time, now or later. You can talk to me, or your parents, or someone else if you like.

You can contact me, Assel Shakuliyeva, a Multilingual Education Program Master student in the Graduate School of Education at Nazarbayev University, at +7 775 535 76 35 or Assel.shakuliyeva@nu.edu.kz. Or you can write to the Research Committee IREC at resethics@nu.edu.kz.

ASSENT OF CHILD (12 -17 years old)

If you decide to participate, and your parents agree, I will give you a copy of this form to keep. That way you can look at it later if you want to.

If you would like to be in this research study, please sign your name on the line below.

Child's Name/Signature (*printed or written by child*)

Date

Signature of Investigator/Person Obtaining Assent

Date

Appendix D

Written Informed Consent for Parents

Russian - dominant and Kazakh - dominant Students' Perceptions on Translanguaging: A Case with a Rural Kazakh-Medium Instruction School

Introduction. Your child is invited to participate in a research study entitled “Russian - dominant and Kazakh - dominant Students' Perceptions on Translanguaging: A Case with a Rural Kazakh-medium Instruction School”.

Procedures. The purpose of this study is to explore and compare the seventh - eleventh grade Russian - dominant and Kazakh-dominant students' perceptions of translanguaging, i.e., the usage of languages other than the medium instruction in a rural school in the North Kazakhstan Region. A child will be requested to choose a convenient date/time to participate in 40 - 50-minute online individual interviews either through Zoom, Skype, or a cell phone directly with the researcher. A child's answers will be audio recorded during the interview only with a CHILD'S PERMISSION. Having direct contact with a child will help to eliminate the involvement of schoolteachers or other school staff and ensure anonymity. During the interview, I will not ask a child to give a real name instead I will assign a pseudonym. Secondly, I will not reveal the name of the school/the village to ensure a participant's anonymity. Neither school administration nor teachers will be able to identify a child as there will be a contact with me directly. The questions in the interview will be focused on a child's language use and perceptions of using languages other than Kazakh at school. To provide confidentiality, all data will be coded during the collection process and will be kept on the researcher's personal computer secured with a password during the data analysis process. Finally, I want to highlight that participation in the interview is voluntary.

Risks. The main potential risk associated with a child's participation in an interview refers to psychological discomfort and identification. In case a child will experience some discomfort while answering some questions, he/she can choose not to answer them. Moreover, to eliminate the risks of being identified by teachers or classmates, a child will be invited to have an online individual interview and provide responses to the researcher directly. The time for the interview will be chosen so that not to distract a child from the school process. A child will be requested to stay in a quiet room at home with no other people in the room to provide safety and make the atmosphere more comfortable. To ensure anonymity, a child will be assigned a pseudonym. Finally, the responses will not be disseminated to teachers or other persons, and collected data will be stored in the researcher's computer, secured by a password and code, as well as only I will have the access to data.

Benefits: There are no direct benefits for a child in research. However, the indirect benefit is that a child's participation may help a child to reflect on situations when and why he/she uses languages other than Kazakh at school and a child may become more aware of translanguaging practices, i.e., usage of languages other than Kazakh at school and own perceptions of them. Various stakeholders may also benefit from the study. Firstly, as a parent your child's voice will be heard. Moreover, Kazakhstani policymakers and teachers can become more aware of students' translanguaging practices in a rural school with a Kazakh-medium instruction and they may consider it when designing class activities.

Compensation. No tangible compensation will be given. A copy of the research results will be available after the study in my master's thesis, which will be available in the NU repository.

Confidentiality & Privacy. Any information that is obtained during this study will be kept confidential to the full extent possible. All efforts, within reason, will be made to keep a child's personal information in a research record confidential. A child will be assigned a pseudonym and the name of the site will be not revealed. I will also ask you as parents to make sure that during one-to-one online interviews a child is in a quiet room with no other people in it. In my turn, I also guarantee to be in a quiet room with no other people present. After the data collection, it will be stored on the researcher's personal computer secured with a password that only the researcher knows and has access to. During the whole process, the researcher will treat the data as confidential and never share it with other participants or anyone outside the study. No identifiable information will be published or reported. Finally, if I ever use the information from this study in my future research, I will not use any real names of people who were in it.

Voluntary Nature of the Study. Participation in this study is strictly voluntary, and if an agreement to participate is given, it can be withdrawn at any time without prejudice.

Points of Contact. It is understood that should any questions or comments arise regarding this project, or a research-related injury is received, the Principal Investigator, Assel Shakuliyeva, Multilingual Education Program Master student in Graduate School of Education at Nazarbayev University, + 77755357635, Assel.shakuliyeva@nu.edu.kz should be contacted. Any other questions or concerns may be addressed to the Nazarbayev University Institutional Research Ethics Committee, resethics@nu.edu.kz.

Statement of Consent

I, _____,

Give my voluntary consent to participate in this study.

The researchers clearly explained to me the background information and objectives of the study and what my participation in this study involves.

I understand that my participation in this study is voluntary. I can at any time and without giving any reason withdraw my consent, and this will not have any negative consequences for me.

I understand that the information collected during this study will be treated confidentially.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Researcher:

Signed _____ Date _____

Appendix E

Appendix E

Coding and Themes Sample of Research Question 1 (Excerpt)

Codes for RQ1	Extracts	Themes RQ1: <u>How do students perceive translanguaging in a rural KMI school?</u>
If translanguages him/herself	Extract 2: <i>Interviewer: And in general, what relation do you have to Shala Kazakh? (The interviewer). RDS 4: Neutral, perhaps...I just try to use Kazakh words, that's why, perhaps, neutral.... At home, we also speak Russian and Kazakh. *Shala Kazakh was defined by RDS 4 as "It is mixing Kazakh and Russian."</i>	Shala Kazakh as a bridge
Negative perception = guilt	Extract 3: <i>"Aaa...I feel a bit uncomfortable when I can't express my idea purely in Kazakh...because I think I do not know Kazakh well enough, sometimes"</i> (KDS 7).	
Purism view	Extract 4: <i>Interviewer: And what do you feel when you translanguage? KDS 9: Mmm, I don't even know. Interviewer: Do you feel as usually, or your feelings change a bit? KDS 9: Well, we live in Kazakhstan, and I do not want to add Russian, I want to speak pure Kazakh, but it is sometimes difficult. Interviewer: Mh, mh. And how do you feel "Well done" or "Not well done" (giggles)? KDS 9: Well, perhaps, not well done (giggles). Interviewer: And why not well done? KDS 9: Well, one should either speak only Kazakh or Russian</i>	Language-as a problem
Mixed perceptions, at school = negative = feeling of disrespect; in general, normal	Extract 5: <i>RDS 2: "...perhaps, normal. But sometimes when I use Russian woRDSs during Kazakh subject. it's somehow not ok as if I do not respect ...as if you, how to say... (trans languages from Russian to Kazakh) do not respect your mother tongue"</i> (RDS 2).	