

**Exploring the Relationship between EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Practices of
Translanguaging in Rural Areas of Kazakhstan**

Aizat Arystanbek

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: 24,382

Author Agreement

By signing and submitting this license, I *Aizat Arystanbek* (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.

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: 

Date: 23.05.2023

Ethical Approval



53 Kabanbay Batyr Ave.
Nur-Sultan 010000
Republic of Kazakhstan
Date: 14 of October 2022

Dear Aizat Arystanbek:

This letter now confirms that your research project titled...

Contradictory or Consistent: The Relationship between EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Practices of Translanguaging in Rural Areas

has been approved by the Graduate School of Education, pending the minor changes as specified by the reviewer with final official approval to be given by the advisor.

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

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Bridget Goodman
Associate Professor

On behalf of:

Dr Matthew Courtney, *PhD*
Chair, GSE Ethics Committee
Graduate School of Education
Nazarbayev University

Block C3, Room M027

Office: +7 (7172) 70 6659

Mobile: +7 708 274 9564

email: matthew.courtney@nu.edu.kz, gse.irec@nu.edu.kz

CITI Training Certificate

Completion Date 16-Jun-2022

Expiration Date 15-Jun-2025

Record ID 49639353

This is to certify that:

Aizat Arystanbek

Has completed the following CITI Program course:

Not valid for renewal of certification
through CME.**Students conducting no more than minimal risk research**

(Curriculum Group)

Students - Class projects

(Course Learner Group)

1 - Basic Course

(Stage)

Under requirements set by:

Nazarbayev University**CITI**
Collaborative Institutional Training InitiativeVerify at www.citiprogram.org/verify/?wcb6a1f57-01c2-413b-b916-f2631cce1bef-49639353

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Bridget Goodman for her guidance, rigorous feedback, and endless support and encouragement throughout this thesis work. Thank you for being not only our “academic mama”, but also caring about our well-being, cheering me up every time when I got frustrated, and showing me the model of a kind, compassionate, knowledgeable, insightful, and remarkable educator.

I would like to thank NUGSE for allowing me to try on the role of a researcher and conduct my own research. I would also like to thank all faculty members of the NUGSE for their support and feedback throughout my academic journey. Your dedication to teaching and research has been an inspiration to me, and I am grateful for the invaluable experience to learn from such talented and passionate educators. Special thanks to Dr. Ainur Almukhambetova and Dr. Andrew Drybrough for being our “academic sister” and “academic brother” and helping me to cope with all of my writing issues by finding the best ways to improve the quality of this thesis.

Маған ылғи да демеу беріп, қандай таңдау жасасам да маған қолдау көрсетіп, әрдайым менің жанымнан табылатын отбасыма, анам мен әкеме, бауырларыма, атам мен апама және барлық жақындарыма алғысымды айтамын. Маған әрбір қиыншылықты жеңуге, менің қуанышым мен бақытымның себепкері болып, маған сенім білдіріп, асқақ армандарымның орындалуына көмектескендеріңіз үшін сіздерге алғысым шексіз.

To my friends and “Rats in Academia” members, thank you for your unwavering support and motivation. You believed in me more than I did, and I am grateful to have you all in my life. With all of you, these two years were full of adventure, happiness, unforgettable moments, and new insights that improved me as a person. I also want to thank the members of the “Translanguaging trio”, Aliya and Aidana, and my dear roommate, Munira, for sharing

my worst and happiest moments, listening to my complaints without judgment and understanding me without words. Thank you all for being my unpaid therapists.

Finally, I would like to thank me. Thank you, Aizat, for your patience, enthusiasm, and hard work. Although this research is like a grain of sand in this immense academic world, I hope it will be a valuable resource for future fellows of translanguaging.

Rejoice, Aizat - you did not drown this world in your tears while you were writing this thesis. You finished it! You did it!

Abstract**Exploring the Relationship between EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Practices of Translanguaging in Rural Areas of Kazakhstan**

The complexity of the relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices was broadly recognized in previous studies highlighting how due to teachers' monoglossic ideologies, they were inclined to limit the use of translanguaging. Notwithstanding, teachers tended to apply translanguaging unintentionally and occasionally in their EFL classes. As a result, this created a discrepancy between EFL teachers' stated monoglossic ideologies and their heteroglossic practices. While there is some evidence of this happening, little is known about rural EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging and how their relationship is built in the system of internal and external factors. This study aims to understand and examine what supports and hinders teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging in a rural area of Kazakhstan based on García and Kleyn's (2016) framework of translanguaging pedagogy and Buehl and Beck's (2015) framework of external and internal factors. Thus, employing a collective case study design and involving semi-structured interviews and classroom observations, with 5 teachers from 5 rural schools, this study found that teachers mainly held positive beliefs toward translanguaging. In addition, the study findings revealed the major and substantial district-specific factor, the school's location, which was found to have a powerful effect on teachers' perceptions and actual use of translanguaging, as this factor activated other school-related and classroom-related factors, which also affected teachers' belief-practice consistency and inconsistency. The findings of this study carry essential implications for the field of language education, such as reconsidering pre-service EFL teachers' curriculum and parental involvement in students' language learning. The inquiry also adds evidence about EFL teachers' teaching conditions in rural areas and provides an understanding of variations of schools located in one rural region.

Keywords: translanguaging, teachers' beliefs, teachers' practices, belief-practice consistency, rural areas, internal factors, external factors

Аңдатпа

Қазақстандағы Ауылдық Аймақтардағы Ағылшын Тілі Мұғалімдерінің Транстілдесу туралы Сенімдері мен Тәжірибелерінің арасындағы Қарым- Қатынасты Зерттеу

Мұғалімдердің сенімдері мен тәжірибелері арасындағы байланыстың күрделілігі алдыңғы зерттеулерде кеңінен танылып, мұғалімдердің біртүлділік идеологияларға байланысты транстілдесудің қолданысын шектеуге бейім екені аталып өтті. Осыған қарамастан, мұғалімдер ағылшын тілі сабақтарында байқаусызда және кейбір жағдайларда транстілдесу тәжірибесін қолдануға бейім болатыны да анықталған болатын. Нәтижесінде, бұл ағылшын тілі мұғалімдерінің айтқан біртүлділік сенімдері мен олардың көптілді тәжірибесі арасында сәйкессіздік тудырды. Әйтсе де, осындай жағдайлардың болғаны жайлы кейбір дәлелдемелер болғанымен, ауылдық аймақтардағы ағылшын тілі мұғалімдерінің сенімдері мен транстілдесуге байланысты тәжірибесі, сондай-ақ олардың арасындағы қарым-қатынасы ішкі және сыртқы факторлар жүйесінде қалай құрылғаны туралы мәліметтер әлі де аз. Сол себепті бұл зерттеу Қазақстанның ауылдық аймақтарындағы мұғалімдердің транстілдесуге деген сенімдері мен тәжірибесін қолдайтын және/немесе кедергі келтіретін факторларды түсінуге және зерттеуге бағытталған. Бұл мақсатқа жету үшін екі теориялық негіз пайдаланылды: Гарсиа мен Клейннің (2016) транстілдесу педагогикасының тұжырымдамасы және Бюль мен Бектің (2015) сыртқы және ішкі факторлар тұжырымдамасы. Осылайша, бес ауылдық мектептің бес мұғалімімен жартылай құрылымдық сұхбат пен сыныптағы бақылауларды қамтитын ұжымдық кейс-стади зерттеуін пайдалана отырып, бұл зерттеу мұғалімдердің транстілдесуге қатысты оң сенімді ұстанатынын анықтады. Сонымен қатар, зерттеу нәтижелері ауданға тән негізгі және маңызды фактор – мектептің орналасқан жері, мұғалімдердің транстілдесуге қатысты сенімдері мен нақты қолданылуына ауқымды әсерін тигізетінін көрсетті. Бұл

фактор мектеп пен сыныпқа байланысты басқа да факторларды белсендіретіндіктен, ол мұғалімдердің сенімдері мен тәжірибелері арасындағы дәйектілік пен сәйкессіздіктің пайда болуына да өз әсерін тигізетіні анықталды. Бұл зерттеудің нәтижелері тілдік білім беру саласына, атап айтқанда, ағылшын тілі оқытушыларының жоғары оқу орындарындағы оқу бағдарламасын қайта қарастыруға және ата-аналарды оқушылардың тіл үйренуіне қатысуына қатысты мәселелерді шешуде маңызы зор. Сондай-ақ, зерттеу нәтижелері ағылшын тілі мұғалімдерінің ауылдық жерде оқыту шарттары жайлы зерттеу саласына деректерді қосып, бір ауылдық аймақта орналасқан әртүрлі мектептердің айырмашылықтары туралы эмпирикалық түсінік береді.

Түйін сөздер: транстілдесу, мұғалімдердің сенімдері, мұғалімдердің тәжірибесі, сенім мен тәжірибенің үйлесімділігі, ауылдық аймақтар, ішкі факторлар, сыртқы факторлар.

Аннотация

Изучение Взаимосвязи между Убеждениями и Практикой Транслингвизма

Учителей Английского Языка в Сельских Местностях Казахстана

Сложность взаимосвязи между убеждениями и практикой учителей английского языка была широко признана в предыдущих исследованиях, в которых подчеркивалось, как из-за одноязычной идеологии, учителя были склонны ограничивать использование транслингвизма. Несмотря на это, учителя непреднамеренно применяли практику транслингвизма на своих занятиях по английскому языку на периодической основе. В результате, это создало несоответствие между заявленной преподавателями английского языка одноязычной идеологией и их разноязычной практикой.

Независимо от существования в литературе некоторых свидетельств таких случаев, мало что известно об убеждениях и практике сельских учителей английского языка по транслингвизму, а также о том, как строятся их взаимоотношения в системе внутренних и внешних факторов. По этой причине данное исследование направлено на то, чтобы понять и изучить факторы, которые поддерживают и/или препятствуют убеждениям и практике транслингвизма учителей в сельской местности Казахстана.

Для достижения данной цели были использованы две теоретические основы:

концепция педагогики транслингвизма Гарсии и Клейна (2016) и концепция внешних и внутренних факторов Бюля и Бека (2015). Таким образом, используя множественное тематическое исследование, включающее полуструктурированные интервью и наблюдения в классе с участием пятерых учителей из пяти сельских школ, данное исследование показало, что учителя, в основном, придерживаются положительных убеждений в отношении практики транслингвизма. Кроме того, результаты исследования выявили основной фактор, характерный для местности – местоположение школы, которое, как было установлено, оказывает сильное влияние на восприятие и фактическое использование учителями транслингвизма. Поскольку этот

фактор активирует другие факторы, связанные со школой и классом, также было выявлено, что они влияют на последовательность и несоответствие в убеждениях и практике учителей. Результаты данного исследования имеют важное значение для языкового образования, так как способствуют пересмотру учебной программы преподавателей английского языка в высших учебных заведениях и вовлечению родителей в изучение языка учащимися. Более того, данное исследование предоставляет эмпирические доказательства об условиях преподавания учителей английского языка в сельской местности, а также о различиях школ, расположенных в одном сельском регионе.

Ключевые слова: транслингвизм, убеждения учителей, практика учителей, согласованность убеждений и практики, сельские местности, внутренние факторы, внешние факторы.

Table of Contents

Author Agreement	ii
Declaration.....	iii
Ethical Approval	iv
CITI Training Certificate	v
Acknowledgments.....	vi
Abstract	viii
Аңдатпа	x
Аннотация.....	xii
Table of Contents.....	xiv
List of Tables	xvii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Background Information.....	1
Problem Statement.....	3
Purpose of the Study and Research Questions	4
Significance of the Study.....	5
Outline of the Study.....	5
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	7
The Concept of Translanguaging	7
Translanguaging in Education: What is Translanguaging in Classroom Settings?.....	8
The Theoretical Framework of Translanguaging	10
Stance.....	11
Design	11
Shift.....	12
The Framework of Internal and External Factors that Influence Beliefs and Practices	13
The Empirical Studies on Effects of Internal and External Factors on Teachers' Beliefs and Practices of Translanguaging	14
Incongruence or Congruence of Teachers' Beliefs and Practices	20
Understanding Kazakhstani EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Practices of Translanguaging	22
Conclusion.....	24
Chapter 3: Methodology	26
Research Design	27
Research Site	28
Sampling.....	28

Data Collection Instruments	30
Data Collection Procedures	31
Data Analysis.....	33
Ethical Considerations.....	37
Conclusion.....	38
Chapter 4: Findings.....	39
EFL Teachers' Beliefs towards Translanguaging Pedagogy.....	40
Translanguaging Stance	40
Translanguaging Design and Shifts.....	43
The Minimal Application of Translanguaging Design	44
The Minimal Translanguaging Shifts	45
Factors Influencing Teachers' Beliefs and Practices of Translanguaging	46
Internal Factors	46
External Factors	50
Congruence and Incongruence between Rural EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Actual Practices of Translanguaging.....	60
Conclusion.....	62
Chapter 5: Discussion	64
RQ: What are EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Practices Regarding the Use of Translanguaging in Rural Schools?.....	64
The Influence of Internal and External Factors on EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Practices of Translanguaging	67
Internal Factors and Schooling	67
Monolingual Professional Development Courses and Work Experience.....	69
External Factors, Classroom-Context, and School-Context Factors	70
District-Level Factors and School's Location	74
RQ2: What is the Relationship between EFL Teachers' Perceptions and Practices of Translanguaging in Rural Areas?	75
Conclusion.....	77
Chapter 6: Conclusion.....	78
Main Findings of the Study	78
Limitations.....	81
Recommendations	82
Future Research Directions	83
Final Reflection	84
References.....	86

Appendix A Interview Protocol	101
Appendix B Letter to Participants.....	107
Appendix C Informed Consent Forms	110
Appendix D Sample of Transcription	116

List of Tables

Table 1 Demographic Data of the Participants	29
Table 2 Sample of Coding based on García and Kleyn's (2016) Framework of Translanguaging Pedagogy	34
Table 3 Sample of Coding based on Buehl and Beck's (2015) Framework of Internal and External Factors	36

Chapter 1: Introduction

Background Information

In recent years, the term “translanguaging” has gained significance in various educational and non-educational contexts in the world (Cenoz & Gorter, 2022). As one of the new methods of language learning, translanguaging can be defined as an important part of “making meaning, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages” (Baker, 2011, p. 288). Translanguaging includes all modes of communication and emphasizes not only the spoken language but also written and other forms of language; thus, it becomes an act of engaging multilingual practices across modalities (García, 2009). In the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom, translanguaging practices can take multiple shapes, depending on contextual factors, students’ language proficiency, and their linguistic background (Nagy, 2018). Accordingly, teachers’ practices of translanguaging have two main approaches to instruction: monoglossic and heteroglossic (Kaipnazarova, 2020). If teachers’ monoglossic practices treat languages as separate entities, heteroglossic practices allow for the integration of languages (García, 2009). In this vein, the role of the teachers in classroom practices is considered influential (OECD, 2005) since teachers have the power, through instruction, to enhance students’ learning outcomes and diverse capabilities in and through multiple languages (Cummins et al., 2011). Furthermore, by remaining “a powerful agent of change in the classroom”, teachers’ particular or general choices and decisions about their classroom practices can and do alter their students’ lives significantly (Cummins et al., 2011, p. 153).

Teachers’ beliefs are one of the key features of effective classroom practices, as teachers make substantial decisions about teaching instructions considering the theoretical beliefs they hold (Kuzborska, 2011). Similarly, Richards and Rodgers (2001) stated that teachers possess beliefs about their teaching and learning experiences that further build a basis for their classroom practices. In order to make relevant decisions, teachers should be

aware of various ways in which students' knowledge can be developed, no matter their learning differences, language, and cultural impacts (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005). However, as Borg (2017) stated, the central issue is that "situational constraints often prevent teachers from putting their beliefs into practice" (p. 86). In this vein, Buehl and Beck (2015) proposed a framework for the relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices in a system of internal and external supports and hindrances. According to their framework, internal factors are mainly related to teachers' own belief systems and include other beliefs, knowledge, experience, and teachers' levels of self-reflection and awareness (Buehl & Beck, 2015). External factors, in contrast, are identified as potential facilitators or challenges to teachers "enacting their beliefs in practice" and include classroom-context factors, school-context factors, and national-, state-, and district-level factors (Buehl & Beck, 2015, p. 76). Cenoz and Gorter (2017, 2020a) also claimed that the main challenges in implementing translanguaging in education are related to teachers' perceptions, pedagogical practices, and different contextual situations.

Hence, teachers' beliefs play an indispensable role in understanding the complexity of challenges in teaching and learning through translanguaging (Amaniyazova, 2020). Additionally, teachers' practices of translanguaging are usually closely connected to how they believe teaching should be conducted and what teaching methods they have implemented throughout their careers (Doiz & Lasagabaster, 2016). Teachers' unawareness of their own beliefs and practices may lead to negative consequences, such as in the case of Batyrova's (2021) study, in which rural school students portrayed their teachers as incompetent and reflected teachers' practices as "monotonous" and ineffective within the "overuse of the mother tongue" (p. 73). Therefore, the study of teachers' beliefs and practices regarding translanguaging is essential to have a deeper knowledge of language teaching and to perceive linguistic differences and use of other languages in the EFL classroom as "a base

of linguistic information to talk about, use, and build from” rather than “a symptom of inability” to learn and teach (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005, p. 35).

Problem Statement

Previous research on Kazakhstani EFL teachers has revealed that teachers tend to prioritize target language-only instruction in their classrooms and hold monoglossic i.e. target-language-only beliefs regarding translanguaging (Amaniyazova, 2020; Kuandykov, 2021). Nevertheless, within the existence of various hindrances and factors, such as low English proficiency caused by “insufficient” hours dedicated to teaching English and “ineffective” textbooks designated by the Central Authority, teachers cannot rely on monolingual instruction; therefore, they modify their teaching practices and use heteroglossic approaches (Kaipnazarova, 2020).

While there is some evidence of EFL teachers' monoglossic beliefs and heteroglossic practices, little is known about teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging in the context of external factors, such as how teachers in rural areas actually enact their translanguaging beliefs in practice and what supports and hindrances either facilitate or impede the relationship between them. McLaughlin et al. (2021) also claimed that school-context factors are significant constraints in implementing new content or techniques in classrooms. This can be reflected in urban-rural disparity, such as geographical isolation and shortage of social, educational, and cultural facilities in rural schools (e.g., Agaidarova, 2019; Irsaliyev et al., 2017; Umbetaliyeva et al., 2016). In addition, rural schools are not offering the appropriate educational and professional support for EFL teachers (Agaidarova, 2019; Batyrova, 2021; Irsaliyev et al., 2017). For instance, there are low indicators of professional development courses provided for rural schoolteachers (SPESD, 2016-2019), which increases the alarming urgency for the ongoing courses within the development and implementation of new approaches to teaching for teachers. In the same vein, Batyrova (2021) underlined the importance of classroom-context factors because teachers' practices and their classroom

decisions regarding the use of students' L1 were reported by students to be one of the influential factors that have led most students to face difficulties in EFL classrooms.

As can be seen, most of the studies in rural regions were focused on the general comparison of education and conditions of Kazakhstani teachers in urban and rural areas (Agaidarova, 2019; Irsaliyev et al., 2017; McLaughlin et al., 2021; Umbetaliyeva et al., 2016). However, rural EFL teachers and their beliefs and practices of translanguaging have not yet been explored. Since teachers are deemed to develop not only students' linguistic knowledge but also to be responsible for creating competent English speakers and preparing them for today's global world (Agaidarova, 2019), it is crucial to study and fill the existing gaps in EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging in rural areas.

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

This study explores EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging in the Kazakhstani teaching context in rural areas. The study also attempts to understand and analyze how internal and external factors impede or/and support the relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging.

In this regard, the following research questions are posed:

RQ1: What are EFL teachers' beliefs and practices regarding the use of translanguaging in rural schools?

Sub-questions:

- a) What are the rural EFL teachers' beliefs about translanguaging in the classroom?
- b) How do rural EFL teachers use translanguaging in the classroom?
- c) What internal and external factors influence EFL teachers' practices and beliefs about translanguaging?

RQ2: What is the relationship between EFL teachers' perceptions and practices of translanguaging in rural areas?

Sub-questions:

- a) How do the rural EFL teachers' stated beliefs differ from their actual practices?
- b) How do internal and external factors impede or support the relationship between EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging?

Significance of the Study

This study can be of a certain value to different educational stakeholders, namely, EFL teachers, school administrators, policymakers, parents, and researchers. The insights into teachers' beliefs and practices may help Kazakhstani teachers to rethink their teaching approaches and make them more effective for students' learning outcomes. School administrators may find the findings from this study helpful when designing their school curricula and creating dialogues between schools and parents. In the same vein, policymakers may find study findings useful for developing policy documents on language use and teaching practices in EFL classrooms, as well as for designing and adapting pre-service EFL teachers' curricula to the local bi/multilingual context. Understanding beliefs that lead teachers' decision-making and behavior in their classrooms could also facilitate policymakers in providing better-directed feedback to support teachers' professional growth throughout their careers.

Lastly, this study will be one of the first works that explores the relationship between EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging in the Kazakhstani context based on classroom observations in rural schools; thus, this study is expected to contribute to the research adding evidence from different mainstream schools located in the rural area.

Outline of the Study

This study consists of six chapters. The first chapter has provided insight into the topic by obtaining the background information, problem statement, the purpose of the study, the research questions, and sub-questions, followed by the significance of the study within the potential benefits for educational stakeholders. The next chapter, the literature review, presents several sections devoted to the conceptualization of translanguaging and its

application in education. The chapter also introduces the two frameworks for translanguaging pedagogy and the relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices in a system of external and internal supports and hindrances. Following this, the chapter describes previous studies on teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging and what factors facilitate or impede the relationship between them. The third chapter focuses on the methodology of the research, which includes discussions around the following areas: (a) the research approach, (b) the research design, (c) the research site and participants, (d) data collection instruments, (e) data collection procedures, (f) data analysis, and (g) ethical considerations. The fourth chapter provides the research findings collected from the semi-structured individual interviews and classroom observations. The following chapter includes a discussion of the study's major findings with reference to the frameworks and literature review. Lastly, the sixth chapter concludes the study with its assets, limitations, and implications and finalizes within the recommendations for further research.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

This chapter provides an overview of the existing studies on the concept of translanguaging and English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging, as well as the main internal and external factors that shape and develop EFL teachers' beliefs about translanguaging as a facilitating tool in the English language classrooms. The chapter consists of seven sections: first, it starts with conceptualizing translanguaging. The following section focuses on the role of translanguaging in education and its application as a pedagogical tool in classrooms. Furthermore, in accordance with the study's purpose, the two theoretical frameworks are presented. Thus, considering the EFL teachers' beliefs and practices within the three aspects of translanguaging pedagogy (García & Kleyn, 2016), this part examines the major supports and impediments of the relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices based on the framework proposed by Buehl and Beck (2015). Following this, an overview of empirical studies on factors influencing teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging is provided. After that, the literature on the nature of the complex relationship between teachers' beliefs and their actual practices of using translanguaging is presented. The section after that analyzes and explains the study phenomena in the Kazakhstani context. The chapter ends by providing the outline and major conclusion of what has been discussed in the literature review chapter.

The Concept of Translanguaging

Originally, translanguaging was first used in education in the 1980s, in particular by Cen Williams (Lewis et al., 2012a) and broadly familiarized after Baker's (2001, 2006, 2011) and García's (2009) studies on bilingualism and bilingual education. Translanguaging originally refers to a systematic and planned instructional approach that assists teachers in leveraging input and output in two different languages, such as reading the text in one language and discussing it in another one (Cummins, 2021; Mazzaferro, 2018). Following this, translanguaging concerns "effective communication, function rather than form, cognitive

activity, and language production” (Lewis et al., 2012a, p. 641). The expanded concept of translanguaging incorporates multilingual individuals’ dynamic heteroglossic linguistic practices and values the legitimacy of bilingual education that integrates rather than segregates languages (García, 2009). Based on this, translanguaging can be described as “multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage to make sense of their bilingual worlds” (García, 2009, p.45). Hence, translanguaging means using one’s repertoire, that is, one’s whole integrated linguistic attributes that the speaker acquires and utilizes through social interactions (Mazzaferro, 2018; Pennycook, 2017).

It is worth mentioning that “a proper understanding of translanguaging requires a return to the well-known but often forgotten idea that named languages are social, not linguistic, objects” (Otheguy et al., 2015, p. 281). Accordingly, a significant issue in understanding the concept of translanguaging emerges in defining the sophisticated matter of what counts as a ‘language’ (Mazzaferro, 2018). From the translanguaging perspective, languages are not a conceptual system of unchangeable and fixed entities; languages are constantly shaped and developed by the practice and actions of individuals in “reflexive, relational and dialogical ways” (Mazzaferro, 2018, p. 1). Therefore, “linguaging” is viewed as an integrated process in which people use language to express themselves, gain knowledge and experience, and communicate with each other (Li & Zhu, 2013), while the prefix “trans-” demonstrates the forms that multilingual people utilize beyond standard language practices (Vogel & García, 2017).

Translanguaging in Education: What is Translanguaging in Classroom Settings?

When it comes to education, teachers are mainly confronted with the issue of choosing appropriate teaching strategies and approaches that would meet the needs of a particular classroom. Traditionally, separating languages and considering a monolingual approach as the key to effective teaching in foreign language classrooms was conventional

(Lewis et al., 2012a; Nagy, 2018). However, with the growing relevance of multilingualism and educational practices that started to be conducted in bi/multilingual settings, traditional methods required reconsideration and modification to meet the learners' needs (Nagy, 2018). Since the classroom includes students with various linguistic skills and competencies, new strategies for teaching languages are needed to take into account learners' diverse backgrounds (Iversen, 2019). Nevertheless, considering the difficulty of implementing new approaches to teaching due to the different factors, such as lack of resources or curriculum that should be followed (Byrnes, 2020), teachers are still supposed to "implement a learner-centered mindset that considers the specific individual needs of the language learner" in order to successfully implement translanguaging (Nagy, 2018, p. 42).

In this vein, translanguaging, as a new progressive term in the educational field, encourages the use of other languages to reinforce the development of the target language and can be activated in all kinds of classroom activities (Cenoz, 2017). Thus, another broader concept of translanguaging was developed by Cenoz and Gorter (2017), who distinguished between spontaneous and pedagogical translanguaging. If pedagogical translanguaging has a more intentional and systematic character within planned instructional strategies of integrating two or more languages, spontaneous translanguaging mainly occurs naturally (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017). Accordingly, in educational contexts, translanguaging can be seen as a new pedagogy that deals with understanding the concept of languages (Creese & Blackledge, 2015; García & Wei, 2014). Translanguaging in education employs a heteroglossic approach to teaching that supports the use of multiple language practices (Nagy, 2018). According to García and Wei (2014), teachers need to use translanguaging in their pedagogy as it not only provides student engagement in the learning process and in-depth comprehension but also helps teachers to develop their students' knowledge in cognitive, social, and creative ways. Notably, translanguaging also empowers teacher-student

relations as it creates a social space for multilinguals (Wei, 2018), bringing the dissemination of information and “the representation of values, identities, and relationship” (Wei, 2011, p. 1222). Moreover, translanguaging goes beyond traditional language teaching practices as it involves other languages which are not traditionally utilized in language instruction; accordingly, it develops teachers’ experiences and, eventually, learners’ learning processes and outcomes (Wei, 2018).

In classroom settings, teachers view translanguaging as a tool for expanding their learners’ cross-linguistic resources and providing better classroom language and content learning stability (Cenoz & Santos, 2020). Teachers and students also use translanguaging as a scaffolding strategy to enhance classroom interactions and teacher-student relationships (Allard, 2017; Sahib, 2019; Wang, 2019). At this rate, Iversen (2019) described five pedagogical perspectives for implementing translanguaging in the classroom: (1) understand the linguistic variety, (2) provide support/respect to linguistic differences, (3) maintain linguistic heterogeneity, (4) facilitate multilingual literacy, (5) apply all linguistic repertoires to study by understanding one language through another. Thus, translanguaging and its application in classrooms can take various shapes depending on diversified factors and contexts.

The Theoretical Framework of Translanguaging

In order to investigate EFL teachers’ beliefs and practices of translanguaging, García and Kleyn’s (2016) translanguaging pedagogy will be used. Based on the expanded definition of translanguaging in instruction identified by García et al. (2017), García and Kleyn (2016) further developed three interconnected dimensions of translanguaging pedagogy: stance, design, and shifts. At this rate, translanguaging involves a transformation for teachers as it implies using students’ whole linguistic repertoire, including L1, which is traditionally not adopted in the EFL context (Yüzlü & Dikilitaş, 2022). This change requires (1) adopting

'stance', (2) 'design', and (3) 'shift', (García et al., 2017, p. 27). Each of these will be explored in more detail in the sections below.

Stance

A stance characterizes the “philosophical, ideological, or belief system” from which teachers draw to facilitate their pedagogical foundation (García et al., 2017, p. 12). Teachers adopting a translanguaging stance support using different languages in their classrooms as fundamental resources, even if it requires teachers to challenge the monolingual ideologies traditionally ingrained in school language practices (Deroo & Ponzio, 2019). Therefore, to implement translanguaging in their practices: (1) teachers need to develop a stance that bilingualism can serve as a resource and develop language classrooms in two or more languages; (2) teachers' stance must reflect their students' needs and languages, not external forces, such as language policy standards and regulations; and (3) teachers should firmly believe that translanguaging supports their students to perform more creatively and critically (Wei, 2011).

Design

In order to possess a stance that facilitates translanguaging practice, teachers should design and plan translanguaging instruction within three core elements: (1) constructing collaborative/cooperative structures; (2) collecting various multilingual and multimodal instructional sources; (3) using translanguaging pedagogical practices (García et al., 2017). Classroom instruction involving translanguaging is based on the theory of joint and student-centered approaches; correspondingly, teachers' teaching practices are designed to emphasize student interaction (García & Kleyn, 2016). Translanguaging design also capitalizes on integrating a variety of resources that are both “multilingual and multimodal” (Kleyn & García, 2019, p. 73). This leverages students with diverse entry prospects for meaning-making of the new language features. In other words, multimodality activates all modes of

communication “assembled contribute to how multimodality affects different rhetorical situations, or opportunities for increasing an audience’s reception of an idea or concept” (Wei, 2018, p. 22). That is, the design of lesson plans and assessment procedures are thoroughly informed and operated by learners’ language practices and knowledge to ensure that learners have sufficient acquaintance with the language features necessary for completing academic tasks (Vogel & García, 2017).

Shift

Even though teachers design and systematize translanguaging instruction, it is also essential for teachers to be acquainted with translanguaging *corriente* provided by bilingual students’ language practices; that is, teachers should also be prepared to adjust to meet students’ whole linguistic repertoires (García & Kleyn, 2016). The translanguaging theory arises “from an understanding of language from the speaker up, and not from the named language down” (p. 23). Otheguy et al. (2015) highlighted that there is an existence of “idiolects”, which is about speakers’ internal perspective of his/her whole repertoire. Everyone’s idiolect is incomparable and idiosyncratic as it emerges in interaction with other speakers. No matter how teachers embrace intended and strategic planning for lessons, classroom interactions and students’ use of languages are unpredictable and different. Therefore, translanguaging shifts refer to the “moment-by-moment decisions that teachers make all the time” (García et al., 2017, p. 13) which teachers must be prepared to and be flexible enough to do (García & Kleyn, 2016; Kleyn & García, 2019). The shifts are closely linked to the stance, as teachers’ beliefs and willingness are the core elements of addressing students’ needs and facilitating meaning-making and instruction at the center of classroom practices (García et al., 2017). To sum up, it is crucial to negotiate the instructional design while confronting spontaneous changes to effectively support students’ comprehension and learning outcomes (Kleyn & García, 2019).

The Framework of Internal and External Factors that Influence Beliefs and Practices

The potential of translanguaging is expansive, especially in facilitating students' input and the significance of rapport among all participants in EFL classrooms; however, reconsidering language learning practices, promoting organized translanguaging approaches, and improving flexible teacher-student interactions still need to be recognized and developed across contexts. Furthermore, the classroom is filled with different contextual constraints and factors influencing teachers' instruction. This suggests that there might be a connection between translanguaging stance, design, and shifts and internal and external factors. Since the translanguaging shifts are related to the teachers' competence to be prepared for the different contextual situations during the lessons, there might also be factors that either facilitate or impede the congruence and incongruence between teachers' beliefs and practices (Buehl & Beck, 2015). The complexity of implementing teachers' beliefs into their practice is primarily apparent in investigating external and internal challenges and supports (Ashton, 2015). Therefore, Buehl and Beck's (2015) framework of external and internal factors will be used to investigate and analyze the factors that develop or affect teachers' beliefs and practices and support or impede their relationships. Based on this framework, internal factors were:

- other beliefs: teachers' own belief system, such as their responsibility, belief in students' capability, and teachers' self-efficacy and capability.
- knowledge: teachers' content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and pedagogical content knowledge to implement instructional practices that would align with their beliefs.
- self-awareness and self-reflection: teachers need to be aware and reflect on the consistency and inconsistency of their beliefs and practices.

External factors included:

- classroom-context factors: students' needs, attitudes, and overall behaviors.

- school-context factors: administration, colleagues, parental support, school resources, and availability.
- national-, state-, and district-level factors: education policies, curricular standards, language policies, and state laws.

Thus, the next section of the literature review will consider these factors separately to understand their nature and how they are connected to teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging. Since most of the studies on teachers' beliefs and practices did not indicate or define revealed factors as internal and external, I will categorize them based on features of factors identified in Buehl and Beck's (2015) framework. Therefore, internal and external factors revealed in the empirical studies on teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging will be extensively discussed in accordance with the framework.

The Empirical Studies on Effects of Internal and External Factors on Teachers' Beliefs and Practices of Translanguaging

This section examined internal and external factors that were identified in previous empirical studies on teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging in accordance with Buehl and Beck's (2015) framework. Accordingly, when it comes to the factors that affect teachers' beliefs, Creese and Blackledge (2010) stated that "the local ecologies of schools and classrooms" may define teachers' translanguaging practices (p. 107). As Yuan and Yang (2020) further claimed, teachers' perceptions about translanguaging might influence how translanguaging practices were implemented in the classroom and how different factors affected the intentional or unintentional use of translanguaging. In other words, even though teachers articulate L1 as a barrier to learning the target language, their language decisions are tightly linked to their cognitive comprehension of language learning and the affective contextual realities (Copland & Neokleous, 2011). Generally, beliefs are considered

contextually and irregularly stable integrations that are likely to change only if there is a consistent and solid interference in various social practices (Skott, 2014).

Internal Factors. As Pajares (1992) pointed out, teachers hold beliefs about many various topics, and these beliefs live in a “multidimensional system” in which some views may be more fundamental than others (Buehl & Beck, 2015, p. 75), and teachers may have even contradictory beliefs (Cross, 2009). Accordingly, internal beliefs refer to teachers' own belief systems, including other beliefs, knowledge, experience, and levels of self-reflection and awareness (Buehl & Beck, 2015). All these factors will be considered particularly below.

Other Beliefs. The features of teachers' own belief systems may either support or hinder their teaching and, eventually, influence their classroom decisions, students' learning outcomes, and opportunities to learn (Levin, 2014). Therefore, teachers' self-efficacy and capability were pointed out as potential mediators and moderators influencing teachers' own belief systems (Buehl & Beck, 2015). Tang et al. (2012) highlighted that teachers are more likely to implement new content and various approaches to teaching English as a second language when they believe in their own capability and confidence to do so. Galante (2020) noted that due to the teachers' hesitation in implementing this approach and fear of negative perceptions from their students, teachers primarily avoided its use in their classrooms.

Knowledge and Experience. In some cases, teachers cannot act on their beliefs due to the lack of content knowledge or, in other cases, when teachers lack the pedagogical knowledge to implement the instructional practices (Buehl & Beck, 2015). At this rate, Fives and Buehl (2008) defined knowledge as “anything the individual holds that helps him or her fulfill the role of the teacher” (p.137). Accordingly, it is crucial to consider teachers' content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and pedagogical knowledge to understand teachers' beliefs about classroom instruction developed throughout the years of professional development experience (Chong et al., 2005; Fives & Buehl, 2008; Mouza, 2009). For

instance, Borg (2015) emphasized the influence of schooling (early language learning experiences at school) on teachers' beliefs. Based on some study outcomes (Lortie, 1975; Moodie, 2015), teachers may inherit some teaching approaches and manners of their previous teachers or, in some cases, reject teaching methods that teachers' former instructors used. These findings indicate that teachers' early language learning experiences related to translanguaging may also be seen as unfavorable, leading to teachers' avoidance of translanguaging in their classrooms. As Burkhalter (2013) claimed, Kazakhstani EFL teachers generally resist adopting new pedagogical strategies due to their received Soviet education and the perceptions that old methods, such as monolingual approaches in teaching EFL, are the most appropriate. The study by Tastanbek (2019) about pre-service teacher educators' translanguaging beliefs has also revealed that teachers are likely to restrict their students' freedom and right to use all their linguistic resources. The author found that teacher educators might believe that translanguaging could decrease the pre-service teachers' English language proficiency development as first-year students have a low level of English, and it is necessary to use a monolingual approach to strengthen students' language proficiency. It is possible that the pre-service teacher's formal educators' practices were shaped by their early language learning experiences, which in turn may shape their students' classroom practices.

Some studies showed that teachers' monolingual beliefs could be formed within their professional development and coursework (Borg, 2011; Kang, 2013), while other studies found that teachers' beliefs about languages changed to a more heteroglossic view by the end of coursework (Gorter & Arocena, 2020). Hence, it can be suggested that the teachers' beliefs are changeable, dependent on the pedagogical impact, and need external interference to change teachers' internal standpoints (Gorter & Arocena, 2020).

Self-Awareness and Self-Reflection. According to Buehl and Beck (2015), teachers' lack of self-awareness and reflection affects the beliefs they hold; as a result, the lack of self-

awareness and reflection might lead teachers to enact practices that vary from their beliefs. To prevent this belief-practice inconsistency, teachers need to critically inspect their beliefs and identify what is best for their classroom practices. However, the empirical studies on translanguaging did not explicitly reveal how teachers' self-awareness and reflection influenced their beliefs and classroom instruction. There were two studies conducted by Korkmaz (2021) and Copland and Neokleous (2011) that highlighted the role of teachers' awareness of their own beliefs; yet, their study outcomes mainly showed how contextual and classroom-context constraints (e.g., students' linguistic difficulties and classroom needs) that emerged spontaneously created a discrepancy between teachers' reported beliefs and actual practices as the teachers may not always know about their own beliefs that cannot be harmonized with their actual practices (Copland & Neokleous, 2011; Korkmaz, 2021).

External Factors. Since teachers' beliefs alone would be weak and insufficient to change traditional teaching practices, external factors and influences should also be addressed (Lim & Chai, 2008). Teachers' beliefs and practices cannot be modified only in terms of narrow contexts, such as teachers' own belief systems; to change teachers' belief-practice inconsistency, it is crucial to consider broader contexts, such as external interference of surrounding culture and policies. At this rate, Buehl and Beck (2015) emphasized the significance of external constraints in studying teachers' beliefs and practices as challenges built by various external factors primarily determine their levels.

Classroom-Context Factors. Several classroom-level factors, such as students' needs, attitudes, and overall behaviors, affect teachers' beliefs and practices to various degrees (Buehl & Beck, 2015). One of these factors can be found in Galante's (2020) study, in which students' positive attitudes toward teachers' practice of translanguaging and how it affected students' language development changed teachers' beliefs regarding translanguaging. Another factor, proficiency, was illustrated in Raja et al.'s (2022) study, in which teachers

admitted that an English-only classroom would mean leaving lower language-level students without support for learning and meaningful classroom interaction (see also Sobkowiak, 2022).

School-Context Factors. According to Buehl and Beck (2015), school administration, parental support, colleagues, and available school resources can represent school-context-level factors. When teachers lack the appropriate resources they “needed to feel successful”, such as prepared activities, professional development, and guidance, their practices do not reflect their beliefs (p. 77). As a result, teachers’ perceptions of potential barriers to instruction may develop negatively (Bullock, 2010). For instance, one teacher in Chant’s (2002) study was not able to put her stated beliefs into practice due to a challenging, not supportive, or collaborative context and lacked appropriate resources.

In this regard, it should be noted that rural areas in Kazakhstan may also lack resources, administrative support, and access to various new approaches to teaching and learning. Teachers from small regions often confront sociocultural barriers, such as the “Stavka” system (management of teachers’ pay and workload) and “bureaucratic accountability” mechanisms (subordinate is tightly controlled by a superior within an organization) that also hinder the implementation of new practices. Some teachers in rural areas are unwilling to adopt new approaches to teaching as they are close to retirement, but schools retain them as there are no available replacements (Afzal Tajik et al., 2022; McLaughlin et al., 2021; Tastanbekova, 2020). As Jima (2018) claimed, poor levels of organization and support in both more and less industrialized areas were found to be a substantial reason for qualified teachers’ unwillingness to take a position or willingness to leave their workplaces. Teachers lacking facilities and professional isolation are especially vulnerable to various hindrances and forces (Jima, 2018).

Research studies have shown that teachers' use of translanguaging practices is also dependent on school contextual factors (Amaniyazova, 2020; Johnson, 2000). According to Anderson and Lightfoot (2018), urban and semi-urban schoolteachers used translanguaging occasionally as a facilitating tool, while for rural schoolteachers, using other languages was seen as an inevitable and regular practice. The research conducted by Yuvapayan (2019) revealed that although teachers are willing to implement new strategies for language learning, actual classroom practices are highly dependent on the monolingual approach approved by the educational institution and teachers' colleagues, thus creating a discrepancy between teachers' beliefs and practices. Therefore, teachers were found to change their beliefs to address the school's necessary conditions; consequently, they tend to limit their translanguaging practices.

National-, State-, and District-Level Factors. Education policies, curriculum, schools' language policies, and state laws may also present some challenges for teachers in their teaching practice. Yet, the impact of these external factors is dependent on "the type of policy, the teachers' role in the political context, and teachers' individual perceptions" (Buehl & Beck, 2015, p.78). Teachers' positive or negative reactions to the policy and curriculum standards ultimately transmit into their classroom practices; thus, teachers primarily reflect belief-practice conflict when teachers are required or prescribed to teach in ways that are ineffective and not in line with their beliefs, and they may reject those policies in favor of practices that are aligned with their beliefs (Buehl & Beck, 2015). For instance, Cincotta-Segi (2011) explored how one teacher from a rural area in the Lao People's Democratic Republic (LPDR) leveraged L1 use despite the mandated law on using only the Lao language at all educational levels. The teacher used the students' mother tongue to develop effective teaching and learning, which did not meet the requirements of language instruction at the national level.

In Kazakhstan, the studies at this level of factors have mainly been conducted to examine the implementation of trilingual policy within Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) and English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) contexts (e.g., Karabassova, 2018; 2021; Karabassova & San Isidro, 2020). However, all these studies were mostly focused on subject teachers' perceptions and practices of the new reforms rather than EFL teachers. Hence, this is arguably a fruitful area for further research on EFL teachers' beliefs and practices in a system of national -, state-, and district-level factors, especially since empirical research into translanguaging in rural areas is still limited, and EFL teachers have received comparatively less attention than CLIL and EMI teachers in the Kazakhstani national-level context.

Incongruence or Congruence of Teachers' Beliefs and Practices

Although teachers' teaching practices and beliefs do not always match, their relationship is recognized as a complex one (Basturkmen, 2012). Beliefs are dynamic and permeable constructions yielding to change within the experience (Muijs & Reynolds, 2002). Likewise, beliefs significantly impact one's practice since teachers' beliefs serve as "a guide to thought and behavior" (Borg, 2001, p. 186). Fives and Buehl (2012) also argued that teachers' beliefs about relevant teaching instructions or the source of knowledge could function as filters applied to assess the information cognitively, affecting how teachers interpret perceived information and how it is enacted into their practice. This echoes Fives and Gill (2015), highlighting the challenging feature of the relationship between beliefs and practices. The belief-practice consistency is not an unsophisticated "one-way relationship from belief to practice, but a dynamic two-way relationship in which beliefs are influenced by practical experience" (Thompson, 1992, as cited in Muijs & Reynolds, 2002, p. 4). Since there are various factors affecting the congruence and incongruence between teachers' beliefs and practices (e.g., Borg, 2011, 2015, 2017; Buehl & Beck, 2015; Fives & Buehl, 2008,

2012), it is essential to consider this complex relationship in a system of the particular context and examine “some understanding of person-in-practice” (Skott, 2014, p. 26).

Studies on this aspect of teachers' perceptions and use of translanguaging reveal that the beliefs can have a considerable and strong effect on the actual practices (Zhang & Liu, 2014). However, in most cases, the teachers' beliefs regarding translanguaging have some contradictions regarding their self-reported practices (e.g., Amaniyazova, 2020; Doiz & Lasagabaster, 2016; Korkmaz, 2021; Rahman et al., 2015; Yuvapayan, 2019). Teachers are likely to unintentionally use translanguaging during their teaching practices despite their beliefs and monoglossic ideologies (Akhmetova, 2021; Amaniyazova, 2020; Doiz & Lasagabaster, 2016); consequently, limiting their translanguaging patterns. For instance, a qualitative study by Copland and Neokleous (2011) revealed inconsistencies between teachers' reported beliefs and actual practices. The authors explained that the discrepancy is related to multiple constraints appearing spontaneously or occasionally. For instance, cognitively, teachers' practice was in line with their beliefs as they provided input in the L2. Yet, due to the learners' linguistic difficulties, teachers implement heteroglossic practices to meet the classroom's needs. In the same vein, Rahman et al.'s (2015) quantitative study indicated that 78% of teachers articulated monoglossic views on using students' L1 in L2 classes; however, only 31% of teachers actually enacted their beliefs into practice; that is, teaching the target language without involving L1 in their classes.

Multiple research studies have revealed that using students' first language(s) in EFL classrooms makes some teachers feel guilty or insufficiently proficient in English (Copland & Neokleous, 2011; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Manan et al., 2022; Ölmez & Kirkgöz, 2021). Accordingly, the feeling of guilt or lack of awareness of teachers' own beliefs (Korkmaz, 2021) might explain this contradiction because teachers struggle to harmonize their personal language learning and teaching philosophies with contextual factors. As discussed above,

internal and external factors either facilitate or impede the congruence and incongruence between teachers' beliefs and practices (Buehl & Beck, 2015). Therefore, there is a need to study the factors and features of the mismatch between two constituents of teachers' translanguaging identities, as it might help to reflect on teachers' own practices and the use of translanguaging in a more rational way.

Understanding Kazakhstani EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Practices of Translanguaging

The previous and recent research on teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging has revealed various findings depending on the study's context and conceptualization (Abdrakhmanova, 2017; Amaniyazova, 2020; Kuandykov, 2021; Tuskeyeva, 2022; Yakshi, 2022). Abdrakhmanova (2017) investigated CLIL and EFL teachers from Bilim Innovation Lyceum (BIL) and secondary school students. The purpose was to explore teachers' and students' beliefs of L1 in English and Science classes. It was revealed that the teachers hold varying views about translanguaging, differing from positive to negative. Similarly, the qualitative research conducted by Yakshi (2022) in one of the BIL schools highlighted the diversity of beliefs depending on the purposes and functions of translanguaging. Both studies found that BIL teachers primarily relied on translanguaging when presenting complex academic materials to ensure students' comprehension, enhance students' engagement and motivation, and create a friendly environment in the classroom.

The study outcomes of Kazakhstani teachers' beliefs of translanguaging were mainly constructed on Macaro's (2001) framework (e.g., Amaniyazova, 2020; Tuskeyeva, 2022; Yakshi, 2022), which includes three categories of teachers' beliefs about using students' mother tongue: virtual position, maximal and optimal positions. Accordingly, Kazakhstani teachers were mainly found to have monoglossic beliefs, employing English-only instruction to facilitate learners to learn the target language more effectively (Amaniyazova, 2020; Yakshi, 2022). Nevertheless, participants used translanguaging as its practice emerged unconsciously and unintentionally; therefore, teachers were shown to use L1 and could not

eliminate its practice in English classes (Yakshi, 2022). These findings resonate with Macaro's (2001) maximal position, indicating L1 use due to the various constraints and circumstances. Other study results demonstrated that most teachers were against using L1, articulating its ineffectiveness and perceiving its use as a hindrance in enhancing students' learning outcomes (Amaniyazova, 2020; Tuskeyeva, 2022), which means they held the virtual position proposed by Macaro (2001). Nonetheless, one participant from Yakshi's (2022) study was found to maintain an optimal position as she believed that using L1 can and might be beneficial as a pedagogical approach; therefore, teachers with this position are likely to be more tolerant towards translanguaging.

When it comes to the factors influencing and shaping teachers' beliefs, Kuandykov's (2021) study can give some evidence of how various hindrances and supports affected Kazakhstani EFL teachers' views of translanguaging pedagogy. According to the two frameworks, Kuandykov (2021) initiated an investigation considering EFL teachers at BIL. The first framework was used to understand teachers' beliefs of translanguaging as a pedagogical approach. Even though teachers were found to hold monoglossic ideologies towards translanguaging, respondents' English-only beliefs differed in their "degrees of strength" and various factors that impacted teachers' beliefs (Kuandykov, 2021, p. 57). Therefore, the second framework was based on Borg's (2015) teacher cognition, consisting of three factors: schooling, professional development, and contextual factors. The study outcomes demonstrated that schooling (teachers' early language learning experiences) might strongly influence their current beliefs. The findings also revealed a moderate impact of professional coursework and a substantial effect of contextual factors on teachers' beliefs of translanguaging. In Kuandykov's (2021) study case, the school's language policy significantly impacted teachers' monoglossic beliefs as the school required teachers to teach the target language without engaging other languages. The study participants explained the

school's language policy by exemplifying its context given to teachers, such as abroad experience and various mandated monolingual approaches to teaching.

Although the research on Kazakhstani EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging did not extensively classify study findings as internal and external factors, several indicators of factors were found in this overview. For instance, teachers' early language experiences (Kuandykov, 2021) can be applied in this study to add some evidence on internal factors, such as teachers' knowledge and experience. Similarly, external factors, such as the school's language policy and teachers' work experience (Kuandykov, 2021), students' language proficiency, and classroom-level and school-level factors (Abdrakhmanova, 2017; Amaniyazova, 2020; Tuskeyeva, 2022; Yakshi, 2022) can complement my study to varying degrees.

Conclusion

This chapter reviewed existing literature on translanguaging. The literature review demonstrated the historical background and conceptualization of translanguaging and its diversified use in EFL classrooms. Following this, the chapter presented García and Kleyn's (2016) theoretical framework intending to understand teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging. In addition, the chapter included discussions around Buehl and Beck's (2015) framework of the relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices in a system of internal and external supports and hindrances to analyze various affecting factors. Based on the empirical studies on factors, there appeared to be several influential external factors that are pivotal in understanding teachers' beliefs and practices, such as students' language proficiency, availability of resources and provision of better educational conditions, and professional development coursework. The chapter also included a subsection attempting to understand the congruence and incongruence between teachers' beliefs and practices. For instance, it was identified that multiple contextual constraints hinder teachers to enact their beliefs into their actual instruction.

Concluding, the chapter involves a part devoted to the research on translanguaging in Kazakhstan, narrowing the study's scope to a particular EFL context. Based on the overview of previous research in Kazakhstan, there appeared to be more advocates of monoglossic approaches to language teaching. Furthermore, some studies also demonstrated the existence and influence of internal and external factors, such as teachers' schooling experiences, school's language policy, and students' language proficiency. However, the literature review indicated a research gap since no detailed studies emphasize EFL teachers' beliefs and practices in rural areas. Therefore, this study aims to fill this gap by interpreting and investigating belief-practice consistency within the two theoretical frameworks and international and local studies on translanguaging.

Chapter 3: Methodology

The previous chapter discussed and analyzed existing studies on teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging and various factors that influence the enactment of teachers' beliefs into their practices. The present chapter intends to introduce the methodological components of the current study, clarify the research design, justify the research approach and the choice of the research site and participants, describe data collection instruments, data collection procedures, data analysis approach, as well as the ethical considerations of the study. This study aimed to explore the relationship between EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging in rural areas and what internal and external factors affect teachers' belief-practice consistencies. Therefore, this study attempts to answer the following research questions, each having several sub-questions:

RQ1: What are EFL teachers' beliefs and practices regarding the use of translanguaging in rural schools?

Sub-questions:

- a) What are the rural EFL teachers' beliefs about translanguaging in the classroom?
- b) How do rural EFL teachers use translanguaging in the classroom?
- c) What internal and external factors influence EFL teachers' practices and beliefs about translanguaging?

RQ2: What is the relationship between EFL teachers' perceptions and practices of translanguaging in rural areas?

Sub-questions:

- a) How do the rural EFL teachers' stated beliefs differ from their actual practices?
- b) How do internal and external factors impede or support the relationship between EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging?

Thus, this chapter explains the reasoning of the methodology used to answer the

research questions and rationalizes each methodological component separately. The conclusion and final thoughts on methodology are drawn at the end of the chapter.

Research Design

This study aimed to explore participants' beliefs and practices of translanguaging and how both of these components interact and impact their belief-practice consistencies in several secondary schools located in rural areas. Therefore, adopting qualitative research was deemed relevant as “qualitative research allows researchers to get at the inner experience of participants, to determine how meanings are formed through and in culture” (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, p. 12). Qualitative research allows researchers to identify and understand the issues from the perspective of the study participants and understand the collected data and information through interpretations that they give to the meanings, behavior, experiences, or objects (Hennink et al., 2020). Accordingly, qualitative research appears appropriate for understanding the “messy construct” (Fives & Buehl, 2012; Pajares, 1992), which is teachers' beliefs and their connection to their classroom practices. Therefore, the qualitative research approach was employed to explore teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging through “detailed interviewing, participant observations, and rich descriptions of the social world” (Hallberg, 2009, p. 141).

The research design chosen for the qualitative study was a collective case study (Stake, 1995) since it covers “multiple bounded systems (cases) through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information” (Creswell, 2013, p. 97). The collective case study is also called a multiple case study (Yin, 2017) and a comparative case study (Hamilton & Corbett-Whittier, 2013). Multiple case study helps researchers to identify and understand the commonalities and differences between the cases (Gustafsson, 2017). In this particular study, each teacher was considered as a case since the case is unique, complex, active, and operating (Stake, 1995). As Shkedi (2005) noted, one of the significant peculiarities of the collective case study is that, even if it deals with multiple case narratives

and presents them all together, each particular case is demonstrated within its context and characteristics. Accordingly, multiple case study was the most appropriate method to study various teachers' perspectives and practices of translanguaging in a more rigorous way as the “qualitative case researcher tries to preserve the multiple realities, the different and even contradictory views of what is happening” (Stake, 1995, p.12).

Research Site

The research sites selected for this study were mainstream schools in rural areas, more precisely, secondary schools in Zhambyl Region, South-Eastern Kazakhstan. To the researcher's personal knowledge, there might be only one or two EFL teachers per school in rural areas, which increases the potential risk of revealing teachers' personal information due to the small capacity of schools; therefore, this research considered several teachers from different rural schools to ensure participants' confidentiality. The rationale for choosing mainstream schools (state secondary schools) was based on the fact that they implement the official state curriculum and follow mandatory educational standards appointed by the government (Tuskeyeva, 2022). Moreover, most of the studies were focused on the general comparison of education and Kazakhstani teachers' conditions in urban and rural areas (Agaidarova, 2019; Irsaliyev et al., 2017; McLaughlin et al., 2021; Umbetaliyeva et al., 2016), while the number of studies based on the emphasis of rural EFL teachers, and their beliefs and practices of translanguaging in the system of internal and external supports and hindrances (Buehl & Beck, 2015) is still limited.

Sampling

As this study seeks to “discover, understand, and gain insight” into teachers' perceptions and practices of translanguaging, purposeful sampling was employed to represent the population of this study (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015, p. 96). Thus, the study recruited five EFL teachers from different rural schools. As purposeful sampling requires particular criteria for choosing the study participants, the teachers of this study were selected according to the

following characteristics: 1) teaching experience at schools for one year and more; 2) teachers at secondary schools located in rural areas; 3) the EFL teachers with proficiency or L1 in the Kazakh language or the Russian language.

This study recruited both less and more experienced teachers from various schools as based on previous literature on teachers' beliefs and practices, teachers' working experience was found as one of the influential predictors of what kind of beliefs and practices teachers reflected in their classrooms (e.g., Korkmaz, 2021; Kuandykov, 2021; Utami, 2016). The language criterion was reasoned in terms of convenience and a better understanding of participants' answers for the researcher as the interviews were carried out in one of the three languages or all three languages (e.g., Kazakh, Russian, English), which would be more comfortable for the research participants. The information about teacher participants is provided in the table below.

Table 1

Demographic Data of the Participants

Pseudonyms	Teachers' L1	Languages	Years of teaching experience	School
Aina	Kazakh	Kazakh, Russian, English	15 years	School A is located near the district center of the Zhambyl region
Nazerke	Kazakh	Kazakh, Russian, English, German	Around 7 years	School B is located in the district center of the Zhambyl region
Saniya	Kazakh	Kazakh, Russian, English	Around 3 years	School C is located far from the district center of the Zhambyl region

Zarina	Kazakh	Kazakh, Russian, English, German	20 years	School D is located far from the district center of the Zhambyl region
Rima	Kyrgyz	Kyrgyz, Russian, English, Kazakh, German	35 years	School E is located near the district center of the Zhambyl region

Note. All schools were in the Zhambyl region, where one village is considered the district center of that region which is bigger and more populated than other villages.

Data Collection Instruments

The study was carried out using two distinct types of data collection to attain data triangulation. Denzin (2009) described triangulation as “the combination of methodologies in the study of the same phenomena” (p. 297). As Kuandykov (2021) noted, “beliefs are best learned when the data collection includes at least two tools, for example, interviews and observations” (p.68). Therefore, semi-structured interviews and classroom observations were conducted to collect qualitative data for this study.

According to Dörnyei (2007), the semi-structured one-on-one interview allows researchers to collect data through open-ended questions, flexible follow-up ideas, and probes that will expand answers to the main research questions. Hence, to fully answer the research questions, one-on-one interviews were employed since it was deemed a relevant tool for retrieving pure data about “what was inside of teachers’ heads” (Cohen et al., 2011, p. 351). The format of the interview varied depending on the participant’s preferences. The interview protocol consisted of 12 open-ended questions and suggested probes translated into the Kazakh and Russian languages because of convenience for the teachers (see Appendix A).

Abd-el-Khalick and Lederman (2000) pointed out that adopting a more interpretive stance and using qualitative interviews to generate more “faithful representations” of the participants’ views are recommended (p. 674). However, as Kagan (1992) noted, teachers

may not be aware of or articulate a language to define their own beliefs. In this case, Skott (2014) suggests that the researcher needs to rely on different types of data, mainly classroom observations, as verbal accounts elaborate on, fulfill, and specify the image of teachers' beliefs within their practices. Thus, after collecting data from interviews, two classroom observations per teacher were conducted to investigate EFL teachers' actual practices of translanguaging. As Muijs (2011) claimed, observations are advantageous when we "want to find out what actually happens in a setting rather than what is reported to us by participants" (p. 52). In this study, classroom observations were beneficial to understanding how teachers use translanguaging in different situations and how their self-reported beliefs relate to their actual practices. The rationale for conducting two classroom observations per teacher was deemed relevant in getting a broader understanding of teachers' practices. Thus, the initial observation portrayed a descriptive and general overview of the study phenomena (Arthur et al., 2012). The following observation was considered a "focusing phase" (Arthur et al., 2012, p. 167) for recognizing particular patterns in the teachers' classroom practices of translanguaging. The researcher's role was a "nonparticipant observational role" for the sake of comfort for participants and gatekeepers at a research site (Creswell, 2014, p. 215). In order to record the data from observations, the researcher used descriptive and reflective field notes. If the descriptive field notes could characterize what happened during observations, the reflective field notes could articulate the researcher's personal interpretations, insights, and thoughts about the site, people, and various situations (Creswell, 2014).

Data Collection Procedures

The data collection period lasted between the 7th and 26th of December 2022. After gaining approval from NUGSE Research Committee, the data collection process began with contacting the potential schools and gatekeepers to request permission to conduct a study at the research site. The gatekeeper was a school principal at the research site. Thus, the gatekeeper assisted the researcher in gaining access to schools and providing contact

information about research participants. Since there were only one or two EFL teachers per school in rural areas, it was essential to ensure their confidentiality, as their identities might be revealed by the school principals. Therefore, after obtaining permission from the gatekeepers to access the research site, the researcher asked for the contact information of all subject teachers at the school. Then, after gaining the contact information of all schoolteachers, invitation letters (see Appendix B) to participate in the study were sent to only EFL teachers, who also were provided with necessary recruitment details via emails or/and messages on the WhatsApp application. The teachers also were informed in advance that their participation was voluntary. Afterward, for those teachers who were willing to participate in this study, the researcher sent an informed consent form (see Appendix C) with research details and further information concerning the individual face-to-face interviews and two classroom observations per teacher during the common educational settings. After receiving signed informed consent forms, the individual interviews were conducted according to the teachers' preferred time, place, and format. In addition, participants were offered to choose a comfortable language for the interview, which can be either Kazakh, Russian, or English. The teacher respondents were also encouraged to mix languages to share their answers more easily and efficiently. It is noteworthy to point out that before starting the data collection, the researcher piloted the interview questions with two graduate students to test the research instrument so that arrangement of the questions would be well-structured to address the research purpose and questions.

Nonetheless, there was a challenge in explaining the concept of my study and why I was conducting this study to teacher participants in rural areas. Teachers were afraid and did not understand my rationale for choosing rural schools and even suggested choosing teachers from urban areas. Although teachers were informed about study details and signed consent forms prior to the interviews, it took several days to explain to study participants the purpose

of my study via WhatsApp application; however, when we met face-to-face, I could clarify some points, and teachers were relieved when they realized that I am not a commission from the Ministry of Education as they thought that I am a researcher from the ministry and that I was sent to check the quality of their work. Thus, after solving some misunderstandings, individual interviews and two classroom observations were conducted with each teacher from five different schools located in the rural area.

Depending on the participant's answers, the length of each interview was about 20-40 minutes. With the permission of each interviewee, their answers to interview questions were recorded on the audio recorder application on the smartphone and then transcribed for the data analysis. After the interviews, the teachers were also asked to participate in two observations during the English language classes. The observed lessons were recorded by the field notes and used only for research purposes.

Data Analysis

Once the data were collected through semi-structured interviews and two classroom observations per teacher, the next stage was to “manage, organize, and make sense of all the separate pieces of accumulated information” (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2018, p. 374). Therefore, six steps suggested by Creswell (2014) were followed to “generate or develop analytical categories and theoretical explanations” for the raw data (Pope et al., 2000, p. 114). The initial step for the researcher was familiarizing herself with the data, which started with transcribing the answers of the study participants recorded by the mobile application on a smartphone (see Appendix D for a sample of transcription). The five interviews were conducted in Kazakh and Russian. Since the researcher must know the data thoroughly, the one way to be immersed in and become acquainted with the collected data is to transcribe interviews yourself (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2018). Therefore, all the interviews were transcribed by hand and later carefully translated into English. Following this, the next phase of familiarization was reading the data as data (Clarke & Braun, 2013). The stage of “reading

data as data” helped in reading the words “*actively, analytically and critically*”; thus, analyzing “*what the data mean*” (p. 205). As for guaranteeing the accuracy of transcriptions and translations, the data were checked several times within the audio recordings, including participants’ answers in the original language (Said, 2021). Since the observation data was documented in English with some teachers’ quotations in Kazakh and Russian, the translations for the observation field notes were applied only to several notes.

After transcribing and translating the data collected from the interviews, the next step was to code interview transcripts and observation notes, as coding assists in organizing the data that will expand the study phenomena to broad themes (Creswell, 2014). In order to code the data from interviews and classroom observations, inductive and deductive orientations were employed to assist the researcher in making decisions about how to “go about *using our data*” (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2018, p. 377). While the inductive approach was a data-driven analysis utilized to build a coding scheme by reducing the information to significant text segments and themes, the deductive approach was applied to define the data through the context of theory and study (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2018). Hence, the hybrid use of both orientations to coding helped in applying a bottom-up strategy to recognize the themes without the theoretical assumptions (inductive orientation) and to identify patterns from the raw data within the study’s two theoretical frameworks (deductive orientation) (Braun et al., 2019). Thus, the coding procedure helped in dividing the collected data “into text segments, label the segments with codes, examine codes for overlap and redundancy, and collapse these codes into broad themes” (Creswell, 2014, p. 243). The samples of analysis from codes to themes are provided below (See tables 2 and 3).

Table 2

Sample of coding based on García and Kleyn’s (2016) framework of translanguaging pedagogy

Interview transcripts (What teachers say)	Inductive codes	Themes based on codes	Main themes
“Since it is an English language class, more attention should be paid to English. In terms of importance, it also should be given to that language”.	Monoglossic beliefs towards translanguaging	The preference for an English-only approach	Translanguaging stance
“I will definitely use other languages as it is challenging to teach only in English. If the student does not understand anything in English, he has to translate everything into Kazakh or Russian. For comparison and better understanding, I give examples from the Russian and Kazakh languages so that they can understand the subject better”.	Heteroglossic teaching practices	Challenges of English-only teaching for children	Translanguaging stance
	Using translanguaging as a comparative approach	The application of translanguaging as a scaffolding approach	Translanguaging design
“...of course, we plan; we have a calendar plan, a lesson plan where everything in English...we try to work according to the plans and textbooks. However, we mainly read, translate, retell texts, and learn grammar along the way, and it is inevitable not to use other languages in such cases. Sometimes we write plans, but sometimes we don't even look at these	Changing plans to meet the classroom needs	The use of translanguaging despite the planned classroom activities	Translanguaging design and shifts
	Adjusting classroom practices	Teacher's readiness to change the prepared lessons to meet students' linguistic repertoire	

plans because we already know everything; we already apply it on the go as there are some unexpected situations”.

Table 3

Sample of coding based on Buehl and Beck's (2015) framework of internal and external factors

Interview transcripts (What teachers say)	Inductive codes	Themes based on codes	Main themes
“... it is good if our English teachers speak only English in their classes. But it all depends on the level of the village and the parents’ knowledge”.	Effects of contextual factors	The dependence of teachers’ translanguaging practices on the context and parents’ education	External factors
“Although we try to conduct the lesson in English, it is already good if the child understands 50 % of the lesson in English. The children do not accept the lesson if it is taught only in English; that is why we always connect the Russian and Kazakh languages to our lessons”.	The unfeasibility of using an English-only approach	Effects of students’ language proficiency on teachers’ translanguaging practices	Classroom-context factors
“...but parents do not care about their children’s education. School education should not be limited only to teachers. There are parents at home. Parents, teachers, school, and	No parental involvement in students’ studies	The deficiency of parents’ supervision at home. The absence of a dialogue between schools and parents	School-context factors

surrounding community -
everything is connected”.

After identifying codes and categories, the next step based on Creswell's (2014) analysis of qualitative data was to represent the findings and interpretations of teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging and what internal and external factors either facilitate or hinder the relationship between them. The findings were explained in accordance with the research questions and were interpreted by examining previous literature on the topic (see Findings chapter). As for the final stage of the six steps, which involves validating the accuracy of findings (Creswell, 2014), the researcher triangulated among various data collection tools, such as observational fieldnotes and interviews. Thus, the researcher ensured the accuracy of study outcomes based on multiple data sources by examining each information resource and finding evidence to facilitate a theme.

Ethical Considerations

In gathering data for a qualitative study, a researcher attempts to explore an in-depth description of a phenomenon (Creswell, 2014). Accordingly, participants might be asked to share their personal experiences and details of their teaching practices with the researcher, which might make them feel frustrated as multiple research studies have revealed that using students' first language(s) in EFL classrooms makes some teachers feel guilty or insufficiently proficient in English (e.g., Copland & Neokleous, 2011; Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Ölmez & Kirkgöz, 2021). It might also be suggested that teachers would not share their true beliefs about using languages other than English in EFL classrooms due to the institutional language policies that emphasize the role of monolingual approaches to language teaching (Yuvapayan, 2019). Hence, teachers might change their answers to meet the school's policy requirements, curriculum objectives, and even the researcher's expectations about the study outcomes (Amaniyazova, 2020). Moreover, teachers might be afraid of

sharing information regarding their actual classroom practices due to the fear of involving any punishment from their employers or harming their reputation.

In respect of minimizing these risks, the researcher thoroughly dealt with the confidential information about teachers' classroom practices and beliefs of translanguaging. The teachers' personal data, such as their real names and any details about their workplaces were carefully changed by pseudonyms and coded; thus, any personal information or details of participants' workplaces did not involve any punishment from their employers or harm their reputations. Furthermore, teachers were informed about their rights as research participants, such as their right to refuse to answer some questions that they find sensitive or inappropriate. Their answers were not disclosed to their supervisors or affected their professional lives.

All the data collected from interviews and lesson observations were accessible to the researcher and only the researcher during all stages of the study. The interviews recorded on the smartphone voice recorder were completely deleted after uploading them into the online cloud storage.

Conclusion

This chapter has provided a detailed description of all methodological components involved in this study by justifying the research method, design, sampling strategies, research instruments, data collection and analysis procedures, and addressed the potential research risks within the principles of ethical considerations. Particularly, the current qualitative inquiry employed a collective case study design, including semi-structured individual interviews and two classroom observations per teacher in different secondary schools in the particular rural region.

Chapter 4: Findings

This qualitative case study intended to explore rural EFL teachers' beliefs and actual practices of translanguaging and how both components interact and impact their belief-practice consistencies in five different secondary schools in rural areas. To achieve this purpose and to answer the research questions, semi-structured individual interviews and classroom observations were conducted. This chapter presents the findings of the study derived from the analysis of obtained data. Each finding is organized individually with appropriate quotations from the teachers' responses and the researcher's observation notes. Since the current inquiry is based on two theoretical frameworks, the thematic classification of each finding is categorized according to their main concepts. In addition, the findings are managed by the following research questions:

RQ1: What are EFL teachers' beliefs and practices regarding the use of translanguaging in rural schools?

Sub-questions:

- a) What are the rural EFL teachers' beliefs about translanguaging in the classroom?
- b) How do rural EFL teachers use translanguaging in the classroom?
- c) What internal and external factors influence EFL teachers' practices and beliefs about translanguaging?

RQ2: What is the relationship between EFL teachers' perceptions and practices of translanguaging in rural areas?

Sub-questions:

- a) How do the rural EFL teachers' stated beliefs differ from their actual practices?
- b) How do internal and external factors impede or support the relationship between EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging?

The findings are generally organized around four major themes with subsequent subthemes. First, rural EFL teachers' beliefs regarding translanguaging are presented in relation to the theoretical framework of García and Kleyn (2016) and its first strand, "translanguaging stance". This is followed by a presentation of findings on the teachers' use of translanguaging in EFL classrooms with the reference to the remaining strands of the framework, "design" and "shifts". The third section discusses various internal and external factors that influence teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging in rural areas based on Buehl and Beck's (2015) framework of various supports and hindrances. Then, the final major theme draws upon how internal and external factors either support or hinder the relationship between EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of using translanguaging.

EFL Teachers' Beliefs towards Translanguaging Pedagogy

This findings section discusses rural EFL teachers' beliefs regarding translanguaging pedagogy. The first major theme is based on the theoretical framework of García and Kleyn (2016) and its first strand, "translanguaging stance".

Translanguaging Stance

This subtheme provides findings according to the teachers' answers about using different languages in their EFL classrooms as essential resources for teaching. The data analysis indicated that the respondents' beliefs about the application of their students' mother tongue or other languages vary from positive views of translanguaging to English-only. In addition, the analysis identified that teachers hold the belief that translanguaging is inevitable. Accordingly, participants' beliefs are categorized into two general subthemes, one which consists of teachers' positive and negative perceptions of translanguaging and the other which focuses on its inevitable nature.

Teachers' Positive and Limited Views of Translanguaging. When asked about their views on using students' L1 and other languages in EFL classes, study participants provided much insight into this topic. Most participants (n=4) expressed their positive

perceptions, noting that translanguaging facilitates comprehension when students face complex assignments or grammar. Moreover, these teachers did not express any concern that using students' L1 would somehow negatively affect the target language development; in contrast, they responded that the use of translanguaging was convenient for them as it is easier for children to understand new information when there is a familiar word in their L1. As one participant commented:

Let them know the translation of that English sentence in Russian, if not in Kazakh, and conversely, in Kazakh, if not in Russian. I think taking all three languages together in English lessons is better (Aina, School A, December 7, 2022).

Another interviewee, Zarina, added that using translanguaging beneficially impacts comparing the grammar features of the target language with other languages; thus, translanguaging may serve as one of the approaches to teaching English. This was also supported by Rima and Saniya, who noted that the previous knowledge of students' L1 reinforces the development of new knowledge in the target language.

However, while most of the teachers had positive attitudes toward using students' L1, one teacher believed that translanguaging might negatively impact students' language development. When the participants were asked to rate the importance of using other languages in the classroom on a scale of 1-5, Nazerke, the teacher from school B, gave only two points. She explained this by saying that in EFL classrooms more attention and importance should be given to the target language. This can be illustrated in the following extract: "I prefer my classes to be only in English. I don't think it will be effective for children to explain something in Kazakh or Russian."

Although Nazerke shared that she insists that students use only English, she was aware that some contextual factors did not allow her to apply a monolingual approach to teaching. First when students demonstrated their eagerness to learn the language and they did not use translanguaging as a tool to cover their "laziness". She also shared that she sometimes

accepts students' wrong answers and mixing English with Kazakh and Russian languages.

She commented: "...at least learners are active and participate in the classroom interaction by trying their best to learn English through other languages."

The second exception to using students' L1 was its beneficial aspect of better comprehension of a new topic when students were confronted with difficulties understanding the tasks. However, Nazerke was inclined to utilize translanguaging only when other methods do not work for instructional purposes, which means using learners' L1 as a last option:

"Even in the 9th and 10th grades, I don't translate complex texts. I try to explain what the text is about by asking questions. ... however, in some cases, it doesn't work, so I use translations". She also pointed out that the excessive use of other languages is what needs to be avoided in EFL classrooms, claiming its negative effect on target language development.

Translanguaging as Inevitable Practice. While teachers' beliefs of translanguaging varied from positive to negative ones, the analysis of data from interviews also identified that most participants perceive learners' L1 as an unavoidable practice. If the interviewees' positive beliefs were related to the effectiveness of translanguaging in EFL classes and not completely but partially viewed its pedagogical value, the inevitability of using students' L1 was seen more as unwilling practice forced by contextual circumstances. The respondents were inclined to believe that they cannot disconnect translanguaging from their teaching instruction, stating that it is already ingrained into the current educational system. One interviewee noted: "I try to carry all three languages because the current educational system demands children to know all three languages" (Aina, School A, December 7, 2022). Another comment: "I think it is absolutely impossible not to use Kazakh or Russian in English lessons. ... because not all of the students can read or understand the target language." (Zarina, School D, December 12, 2022). Thus, teachers mainly had two different responses that explained and aligned with the fixed nature of translanguaging in their instruction.

In addition, when respondents were asked to comment on whether they restrict or completely do not allow their students to use translanguaging in some instances, almost all teachers answered that it is unattainable and unavoidable even when students have summative and formative assessment tasks. Interviewees mentioned that they should employ learners' L1 continuously so that assignments would be more understandable and learners would not feel left without teachers' support.

The common view among interviewees was that learners' needs are a priority; accordingly, when students need explanations and clarifications in their mother tongue, teachers cannot ignore these demands. Aina commented: "Even if you don't want to say it in Kazakh, you can't. It is impossible to avoid translations and provide English-only lessons." Other respondents shared the same belief, indicating that using students' L1 is inevitable while conducting monolingual lessons is what they aspire to reach.

In general, all these specific examples illustrate the complexity of knowledge in teachers' personalized belief systems that shape their instructional approaches and decisions. Although one teacher mentioned that translanguaging is less beneficial for teaching English, all agreed that translanguaging provides student engagement in the learning process and in-depth comprehension. Nonetheless, if summarized, only Nazerke had more monoglossic beliefs than heteroglossic beliefs as compared to other teachers. This shows that the participant does not believe in the pedagogical value of translanguaging, viewing its advantageous features only when different approaches to teaching do not provide effective student learning outcomes. Despite the shared understanding and awareness of contextual impediments, compared to other participants, Nazerke viewed translanguaging only as a last resort, applying it in practice only in the two cases.

Translanguaging Design and Shifts

The second major theme includes the remaining strands from García and Kleyn's (2016) framework, "translanguaging design" and "shifts." In this section, teachers' practice

of using students' L1 and other languages in EFL classrooms is reported based on data analysis from individual interviews and classroom observations.

The Minimal Application of Translanguaging Design

The analysis of interview data identified teachers' minimal design of their heteroglossic practices. In most cases, respondents were found to be using students' L1 unintentionally without planning or applying multimodalities. When interviewees were asked to share their approaches to teaching English, the majority mentioned monolingual methods, with some exceptional cases when multilingual instructional strategies were designed. Teachers purposefully developed a comparative approach to teaching grammar to students to improve comprehension of complex grammatical structures of the target language. Therefore, participants used translanguaging to compare the grammatical peculiarities of English with Kazakh and Russian languages.

However, although all teachers mentioned the use of translanguaging as a comparative approach, they did not specify how and in what ways they implement it in their practice. Rima and Aina gave general examples of translanguaging design, which can be illustrated in the following interview extract: "I explain grammar to secondary school learners first in Kazakh, ask them to consider the features of that grammar in Kazakh, and then give examples in English and explain by comparing these two languages" (Aina, School A, December 7, 2022). Rima added:

...when I explain grammar, I also speak three languages...for example, I explain that in the English language, the verb comes in second place [in the sentence]; in the Kazakh language, the verb comes in third place. Then we give a sentence in Russian, translate it into Kazakh and English, and compare these sentences.

The data obtained from classroom observations, where teachers demonstrated their actual pedagogical practices, confirmed teachers' approaches to teaching grammar by using

translanguaging. The study participants introduced a new grammar structure in English and then used students' L1 as a scaffolding approach to compare the grammar in both languages. During the observations, it was noted that only one teacher (Rima) used multilingual and multimodal materials to facilitate students' usage of full linguistic repertoire. As compared to other participants who rarely involved multimodalities of heteroglossic nature, Rima actively and beneficially leveraged students' L1 by using different bilingual cards, worksheets, and semiotic resources.

The Minimal Translanguaging Shifts

Even though four of the five participants reported their positive views on using students' L1, the majority did not demonstrate translanguaging shifts during their English classes and in their responses when asked more detailed questions. It was found that teachers mainly relied on the spontaneous use of the student's mother tongue, involving either minimal pedagogical application or the absence of translanguaging design. Therefore, the data analysis did not reveal the explicit form of translanguaging shifts, as participants' practices had more natural changes rather than systematic or instructional intentions to respond to learners' linguistic needs.

Notwithstanding the absence of translanguaging shifts among the majority of teachers, there was one teacher, Rima, who showed the core elements of shifts by meeting students' whole linguistic repertoire and expanding instruction at the center of classroom practices. In addition, while observing her classroom practices, she demonstrated a considerable practice of translanguaging within its pedagogical approaches to teaching. Thus, Rima facilitated students' comprehension and learning outcomes by changing her classroom practices based on the learners' needs. Although the learners were from the Russian group, Rima, from time to time, used Kazakh for quick clarifications, such as “дұрыс па?” [durys pa? - is it correct]; thus, checking if students are following the teacher or participating in the

classroom interaction. Accordingly, teachers' translanguaging shifts eventually resulted in learners' high engagement and active contribution to the effective application of translanguaging pedagogy. Nevertheless, during the classroom observations, there appeared to be some obstructive consequences of the teacher's quick changes in applying various methods, which are discussed and expanded when answering the third sub-question of the first research question.

Factors Influencing Teachers' Beliefs and Practices of Translanguaging

This section of the chapter presents the findings about internal and external factors that facilitate or/and hinder teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging and its application in EFL classrooms. All the themes are categorized based on the study's second theoretical framework proposed by Buehl and Beck (2015).

Internal Factors

Internal factors are defined as teachers' inner perspectives and their personal peculiarities, such as their own belief system, skills in a particular field, self-efficacy, and teachers' overall beliefs in their students' performance or capability. For that reason, to identify internal factors that influence teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging, the researcher asked participants about their work experience, schooling, and inner beliefs about using students' L1.

The Influence of Previous Experience and Knowledge. This section of the chapter presents respondents' given information on their early language learning experiences (schooling) and their overall knowledge and work experience. When the participants were asked whether their schooling in some way impacted their current teaching practices and general beliefs about language teaching, responses varied depending on the context of their previous experiences.

For example, Aina said that she learned to read by using Kazakh letters for English words during her school years; that is, she learned to read through Kazakh transliteration of English words. As a result, this practice created difficulties in reading and spelling English words correctly. Therefore, now, Aina did not allow her students to use this approach to read and memorize the pronunciation of words in her classroom instruction. On the other hand, Aina reflected that during her schooling, teachers primarily translated English words into Russian as it was easier to work with Russian translations rather than Kazakh ones; as a result, in her current practice, she also applies this method as Kazakh translations are not always comprehensible or equivalent to the original versions in English. Zarina supported this view, sharing that her university teachers shaped her current teaching practices. She commented: "... we basically follow the same Soviet method; I think it is already deep-rooted into my teaching manner". However, Zarina did not mention detailed features of her schooling, stating only her neutral view toward using the Soviet method and its similarity to the methods referred to by Aina.

Two other participants, Rima and Nazerke, were also inclined to believe that their prior language learning experiences, one way or another, influenced their current pedagogical instruction. For instance, Rima highlighted how her English teacher's classroom practice showed what methods and approaches should not be applied in EFL classes. Consequently, the unfavorable effects of schooling led Rima to use a different approach. This can be exemplified in the following interview extract:

During my school years, we had English once a week. And what can you learn from a lesson only once a week? Then we just knew simple sentences and words in English, and we spoke and used grammar randomly by guessing. There were not any proper instructions for learning the grammatical features of English. And now, I demand grammar from students; I always require grammar. I prepare grammar tests for students so that I will know if they have understood the grammatical structures or not.

Nazerke, in contrast, articulated how she ultimately inherited her university educators' teaching manners and how they shaped her monoglossic beliefs. According to Nazerke, her schooling was accompanied by the strict requirements of using English and only English in teaching a foreign language at school. Nazerke stated that her previous educators adhered to the rule of applying all methods in the target language, which eventually translated into her instructional views and practices. This was also one of the reasons why Nazerke held English-only beliefs and was resistant to using translanguaging in her EFL lessons. However, interestingly, her firmer monoglossic beliefs were changed to a moderate level due to some personal factors. Nazerke commented:

At the beginning of my teaching experience, like my previous teachers from the university, I taught only in English without involving other languages in my classes. But after marriage, since there was a break in my teaching career, there emerged a barrier in English; therefore, I started to use other languages in particular cases.

Compared to other teachers, who were self-assured about the moderate or high impact of their schooling, Saniya expressed some hesitations regarding the influence of her former educators' teaching methods on her classroom practices and decisions. She answered: "There wasn't a memorable or excellent method I can recall now. But they taught grammar differently, and sometimes, they used Russian so that we could understand complex subjects". Even though Saniya was unsure about the impacts of schooling, at the same time, she did not deny that her university educators used translanguaging in their teaching practices. At this rate, it can be concluded that teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging are not necessarily encouraged or influenced by their prior language learning experiences.

Regarding the influence of work experience on the teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging, the data analysis revealed the complexity of differences between less and more experienced teachers. For instance, the more experienced teachers (Aina, Zarina, Rima)

had positive perceptions of using translanguaging involving minimal and moderate translanguaging design and shifts in their classrooms. However, contrary to expectations, Saniya, who had three years of teaching experience, was also found to have positive views toward translanguaging, while Nazerke, with seven years of work experience, held more monoglossic beliefs and limited translanguaging in her classroom. Therefore, it can be supposed that teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging are not necessarily influenced or driven by the number of working years.

The Influence of Monolingual Professional Development Courses. Professional coursework refers to the process through which teachers' skills, knowledge, and attitudes will be developed and improved for a better quality of work. Aiming to understand if the developmental programs influence rural EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging, the participants were asked to share their experiences and outcomes of professional courses on language instruction. Four of the five teachers indicated that professional training courses primarily had a favorable effect on their teaching practices by increasing the effectiveness of contemporary instructional methods. The participants also expressed the substantial significance of evolving courses in their daily practice, thus, underlying how EFL teachers need to enhance their knowledge and update their approaches to teaching. Nazerke noted: "Teachers should be well prepared, develop themselves, and increase their vocabulary. Teachers are lifelong learners; therefore, they need to increase their knowledge and attend courses". However, most interviewees reported that all the courses they attended had a prevalent emphasis on English-only methods. That is, professional courses predominantly translated how to apply monolingual methods and techniques in EFL classes without involving any pedagogical value or implications for using translanguaging. Although these courses, in some ways, improved teachers' instructional practices, they did

not change or reshape teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging in a negative or positive way.

Furthermore, Aina shared her opinion about the disadvantages of monolingual professional courses, stating that they do not always facilitate learners' efficient learning outcomes. The following example can explain her point:

Those courses were held only in English. The methods were taught and shown only in English. Of course, all the participants in such courses are mainly English language teachers, and they will understand English-only methods and find them helpful; however, all students are not that proficient. They need a different approach.

As it is evident from the extract above, professional training courses have their own cause-effect factors. While some participants found those courses helpful in developing their instructional practices and internalized some features into their beliefs, one respondent expressed the unfavorable impacts of monolingual courses, highlighting the necessity of space for translanguaging within its pedagogical value. Therefore, it can be suggested that professional coursework influences teachers' teaching practices to some extent; yet, not conclusively, as teachers' translanguaging beliefs do not seem to be affected by monolingual developmental courses.

External Factors

This section intends to give more information regarding external factors related to the interference of surrounding culture and contexts on teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging. Based on the study findings, several external factors were identified and categorized into three domains: (1) classroom context, (2) school context, and (3) district-level factors.

Classroom-Context Factors. The data obtained from classroom observations and individual interviews revealed several classroom-level factors, such as students' language

proficiency, students' classroom needs, and the misalignment between English textbooks and learners' language learning levels.

The Influence of Students' Language Proficiency on Teachers' Beliefs and Practices. According to the data analysis, teachers primarily used students' L1/L2 to scaffold and support their students with low language proficiency. Since learners have difficulties understanding and expressing their thoughts in English, the majority of teachers use translations and try to create a space for translanguaging so that students will understand at least 50% of the lesson. During the classroom observations, one participant (Aina) demonstrated how she applies scaffolding in situations when students did not understand the task. First, she asked about charity organizations and since the students did not fully understand, Aina translated the question into Kazakh and additionally connected the topic to the country's context: “Қазақстанда қандай қайырымдылық қорлары бар?” [What charity organizations are there in Kazakhstan?].

Teachers also shared that they want their lessons to be in English only; however, due to the student's language proficiency, they have to use translanguaging. That kind of unwilling use of students' L1 was expressed by two interviewees, who considered learners' low language level as a hindrance. Saniya commented: “Students' English proficiency is a big obstacle and the main reason for using other languages. It would be better not to use other languages in English classes, but the children will not understand”. Another participant, Zarina, added: “There are some very weak classes. In such classes, I almost have to conduct the lesson in Kazakh”. As is evident from these extracts, two participants were more inclined to perceive students' language proficiency adversely; however, Saniya and Zarina also connected this to the school's context, stating that the students from villages are not ready to learn the target language fully in English.

When the participants were asked whether the use of translanguaging differs between

secondary and upper-secondary grades, the majority of teachers reported there are no substantial differences as it is still challenging for all learners to study only in monolingual settings. Furthermore, some participants expressed the belief that the main thing in their classes is students' understanding. That is, two other interviewees, Aina and Rima, reported that no matter what ways and methods are applied in their EFL classrooms, priority is given to students' classroom needs and small achievements. Aina commented: "We are happy even if the learner makes 4-5 sentences during the lesson". And Rima added:

Let them speak Kazakh, let them speak Russian, let them speak English; the main thing is that they understand the topic. Let them understand this topic, even if they say it in Russian. But the main thing is that the topic is understandable to children. ... In any case, we should help children. These are our children; we are trying for their future.

In addition, Aina and Rima were aware that students would not accept the monolingual lesson as they need more time to learn the foreign language. Aina shared some factors that have more contextual character, such as the lesson's duration and class size, which in turn, also influences students' language development. She said: "We have 45 minutes for the lesson. We have divided groups of children, and even if there are 12 children in one class, it is impossible to explain everything to each child individually".

Interestingly, two teachers mentioned the importance of facilitating students with high language proficiency. Since students with a better linguistic performance complete the tasks faster than other learners, Aina responded that she encourages them to help students with lower language levels, thus, reinforcing peer scaffolding in her EFL classes through translanguaging. In contrast, Nazerke stated that she tends to limit translanguaging to meet the needs of students with high English proficiency. The following extract can exemplify her point:

There are different situations because children have different language levels and all study in the same class. In comparison with students with low language proficiency,

there are also talented students who say, “please speak English to me; I want to improve my language skills”. ...In such cases, I do not use other languages as there are students who want to study only in English.

Although participants had different views and practices regarding the classroom context factors, all teachers held the same belief in their students' capability, which was related to their inner perspectives on translanguaging. Most of the interviewees responded that over time, students will be able to gradually improve their linguistic capabilities. Accordingly, they also mentioned various school-context factors that play an important role in students' language development, which will be discussed in another section.

The Misalignment between English Textbooks and Students' Language Learning Levels. Two participants highlighted that EFL textbooks do not match the students' language level as they have rigorous tasks. This is especially evident in higher grades where the level of rigor in the texts is significantly higher than students' actual language level. For instance, one participant (Zarina) commented: “... compared to Russian language textbooks for Kazakh group students, English textbooks are generally not suitable and challenging to teach. ... They need to be reviewed, or teachers need to be trained to teach lessons effectively”.

Thus, while Zarina indicated that textbook programs are not suitable and complicated for learners connecting it to the use of translanguaging, the other participant, Saniya, believed that due to the students' low language proficiency, they cannot understand the materials from English textbooks resulting in the unfeasibility of applying English-only approaches to teaching.

School-Context Factors. The data analysis revealed several school-related factors, including the school's language policy, school-parent interaction and parental involvement, availability of school resources, the EFL teachers' turnover, the disparity of rural-urban schools, and teachers' collaboration. All these school-related factors are discussed in more detail in the following section.

School Language Policy. When the participants were asked if their school has a policy regarding languages or mandated methods for teaching, most participants noted the absence of the school language teaching policy. Interviewees highlighted that there is no mandated school language policy requiring teachers to use an English-only approach or restricting translanguaging in EFL classrooms. Three of five participants reported that their classroom interaction is managed by their own skills, methods, and approaches to teaching languages. As one of the participants commented: “You search for yourself and your students. ... Teachers set their own rules. There is no demand from the school to use one certain language or fixed method” (Aina, personal communication, December 7, 2022). This is similar to another participant’s comment: “There is no such an authorized policy. Each teacher conducts lessons according to their level and competencies” (Nazerke, personal communication, December 9, 2022).

Other participants also commented that although there are no specific regulations or requirements, school administration, to a certain extent, encourages teachers to use English more in their EFL classes. As one participant (Zarina) commented: “...they say that it is desirable to conduct a lesson in English if possible”. Similar comment from another participant:

They require that in English lessons, of course, there should be 60-70% of spoken language in English. ...but no one scolds students or teachers for using other languages. The main thing is that students speak and learn something; that’s it (Rima, School E, December 8, 2022).

As it is evident from the extracts above, the schools seem not to pressure teachers into using particular approaches to teaching languages or impeding the use of translanguaging in EFL instruction. On the contrary, schools consider following monolingual paradigms as a desirable rather than demanding and fixed policy.

Availability of Resources. The current study revealed that the lack of school resources and a conducive environment have unfavorable effects on teachers' beliefs regarding their instructional practices. Overall, almost all participants reported the significance of school resources as they perceived that the effectiveness of their classes depended on such resources as teaching materials, availability of the Internet, and classroom facilities. The participants agreed that these resources help the teacher create an engaging and interesting classroom environment.

However, four participants indicated that they experienced a deficiency of school resources. For instance, Aina responded that additional resources in the English language are available only in the school library, while in the classroom settings, the available resources are those prepared by herself. Other participants shared the same view, noting that they prepare supplementary resources by themselves as creating better conditions for effective learning outcomes is their responsibility. The respondents highlighted that the effectiveness of language teaching depends on the school's resources, additional electives, and courses with an emphasis on target language development. As Saniya commented:

...as you can see, there is no Internet. We don't even have enough books for the students in the classroom. Ten children are in one classroom, and only three books are given to the whole class. In most cases, children come with the excuse that they don't have a textbook and lose their interest in learning.

During the observations, it was evident that students were not provided with a sufficient number of English textbooks and had to take pictures of the textbook to work in class on their assignments. Furthermore, it was also observed that, as a consequence, students ignored the teacher's instruction and used the insufficient number of textbooks as an excuse to use Kazakh in classroom interaction.

In contrast with other participants, only one participant was satisfied with the available resources at her school. Nazerke shared that their school has special multimedia

classrooms, foreign literature in the library, and access to the Internet, which facilitates learners' better exposure to language learning. In addition, the availability of resources was helpful in using English-only approaches to teaching as all school facilities help the teacher to create engaging and interesting classroom interactions with students.

The Disparity between Urban and Rural Schools. During the interviews, most participants agreed that it is difficult not to compare rural and urban schools; accordingly, some interviewees' responses were accompanied by a comparison of rural and urban EFL teachers, students, and the environment. For instance, teachers believed that urban school students are more competent in English than rural students who prefer speaking Kazakh in EFL classes. Therefore, teachers in urban areas can conduct English-only lessons and apply monolingual approaches to classroom instruction.

Further, the interviewed teachers shared the common view that there is a lack of communicative environment for language learners, noting the absence of opportunities for real-life communication in English in rural areas. As one participant stated: "Children have radio, television, acquaintances, and friends who speak in Kazakh or Russian. They have a communication environment in these languages. But we do not have a social environment in English" (Rima, School E, December 8, 2022). Another participant, Aina, supported this viewpoint, suggesting that it would be good to attract proficient English speakers and native speakers from urban regions to their schools to provide additional courses for rural students, as it would increase their motivation and interest to learn the English language. She commented:

Носитель языка – это же носитель языка [a native speaker is a native speaker]. ... Although we are English teachers, we are not native speakers. The children always perceive us as Kazakhs, and I wonder if the situation would be improved if the native speaker visited our school. ... They make a small thing look different.

Aina also supposed that translanguaging may not be applied in urban schools; however, many teachers in rural areas use other languages in EFL classes, which is unavoidable. She added that her students sometimes even have difficulties understanding a small sentence, no matter how the teacher uses pictures, facial expressions, gestures, and overall semiotic resources. At this point, Rima also agreed that it is challenging for rural school students to learn English. She noted: “English is a complex subject for learners, here, in our village”. Thus, the participants were inclined to believe that the contrast between urban and rural contexts also affects their use of languages in terms of differences in conditions, environment, and students’ language proficiency.

School-Parent Interaction and Parental Involvement. The analysis of interview data identified that school-parent interaction and parental involvement were considered indicators of developing students’ language skills. Two participants linked the students’ low language proficiency to the absence of parental supervision at home. According to the information provided by Aina and Zarina, EFL teachers’ practice of translanguaging depends not only on the level of the village but also on the parents’ interest in their children’s studies. The following extract can exemplify this: “But parents do not care about their children’s education. School education should not be limited only to teachers. ... Parents, teachers, school, and surrounding community - everything is connected” (Aina, December 7, 2022). Aina also commented: “A child who studies will do his homework, but a child who does not study will return to school without completing his homework”, thus, highlighting the role of parents in working with low-level students as they need additional support in completing the assignments at home.

Zarina supported this view, noting that although teachers teach at school, students are left without parental attention, and everything learned during the lesson is not revised at

home. She suggested that the reason might be the parents' absence of English proficiency, raising the issue of the necessity of opening language courses for parents at schools.

Teacher Turnover. When respondents were asked to suggest other factors that impede their classroom practices, a variety of perspectives expressed the impermanence of EFL teachers in rural schools. Based on the data analysis, there were two reasons teachers quit their jobs or worked in different schools, which eventually influenced their practices of translanguaging. If the first reason was related to teachers' maternity leave, the second case included the new changes in the Stavka system (management of teachers' pay and workload).

Zarina explained the first factor, reporting that when one EFL teacher went on maternity leave, the classes under that teacher's instruction switched to another EFL teacher (to Zarina). Saniya shared the same view with Zarina, highlighting that since children get used to the methodology of one teacher, they have a hard time getting used to another teacher. Zarina experienced this case by herself and added that compared to the class where she has been teaching for a while, the newly assigned class was weaker. As a result, Zarina was found to use students' L1 excessively in new classes, while in other classrooms, she tended to use translanguaging only for 30%. This case was also evident while observing two classes, one of which was Zarina's new class and another was her permanent class which she has been teaching for six years. There were considerable differences in learners' participation, language proficiency, and attitude towards the teacher mentioned by Zarina.

Another response involving the changes in the school's Stavka system was mentioned by Saniya, who gave in-depth information about teachers' challenges which eventually translated into their classroom practices. She commented:

Many teachers' working hours have been reduced due to the Stavka system. It was made to give teachers more time to prepare better lessons, but teachers cannot get more than 16 hours, so teachers often wander around looking for other additional work. The salary with this workload is insufficient; therefore, teachers are working in

2-3 places without being able to prepare for their lessons properly. Sometimes they even quit teaching and get another lucrative job.

Saniya also shared her own experience of working in two workplaces because of the Stavka system and compared how the use of translanguaging varied depending on the duration of work with students.

District-Level Factors. Contrary to expectations, the study findings did not reveal any national- or state-level factors. However, there appeared to be one factor at the district level, which was categorized as the school's beneficial location.

School's Location. While asking questions regarding the influence of teacher collaboration meetings, which did not give significant data about the use of translanguaging in EFL classrooms, some teachers revealed other finding related to the district-level factors. According to the interviewees' responses, most of the teachers' methodological advice meetings, gatherings, seminars, and open classes are likely to be conducted in the district center. Although all five different schools were in the Zhambyl region, there was one village considered the district center of that region which is bigger and more populated than other villages. Accordingly, most teachers suggested that the educational conditions and resources were better in the schools located in or closer to the district center. The following extract can exemplify this:

Many methodological meetings and seminars are held there [in the district center]. Since we are further away, we don't have much. In fact, the closer you are to that district, the better it will be for your school, as conditions in those schools are better. However, it is not always possible to attend those meetings as it is challenging to get there (Saniya, School C, December 15, 2022)

In contrast, Nazerke, who was a teacher at school B, shared that she regularly participates in open classes, teacher collaborations, and gatherings that are held not only at her school but also in other schools in the district center. She noted that these methodological

advice meetings beneficially influenced her teaching practice and increased the effectiveness of her instructional approaches, while Aina and Zarina expressed the need for participating in such gatherings. However, the difference between school locations not only limited teachers from cooperative work and teacher development meetings but also created disparity among schools located in rural areas.

Congruence and Incongruence between Rural EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Actual Practices of Translanguaging

Since the previous section discussed how internal and external factors impact teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging, this section presents the findings regarding teachers' belief-practice consistency. To understand the contradiction or consistency of this relationship, teachers' stated beliefs from individual interviews and their observed actual classroom practices were analyzed and compared. Accordingly, there appeared to be minimal incongruences and moderate congruences between teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging.

According to the participants' responses about their perceptions of translanguaging, the majority of teachers articulated the use of students' L1 in a positive vein with some exceptions, such as not allowing its excessive use; that is, the use of languages in EFL classes should be balanced between 70% for the target language and the remaining 30% for other languages. In addition, there were moderate monoglossic beliefs, such as using translanguaging as a last option. However, during the observations of English classes, it was evident that there are both some consistencies and inconsistencies between teachers' beliefs and practices. For instance, Nazerke believed that using students' L1 should be avoided as it is counterproductive for teaching English effectively. This belief was reinforced by Nazerke's schooling as her former university educators taught only monolingual approaches and required English-only classes. Accordingly, Nazerke's instructional practices in relation to L1

usage were considered to match her articulated beliefs during the two observed classes. She primarily conducted her lessons in English, with some exceptional cases when students did not understand the task despite teachers' attempts to explain it in English.

Nevertheless, there was evidence of contradiction in how Nazerke reacted to students' usage of L1 in EFL classes. The observational data from Nazerke's lessons indicated that students often used their L1 among themselves when they had group discussions. Although Nazerke stated that she does not allow her students to use their L1/L2 in discussions for the sake of developing students' speaking skills, her reactions to it proved the opposite. Some of Nazerke's students often resorted to their L1 or L2 while doing pair or group work; however, she did not make any interventions to caution students or restrict the usage of students' mother tongue in these activities. Furthermore, in most classroom interactions, students spoke English when Nazerke asked them; yet, if she did not require learners to use the target language instead of Kazakh, they continued using L1 while the teacher used an English-only approach in her instruction.

Since other teachers mainly displayed positive perceptions of translanguaging, their classes were observed to understand how and in what ways their instruction connected to their beliefs. Compared to Nazerke, most participants considered using students' L1 as a supportive strategy in enhancing learners' learning outcomes; yet they believed that the acceptable use of translanguaging should not exceed 30%. However, observational data demonstrated that the use of students' L1 is more than teachers expected and planned, as most instruction during the lesson was in L1. In most cases, teachers used translanguaging in classroom interactions, translations of the texts, making corrections in students' answers, and explaining or clarifying the given task. It can be suggested that the result stems from students' low language proficiency, which affects teachers' translanguaging without involving its pedagogical features; however, it is more likely that participants' application of

students' L1 has a spontaneous character. Accordingly, due to the various classroom situations and unintentional use of translanguaging, teachers' stated beliefs cannot be espoused in their practice.

Furthermore, all respondents reported in pre-observation interviews that during their EFL classes, they utilize various methods and additional materials and plan their lessons to be conducted only in English. However, observational data revealed that only three of five participants enacted their articulated statements in their actual classroom practices. The only prevailing method was the Grammar Translation Method which involved many translations from English into Kazakh and Russian. As discussed in the previous section, the explanation for this discrepancy might be school-context and classroom-context factors that hinder teachers from enacting their beliefs into practice. Therefore, it can be concluded that teachers' belief-practice congruence depends on other internal and external factors that influence not only teachers' beliefs and practices but also the relationship between them by creating a contradiction in the enactment of teachers' stated beliefs into their actual classroom practices.

Conclusion

This chapter illustrated the major findings related to the rural EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging and factors that impede or support the relationship between them. The results indicated that teachers have positive and moderate monoglossic beliefs about using students' L1 in EFL classrooms. The respondents also held mixed perceptions of translanguaging, which was the result of its inevitable nature; accordingly, due to the unavoidable and spontaneous use of translanguaging, teachers' beliefs were between the effective and unwilling practice of translanguaging. Further, the data analysis identified various internal and external factors that were pivotal in understanding teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging and the relationship between them. For instance, teachers are likely to have more monoglossic beliefs in schools in the district center, where they have

better conditions and a conducive environment for teaching languages. In addition, the EFL teacher turnover in rural areas also seems to be affecting teachers' use of languages in their classes, as the data showed the dependence of teachers' translanguaging on the duration of work with the class. Furthermore, the study results demonstrated that several external factors, such as parental involvement, the impact of rural context, and the availability of school resources, influence teachers' beliefs and classroom practices. It is also important to note that all internal and external factors were found to be interdependent and interrelated; therefore, they create complexity in understanding the relationship between teachers' beliefs and actual practices of translanguaging. The next chapter will discuss all these findings in relation to the previous research on the topic.

Chapter 5: Discussion

The previous chapter presented the main findings of this study obtained from semi-structured interviews of five rural EFL teachers and classroom observations of their practices. The present chapter discusses some significant aspects of those findings and their interpretation in relation to the existing theoretical knowledge on the topic. In light of the study's aim, which was to explore EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging with the analysis of internal and external factors that either facilitate or impede their relationship, this chapter goes within the research questions and sub-questions that guided this study:

RQ1: What are EFL teachers' beliefs and practices regarding the use of translanguaging in rural schools?

Sub-questions:

- a) What are the rural EFL teachers' beliefs about translanguaging in the classroom?
- b) How do rural EFL teachers use translanguaging in the classroom?
- c) What internal and external factors influence EFL teachers' practices and beliefs about translanguaging?

RQ2: What is the relationship between EFL teachers' perceptions and practices of translanguaging in rural areas?

Sub-questions:

- a) How do the rural EFL teachers' stated beliefs differ from their actual practices?
- b) How do internal and external factors impede or support the relationship between EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging?

RQ: What are EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Practices Regarding the Use of Translanguaging in Rural Schools?

This research question aimed to explore rural EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging in classroom settings. Based on the study findings, four of five teachers were

found to hold positive views toward using students' L1. This is in contrast with previous studies on Kazakhstani teachers' monoglossic beliefs (Abdrakhmanova, 2017; Amaniyazova, 2020; Kuandykov, 2021).

Rather teachers viewed translanguaging as an important and necessary tool in their EFL classrooms that enhances the process of teaching and learning. This finding is consistent with the previous research by Liu and Fang (2020), who revealed that most teachers in their study perceived using students' L1 as an essential asset for achieving teaching purposes in classes with lower-level language students. Moreover, the current study found that participants viewed translanguaging as a tool for facilitating students' receptive and productive skills and enhancing classroom interactions. This resonates with the studies by Cenoz and Santos (2020) and Wang (2019), who found that teachers use other languages as a scaffolding strategy to leverage input and output in different languages.

Furthermore, similar to previous studies in the Kazakhstani context (Abdrakhmanova, 2017; Yakshi, 2022), teachers in this present inquiry applied translanguaging practices to increase students' engagement and meaning-making skills and to present complex academic materials, except for one teacher, Nazerke, who held a more monoglossic stance and considered using students' L1 as a last resort. Significantly, she had a mixture of perceptions, demonstrating the contradiction between positive and negative perceptions of translanguaging due to the various factors that require using other languages to meet external constraints.

In general, Nazerke's perceptions of translanguaging recalled Escobar and Dillard-Paltrineri's (2015) study, in which teacher participants' beliefs about translanguaging in EFL classrooms had three overlapping perspectives: (1) the research participants considered translanguaging as an ineffective approach to EFL classrooms; (2) they stated that the use of L1 would create a "habit of laziness, deadening both conscious and subconscious processes

of learning” (p.312); and (3) L1 use in EFL classroom was seen among participants as Grammar-Translation Method that hinders communicative language teaching. Nevertheless, although Nazerke tended to limit translanguaging in her classroom and articulated its ineffectiveness, similar to the previous study results (Amaniyazova, 2020; Tuskeyeva, 2022), she could not completely disconnect students’ L1 from her instruction. This echoes Yakshi (2022), who found that although teachers support the monolingual teaching approaches and believe in the adverse effects of translanguaging on students’ language development, they used it in particular cases to ensure students’ comprehension and facilitate lower-level learners.

Further, it was identified that EFL teachers do not design and plan their translanguaging practices systematically, integrating different multilingual and multimodal resources in EFL classrooms to a limited extent (García et al., 2017). This contrasts with García and Kleyn’s (2016) framework of translanguaging pedagogy, which states that teachers holding a translanguaging stance should purposefully and systematically plan their lessons to create student-centered approaches. In addition, teachers shared that translanguaging has an inevitable and natural character; therefore, they rely on its use unintentionally. This is concurrent with Canagarajah’s (2011) and Rahman et al.’s (2016) findings which indicated that translanguaging happens naturally in instruction, and mainly teachers use it without involving premeditated pedagogical practices.

Another finding related to García and Kleyn’s (2016) translanguaging shifts was in line with Kuandykov’s (2021) study results, indicating the absence of the “moment-by-moment decisions that teachers make all the time” (García et al., 2017, p. 13) as participants’ instruction had changes that were more of natural and spontaneous character rather than systematic or planned intentions to meet students’ language differences and needs.

Yet, one participant, Rima, was found to apply explicit translanguaging design and shifts in her instructional pedagogy, including various multilingual and multimodal resources, and effectively leveraged different languages in her classroom practices while confronting spontaneous changes to effectively support students' comprehension and learning outcomes (Kleyn & García, 2019). This participant reconsidered and modified her instructional methods to meet the learners' needs in bi/multilingual settings and ensured that learners have appropriate acquaintance with the language features necessary for completing academic tasks (Nagy, 2018; Vogel & García, 2017).

The Influence of Internal and External Factors on EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Practices of Translanguaging

This section discusses the internal and external factors associated primarily with schooling, classroom settings, school context, and students' language proficiency and their impact on the participants' beliefs and practices of translanguaging.

Internal Factors and Schooling

The study findings revealed that teachers' schooling experience shaped their current teaching practices and their perceptions of using students' L1 in EFL classrooms in two ways; that is, teachers either wish to continue to follow teaching approaches used by their prior teachers or they wish to reject translanguaging that they previously experienced in the classroom. This supports Chong et al.'s (2005) theory about the three sources of teachers' beliefs, which consisted of their personal experience, schooling and instruction, and formal education – both school and pedagogical education. It is also important to note that beliefs shaped at early stages in teachers' lives considerably impact how new experiences will be interpreted and internalized into their overall belief system (Chong et al., 2005).

Similarly, the findings showed that two teachers' (Nazerke and Zarina) classroom decisions were influenced by their previous language learning experiences, eventually

impacting their beliefs. In Nazerke's case, her former educators' English-only approach and instruction shaped her monoglossic beliefs about translanguaging; however, due to the influence of external factors, such as maternity leave, a break in her career, and difference in students' language proficiency, her former monoglossic beliefs changed to the moderate level. At this rate, Johnson (1994) argued that novice teachers mainly teach in the same way as their former educators as they do not have any experience and need time to get themselves out of that previous teaching model. Therefore, it can be suggested that Nazerke's beliefs and classroom practices changed not only due to the limited teaching experience but also because of the external hindrances. In contrast, Zarina's teaching pedagogy was similar to the teaching pedagogies of her previous teachers, and she followed the "Soviet" Grammar-Translation method, which is deeply rooted in her practice. This resonates with Burkhalter's (2013) study outcomes, indicating that Kazakhstani EFL teachers mainly resist adopting new pedagogical strategies due to their received Soviet education.

Other findings from this study related to schooling demonstrated that teachers developed an "anti-apprenticeship of observation" (Moodie, 2015, p. 260) that influenced their beliefs and practices. Instead of following former educators' teaching methods, two participants (Aina and Rima) considered their schooling experience as examples of what should be avoided as EFL teachers. That is, they tried not to involve in their pedagogical approaches to learning English what their previous teachers used, such as Kazakh transliteration of English words (Aina) and randomly applying grammatical rules (Rima). These findings echo Kuandykov's (2021) study when one participant's monoglossic beliefs about translanguaging were formed due to her former educator's application of grammar-based methods and excessive use of mother tongue in EFL classrooms; therefore, she believed that the use of translanguaging is an ineffective way of teaching English. Thus,

lacking positive models of effective translanguaging pedagogy during schooling may also lead to the formation of more monolingual teaching manners in teachers' careers.

Monolingual Professional Development Courses and Work Experience

To enact their beliefs into teaching practice, teachers need the necessary knowledge that helps them to accomplish the role of the teacher (Fives & Buehl, 2008). Accordingly, various sources of knowledge and learning opportunities can facilitate teachers' further professional growth and development throughout their teaching careers (Buehl & Beck, 2015). Thus, another finding related to the internal factors, the impact of professional coursework, revealed that those courses were primarily based on monolingual teaching approaches; therefore, they did not involve any pedagogical value or implications for using translanguaging. Compared to other studies in which teachers' monoglossic beliefs were shaped by their professional development (e.g., Borg, 2011; Kang, 2013) and changed to a more heteroglossic view by the end of coursework (Gorter & Arocena, 2020), the present research did not find substantial effects of professional development courses on teachers' negative or positive perceptions of translanguaging. Although Skott (2014) noted that beliefs are considered contextually and irregularly stable integrations that are likely to change only if there is a consistent and solid interference in various social practices, the study's participants' translanguaging beliefs do not seem to be affected by regular monolingual developmental courses.

The present research study found contrasting findings to previous study outcomes (e.g., Korkmaz, 2021; Kuandykov, 2021; Utami, 2016), which revealed that more experienced teachers are more likely to be tolerant towards using translanguaging. In the present study, one of the less experienced teachers, Saniya, held more positive views toward translanguaging and partially had the same classroom translanguaging practices as the more

experienced teachers. Therefore, it is difficult to consider work experience as an influential factor that determines teachers' monoglossic or heteroglossic beliefs and practices.

External Factors, Classroom-Context, and School-Context Factors

Although teachers' beliefs and practices were predominantly monoglossic due to the schooling, external factors move teachers' practice differently, thus, encouraging them to do translanguaging in their EFL classes. One of the key external factors that affects teachers' beliefs and language use in EFL classrooms is students' language proficiency. For that reason, participants applied translanguaging in their practices to support lower language-level students and create meaningful classroom interaction. This is consistent with Sobkowiak (2022) and Allard (2017), who found that teachers especially refer to translanguaging when learners have low English language proficiency, as it assists in increasing students' inclusion and involvement in classroom activities.

Although respondents of this study allowed lower-level students to use their L1, they still consider this factor as the main hindrance to implementing English-only instruction. In addition, when teachers provided classes only in English, students became less active and bored; accordingly, to create a positive classroom environment, teachers had to apply translanguaging practices in EFL classrooms (Sahib, 2019). This echoes Kaipnazarova (2020) and Tuskeyeva (2022), who revealed the same findings regarding Kazakhstani teachers' view of students' language level as the obstacle that impedes applying monolingual approaches; therefore, the exclusive use of English was teachers' end goal and what they aspire to reach.

In contrast with Batyrova's (2021) study among Kazakhstani rural school students, in which she found how they negatively perceived their teachers' excessive use of students' L1, the current investigation demonstrated this finding from teachers' perspectives. The students in Batyrova's (2021) study connected the ineffectiveness of English lessons to teachers' language use in EFL classrooms, sharing that 80% of the lesson was conducted in Kazakh

and only 20% was devoted to English; therefore, they adversely perceived teachers' overusing translanguaging. However, the present study findings revealed explanations of why rural EFL teachers excessively use students' L1, illustrating some particular factors, one of which was students' low language proficiency, which in turn, was the result of school-context and classroom-context factors. Moreover, teachers were more than open to supporting students with higher language proficiency, and one participant, Nazerke, was inclined to limit translanguaging to meet those students' needs. At the same time, Aina encouraged students with developed English levels to help lower-level students: thus, facilitating peer-scaffolding (Wang, 2019) in her classes.

In addition, respondents mentioned other external factors that influence students' language proficiency, such as the mismatch between English textbooks and students' language levels. In the vein of Kaipnazarova's (2020) study, in which teachers viewed learners' low English proficiency as a cause-effect of ineffective textbooks and connected it to the unfeasibility of conducting monolingual lessons, this inquiry's participants shared the same belief, stating that textbook programs unsuitable and challenging for language learners. As a result, teachers used translanguaging to make teaching materials more comprehensible and meet students' language needs.

Further, the study participants connected students' low English proficiency with other school-context factors that also affect their language use in their classes. For instance, respondents highlighted the role of academic environments in reinforcing students' language learning outcomes and implementing new approaches to teaching. Only one teacher was satisfied with the provision of resources at her school, while four other teachers shared that they have a deficiency of facilities and additional materials, which could increase students' engagement and interest in their EFL classrooms. This finding is concurrent with previous study outcomes (e.g., Afzal Tajik et al., 2022; Agaidarova, 2019; Jima, 2018; McLaughlin et

al., 2021), in which it was pointed out that most rural schools were confronted with challenges due to the limited availability of resources, such as new technologies, textbooks, poor Internet connectivity, and other educational materials.

Moreover, similar to Goodman and Abdimanapova's (2020) study findings, this research revealed the problem of an insufficient supply of textbooks for students. For instance, Saniya shared how students even lack elementary classroom supplies, such as English textbooks, not to mention other additional materials and resources. The classroom observations also confirmed that the issue of the insufficient number of textbooks resulted in students' low levels of academic achievement and low engagement. Students used an inadequate number of materials as an excuse to use excessive L1 in EFL classrooms. This recalls Johnson's (2000) study, which found how two schools with contrasting provisions of facilities differed in students' language learning outcomes. Compared to the well-equipped school with enhanced instruction for students, the other one reflected a deficit in school infrastructure, resulting in low levels of English proficiency, motivation, readiness, and an unwelcoming academic environment (Johnson, 2000). Therefore, the issue of limited access to all necessary facilities creates a gap between rural and urban schools, making it difficult to provide students with the same level of knowledge as those in more urbanized areas (Afzal Tajik et al., 2022). The participants of the current study repeatedly mentioned the disparity between rural and urban schools, which was related to the differences in school infrastructure and stimulating environment that influenced the development of students' language proficiency. Subsequently, rural EFL teachers were found to use translanguaging regularly in their classrooms due to the surrounding culture (Anderson & Lightfoot, 2018). However, it is worth mentioning that some teachers viewed the shortage of supplementary resources as an opportunity to be creative and resourceful in their teaching methods as they prepared all the hands-on activities and interactive approaches by themselves.

Another factor the findings show to have an impact on shaping students' language skills, and ultimately, teachers' use of translanguaging, is parental involvement. Two participants (Aina and Zarina) stated that the significance of the interaction between schools and parents should not be understated, meaning how the academic and home environments are bounded together. These teachers indicated the absence of parental supervision at home, which further affects how students do their home assignments, especially lower-level learners, as they need extra support in completing and working on the tasks. This point was also mentioned in McLaughlin et al.'s (2021) study, which consistently demonstrated that parental involvement in education is positively associated with students' academic achievement. Therefore, since resources are limited in rural areas, parents' involvement is critical in providing students with the support and resources that are more challenging to find than in urban areas (Afzal Tajik et al., 2022; Amankulova, 2017).

Contrary to prior studies that revealed how teachers held monoglossic beliefs and tended to limit their translanguaging practices due to the school's language policy (Kuandykov, 2021; Yuvapayan, 2019) and curriculum (Amaniyazova, 2020; Byrnes, 2020), the present research demonstrated the absence of school language teaching policy. Although some schools encouraged and articulated the use of monolingual paradigms as a desirable approach, they did not pressure or mandate teachers to apply particular teaching methods or restrict the use of translanguaging in EFL classrooms. Therefore, it can be supposed that the schools located in rural areas, to some extent, are aware of the contextual constraints that do not allow teachers to integrate monolingual teaching instruction in English lessons fully.

Participants also indicated the impermanence of rural EFL teachers' jobs as an impediment that affects their excessive use of translanguaging. Two participants (Zarina and Saniya) shared several cases which resulted in teacher turnover. In the first case, one EFL teacher was replaced by another due to maternity leave. Accordingly, students who got used

to the previous teacher's instruction and methodology faced difficulties adapting to a new one. It was found that teachers tended to use translanguaging more in newly assigned classes in comparison with those where they have been teaching for a while.

The second case was similar; however, this also entailed a change in teaching hours. That is, due to the limited teaching hours, most teachers had to work part-time in other schools or even look for other jobs. This is consistent with McLaughlin et al. (2021) and Tastanbekova (2020), who argued that schoolteachers face sociocultural barriers due to low salaries and high workloads in the form of the Stavka system. While these studies discuss only the sociocultural aspects, the current inquiry revealed its detrimental effects on teachers' language use. This recalls Chant (2002), who stated that the teachers' pedagogical practices change based on their experiences as beginner teachers in a new context.

District-Level Factors and School's Location

Although the study findings did not identify national- or state-related factors, there appeared to be one unanticipated district-level factor, which was revealed while asking teachers about the influence of professional coursework and teacher collaboration meetings. School location created a disparity among five different schools. Despite the fact that all five schools were in the Zhambyl region, there was one village considered the district center of that region. Most teachers who worked in schools far from that village believed that educational conditions and infrastructure were better in schools located in or closer to the district center, as most teacher collaborations and gatherings were held in the district center. Accordingly, teachers whose schools are closer to that district center had more opportunities to increase their professional development and effectiveness of their pedagogical practices by participating in those methodological advice meetings. At the same time, other teachers working far from the district center felt isolated from these gatherings due to the school's location and transportation issues. Thus, the study identified not only the disparity between

rural and urban schools but also identified the influence of such factors as the school's location within one rural region. This finding also demonstrates the interrelation and interdependence of various factors. In other words, the school's location as a context-specific factor, in turn, influences external factors, such as the availability of resources, which impacts classroom-context factors, such as students' language proficiency, which further affects teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging. This ultimately brings other internal and external factors that create a set of supports and hindrances, which, in turn, influences teachers' beliefs and practices, as well as the relationship between them.

RQ2: What is the Relationship between EFL Teachers' Perceptions and Practices of Translanguaging in Rural Areas?

This question was intended to explore to what extent study participants enact their classroom practices based on their beliefs. In order to understand how teachers' views differ from their practices and what internal and external factors impede or support their relationship, the study examined interview data in relation to reported and observed participants' practices. The findings indicated that rural EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging impact one another (Richardson, 1996; Thompson, 1992), and the strength of their congruence or incongruence vary across individuals and contexts.

Contrary to previous studies that revealed some contradictions regarding the teachers' beliefs and their self-reported practices (e.g., Amaniyazova, 2020; Doiz & Lasagabaster, 2016; Korkmaz, 2021; Rahman et al., 2015; Yuvapayan, 2019), this inquiry did not find substantial inconsistencies; instead, there appeared to be moderate consistencies between teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging.

In contrast with prior research in the Kazakhstani context, which demonstrated the gap between teachers' monoglossic beliefs and heteroglossic practices (Akhmetova, 2021; Amaniyazova, 2020), this study found that four of five participants held positive views

towards translanguaging; therefore, their stated beliefs were consistent with their actual practices as they used students' L1 as a supportive and beneficial tool in their teaching pedagogy. However, there emerged a minimal discrepancy between teachers' articulated acceptable use of translanguaging, which should not exceed 30%, and what was observed in their EFL classrooms. Although teachers reported that the lesson should be conducted 70% in English, in most cases, teachers were consistently using translanguaging, such as translating instances into Kazakh and Russian, providing explanations, clarifications, and classroom interaction in L1; that is, teachers used translanguaging more than they expected and intended to do. This indicates that the teachers' perceptions of their ideal use and distribution of the target language and other languages contrast with what actually happens in EFL classes. This finding concurs with Copland and Neokleous (2011), who revealed that the teachers' belief-practice inconsistencies often result from multiple constraints that appear spontaneously or occasionally. At this rate, as Amaniyaova (2020) stated, such inconsistencies might be the outcome of schools' provided conditions and resources that impact teachers' beliefs, which could further shape their practices.

One example of this is Nazerke's case, as she demonstrated belief-practice consistency, while the other four participants had some differences between their stated beliefs and actual practices. That is, Nazerke's pedagogical instruction in relation to L1 usage was considered in line with her moderate monoglossic beliefs, as she primarily conducted lessons in English, with some exceptional cases when other approaches to teaching did not work or students had difficulties in comprehending the task. Accordingly, as a teacher, she performed English-only but left space for students to use L1. This finding contrasts with previous study outcomes, in which 78% of teachers articulated monoglossic views on using students' L1 in L2 classes; however, only 31% of teachers actually enacted their beliefs into practice; that is, teaching the target language without involving L1 in their classes (Rahman

et al., 2015). Notably, Nazerke was the only teacher satisfied with provided school's resources, while other teachers indicated their deficiency. Therefore, her belief-practice consistency might have been reinforced by adequate resources and the school's location in the district center, which ultimately positively influenced students' language proficiency and allowed her to conduct more monolingual EFL classes. This implies that the teachers' perceptions of the context and the context itself mediate rural EFL teachers' belief-practice consistency and inconsistency.

Conclusion

This discussion chapter provided detailed information about the study's major findings in relation to the research questions, the previous literature on the topic, and García and Kleyn's (2016) and Buehl and Beck's (2015) theoretical frameworks. The findings demonstrate the intricate, interdependent, and multidimensional features of teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging. The findings revealed one unanticipated factor, district-specific factor in the form of the school's location, which created a set of interrelated internal and external factors that considerably influence teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging. The findings also showed that teachers' beliefs could be shaped by their schooling in two ways: teachers either reject translanguaging from their schooling experiences or continue to follow monoglossic beliefs shaped by their prior language education. However, most importantly, although the teachers' beliefs and practices were primarily monoglossic due to the schooling, external factors, such as the availability of resources, students' language proficiency, teacher turnover, and the school's location, let them do translanguaging in their EFL classes. Thus, the current inquiry revealed that internal and external factors affect teachers' beliefs and practices, as well as their relationships, not only in an isolated way but also altogether; thus, creating an interdependent system of all their interactions. The next chapter summarizes the major findings, outlines the study's limitations, and its implications for further research and practice.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

This study aimed to explore Kazakhstani EFL teachers' beliefs and actual practices of translanguaging in different schools located in rural areas. The research also attempted to identify and analyze how internal and external factors support or impede the relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices of using translanguaging. In light of these aims, a qualitative collective case study was conducted where five EFL teachers participated in semi-structured individual interviews and two classroom observations each.

This chapter consists of three parts that will draw upon the main conclusions of this inquiry. The first part presents a summary of the major study findings. Following this, the second part discusses the limitations of the study with regard to the methodology used. The last part provides the implications of this study and offers some recommendations to educational stakeholders, namely, school administrators, EFL teachers, policymakers, and parents. Finally, some implications for future research are also discussed.

Main Findings of the Study

Contrary to previous studies, this study found that four of five participants viewed the use of students' L1 positively, considering its application in EFL classrooms as an essential and facilitating tool for achieving teaching and learning purposes. However, although the teachers articulated the effectiveness of translanguaging, they did not design and plan its use purposefully; accordingly, there was no explicit and systematic integration of multilingual and multimodal resources in teachers' teaching practices. The deliberate design of heteroglossic instruction and translanguaging shifts appeared to be used only by one teacher, Rima, indicating that purposeful pedagogical use of students' L1 varies depending on the particular teacher's competency and personal classroom decisions, as each teacher was found to use those teaching methods and approaches that would meet their students' classroom needs.

Furthermore, the study demonstrated that internal and external factors influence teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging. Yet, the impact of each factor was stated to be different for each teacher's case and teaching context. For instance, the study showed that schooling experience as an internal factor shapes teachers' beliefs and practices in two ways. If some teachers might follow their previous educators' instructional manners, such as holding monoglossic views and limiting the use of students' L1 in EFL classes or use translanguaging practices to some extent, other teachers, in contrast, can reject and avoid translanguaging teaching approaches their former teachers applied during their prior language learning experiences.

Although schooling was found to be important in shaping teachers' beliefs about not using translanguaging, external factors led them to view translanguaging positively. For instance, the school's location as a district-specific factor seemed to have a powerful impact on teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging, as this factor involves all other school-related and classroom-related factors, such as students' language proficiency, availability of resources, and teacher collaboration opportunities and meetings. Moreover, it was found that the school's location also creates a disparity among five different schools located in one rural area. Since one more populated and urbanized village was considered the district center of that rural region, the schools located near or in that area were believed to provide better conditions for students' language development and teachers' professional growth. However, other schools located far from the district center were isolated from methodological advice gatherings and had limited resources due to the school's location and transportation issues.

Since students play a crucial role in teachers' classroom decisions regarding the approaches to teaching, classroom-context factors, such as students' language proficiency, were found to support translanguaging and override schooling. In addition, an inadequate number of textbooks in schools farther from the district center led students to use excessive

L1, which indicates how the availability or deficiency of resources affects students' academic achievement, language proficiency, and engagement in EFL classes. Thus, district-specific factors induced school-related factors, which in turn, activated classroom-context factors; consequently, all these external factors influenced students' language learning outcomes and language development, which eventually reflected in teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging.

Further, the study findings demonstrated that parental involvement in language learning is crucial for addressing lower-level students' language proficiency, as students mainly need additional help completing home assignments. Accordingly, this finding demonstrates how language education is not limited to only teachers and school but also the home environment and support from family members.

Although this inquiry did not reveal notable findings related to the school's language policy, the study found another school-related factor, such as teacher turnover. This impermanence of rural EFL teachers was recognized as a hindrance to conducting monolingual lessons due to the changes in assigned classes, leading them to use students' L1 excessively. Teacher turnover, in turn, emanated from other factors, such as teachers' maternity leave and the Stavka system, which created difficulties for language learners as they got used to their previous teacher's pedagogy and were confronted with challenges in adapting to a new one. Likewise, due to the Stavka system (management of teachers' workload), most teachers had to look for another lucrative job or work part-time in other schools as they had limited teaching hours. Thus, this finding shows that schoolteachers face not only sociocultural barriers due to low salaries or high workload caused by the Stavka system but also experience its adverse effects on language teaching.

Contrary to prior research that found some inconsistencies between teachers' reported beliefs and their actual practices of translanguaging, the present study did not reveal

substantial discrepancies; instead, there appeared to exist moderate consistency, and teachers could enact their stated beliefs into their teaching instruction. Notwithstanding, considering the complexity of understanding the relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices due to various internal and external factors, it is challenging to evaluate to what extent teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging influence one another. For example, in this study, teachers' major belief-practice inconsistencies were the outcome of the school's provided resources and appropriate facilities for teaching. Yet, as Buehl and Beck (2015) highlighted, although the relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices can be strong, "there was never a perfect correspondence between beliefs and practices, nor a complete lack of relationship" (p. 71). With this in mind, it can be concluded that "the complex and embedded nature of the supports and hindrances" (Buehl & Beck, 2015, p. 80) underlines the need to consider a variety of factors and examine specific ways of their influence when exploring the relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices.

Limitations

The present study has several limitations that need to be highlighted. Although the study explored five different schools, all the participants come from one region; therefore, the findings should not be generalized to all teachers. The next limitation is the number and choice of data collection instruments. Even though semi-structured interviews and two classroom observations per teacher were employed to obtain data, it would be more insightful to conduct interviews before and after the observations to understand the relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices of translanguaging. The pre-observation interviews would allow the researcher to identify teachers' pre-existing beliefs, while post-observation interviews would help in constructing more relevant interview questions and recognizing patterns of how teachers' beliefs and practices changed after their short reflection in the previous interview.

Recommendations

There are some recommendations for different educational stakeholders, namely, policymakers, school administrators, parents, and EFL teachers. The insights and findings of this study could benefit EFL teachers in reflecting on their own beliefs and understanding how to effectively incorporate translanguaging into their teaching practices to help language learners build confidence, promote language development, and improve language learning outcomes. Moreover, the knowledge about existing internal and external factors could be a good source for teachers to purposefully design multilingual and multimodal resources and be prepared for translanguaging shifts initiated by various supports and hindrances identified in this study.

Since the study found how schooling might have adverse effects on teachers' beliefs and practices, policymakers could be recommended to reconsider pre-service EFL teachers' curriculum and focus on more flexible and heteroglossic teaching methodologies that will help future and novice EFL teachers to be prepared for translanguaging shifts and effectively support students' needs in EFL settings. This could be achieved by adding specific courses with an emphasis on multilingual education, such as "Foundations to Multilingual Education," "Multilingual School," and "Multilingual Curriculum Development and Assessment." In addition, policymakers could initiate collaboration with local and international universities that would have shared their experiences in providing multilingual education courses. For instance, Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education might be asked to provide guidance in developing curricula for pre-service EFL teachers for teacher training universities in Kazakhstan. Furthermore, policymakers should consider the educational context in rural schools and provide more resources and conducive conditions so that learners and teachers have an opportunity to give and gain equal knowledge as in more urbanized areas and within variations of schools in one rural region. In addition, it can be

proposed that English textbooks need to be designed by utilizing a differentiation approach to minimize the mismatch between students' language proficiency and English textbooks.

Further, school administrators could be recommended to engage in more dialogues with parents so that they understand the importance of parental involvement in language learning. Parents, in turn, are suggested to reflect on their engagement with language education and adjust appropriately. The responsibility for students' academic achievements and learning outcomes should not be limited to teachers only, but also parents.

Future Research Directions

The following suggestions and implications can be drawn from the present study for further research. First and foremost, the research on translanguaging from rural EFL teachers' perceptions and practices in the system of internal and external factors is still in its infancy. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct more and preferably larger-scale studies to explore if other EFL teachers from various rural schools share the same beliefs and approaches to language teaching and what factors affect their belief-practice congruence. In addition, since multiple facets were dependent on the school's location, it can be suggested to find two EFL teachers from one rural school to see if the identified classroom-related and school-related factors impact in the same way. This might also reveal if the school's location is really that powerful.

Although the present inquiry initially planned to compare urban and rural schools' EFL teachers' beliefs, the study was conducted only in rural schools due to time constraints. Therefore, it would be useful to conduct a comparative study to see how EFL teachers' use of translanguaging and understanding of factors differ in two contrasting settings - urban and rural schools. This research might also be valuable for understanding the ways of minimizing the disparities between urban and rural schools in terms of language education, school infrastructure, availability of resources, teachers' professional development and for gaining insights from diverse teaching experiences.

Moreover, there appeared to be some explanations for teachers' undesirable use of translanguaging from the lesson observations of this current study. Students actively spoke in L1 during the English classes even if teachers encouraged them to speak in English. Similarly, one teacher's requirements regarding the language were ignored, as students kept answering in Kazakh. Therefore, it can be suggested that some classroom-context factors cannot be measured only from the teachers' perspective. Considering how teachers prioritize students' needs in their teaching instruction, it could be recommended to conduct studies emphasizing both students' and teachers' perceptions of translanguaging. This research would open space for students' voices and evaluate the emerging issues in language learning and teaching from both sides, which further might provide insight into the strategies that lead to effective student outcomes and high-quality teaching practices.

Final Reflection

This study is full of various concepts, and each of them plays an essential role in understanding the complexity of the belief system and how it further caters to the actual use of languages in real life. Before conducting this study, I had contradictory views regarding using translanguaging in my daily life. Although I believed that mixing languages made me incompetent and unable to express my thoughts in one language, I continued to use Kazakh, Russian, and English languages simultaneously in my speech.

Thus, the first belief-practice inconsistency emerged before this study, which was tightly linked to my personal experiences. Nonetheless, while working on this thesis for more than one year, I came to the conclusion that using different languages is not a symptom of inability; instead, it is what makes me "me" and what makes me unique. I can share my thoughts, express my feelings, develop my knowledge, and learn something new; it all happens through my everyday use of translanguaging.

If I had not done this study, I might also hold monoglossic beliefs and still translanguage, which would also result in "guilty multilingualism" (Manan et al., 2022, p.

535). However, understanding teachers' translanguaging in the system of internal and external factors helped me to see implicit language ideologies and practices that are primarily invisible and beyond people's perceptions, thus, being one step forward in reaching "celebratory multilingualism" (Manan et al., 2022, p. 538). Therefore, I thought, rather than being silent and afraid of using my whole linguistic repertoire and surfing on the sea of monolingualism, why can I not dive into the ocean of multilingualism and use translanguaging as a base for developing my multilingual self?

References

- Abd-El-Khalick, F., & Lederman, N. G. (2000). Improving science teachers' conceptions of nature of science: A critical review of the literature. *International Journal of Science Education*, 22(7), 665–701. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500690050044044>
- Abdrakhmanova, M. (2017). *Teachers' and students' perceptions on the role of the first language in foreign language and science classes at Bilim Innovation Lyceum* (Master's thesis, Nazarbayev University).
<http://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/2564>.
- Afzal Tajik, M., Shamatov, D., & Fillipova, L. (2022). Stakeholders' perceptions of the quality of education in rural schools in Kazakhstan. *Improving Schools*, 25(2), 187–204. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/13654802211031088>
- Agaidarova, S. (2019). *Rural school stakeholders' perceptions and practices of trilingual education: Same or different?* (Master's thesis, Nazarbayev University).
<http://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/4327>
- Akhmetova, I. (2021). *Practitioners' views on translanguaging in Kazakhstani EFL classrooms* (Master's thesis, Nazarbayev University).
<http://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/5623>
- Allard, E. C. (2017). Re-examining teacher translanguaging: An ecological perspective. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 40(2), 116–130.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2017.1306597>
- Amaniyazova, A. (2020). *Kazakhstani teachers' beliefs on translanguaging: Evidence from a trilingual context* (Master's thesis, Nazarbayev University).
<http://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/4853>
- Amankulova, Z. (2018). How rurality affects students' higher education access in Kazakhstan. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Perspectives in Higher Education*, 3(1), 4–18.

- Anderson, J., & Lightfoot, A. (2018). Translingual practices in English classrooms in India: Current perceptions and future possibilities. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 24 (8), 1210–1231.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1548558>
- Arthur, J., Waring, M., Coe, R., & Hedges, L. V. (Eds.). (2012). *Research methods and methodologies in education*. Sage.
- Ashton, P. T. (2015). Historical overview and theoretical perspectives of research on teachers' beliefs. In H. Fives, & M. G. Gill, (Eds.). *International handbook of research on teachers' beliefs* (pp. 31–47). Routledge
- Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (3rd ed.). Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (4th ed.). Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Multilingual Matters.
- Basturkmen, H. (2012). Review of research into the correspondence between language teachers' stated beliefs and practices. *System*, 40(2), 282–295.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2012.05.001>
- Batyrova, A. (2021). *Understanding Kazakhstani students' challenges in speaking English and their strategy use: A phenomenographic study* (Master's thesis, Nazarbayev University). <http://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/5624>
- Bloomberg, L. D., & Volpe, M. (2018). *Completing your qualitative dissertation: A road map from beginning to end*. Sage Publications.
- Borg, M. (2001). Key concepts in ELT. Teachers' beliefs. *ELT Journal*, 55(2), 186-188.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what

- language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36(2), 81–109.
<http://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444803001903>
- Borg, S. (2011). The impact of in-service teacher education on language teachers' beliefs. *System*, 39(3), 370-380. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.07.009>
- Borg, S. (2015). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Borg, S. (2017). Teachers' beliefs and classroom practices. In P. Garrett & J.M. Cots, (Eds.). *The Routledge handbook of language awareness* (pp. 75-91). Routledge.
- Braun, V., Clarke, V., Hayfield, N., & Terry, G. (2019). *Thematic Analysis*. In P. Liamputtong (Ed.), *Handbook of research methods in health and social sciences* (pp. 843–860). Springer.
- Buehl, M. M., & Beck, J. S. (2015). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and teachers' practices. In H. Fives & M. G. Gill, (Eds.). *International handbook of research on teachers' beliefs* (pp. 66-103). Routledge.
- Bullock, D. (2011). Learner self-assessment: An investigation into teachers' beliefs. *ELT Journal*, 65(2), 114-125. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccq041>
- Burkhalter, N. (2013). Overcoming resistance in post-soviet teacher trainees in Kazakhstan. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 15(3), 248-279.
- Byrnes, H. (2020). Navigating pedagogical translanguaging: Commentary on the special issue. *System*, 92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102278>
- 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., & Gorter, D. (2017). Minority languages and sustainable translanguaging: Threat or opportunity? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38(10), 901–912. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2017.1284855>.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2020a). Pedagogical translanguaging: An introduction. *System*, 92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102269>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2020b). Teaching English through pedagogical translanguaging. *World Englishes*, 39(2), 300–311. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12462>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2022). Pedagogical translanguaging and its application to language classes. *RELC Journal*, <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F00336882221082751>
- Cenoz, J. & Santos, A. (2020). Implementing pedagogical translanguaging in trilingual schools. *System*, 92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102273>
- Chant, R. H. (2002). The impact of personal theorizing on beginning teaching: Experiences of three social studies teachers. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 30, 516–540.
- Chong, S., Wong, I. Y. F., & Quek, C. L. (2005, May - June). Pre-service teachers' beliefs, attitudes and expectations: a review of the literature. *Proceedings of the Redesigning Pedagogy: Research, Policy, Practice Conference*. Ministry of Education, Singapore. <http://hdl.handle.net/10497/138>
- Cincotta-Segi, A. R. (2011). Signalling L2 centrality, maintaining L1 dominance: Teacher language choice in an ethnic minority primary classroom in the Lao PDR. *Language and Education*, 25(1), 19–31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2010.511232>
- Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2013). *Successful qualitative research: A practical guide for beginners*. Sage.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

- Copland, F., & Neokleous, G. (2011). L1 to teach L2: Complexities and contradictions. *ELT Journal*, 65(3), 270–280. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccq047>
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Sage Publications.
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 103–115. *System*, 92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102273>
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2011). Separate and flexible bilingualism in complementary schools: Multiple language practices in interrelationship. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5), 1196–1208. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.10.006>
- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2015). Translanguaging and identity in educational settings. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 20–35. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190514000233>
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. (2014). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research: International edition (4th ed.)*, *Electronic Package*. Pearson
- Cross, D. I. (2009). Alignment, cohesion, and change: Examining mathematics teachers' belief structures and their influence on instructional practices. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education*, 12(5), 325–346.
- Cummins, J. (2021). Translanguaging: A critical analysis of theoretical claims. In P. Juvonen & M. Källkvist (Eds.), *Pedagogical translanguaging: theoretical, methodological and empirical perspectives*. (pp.7–36). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788927383-004>
- Cunningham, D. L. (2004). *Professional practice and perspectives in the teaching of*

- historical empathy* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oxford).
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. Jossey-Bass.
- Denzin, N. K. (2009). *Qualitative inquiry and social justice: Toward a politics of hope*. Left Coast Press.
- Deroo, M. R. (2020). Translanguaging pedagogy to support bi/multilingual students' language learning in social studies: "How we communicate everything". In A. Slapac & S. Coppersmith (Eds.), *Beyond language learning instruction: Transformative supports for emergent bilinguals and educators* (pp. 231–266). IGI Global.
- Deroo, M. R., & Ponzio, C. (2019). Confronting ideologies: A discourse analysis of in-service teachers' translanguaging stance through an ecological lens. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 42(2), 214–231. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2019.1589604>
- Doiz, A., & Lasagabaster, D. (2017). Teachers' beliefs about translanguaging practices. In C. M. Mazak & K. S. Carroll (Eds.), *Translanguaging in higher education* (pp. 157–176). Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Escobar, C. F., & Dillard-Paltrineri, E. (2015). Professors' and students' conflicting beliefs about translanguaging in the EFL classroom: dismantling the monolingual bias. *Revista de Lenguas Modernas*, (23), 301–328.
- Fives, H., & Buehl, M. M. (2008). What do teachers believe? Developing a framework for examining beliefs about teachers' knowledge and ability. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 33(2), 134–176. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2008.01.001>
- Fives, H., & Buehl, M. M. (2012). Spring cleaning for the "messy" construct of teachers' beliefs: What are they? Which have been examined? What can they tell us? In K. R. Harris, S. Graham, T. Urdan, S. Graham, J. M. Royer, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *APA*

- educational psychology handbook, Vol. 2. Individual differences and cultural and contextual factors* (pp. 471–499). American Psychological Association.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/13274-019>
- Fives, H., & Gill, M. G. (Eds.). (2015). *International handbook of research on teachers' beliefs*. Routledge.
- Galante, A. (2020). Pedagogical translanguaging in a multilingual English program in Canada: Student and teacher perspectives of challenges. *System*, 92.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102274>
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. WileyBlackwell.
- García, O., Johnson, S. I., & Seltzer, K. (2017). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.
- García, O., & Kleyn, T. (2016). Translanguaging theory in education. In O. García & T. Kleyn (Eds.), *Translanguaging with multilingual students. Learning from classroom moments*. (pp. 9–33). Routledge.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan Pivot.
- Goodman, B., & Abdimanapova, L. (2020). Alignment, challenge, and agency: EFL teachers' perspectives on trilingual education and curriculum reform in Kazakhstan. *Asian EFL Journal*, 24(6), 73–102.
- Gorter, D. & Arocena, E. (2020). Teachers' beliefs about multilingualism in a course on translanguaging. *System*, 92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102272>
- Gustafsson, J. (2017). Single case studies vs. multiple case studies: A comparative study.

- (Unpublished manuscript). Academy of Business, Engineering and Science, Halmstad University. Retrieved from <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1064378/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- Hallberg, L. R. (2006). The “core category” of grounded theory: Making constant comparisons. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being*, 1(3), 141–148. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17482620600858399>
- Hamilton, L., & Corbett-Whittier, C. (2012). *Using case study in education research*. Sage.
- Hennink, M., Hutter, I., & Bailey, A. (2020). *Qualitative research methods*. Sage.
- Iversen, J.Y. (2019). “Translanguaging” and the implications for the future teaching of English in Norway. *Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences*, 7 (1), 50–66.
- Irsaliyev, S., Kultumanova, A., Tulekov, E., Buldybaev, T., Nurmuhametova, Zh., Kussidenova, G., & Ismurzina, G. (2017). *National report on the state and development of educational system of the Republic of Kazakhstan*. (for the years of Independence of Kazakhstan) JSC “Information-Analytic Centre”.
- Irsaliyev, S., Karabassova, L., Mukhametzhanova, A., Adil, A., Bekova, M., & Nurlanov, Y. (2017). *Teaching in three languages: International experience and recommendations for Kazakhstan*. JSC “Information-Analytic Centre”.
- Jima, K. (2018). *Factors affecting teachers’ motivation and performance in secondary Schools* [Master’s thesis, Addis Ababa University].
- Johnson, R. J. (2000). Case studies of expectation climate at two bilingual education schools. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 24(3), 261–276. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2000.10162765>
- Kagan, D. M. (1992). Implication of research on teacher belief. *Educational Psychologist*, 27(1), 65–90. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2701_6
- Kaipnazarova, B. (2020). *Beliefs of English language teachers about multilingual pedagogy*

and their teaching practices: a case of a school for gifted students.

(Master's thesis, Nazarbayev University) <http://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/4891>

Kang, D.M. (2013). EFL teachers' language use for classroom discipline: A look at complex interplay of variables. *System*, 41(1), 149–163.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.01.002>

Karabassova, L. (2018). Teachers' conceptualization of content and language integrated learning (CLIL): evidence from a trilingual context. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1550048>

Karabassova, L. (2021). English-medium education reform in Kazakhstan: comparative study of educational change across two contexts in one country. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 22(5), 553–573. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2021.1884436>

Karabassova, L., & San Isidro, X. (2020). Towards translanguaging in CLIL: A study on teachers' perceptions and practices in Kazakhstan. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2020.1828426>

Kleyn, T., & García, O. (2019). Translanguaging as an act of transformation: Restructuring teaching and learning for emergent bilingual students. In de Oliveira L. (Ed.), *The handbook of TESOL in K-12*, (pp. 69–82). John Wiley & Sons.

Korkmaz, S. Ç. (2021). Target language use in EFL Classrooms: Turkish EFL teachers' beliefs and practices. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 6(1), 155–171.

Kuandykov, A. (2021). *EFL teachers' translanguaging pedagogy and the development of beliefs about translanguaging* (Master's thesis, Nazarbayev University). <http://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/5608>.

Kuzborska, I. (2011). Links between teachers' beliefs and practices and research on reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 23(1), 102–128.

- Levin, B. B. (2014). The development of teachers' beliefs. In H. Fives & M. G. Gill, (Eds.). *International handbook of research on teachers' beliefs* (pp. 60–77). Routledge.
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012a). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), 641–654. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718488>
- Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012b). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualization and contextualization. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 18(7), 655–670. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2012.718490>
- Li, J. (2012). *University tutors' beliefs about and practices in assessing undergraduates' writing-A New Zealand case study* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Waikato). <https://hdl.handle.net/10289/6590>
- Li, W., & Zhu, H. (2013). Translanguaging identities and ideologies: Creating transnational space through flexible multilingual practices amongst Chinese university students in the UK. *Applied Linguistics*, 34(5), 516-535. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt022>
- Lim, C. P., & Chai, C. S. (2008). Teachers' pedagogical beliefs and their planning and conduct of computer-mediated classroom lessons. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 39(5), 807-828. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2007.00774.x>
- Liu, Y., & Fang, F. (2020). Translanguaging theory and practice: how stakeholders perceive translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Regional Language Centre (RELIC) Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0033688220939222>
- Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. University of Chicago Press.
- Manan, S. A., Channa, L. A., & Haidar, S. (2022). Celebratory or guilty multilingualism? English medium instruction challenges, pedagogical choices, and teacher agency in Pakistan. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 27(4), 530–545. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2022.2045932>

- Mazzaferro, G. (2018). Translanguaging as everyday practice. An introduction. In G. Mazzaferro (Ed.), *Translanguaging as everyday practice* (pp. 1–12). Springer, Cham.
- McLaughlin, C., Winter, L., Fimyar, O., & Yakavets, N. (2021). Reforming a whole school system: The case of Kazakhstan. In C. McLaughlin & A. Ruby (Eds.), *Implementing educational reform: Cases and challenges* (pp. 67–90). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108864800.005>
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2015). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. John Wiley & Sons.
- MoES (Ministry of Education and Science). (2016). *The State Program of Education and Science Development 2016-2019*. <https://nu.kz.libguides.com/602>
- Moodie, I. (2015). *Grounded narrative inquiry into language teacher cognition: Stories and case studies on English language teaching in South Korea* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Otago). <https://ourarchive.otago.ac.nz/handle/10523/5741>.
- Mouza, C. (2009). Does research-based professional development make a difference? A longitudinal investigation of teacher learning in technology integration. *Teachers College Record*, 111(5), 1195–1241. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F016146810911100502>
- Muijs, D., & Reynolds, D. (2002). Teachers' beliefs and behaviors: What really matters? *The Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 3–15. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23870407>
- Nagashima, Y., & Lawrence, L. (2022). To translanguage or not to translanguage: Ideology, practice, and intersectional identities. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 13(5), 735–754. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2019-0040>
- Nagy, T. (2018). On translanguaging and its role in foreign language teaching. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica*, 10(2), 41–53.

- OECD. (2005). *Education and Training Policy: Teachers Matter: Attracting, Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers*. OECD.
- Ölmez, M. Ö., & Kirkgöz, Y. (2021). Examining secondary school teachers' beliefs and purposes about the use of L1 in foreign language classes. *Education Quarterly Reviews*, 4(1), 596–606.
- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(3), 281–307. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2015-0014>
- Pajares, M. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307–332.
www.jstor.org/stable/1170741
- Pehkonen, E., & Pietilä, A. (2003, February 28–March 3). On relationships between beliefs and knowledge in mathematics education. In M. A. Mariotti (Ed.), *European Research in Mathematics Education III: Proceedings of the Third Conference of the European Society for Research in Mathematics Education*. Department of Mathematics of the University of Pisa.
http://www.dm.unipi.it/~didattica/CERME3/proceedings/Groups/TG2/TG2_pehkonen_cerme3.pdf
- Pope, C., Ziebland, S., & Mays, N. (2000). Qualitative research in health care: Analysing qualitative data. *BMJ: British Medical Journal*, 320(7227), 114.
- Rahman, G., Ali, S. S., & Iqbal, M. (2015). The gap between English language teachers' beliefs and practices. *Dialogue (Pakistan)*, 10(3).
- Raja, F. D., Suparno, S., & Ngadiso, N. (2022). Teachers' attitude towards translanguaging practice and its implication in Indonesian EFL classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(3), 567–576.

Richards, J. C. (1998). *Teaching in action: Case studies from second language classrooms.*

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching.*

Cambridge University Press.

Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula, T.

Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 102–

119). Simon & Schuster Macmillan

Sahib, R. (2019). Translanguaging as a Pedagogical Strategy in EFL Classroom. *ELT-*

Lectura, 6(2), 139–146. <https://doi.org/10.31849/elt-lectura.v6i2.3032>

Said, F. F. (2021). ‘Ba-SKY-a P with her each day at dinner’: technology as supporter in the

learning and management of home languages. *Journal of Multilingual and*

Multicultural Development, 42(8), 747–762.

Saldana, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers.* Sage.

Saldaña, J. (2014). Coding and analysis strategies. In P. Leavy. (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook*

of qualitative research, (pp. 581–605). Oxford University Press.

Sali, P. (2014). An analysis of the teachers’ use of L1 in Turkish EFL classrooms. *System*, 42,

308-318. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.12.021>

Skott, J. (2014). The promises, problems, and prospects of research on teachers’ beliefs. In H.

Fives & M. G. Gill, (Eds.). *International handbook of research on teachers’ beliefs.*

(pp. 25–42). Routledge

Sobkowiak, P. (2022). Translanguaging practices in the EFL classroom - the Polish

context. *Linguistics and Education*, 69. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2022.101020>

Shkedi, A. (2005). *Multiple case narrative: A qualitative approach to studying multiple*

populations. John Benjamins Publishing.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research.* Sage.

- Tang, E. L. Y., Lee, J. C. K., & Chun, C. K. W. (2012). Development of teaching beliefs and the focus of change in the process of pre-service ESL teacher education. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(5), 90–107.
- Tastanbek, S. (2019). *Kazakhstani pre-service teacher educators' beliefs on translanguaging*. (Master's thesis, Nazarbayev University).
<http://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/4328>
- Tastanbekova, K. (2020). Professional prestige, status, and esteem of educational occupation in Kazakhstan: temporal, regional and gender analysis of payroll data. *Journal of Eastern European and Central Asian Research (JEECAR)*, 7(2), 175–190.
- Tleuov, A. (2016). *The teaching of speaking: An investigation into the relationship between Teachers' beliefs and practices in Kazakhstani state secondary school EFL classrooms* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Bath).
- Thompson, A. G. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and conceptions: A synthesis of the research. In D. A. Grouws (Ed.), *Handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning: A project of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics* (pp. 127–146). Macmillan Publishing Co, Inc.
- Tuskeyeva, A. (2022). *Perceptions on Translanguaging from EFL Teachers with Different Linguistic Backgrounds in Kazakhstan*. (Master's thesis, Nazarbayev University).
<http://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/6558>
- Umbetaliyeva, T., Rakisheva, B., & Teschendorf, P. (2016). *Youth in Central Asia: Kazakhstan*. Friedrich Ebert Stiftung.
- Utami, D. N. (2016). The EFL teachers' beliefs and their teaching practices. *OKARA: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*, 10(2), 135–144.
- Vogel, S., & García, O. (2017). Translanguaging. In G. Noblit & L. Moll (Eds.), *Oxford research encyclopedia of education*, (pp. 1–18). Oxford University Press.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.181>

- Wang, D. (2019). Translanguaging in Chinese foreign language classrooms: students and teachers' attitudes and practices. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 22(2), 138–149. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1231773>
- Wei, L. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5), 1222–1235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.07.035>
- Wei, L. (2018). Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Applied Linguistics*, 39(1), 9–30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx039>
- Yakshi, S. (2022). *Translanguaging in EFL Classrooms: Teachers' Beliefs and Purposes in Kazakhstan*. (Master's thesis, Nazarbayev University).
<http://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/6588>
- Yin, R. K. (2017). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Sage.
- Yuan, R., & Yang, M. (2020). Towards an understanding of translanguaging in EMI teacher education classrooms. *Language Teaching Research*.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1362168820964123>
- Yuvayapan, F. (2019). Translanguaging in EFL classrooms: Teachers' perceptions and practices. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(2), 678–694.
- Yüzlü, M. Y., & Dikilitaş, K. (2022). The impact of translanguaging-driven training on in-service EFL teachers: Complexity theory prism. *Linguistics and Education*, 71.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2022.101080>
- Zhang, F., & Liu, Y. (2014). A study of secondary school English teachers' beliefs in the context of curriculum reform in China. *Language Teaching Research*, 18(2), 187–204.

Appendix A Interview Protocol

Exploring the Relationship between EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Practices of Translanguaging in Rural Areas of Kazakhstan

Interviewer: Aizat Arystanbek

Interviewee: Teacher 1

Position of Interviewee: An EFL teacher

Duration of the interview: 30 – 40 minutes

The purpose of the study is to explore the relationship between English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers' beliefs and practices of using learners' first language or other languages in their English classes at schools in the context of Kazakhstan. This study also seeks to identify external and internal factors that affect teachers' beliefs and practices of using learners' first language or other languages in their English classes and how these factors impede or support the relationship between them.

Questions Framework

1. Could you tell me a little bit about your teaching experience? How long have you been teaching English?
2. How did you learn English? Can you share your personal experience of learning English? Have your own English language learning experiences affected your current teaching practices at school?
3. Moving to your current teaching practices, how do you usually introduce new material to the students? What teaching approaches and methods help you in facilitating students' understanding?
4. What is your opinion about using multiple languages in teaching? How do students' first language (L1) or second language (L2) (e.g., Kazakh and Russian) support the teaching process?
5. Do you plan to use only English in your classes?
6. Do you use other languages unintentionally in the classroom?
 - 4.1 If yes, can you give examples or cases when you used other languages without planning?
 - 4.2 If no, how do you plan and design your teaching approaches using languages other than English?
7. Is there a difference between what you plan to use in your teaching and what happens in everyday English lessons?
8. Do you use other languages in the classroom due to the students' low level of English? Are there any positive or negative effects of using students' mother tongue in English lessons?
9. Are there cases when you do not allow your students to use other languages in the classroom?
10. Does the school have a policy about the language of the classroom instruction in English classes? If yes, how does this policy impact your teaching practices?

11. From your point of view, what are the key factors to successful language learning and effective language teaching? Similarly, how would you describe the main hindrances in your teaching practices?

12. Is there anything you would like to comment on or add?

Suggested probes:

Q4: Do you use Kazakh or Russian languages to expand the learners' comprehension while explaining and clarifying new information or grammar to students? On a scale of 1-5, how would you rate the importance of using other languages?

Q5: What about classroom situations? Are there any cases when you changed your plans and used other languages in English classes?

Q6: Are there any prepared materials or resources that help you in teaching? If yes, in what classroom situations are these materials used?

Q7: For example, we have two cases. On the one hand, you have a planned English lesson, that is, a calendar plan which is a theory. On the other hand, you have a lesson that is actually happening, which is practice. What is the difference or similarity between these two situations?

Q8: Do you think that teachers need to support students with low English proficiency by using their first language? Why/Why not?

Q10: Does your school curriculum require you to use a definite English language teaching approach?

Q11: Have you ever participated in professional development courses intended to increase your knowledge and develop your teaching skills? If yes, how has this kind of training influenced your teaching practices? Did any of these courses mention the strategies or pedagogical implications of using languages other than the target language in English classrooms?

Q11: Do EFL teachers collaborate to share any strategies and experiences regarding English language teaching? If yes, how do these collaborative works help your teaching practices? To what extent does collaboration with other EFL teachers enhance or impact your teaching skills?

Сұхбат хаттамасы
Қазақстандағы Ауылдық Аймақтардағы Ағылшын Тілі Мұғалімдерінің
Транстілдесу туралы Сенімдері мен Тәжірибелерінің арасындағы Қарым-
Қатынасты Зерттеу

Зерттеуші: Айзат Арыстанбек

Сұхбат беруші: Мұғалім 1

Сұхбат берушінің лауазымы: ағылшын тілі мұғалімі

Сұхбат ұзақтығы: 30-40 минут

Зерттеудің мақсаты – Қазақстан мектептеріндегі ағылшын тілі мұғалімдерінің өз сабақтарында оқушылардың ана тілін немесе басқа тілдерді қолдануы жайлы сенімдері мен тәжірибелері арасындағы өзара байланысты анықтау. Бұл зерттеу сонымен қатар мұғалімдердің ағылшын тілі сабақтарында оқушылардың бірінші тілін немесе басқа тілдерді пайдалану тәжірибесі мен сеніміне әсер ететін сыртқы және ішкі факторларды анықтауға және бұл факторлардың олардың арасындағы қарым-қатынасқа қалай кедергі келтіретінін немесе қолдау көрсететінін анықтауға бағытталған.

Сұхбат сұрақтары:

1. Мұғалімдік тәжірибеңіз туралы қысқаша айтып бере аласыз ба? Ағылшын тілінен сабақ бергеніңізге қанша уақыт болды?
2. Сіз ағылшын тілін қалай үйрендіңіз? Өзіңіздің ағылшын тілін үйрену бойынша жеке тәжірибеңізбен бөлісе аласыз ба? Қалай ойлайсыз, сіздің ағылшын тілін үйрену тәжірибеңіз қазіргі оқыту әдістеріңізге әсер етеді ме?
3. Ал енді қазіргі кездегі ағылшын тілін оқыту тәжірибеңізге тоқталсақ, сіз әдетте сабақ барысында оқушыларды жаңа материалмен қалай таныстырасыз? Оқытудың қандай әдіс-тәсілдері оқушылардың түсінуін жеңілдетуге көмектеседі?
4. Ағылшын тілін оқытуда бірнеше тілді қолдану туралы пікіріңіз қандай? Оқушылардың ана тілін немесе екінші тілін (мысалы, қазақ және орыс тілдері) ағылшын тілі сабағында қолдану оқыту процесіне қалай әсер етеді?
5. Сіз ағылшын тілі сабағында тек ағылшын тілін ғана қолданамын деп жоспарлайсыз ба?
6. Сіз ағылшын тілі сабағында басқа тілдерді **байқаусыздан** қолданған жағдайларыңыз болды ма?
 - 6.1 Егер иә болса, мысал келтіре аласыз ба?
 - 6.2 Егер жоқ болса, басқа тілдерді қолдануды қалай жоспарлайсыз және дамытасыз?
7. Сабақ барысындағы жоспарларыңыз бен күнделікті ағылшын тілі сабақтарында болып жатқан жағдайлар арасында айырмашылық бар ма?
8. Оқушылардың ағылшын тілін меңгеру деңгейі Сіздің басқа тілдерді қолдануға әсер ете ме? Ағылшын тілі сабақтарында оқушылардың ана тілін қолдануының қандай да бір оң немесе теріс әсері бар ма?
9. Оқушыларыңызға сабақ барысында басқа тілдерді қолдануға рұқсат етпейтін жағдайлар болады ма? Неге\неге жоқ?

10. Мектепте ағылшын тілі сабақтарындағы оқыту тілі туралы саясат-требование бар ма? Иә болса, бұл саясат Сіздің оқыту тәжірибелеріңізге қалай әсер етеді?
11. Сіздің көзқарасыңыз бойынша, ағылшын тілін табысты меңгерудің және тиімді оқытудың негізгі факторлары қандай? Және де, оқыту тәжірибесіндегі негізгі кедергілерді Сіз қалай сипаттар едіңіз? Мектеп жағдайында қандай кедергілер бар?
12. Сіздің ағылшын тілі сабағында басқа тілдерді қолдану жайлы тағы да пікірлеріңіз немесе айтылмай қалған қосымша ақпараттарыңыз бар ма? Бар болса, бөліссеңіз болады. Жоқ болса, сұхбатымыз осымен өз мәресіне жетті. Қатысқаныңызға үлкен рахмет! Сау болыңыз!

Ұсынылатын қосымша сұрақтар:

- 4 - сұрақ:** Оқушыларға жаңа ақпаратты немесе грамматиканы таныстыру барысында оқушылардың түсінігін арттыру үшін қазақ немесе орыс тілдерін пайдаланасыз ба? Басқа тілдерді ағылшын тілі сабағында қолданудың маңыздылығын 1-5 балл аралығында қалай бағалар едіңіз? Неліктен ондай баға бердіңіз?
- 5 - сұрақ:** Ал сабақ кезінде ше? Сондай жағдайлар болған мысалдарды келтіре аласыз ба?
- 6 - сұрақ:** Мектеп тарапынан ағылшын тілі сабағын беруге көмектесетін дайын немесе қосымша материалдар беріледі ма? Мысал келтіре аласыз ба? Егер берілетін болса, қандай жағдайларда қолданасыз?
- 7 – сұрақ:** Мысалға, бізде екі жағдай бар. Бір жағынан Сізде жоспарланған ағылшын тілі сабағы бар, яғни күнтізбелік жоспар- теория. Ал екінші жақтан, Сізде кәдімгі болып жатқан сабақ бар-практика. Осы екі жағдай арасында қандай айырмашылық немесе ұқсастық бар?
- 8 - сұрақ:** Сіздің ойыңызша, мұғалімдер ағылшын тілін төмен деңгейде меңгерген оқушыларға орыс немесе қазақ тілдерін қолдану арқылы көмек көрсетуі керек пе? Неге/Неге жоқ?
- 10 - сұрақ:** Мектебіңіздің бағдарламасы Сізге ағылшын тілі сабағында нақты бір тәсілді қолдануды талап етеді ме?
- 11 - сұрақ:** Сіз өз біліміңізді арттыруға және мұғалімдік дағдыларыңызды дамытуға бағытталған кәсіптік курстарға қатыстыңыз ба? Егер иә болса, мұндай курстар Сіздің оқыту тәжірибелеріңізге қалай әсер етті? Осы курстарда ағылшын тілі сыныптарында басқа тілдерді пайдаланудың әдістері немесе педагогикалық салдары туралы айтылды ма?
- 11 - сұрақ:** Ағылшын тілі мұғалімдері тілді оқытуға байланысты қандай да бір әдістер мен тәжірибелермен бөлісу үшін бірлесіп жұмыс жасайды ма? Егер иә болса, бұл бірлескен жұмыстар Сіздің оқыту тәжірибелеріңізге қалай көмектеседі? Басқа ағылшын тілі мұғалімдерімен бірлесіп ой бөлісу Сіздің оқыту дағдыларыңызды қаншалықты арттырады немесе қалай әсер етеді? – басқа мұғалімдер

Протокол интервью

Изучение Взаимосвязи между Убеждениями и Практикой Транслингвизма Учителей Английского Языка в Сельских Местностях Казахстана

Интервьюер: Айзат Арыстанбек

Интервьюируемый: Учитель 1

Должность интервьюируемого: Преподаватель английского языка

Продолжительность интервью: 30–40 минут

Цель исследования изучить взаимосвязь между убеждениями и практикой учителей английского языка в использовании родного языка учащихся или других языков на уроке английского языка в контексте школ Казахстана. Это исследование также направлено на выявление внешних и внутренних факторов, которые влияют на убеждения учителей и практику использования родного языка учащихся или других языков на уроках английского языка, и на то, как эти факторы препятствуют или поддерживают отношения между ними.

Вопросы для интервью:

1. Не могли бы Вы рассказать мне о своем преподавательском опыте? Как давно Вы преподаете английский язык?
2. Как Вы выучили английский? Можете ли Вы поделиться своим личным опытом изучения английского языка? Повлиял ли Ваш собственный опыт изучения английского языка на вашу нынешнюю практику преподавания в школе?
3. Как Вы обычно знакомите студентов с новым материалом? Какие подходы и методы преподавания помогают Вам облегчить понимание учащимися?
4. Каково Ваше мнение об использовании нескольких языков в преподавании? Как родной язык учащихся или второй язык (например, казахский и русский) способствуют процессу обучения?
5. Планируете ли Вы использовать только английский язык на своих занятиях?
6. Используете ли Вы другие языки непреднамеренно в классе?
 - 6.1 Если да, можете ли Вы привести примеры или случаи, когда Вы использовали другие языки без планирования?
 - 6.2 Если нет, то как Вы планируете и разрабатываете свои подходы к обучению с использованием других языков кроме английского языка?
7. Существует ли связь между тем, что Вы планируете использовать в своем преподавании, и тем, что происходит на повседневных уроках английского языка?
8. Используете ли вы другие языки в классе из-за низкого уровня владения учащимися английским? Существуют ли какие-либо положительные или отрицательные последствия использования родного языка учащихся на уроках английского языка?

9. Бывают ли случаи, когда Вы не разрешаете своим ученикам использовать другие языки в классе?
10. Есть ли в школе политика в отношении языка преподавания на уроках английского языка? Если да, то как эта политика влияет на Вашу преподавательскую практику?
11. С Вашей точки зрения, каковы ключевые факторы успешного изучения языка и эффективного преподавания языка? Аналогичным образом, как бы Вы описали основные препятствия в Вашей преподавательской практике?
12. Есть ли что-нибудь, что Вы хотели бы прокомментировать или добавить?

Наводящие вопросы:

Вопрос 4: Используете ли Вы казахский или русский языки для расширения понимания учащихся при объяснении и уточнении новой информации или грамматики? По шкале от 1 до 5, как бы Вы оценили важность использования других языков на уроках английского языка?

Вопрос 5: Как насчет ситуаций в классе? Были ли какие-либо случаи, когда Вы меняли свои планы и использовали другие языки на уроках?

Вопрос 6: Существуют ли какие-либо подготовленные материалы или ресурсы, которые помогают Вам в преподавании? Если да, то в каких ситуациях в классе используются эти материалы?

Вопрос 7: Например, у нас есть два случая. С одной стороны, у вас есть запланированный урок английского языка, то есть календарный план, который представляет собой теорию. С другой стороны, у вас есть урок, который действительно происходит, а именно практика. В чем разница или сходство между этими двумя ситуациями?

Вопрос 8: Считаете ли Вы, что учителям нужно поддерживать учащихся с низким уровнем владения английским языком, используя их родной язык? Почему/Почему нет?

Вопрос 10: Требуется ли Ваша школьная программа, чтобы Вы использовали определенный подход к преподаванию английского языка?

Вопрос 11: Вы когда-нибудь участвовали в курсах повышения квалификации, направленных на повышение Ваших знаний и развитие ваших преподавательских навыков? Если да, то как этот вид обучения повлиял на Вашу преподавательскую практику? Упомянулось ли в каком-либо из этих курсов о стратегиях или педагогических подходах использования других языков на уроках английского языка?

Вопрос 11: Сотрудничают ли преподаватели английского языка, чтобы поделиться какими-либо стратегиями и опытом в области преподавания? Если да, то как эти совместные работы помогают Вашей преподавательской практике? В какой степени сотрудничество с другими преподавателями английского языка улучшает или влияет на Ваши преподавательские навыки?

Appendix B Letter to Participants**Invitation to a voluntary research study****Exploring the Relationship between EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Practices of Translanguaging in Rural Areas of Kazakhstan**

Dear ...

My name is Aizat, and I am a second-year graduate student at Nazarbayev University pursuing my master's degree in the "Multilingual Education" program in the Graduate School of Education.

I am writing to let you know about an opportunity to participate in a voluntary research study on an exploration of the relationship between Kazakhstani EFL teachers' beliefs and practices of their own and their students' use of their first language (s) and other languages in the English language classrooms.

Your participation includes face-to-face or online interviews and two classroom observations. The interview will last about 40 minutes and be audio-taped and then transcribed. The interviews will take place at a time, place, and format convenient to you. The study also involves your participation in two classroom observations, in which I will take notes to identify teachers' classroom practices of using learners' first language (s) and/or other languages in English classes. The lesson observations will take 80 minutes of your time. You will not be identified by name when information is analyzed or in any findings that come from the study.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may choose not to participate at all or withdraw your participation and data from your interview and lesson observations. Your participation will be kept confidential to the extent possible. The data will only be used for research purposes.

If you are willing to participate in this study and you need more information about research procedures, and/or your rights as a participant in the study, please, let me know by contacting me at:

+7(775) 159-94-96

aizat.arystanbek@nu.edu.kz

Thank you for your consideration!

Yours sincerely,
Aizat Arystanbek

Nazarbayev University

Ерікті зерттеуге шақыру

Қазақстандағы Ауылдық Аймақтардағы Ағылшын Тілі Мұғалімдерінің Транстілдесу туралы Сенімдері мен Тәжірибелерінің арасындағы Қарым- Қатынасты Зерттеу

Құрметті / қымбатты ...

Менің есімім Айзат. Мен Назарбаев Университетінің жоғары білім беру мектебінде “Көптілді білім беру” бағдарламасының екінші курс магистрантымын.

Осы хатыммен Сізді ағылшын пәні мұғалімдерінің сабақ барысында өз оқушыларының ана тілін қолдануға қатысты сенімдері мен тәжірибесі арасындағы байланысты анықтауға бағытталған зерттеуге қатысуға шақырғым келіп отыр.

Зерттеу барысында Сіздің онлайн немесе жеке сұхбатқа, және де екі сабақты бақылауға қатысуыңыз керектігі жайлы хабарлаймын. Сұхбат шамамен 40 минутқа созылады және аудиозаңбаға жазылады. Сондай-ақ, сұхбат сізге ыңғайлы уақытта және форматта өтеді. Зерттеу сонымен қатар сіздің ағылшын тілі сабақтарын жүргізу барысындағы екі бақылауға қатысуыңызды қамтиды. Бұл сабақты бақылаудың басты мақсаты – ағылшын тілі мұғалімдерінің оқушылардың ана тілін немесе басқа тілдерді ағылшын тілі сабақтарында қолдану тәжірибелерінің табиғатын түсіну және анықтау болып табылады. Екі сабақты бақылау сіздің 80 минут уақытыңызды алады. Сіздің атыңыз немесе сізді анықтауға болатын кез келген басқа жеке ақпарат зерттеу деректерін талдау және анықтау барысында қамтылмайтын болады.

Бұл зерттеуге қатысу толықтай ерікті болып табылады. Сіз зерттеуге қатысудан кез келген уақытта бас тарта аласыз. Сонымен қатар, сұхбат алу барысындағы және де сабақты бақылау барысындағы алынған барлық деректеріңізді қайтарып алуға немесе алдырып тастауыңызға болады. Сіздің қатысуыңыз мүмкіндігінше құпия түрде сақталады. Деректер тек зерттеу мақсаттарында ғана қолданылатын болады.

Егер Сіз осы зерттеуге қатысқыңыз келсе және де Сізге осы зерттеу бойынша қосымша ақпарат қажет болса, маған төмендегі телефон нөмірі немесе электрондық пошта мекен-жайы бойынша хабарласуыңызды сұраймын:

+ 7 (775) 159-94-96

aizat.arystanbek@nu.edu.kz

Назарыңызға рахмет!

Құрметпен,
Айзат Арыстанбек

Назарбаев Университеті

Приглашение к добровольному исследованию

Изучение Взаимосвязи между Убеждениями и Практикой Транслигвизма Учителей Английского Языка в Сельских Местностях Казахстана

Уважаемый/уважаемая ...

Меня зовут Айзат Арыстанбек. Я являюсь студенткой второго курса магистратуры программы “Полиязычное образование” в Высшей Школе Образования Назарбаев Университета.

Данным письмом хочу сообщить Вам о возможности принять участие в исследовании, направленном на изучение взаимосвязи между убеждениями и практикой учителей английского языка в использовании своего родного языка и родного языка учащихся и/или других языков на уроке английского языка.

Участие в исследовании предполагает прохождения интервью и двух наблюдений в классе во время урока английского языка. Интервью продлится около 40 минут и будет записано на диктофон, а затем будет затранскрибировано. Время, место и формат интервью будет определено согласно Вашим предпочтениям. Исследование также предполагает Ваше участие в двух наблюдениях в классе. Главная цель этого исследования - изучить процессы преподавания и обучения в их естественных условиях, намереваясь понять и определить практику учителей английского языка в отношении использования родного и/или других языков учащихся. Наблюдения за двумя уроками займут 80 минут вашего времени. Ваше настоящее имя не будет использовано при анализе информации и в описании результатов, полученных из исследования.

Участие в этом исследовании полностью добровольное. Вы можете отказаться от участия или отозвать свое участие и данные, собранные во время интервью и наблюдений за уроками. Ваше участие будет, насколько это возможно, конфиденциальным. Данные будут использоваться только в исследовательских целях.

Если Вы согласны участвовать в данном исследовании, и Вы нуждаетесь в дополнительной информации, прошу связаться со мной по нижеприведённому номеру телефона или адресу электронной почты:

+ 7 (775) 159-94-96

aizat.arystanbek@nu.edu.kz

Спасибо за внимание!

С уважением,
Айзат Арыстанбек

Назарбаев Университет

Appendix C Informed Consent Forms

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Exploring the Relationship between EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Practices of Translanguaging in Rural Areas of Kazakhstan

DESCRIPTION: You are invited to participate in a research study aimed at exploring the relationship between English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers' beliefs and practices of using learners' first language or other languages in their English classes at schools in the context of Kazakhstan. This research is undertaken by a master's student of Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education, Aizat Arystanbek. The ultimate purpose of this study is to examine teaching and learning processes in their natural settings in intending to understand and define the nature of English language teachers' beliefs and practices of using learners' first language (s) and what factors might have influenced their beliefs and practices, as well as the relationship between them.

You will be invited to participate in the individual face-to-face or online interview between you and the researcher at a public place of your choice. With your permission, your answers will be recorded on an audio-recorder application on the smartphone and will later be transcribed for data analysis. You also will be asked to allow the researcher to observe two of your English classes. These classroom observations are needed not for evaluation of your teaching practice but only for research purposes. Neither the principal of the school nor other teachers or anyone else will be informed about the results of the observation. All the data collected from interviews and lesson observations will be accessible to the researcher and only the researcher during all stages of the study. The information will be kept on the researcher's personal computer, which is protected by a password. Your participation is completely voluntary, and you will have a full right to withdraw from the research at anytime.

TIME INVOLVEMENT: Your participation will take approximately 40 minutes for interviews and 80 minutes for the two lesson observations.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: The risks associated with the study are minimal. In order to ensure your confidentiality, the researcher will use pseudonyms instead of your real names. The information about you and your school will be coded; thus, no personal information identifying the personal data and workplace details will be revealed to anyone. Your participation will not involve any kind of punishment from your employers or harm your reputation. The interview questions are designed and carefully checked in accordance not to cause any psychological damage. The lesson observation materials will only be used for research purposes to gain a deeper understanding of the teachers' classroom practices of using learners' first language (s) and other languages during the English language classes. As for the benefits, you will not obtain any direct benefits from this research; however, your participation in this study will facilitate the research literature in the field of English language teaching in the Kazakhstani context from teachers' perspectives and contribute to the expansion of research on education in rural areas. Your decision on whether or not to participate in this study will not affect your employment.

PARTICIPANT'S RIGHTS: If you have read this form and have decided to participate in this project, please understand your participation is voluntary, and you have the right to withdraw your consent or discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. The alternative is not to participate. You have the right to refuse to answer particular questions. The data results of this research study may be

presented at scientific or professional meetings or published in scientific journals. The data collected from this study will be used for writing a master's thesis.

CONTACT INFORMATION:

Principal investigator: Aizat Arystanbek, Master's student
Graduate School of Education, Nazarbayev University, Astana, Kazakhstan.
E-mail: aizat.arystanbek@nu.edu.kz, +7 (775) 159-94-96

Questions: If you have any questions, concerns, or complaints about this research, its procedures, risks, and benefits, contact the Master's Thesis Supervisor for this student work, Associate Professor Bridget A. Goodman, bridget.goodman@nu.edu.kz, +7(702) 181-02-64

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

Please sign this consent form if you agree to participate in this study.

- I have carefully read the information provided;
- I have been given full information regarding the purpose and procedures of the study;
- I understand how the data collected will be used, and that any confidential information will be seen only by the researchers and will not be revealed to anyone else;
- I understand that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time without giving a reason;
- With full knowledge of all foregoing, I agree, of my own free will, to participate in this study.
- I give my permission to audio record the interview: Yes ☐ No ☐

Signature: _____

Date: _____

ЗЕРТТЕУ ЖҰМЫСЫ КЕЛІСІМІНІҢ АҚПАРАТТЫҚ ФОРМАСЫ

Қазақстандағы Ауылдық Аймақтардағы Ағылшын Тілі Мұғалімдерінің Транстїлдесу туралы Сенїмдерї мен Тәжірибелерінің арасындағы Қарым-Қатынасты Зерттеу

СИПАТТАМА: Сіз Қазақстан мектептеріндегі ағылшын тілі мұғалімдерінің өз сабақтарында оқушылардың ана тілін немесе басқа тілдерді қолдануы жайлы сенімдері мен тәжірибелері арасындағы өзара байланысты анықтауға бағытталған зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға шақырылып отырсыз. Бұл зерттеуді Назарбаев Университетінің Жоғары Білім Беру Мектебінің магистранты Арыстанбек Айзат жүргізеді. Бұл зерттеудің басты мақсаты – ағылшын тілі мұғалімдерінің оқушылардың ана тілін педагогикалық тәсіл ретінде қолдануға деген сенімдері мен тәжірибелерінің табиғатын, сондай-ақ мұғалімдердің сенімдері мен тәжірибелері арасындағы қарым-қатынасқа қандай факторлар әсер етуі мүмкін екендігін түсіну және анықтау. Ақпаратты талдау мақсатында зерттеуші сұхбат барысында қатысушылардың берген жауаптарын олардың келісімімен дыбыстық құралға жазатын болады. Сондай-ақ сізден зерттеушіге екі ағылшын тілі сабағын бақылауға рұқсат беру сұралады. Бұл сыныптағы бақылаулар сіздің оқу тәжірибеңізді бағалау үшін емес, тек зерттеу мақсатында қажет. Бақылау нәтижесі туралы мектеп директорына да, басқа мұғалімдерге де, ешкімге де хабарланбайды. Сұхбаттан және сабақтағы бақылаулардан жиналған барлық деректер зерттеудің барлық кезеңдерінде тек зерттеушіге қолжетімді болады. Барлық жиналған ақпарат құпия сөзбен қорғалған зерттеушінің жеке компьютерінде сақталады. Сіздің зерттеуге қатысуыңыз толығымен ерікті. Сіздің кез-келген уақытта зерттеуге қатысудан бас тартуға толық құқығыңыз бар.

ӨТКІЗІЛЕТІН УАҚЫТЫ: Сіздің қатысуыңыз шамамен сұхбатқа 40 минут және екі бақылау сабағына 80 минут уақытыңызды алады.

ЗЕРТТЕУ ЖҰМЫСЫНА ҚАТЫСУДЫҢ ҚАУІПТЕРІ МЕН АРТЫҚШЫЛЫҚТАРЫ:

Зерттеу жұмысына қатысудың қауіптері шектеулі. Сіздің берген ақпарат құпиялылығын қамтамасыз ету үшін зерттеуші сіздің аты-жөніңізді лақап атпен ауыстырады. Және де сіз және сіздің мектебіңіз туралы ақпарат шифрланады. Осылайша, жеке деректерді және жұмыс орны туралы мәліметтерді анықтайтын қандай да ақпарат ешкімге көрсетілмейді. Сіздің қатысуыңыз өзіңіздің жұмыс беруші тарапынан қандай да бір жауапкершілікке немесе жазаға әкеліп соқтырмауға, сондай-ақ сіздің жеке беделіңізге нұқсан келтірмеуге барлық жағдай жасалынатын болады. Сонымен қатар, сұхбатқа арналған барлық сұрақтар психологиялық зиян келтірмейтіндей мұқият тексеріліп жазылған. Сабақты бақылау материалдары да тек зерттеу мақсаттарында қолданылатын болады. Мысалы, бақылау арқылы ағылшын тілі сабақтарындағы мұғалімдердің оқушылардың ана тілін немесе басқа тілдерді қолдану тәжірибесі туралы терең түсінік алу. Зерттеудің пайдасы жайлы айтатын болсақ, қатысушылар ғылыми-зерттеу жұмыстарынан ешқандай тікелей пайда алмайды. Алайда, сіздің осы зерттеуге қатысуыңыз Қазақстандағы мұғалімдердің ағылшын тілін оқыту саласындағы көзқарастары мен тәжірибелері жайлы зерттеу әдебиетін кеңейтеді. Сондай-ақ, ауылдық аймақтардағы білім беру саласындағы зерттеулерді кеңейтуге де өз үлесін тигізеді. Осы

зерттеуге қатысу немесе қатыспау туралы шешіміңіз Сіздің жұмысыңызға еш әсерін тигізбейді.

ҚАТЫСУШЫ ҚҰҚЫҚТАРЫ: Егер Сіз берілген формамен танысып, зерттеу жұмысына қатысуға шешім қабылдасаңыз, Сіздің қатысуыңыз **ерікті** түрде екенін хабарлаймыз. Сонымен қатар, **қалаған уақытта айыппұл төлемей және сіздің әлеуметтік жеңілдіктеріңізге еш кесірін тигізбей зерттеу жұмысына қатысу туралы келісіміңізді кері қайтаруға немесе тоқтатуға құқығыңыз бар. Зерттеу жұмысына мүлдем қатыспауыңызға да толық құқығыңыз бар.** Сондай-ақ, қандай да бір сұрақтарға жауап бермеуіңізге де әбден болады. Бұл зерттеу жұмысының нәтижелері академиялық немесе кәсіби мақсаттарда баспаға ұсынылуы немесе шығарылуы мүмкін. Осы зерттеу барысында жиналған мәліметтер магистрлік диссертация жазу үшін пайдаланылады.

БАЙЛАНЫС АҚПАРАТЫ:

Бас зерттеуші: Айзат Арыстанбек, магистрант

Жоғары білім беру мектебі, Назарбаев Университеті, Астана қаласы, Қазақстан.

E-mail: aizat.arystanbek@nu.edu.kz, +7 (775) 159-94-96

Сұрақтарыңыз: Егер жүргізіліп отырған зерттеу жұмысының процесі, қаупі мен артықшылықтары туралы сұрағыңыз немесе шағымыңыз болса, келесі байланыс құралдары арқылы зерттеушінің магистрлық тезисі бойынша жетекшісімен хабарласуыңызға болады,

Қауымдастырылған Профессор Бриджит Гудман, bridget.goodman@nu.edu.kz,
+7(702) 181-02-64

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

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

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

Қолы: _____

Күні: _____

ФОРМА ИНФОРМАЦИОННОГО СОГЛАСИЯ

Изучение Взаимосвязи между Убеждениями и Практикой Транслигвизма Учителей Английского Языка в Сельских Местностях Казахстана

ОПИСАНИЕ: Вы приглашены принять участие в исследовании по изучению взаимосвязи между убеждениями и практикой учителей английского языка в использовании родного языка учащихся или других языков на уроке английского языка в школах Казахстана. Это исследование предпринято магистрантом Высшей Школы Образования Назарбаев Университета, Арыстанбек Айзат. Главная цель этого исследования - изучить процессы преподавания и обучения в их естественных условиях, намереваясь понять и определить природу убеждений и практики учителей английского языка в отношении использования родного языка учащихся и какие факторы могут повлиять на взаимосвязь между их убеждениями и практикой. Вам будет предложено принять участие в полу структурированном индивидуальном интервью в удобном для вас месте. С вашего разрешения ваши ответы будут записаны на диктофон и позже будут расшифрованы для анализа данных. Вам также будет предложено разрешить исследователю наблюдать за двумя Вашими занятиями по английскому языку. Эти наблюдения в классе необходимы не для оценки вашей педагогической практики, а только в исследовательских целях. Ни директор школы, ни другие учителя, ни кто-либо еще не будут проинформированы о результатах наблюдения. Все данные, собранные в ходе интервью и наблюдений за уроками, будут доступны исследователю и только исследователю на всех этапах исследования. Информация будет храниться на персональном компьютере исследователя, который защищен паролем. Ваше участие является полностью добровольным, и Вы будете иметь полное право отказаться от участия в исследовании в любое время.

ВРЕМЯ УЧАСТИЯ: Ваше участие займет около 40 минут для интервью, и 80 минут для наблюдения за двумя уроками.

РИСКИ И ПРЕИМУЩЕСТВА: Риски, связанные с исследованием, минимальны. Для обеспечения вашей конфиденциальности исследователь будет использовать псевдонимы вместо ваших настоящих имен. Информация о вас и вашей школе будет закодирована. Таким образом, никакая личная информация, идентифицирующая личные данные и сведения о рабочем месте, не будет никому раскрыта. Ваше участие не повлечет за собой никаких наказаний со стороны ваших работодателей и не нанесет ущерба вашей репутации. Более того, все вопросы для интервью разработаны и тщательно проверены в соответствии с тем, чтобы не нанести никакого психологического ущерба. Сведения полученные из наблюдения за уроком будут использоваться только в исследовательских целях, таких как получение более глубокого понимания практики учителей в использовании родного языка учащихся или других языков на уроках английского языка. Что касается преимуществ, вы не получите каких-либо прямых выгод от этого исследования; однако ваше участие в этом исследовании расширит исследовательскую литературу в области преподавания английского языка с точки зрения учителей в контексте Казахстана, и будет способствовать расширению исследований в области образования в сельских местностях. Ваше решение о том,

участвовать или не участвовать в этом исследовании, не повлияет на ваше трудоустройство.

ПРАВА УЧАСТНИКОВ: Если Вы прочитали данную форму и решили принять участие в данном исследовании, Вы должны понимать, что Ваше участие является добровольным и что у Вас есть право отозвать свое согласие или прекратить участие в любое время без штрафных санкций и без потери социального пакета, который Вам предоставляли. В качестве альтернативы можно не участвовать в исследовании. Также Вы имеете право не отвечать на какие-либо вопросы. Результаты данного исследования могут быть представлены или опубликованы в научных или профессиональных целях. Данные, собранные в ходе этого исследования, будут использованы для написания магистерской диссертации.

КОНТАКТНАЯ ИНФОРМАЦИЯ:

Главный исследователь: Айзат Арыстанбек, магистрант
Высшая школа образования, Назарбаев университет, город Астана, Казахстан.
E-mail: [aizat.arystanbek@nu.edu.kz](mailto: aizat.arystanbek@nu.edu.kz), +7 (775) 159-94-96

Вопросы: Если у Вас есть вопросы, замечания или жалобы по поводу данного исследования, процедуры его проведения, рисков и преимуществ, Вы можете связаться с руководителем магистерского тезиса исследователя: Ассоциированный Профессор Бриджит Гудман, , [bridget.goodman@nu.edu.kz](mailto: bridget.goodman@nu.edu.kz), +7(702) 181-02-64

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

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

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

Подпись: _____

Дата: _____

Appendix D Sample of Transcription

Exploring the Relationship between EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Practices of Translanguaging in Rural Areas of Kazakhstan

Interviewer: Aizat Arystanbek

Interviewee: Aina

Position of Interviewee: An EFL teacher

Duration of the interview: 30 – 40 minutes

The purpose of the study is to explore the relationship between English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers' beliefs and practices of using learners' first language or other languages in their English classes at schools in the context of Kazakhstan. This study also seeks to identify external and internal factors that affect teachers' beliefs and practices of using learners' first language or other languages in their English classes and how these factors impede or support the relationship between them.

Researcher: How would you rate the importance of using other languages in the English language class on a scale of 1-5?

Aina: How can I put it this way... it's good if our English teachers speak only English in their classes. But it all depends on the level of the village and the parents' knowledge. We have 45 minutes for the lesson. We have divided groups of children, and even if there are 12 children in one class, it is impossible to explain everything to each child individually. Although we try to conduct the lesson in English, it is already good if the child understands 50 % of the lesson in English. The children do not accept the lesson if it is taught only in English; that is why we always connect the Russian and Kazakh languages to our lessons. English must be used, but we are not native English speakers. Since English is not our mother tongue and we are only teachers of that language, which is a foreign language, I think it is better if we teach 70 % of the lesson in English and add other languages in the remaining 30 %. Let them know the translation of that English sentence in Russian, if not in Kazakh, and conversely, in Kazakh, if not in Russian. I think taking all three languages together in English lessons is better. Regarding the importance of using other languages in English classes, I give 4 points. We want our lessons to be in English only, and maybe over time, we will probably reach the level where the children can fully understand English. But now the children of the village are not ready to learn English fully in that language. That is why we need to use other languages.

Researcher: Thank you a lot for your answer. Do you plan to use only English in your English classes?

Aina: Yes, I do.

Researcher: But as you previously mentioned, it is impossible to use only English during the actual classes, right?

Aina: Yes. But only 70 %, and we use other languages in the remaining 30 %. For example, after learning a new word, when we say its translation, we use other languages. Even in higher classes, we cannot conduct lessons only in English because children have difficulties speaking English. They cannot fully express their thoughts in English. We are happy even if the child makes 4-5 sentences during the lesson. We believe that the child will learn the language gradually in the future.

Researcher: So, do you plan to use other languages in advance, or does it happen unintentionally during the lesson?

Aina: No, I don't plan. In my plans, everything is written in English; we write in our plans that everything will be held in English. However, during the lesson, it will not happen. The children need explanations and instructions in Kazakh or Russian. Even if you don't want to say it, you can't. I use special videos in upper classes to use English more, but it is still difficult for children to understand. I don't know about other teachers, but you must carry all three languages after becoming an English teacher. And if we put a foundation for children with a low level, if they understand the basics of the English language, at least recognize the letters, and learn to read even if they do not know how to translate them, then it is a victory for the teacher.

Researcher: Is there a difference or similarity between what you plan to use in your teaching and what happens in everyday English lessons? For example, we have two cases. On the one hand, you have a planned English lesson, that is, a calendar plan, which is a theory. And on the other hand, you have a regular class; it is practice. What is the difference or similarity between these two situations?

Aina: We have many related plans, and all lesson plans and textbooks are in English. But now, when it comes to the class, we look at the child's level. Sometimes in the lesson, children do not understand the topic when using the planned methods, and then if we speak in Kazakh, the child will take it further and become active. But all our plans are in English. However, I do not use other languages 100 % during the lessons. I try to use only one language, especially in upper grades. I explain grammar to secondary school learners first in

Kazakh, ask them to consider the features of that grammar in Kazakh, and then give examples in English and explain by comparing these two languages.

Researcher: Do you think that teachers need to support students with low English proficiency by using their first language?

Aina: Yes, all children need support and a proper attitude. For example, for the sake of simplification, I try to create tasks with Kazakh translations for students with low English levels. Since good students complete the task faster than other children, I ask them to help other children or write it on the blackboard so all children can complete it.

Researcher: From your point of view, what are the main factors of successful learning of English and effective teaching?

Aina: Effective factors?

Researcher: Yes. What factors help to teach the English language effectively in the context of school or classroom situations?

Aina: I think it would be good if at least one native speaker came to this area or the school and held meetings 1-2 times a week, met with children, and shared experiences.

Alternatively, if proficient English speakers from urban areas come to our school as volunteers, visit schools and teach our students, it would increase their interest. Носитель языка это же носитель языка [native speaker is a native speaker], children would be interested and motivated if they see native speakers. Although we are English teachers, we are not English or British. The children always perceive us as Kazakhs, and I wonder if the situation would be improved if the native speaker visited our school introduced. Even though I am a teacher, I am interested when such foreigners come and teach us in courses or seminars. They make a small thing look different.

Researcher: Thank you very much for your answer. How would you describe the main obstacles in your teaching experience?

Aina: Now, there are no tremendous challenges. We live in the 21st century, a developed age. Now everything is on the Internet; children go to a tutor if necessary. But parents do not care about their children's education. School education should not be limited only to teachers. There are parents at home. Parents, teachers, school, and surrounding community - everything is connected. For example, although we teach in the classroom, students are left without supervision at home. Everything learned in the lesson is not revised at home. That's why it would be good for parents to pay attention to their child's studies. At home, parents do not take care of their children; the reason for this might be that those parents do not know English. A child who studies will do his homework, but a child who does not study will

return to school without completing his homework. I don't know; maybe it is necessary to open a course for parents. Perhaps parents should be taught the same English language at an elementary level.

Researcher: Have you attended professional courses to improve your knowledge and develop your teaching skills?

Aina: I studied various courses. I participated in seminars such as Forum and Kastei.

Researcher: Did any of these courses mention the strategies or pedagogical implications of using languages other than the target language in English classrooms?

Aina: Those courses were held only in English. The methods were taught and shown only in English. All the participants in such courses are mainly teachers of the English language, and they will understand English-only methods; however, all students are not that proficient. They need a different approach.

Researcher: And...do EFL teachers collaborate to share any strategies and experiences regarding English language teaching?

Aina: There were seminars in the district where we would share experiences. We participate in open classes, coaching, training, and gatherings where reports are read. At that time, we take the things we need and use them in the lesson. Since the time in the lesson is limited, I will be happy if we use at least one method.

Researcher: Good. Now, it is the last question. Do you have any comments or additional information about using other languages in the English classes?

Aina: To summarize, I think other languages should be included in the English classes. Other languages may not be used in urban schools, but many teachers in our rural areas use other languages. If we do not use it, the child sometimes does not understand even a small sentence. Even if we use pictures, facial expressions, and gestures, some children do not understand. Therefore, 20-30 % of the lesson should be in other languages.

Researcher: That's the end of our interview. Thank you very much for answering all the questions.

Сұхбат Транскрипті
Қазақстандағы Ауылдық Аймақтардағы Ағылшын Тілі Мұғалімдерінің
Транстілдесу туралы Сенімдері мен Тәжірибелерінің арасындағы Қарым-
Қатынасты Зерттеу

Зерттеуші: Айзат Арыстанбек

Сұхбат беруші: Айна

Сұхбат берушінің лауазымы: ағылшын тілі мұғалімі

Зерттеуші: Ал осы басқа тілдерді ағылшын тілі сабағында қолданудың маңыздылығын 1-5 балл аралығында қалай бағалар едіңіз?

Айна: Енді былай қалай айтсам...бізде ағылшын тілі мұғалімдері сабақтарында тек ағылшын тілінде сөйлесе – ол жақсы. Бірақ оның барлығы мына ауылдың деңгейіне және ата-аналардың білімдеріне байланысты. Бізде бір 45 минут беріледі сабаққа, балаларды топқа бөліп, бір сыныпта 12 бала отырғанның өзінде әр балаға жеке-жеке барлығын түсіндіру мүмкін емес. Біз ағылшын тілінде сабақты өтуге тырысқанымызбен, бала сол ағылшын тілінде өтіп жатқан сабақтың 50 пайызын түсінсе де жақсы. Ал балалар тек ағылшын тілінде өтсең, сабақты қабылдамайды, сондықтан да біз ылғи орыс жіне қазақ тілімен байланыстырмайз. Ағылшын тілін қолдану керек, бірақ біз ағылшын тілінің носителі емеспіз. Ол тіл біздің ана тіліміз болмағандықтан және біз тек сол ағылшын тілінің, шет тілінің мұғалімі болғандықтан, біз сабақтың 70 пайызын ағылшын тілінде өтіп, қалған 30 пайызында басқа тілдерді қоссақ жақсы ма деп ойлаймын. Өйткені бала үш тілді де бірге алып жүруі керек. Сол ағылшынша сөйлемнің аудармасын қазақ тілінде болмаса орыс тілінде білсін және керісінше орыс тілінде болмаса да, қазақ тілінде білсін. Ағылшын тілі сабақтарында солай үш тілді де бірге алып жүрген дұрыс деп ойлаймын. Ал сол жаңағы маңыздылығын бағалағанда 4 балл беремін. Енді сабақтың таза ағылшын тілінде болғанын қалаймыз, бірақ енді уақыт өте келе соған да жететін шығармыз, балалар ағылшын тілін толық түсінетін деңгейге. Бірақ қазір ауылдың балалары ондай 100 процент ағылшын тілінде сабақты өтуге дайын емес. Сол үшін де басқа тілдерді біз қолдануымыз қажет.

Зерттеуші: Жауабыңызға үлкен рахмет. Сіз ағылшын тілі сабағында тек ағылшын тілін ғана қолданамын деп жоспаралайсыз ба?

Айна: Иә.

Зерттеуші: Ал бірақ сабақ кезінде жаңа айтып өткеніңіздей, тек ағылшын тілін қолдану мүмкін болмайды, иә? Сондай жағдайлар болған мысалдарды келтіре аласыз ба?

Айна: Болады. Бірақ тек 70 процент қана. Ал қалған 30 процентінде біз басқа тілдерді қолданамыз. Мысалы, жаңа сөз өткен соң оның аудармасын айтамыз, сол сияқты кездерде басқа тілдерді қолданамыз. Тіпті үлкен сыныптарда да 100 процент таза ағылшынша сабақ өте алмаймыз. Себебі балалар ағылшынша сөйлегенде қиналады. Өз ойларын ағылшын тілінде толығымен жеткізе алмайды. Біз сол сабақта бала 4-5 сөйлем құрап айтса да біз соған қуанамыз. Солай бала болашақта біртіндеп тілді меңгеріп кетеді деп сенеміз.

Зерттеуші: Сонда сіз басқа тілдерді қолданамын деа алдын ала жоспарлайсыз ба әлде ол сабақ барысында байқаусызда болатын жағдай ма?

Айна: Жоқ, жоспарламаймын. Менің жоспарлармыда бәрі ағылшын тілінде жазылады, барлығы ағылшынша өтеді деп жоспарлаймыз. Ал сабақ барысында ола болмай қалады. Қазақша балаларға айту керек болады. Айтпай қояйын десең де болмайды. Үлкен сыныптарда мен арнайы видеоларды қолданамын сол ағылшын тілін көбірек қолдану мақсатында, бірақ бәрібір балаларға түсіну қиын. Басқа мұғалімдерді білмеймін, бірақ мен өзім ойлаймын, ағылшын тілінің мұғалімі болған соң үш тілді де алып жүру керек. Ал деңгейі төмен балаларға фундамент құйсақ, яғни ағылшын тілінің негізін біліп, әріптерді танып, жәй ғана аудармасын білмесе де оқылуын біліп шықса – ол мұғалімнің жеңісі деп ойлайсын.

Зерттеуші: Сабақ барысындағы жоспарларыңыз бен күнделікті ағылшын тілі сабақтарында болып жатқан жағдайлар арасында айырмашылық бар ма? Мысалға, бізде екі жағдай бар. Бір жағынан Сізде жоспарланған ағылшын тілі сабағы бар, яғни күнтізбелік жоспар- теория. Ал екінші жақтан, Сізде кәдімгі болып жатқан сабақ бар- практика. Осы екі жағдай арасында қандай айырмашылық немесе ұқсастық бар?

Айна: Байланысымз мол күнтізбелік жоспарлардығы жоспарларымыз, мынау ҚМЖ-мыз ағылшын тілінде, барлық сабаққа байланысты жоспарларымыз бен оқулықтарымыз ағылшын тілінде. Бірақ енді сыныпқа келгенде баланың деңгейіне қараймыз. Кейде сабақта балалар жоспардағы әдіс-тәсілдерді де қолданғанда тақырыпты түсінбей қалады, сол кезде қазақ тілінде айтсақ бала әрі қарай алып кетеді. Бірақ жоспарларымыздың бәрі ағылшын тілінде. Ал былай сабақ барысында басқа тілдерді 100 пайыз қолданбаймын. Үлкенірек сыныптарда әсіресе басқа тілдерді

қолданбауға тырысамын. Ал орта буындағы оқушыларға грамматиканы мен бірінші қазақ тілінде түсіндіріп, олардан сол грамматиканың ерекшеліктерін қазақ тілінде қарастырып, кейіннен ағылшын тілінде мысалдар келтіремін жне салыстыру арқылы түсіндіремін.

Зерттеуші: Сіздің ойыңызша, мұғалімдер ағылшын тілін төмен деңгейде меңгерген оқушыларға орыс немесе қазақ тілдерін қолдану арқылы көмек көрсетуі керек пе?

Айна: Иә, барлық балаларға көңіл бөлініп, көмектесу қажет. Мен мысалы, оңайлату мақсатында ағылшын тілін төмен деңгейде меңгерген оқушыларға қазақша аудармалары бар тапсырмаларды жасап келуге тырысамын. Ал жақсы оқитын оқушылар басқа балаларға қарағанда тапсырманы тез орындап қоятындықтан, оларға басқа балаларға көмектесіңдер деп немесе тақтаға шығарып тапсырманы орындатқызамын.

Зерттеуші: Сіздің көзқарасыңыз бойынша, ағылшын тілін табысты меңгерудің және тиімді оқытудың негізгі факторлары қандай?

Айна: Тиімді факторлар?

Зерттеуші: Иә, мысалы мектеп тарапынан не болмаса сыныптағы жағдайларда қандай факторлар сол ағылшын тілін тиімді оқытуға көмектеседі?

Айна: Мен ойлаймын, хотя бы біреу болса да осы ауданға ма, әлде мектептің өзіне бір носитель языка келіп, аптасына 1-2 рет жиындар жасап, балалармен кездесіп, тәжірибе бөліссе жақсы болар еді. Болмаса қалалық жерлерден ағылшын тілін жақсы меңгерген кісілер волонтер ретінде келіп, мектептерді аралап, сабақ сияқты өтсе, балалардың қызығушылығын арттырса деп ойлаймын. Носитель языка это же носитель языка, балалар олардың сөйлеуіне қарап қызығып, мотивациясы артар еді. Біз ағылшын тілі мұғалімі болғанымен, біз ағылшындар не британдықтар емеспіз. Бізді балалар ылғи қазақ ретінде қабылдайды, ал егер носитель языка келіп тұрса жағдай жақсарар ма еді деп ойлаймын. Мен өзім мұғалім болсам да, сондай шетелдіктер келіп бізге курстарда не семинарларда сабақ өтсе, мен қызығып кетемін. Олар кішкентай заттың өзін басқаша қылып жеткізеді.

Зерттеуші: Жауабыңызға үлкен рахмет. Ал осы оқыту тәжірибеңіздегі негізгі кедергілерді Сіз қалай сипаттар едіңіз?

Айна: Енді бір үлкен кедергі жоқ. Өйткені қазір 21 ғасыр, дамыған заман. Қазір барлығы интернетте бар, балалар керек болса репетиторға да барып жатыр. Бірақ та ата-аналар тарапынан балалардың оқуына деген қаралым болмайды. Мектептегі білім ол тек мұғалімдермен ғана шектелмеу керек деп ойлаймын. Үйде ата-ана бар. Ата-ана,

мұғалім, мектеп жіне орта- барлығы бірге байланысты. Мысалы, біз сыныпта үйреткенмен, ол үйде қараусыз қалып жатыр. Сабақтағы өтілгеннің барлығы үйде қақталанбайды. Сол себепті ата-аналар да кішкене баласының сабағына қарап, көңіл бөлсе жақсы болатын еді. Үйде ата-аналар балаларына қарамайды, бұған себеп сол ата-аналардың ағылшын тілін білмеуі, бұрында мектеп кезінде оқымағандығы да шығар. Солай орындайтын бала орындайды үй тапсырмасын, ал оқымайтын бала қайтадан оқымай келеді мектепке. Соған ата-аналарға да бір курс ашу керек па, білмеймін. Мүмкін сол ағылшын тілін ата-аналарға да бір бастапқы деңгейде үйрету керек сияқты.

Зерттеуші: Сіз өз біліміңізді арттыруға және мұғалімдік дағдыларыңызды дамытуға бағытталған кәсіптік курстарға қатыстыңыз ба?

Айна: Деңгейлік курстарды оқыдым. Форум, Kastee деген сияқты семинарларға қатыстым.

Зерттеуші: Осы курстарда ағылшын тілі сыныптарында басқа тілдерді пайдаланудың әдістері немесе педагогикалық салдары туралы айтылды ма?

Айна: Курстарда тек ағылшын тілінде ғана өтетін. Сол ағылшын тіліндегі әдістерді үйретеді. Ал бірақ ол жерде барлығы мұғалімдер ғой, олар түсінеді. Ал баланың аты бала. Оларға басқа подход керек.

Зерттеуші: Ал ағылшын тілі мұғалімдері тілді оқытуға байланысты қандай да бір әдістер мен тәжірибелермен бөлісу үшін бірлесіп жұмыс жасайды ма?

Айна: Ауданда семинарлар болады, сол жерде бір-бірімізбен тәжірибе бөлісеміз. Ашық сабақтарға қатысамыз, коучингтер және тренингтер, баяндамалар оқылатын жиындар болып тұрады. Сол кезде өзімізге керекті заттарды алып, сабақта қолдануға тырысамыз. Бірақ сабақта уақыт шектеулі болғасын, бір әдіс-тәсілді қолданып шықсақ та риза боламын.

Зерттеуші: Енді соңғы сұраққа келсек, сіздің ағылшын тілі сабағында басқа тілдерді қолдану жайлы тағы да пікірлеріңіз немесе айтылмай қалған қосымша ақпараттарыңыз бар ма?

Айна: Енді мен қорытып айтсам, басқа тілдерді ағылшын тілі сабағында алып жүру керек деп ойлаймын. Қалалық мектептерде басқа тілдерді қолданбайтын шығар, бірақ біздің ауылдық жерде көп мұғалім қолданады. Біз қолданбасақ бала кейде кішігірім сөйлемді де түсінбей қалады. Тіпті суретпен де, мимика мен жестпен де көрсетіп тұрсақ, түсінбей қалатын балалар болып тұрады. Сол үшін де 20-30 пайыз болсын басқа тілдерді қолдану керек.

Зерттеуші: Сонымен біздің сұхбатымыз аяқталды. Барлық сұрақтарға жауап бергеніңізге үлкен рахмет.