INTERNATIONAL
SCIENCE COMPLEX
ISCA ASTANA

ASTANA
INTERNATIONAL
AIU UNIVERSITY

MEDIEVAL HISTORY
OF CENTRAL EURASIA

Has been published since 2020

No. 2 (5) 2024

Astana 2024

EDITORIAL TEAM OF THE JOURNAL
MEDIEVAL HISTORY OF CENTRAL EURASIA
CHIEF EDITOR

Doctor of historical sciences,
Assistant Professor
Nursultanova L.N.

EDITORS:

- **Qydyráli Darhan**   Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor (Kazakhstan)
- **Muminov A.K.**   Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor (Kazakhstan)
- **Samashev Z. S.**   Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor (Kazakhstan)
- **Abuseitova M. K.**   Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor (Kazakhstan)
- **Sabitov Zh. M.**   PhD in Political Science (Kazakhstan)
- **Golden Peter B.**   Dr., Professor (USA)
- **Kradin N.N.**   Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor (Russia)
- **Erdélyi István**   Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor (Hungary)
- **Uzelac Aleksandar**   PhD in History (Serbia)
- **Mirgaleev I. M**.   Candidate of Historical Sciences (Russia)
- **Zaytsev I. V.**   Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor (Russia)
- **Petrov P.N.**   Candidate of Historical Sciences (Russia)
- **Nagamine Hiroyuki**   PhD in History (Japan)

CONTENT

МРНТИ 03.20

ENGLISH MEDIUM INSTRUCTION POLICY AND PRACTICE IN THE MULTILINGUAL CONTEXT OF A PRIVATE UNIVERSITY IN KAZAKHSTAN

Aigerim Kazhigaliyeva

MA in Multilingual Education, PhD in Education

Vice dean for Academic Affairs, Astana International University

+77473709015

Abstract. The publication discusses the rise of English Medium Instruction (EMI) in higher education worldwide, driven by internationalization and neoliberal policies that prioritize English. Although EMI aims to enhance global competitiveness and attract international students, its implementation poses challenges, such as ideological biases favoring English, limited resources, and equity issues. Stakeholders, including faculty and students, face difficulties due to insufficient consultation and support. The adoption of EMI is widespread, particularly in countries like Kazakhstan, where the government promotes trilingual education. However, there are concerns about linguistic diversity and inclusion, as English dominance may marginalize local languages. To address these issues, a more inclusive EMI policy is recommended, recognizing the role of local languages and stakeholders. Translanguaging and the multilingual turn are suggested as approaches to enhance EMI effectiveness by integrating learners' full linguistic repertoires. The study emphasizes the need for policies responsive to local contexts and the complex realities of educational settings.

Keywords: EMI, internationalization, policy, practice.

INTRODUCTION

The global adoption of EMI policies has had a substantial influence on language policies in higher education worldwide. This phenomenon exemplifies a more extensive change in university policies that adhere to neoliberal principles, frequently giving preference to English as the primary medium of teaching. This aligns with broader social and political dialogues. Nevertheless, implementing language policing methods to impose English-only environments may inadvertently strengthen ideological biases and marginalize non-standard dialects, so impacting students' educational encounters and self-perception [1].

Stakeholders, like as faculty members and learners, often face challenges because they do not receive sufficient consultation and support while implementing EMI policies. In order to tackle these issues, it is essential to guarantee the availability of enough resources and modify curricula to incorporate learning objectives that accommodate diverse language backgrounds. Policymakers must also take into account the influence of global rankings and performance metrics on education systems and tackle concerns related to equity and inclusiveness.

The adoption of EMI has gained momentum in higher education, particularly in countries such as South Africa, South Korea, Malaysia, Saudi Arabia, Bolivia, Myanmar, Spain, Hong Kong, and Kazakhstan. This trend has been driven by the process of internationalization. The widespread use of English in academia, motivated by the need to attract international students and compete globally, has resulted in substantial changes in language policies in higher education institutions.

However, advocating for the exclusive use of English as the medium of education gives rise to apprehensions regarding linguistic variety and impartiality. Stakeholders may encounter difficulties in fulfilling English proficiency requirements, leading to exclusion and inequitable access to educational opportunities. The government of Kazakhstan is enacting measures to internationalize higher education institutions by adopting EMI programs. This might potentially affect the language used for teaching at higher educational institutions, as well as aspects of equality and justice.

Ultimately, the worldwide growth of higher education has resulted in the extensive adoption of EMI, although it has also presented difficulties concerning linguistic variety, equity, and assimilation. Policymakers are confronted with the task of fostering English fluency while also safeguarding other languages and addressing the varied requirements of stakeholders to guarantee equitable access to top-notch education [3].

RESEARCH METHODS

The qualitative research design enables the gathering of insights into the underlying principles governing a social phenomenon, including causes, opinions, and motives. Gaining a comprehensive understanding of reality requires a meticulous analysis of observed, experienced, and reported

phenomena. Qualitative research particularly focuses on reality as socially constructed, the intimate relationship between the researcher and the study subject, and the situational constraints affecting the research process. Qualitative research represents a complex and multifaceted concept that has been interpreted in various ways by scholars over time, largely because the field encompasses a myriad of interconnected terms, concepts, and assumptions. Nevertheless, a consensus exists on the conceptualization of qualitative research. Fundamentally, it is recognized for its robust foundation in exploration, description, and analysis, allowing researchers to deeply understand individuals, communities, or events within natural settings. This approach yields detailed portrayals of the social world[4].

According to Lincoln, there is a widely accepted understanding of qualitative research. Qualitative research is typically seen as being grounded, exploratory, descriptive, and inductive. It allows researchers to gain a comprehensive understanding of individuals, communities, or events in their natural environments, resulting in detailed descriptions of the social world. The significance of utilizing these three data sources to their maximum capacity is highlighted, stressing the distinct contribution each makes in addressing the study objectives[5-10].

The study investigates the EMI policy and practice, as well as how that practice relates to evolving beliefs about policy implementation in Kazakhstan. It delves into the "what", "how", and "why" of students and faculty members' language use in the EMI context of a private university. The need for a detailed and in-depth understanding of the policy processes in a specific EMI context provides me with a rationale for conducting my research using a qualitative research design because a qualitative analysis of policy is about in-depth exploration of data. Furthermore, the nature of my research questions makes it appropriate for me to employ a qualitative research methods. In this research study, I employed interviews, observations, and document analysis to investigate the perceptions and interpretations of language policies and practices among stakeholders at the EMI university, including students, faculty members, and administration. Interviews are crucial for revealing the values, beliefs, and attitudes of stakeholders regarding the languages used in classroom settings and the wider university environment. Utilizing in-depth interviews, observations,

and document analysis is a suitable approach for studying phenomena that cannot be easily measured quantitatively. This comprehensive data-gathering method enhances the study by offering a nuanced comprehension of the complex interaction between policy, practice, and the various perspectives within EMI institution.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Nations in Southeast Asia, including Malaysia, Thailand, Singapore, and Indonesia, are increasingly adopting EMI to enhance global competitiveness and improve English language proficiency among their students. Despite rapid adoption, challenges such as cultural resistance, limited student engagement, insufficient funding, and a shortage of qualified educators persist. The implementation of EMI policies often occurs without adequate consultation with teachers and students, leading to a situation where a significant number of educators teach in English primarily due to institutional requirements rather than personal choice.

In South Asia, particularly in India and Pakistan, the dominance of English has significant implications for educational policy and linguistic identity. Manan highlight the contradictions within EMI policies, pointing out the symbolic violence and marginalization of indigenous languages. Evidence suggests that a multilingual instructional approach, which includes English, could lead to better educational outcomes and greater student engagement.

European universities have broadly implemented EMI with the aim of internationalizing their campuses and attracting a diverse student body. Despite widespread adoption, concerns about language proficiency, impact on program quality, and the need for quality assurance measures have been raised. The adoption of EMI in Africa and South America is closely linked to the globalization of education and the desire to enhance English language proficiency. In Myanmar, the mandate for using English in higher education highlights the challenges of teaching and learning exclusively in English due to inadequate proficiency among faculty and students. Kazakhstan also aims to encourage local students to stay and study domestically through EMI policies[11-16].

Across these regions, the literature calls for more inclusive and collaborative approaches to EMI policy development. The imposition of English

instruction without considering the linguistic and cultural contexts of learners often leads to implementation challenges and acceptance issues. Additionally, emphasizing English can devalue indigenous languages, thereby affecting students' linguistic identities and educational experiences. The global spread of EMI policies highlights various motivations and outcomes, from the goal of internationalizing higher education to the need for English proficiency. However, EMI adoption faces substantial challenges, including cultural resistance, financial limitations, and the need for experienced educators. A successful EMI approach requires a holistic strategy that recognizes the importance of local languages and stakeholder engagement. Further research is needed to explore the complex dynamics of EMI, focusing on policy development, teacher and student experiences, and the balance between global engagement and local needs[17-20].

The educational linguistic landscape in Kazakhstan has undergone substantial changes since gaining independence in 1991, like other developing countries in Asia. The demand for English has had a significant influence on educational agendas, policies, and planning in Kazakhstan, as seen in various other countries in the region. In 2007, Kazakhstan's government implemented extensive education reforms, which included a concept known as the "trinity of languages". The policy also focused on promoting English instruction in schools and higher education institutions, in addition to Kazakh and Russian languages. The former President of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, advocated for expedited educational changes by introducing his Trilingual education policy, with a significant emphasis on English. The ex-President viewed English as a crucial element in Kazakhstan's progress and saw it as a primary factor in the country's incorporation into the global cultural economy.

The example of Kazakhstan demonstrates the influence of government-led reforms on language policies in the context of internationalizing higher education. These reforms cover a wide range of aspects in secondary education, higher education, such as language policies, employability, academic mobility, international research, and staff mobility. An essential component of these reforms involves using EMI in higher education institutions, which represents a substantial change in teaching and learning methodologies. Several EMI schools have been launched in Kazakhstan, including NIS, Nur-Orda, Astana Garden

School, Haileybury School, Astana English School, Astana International School, and EMI universities such as Nazarbayev University, KIMEP, Kazakh British Technical University, Astana IT University, among many other institutions.

According to the Concept for the Development of Higher Education and Science in the Republic of Kazakhstan for the years 2023 to 2029, up to 500 Kazakh scholars will be sent annually on internships to leading scientific centers worldwide. These internships will include training in academic writing, English, digital skills and other necessary competencies and skills. Additionally, efforts to attract Kazakhstani professionals working abroad back to local institutions and the training of university leaders are expected to stimulate the influx of young talent into universities. The plan also includes increasing the share of higher education institutions that implement international educational programs and academic exchanges with foreign partners, with targets set at 40% for 2023, 45% for 2024, 50% for 2025, 55% for 2026, 60% for 2027, 65% for 2028, and 70% for 2029. Furthermore, the strategy involves attracting international experts for teaching from leading universities such as Harriot-Watt University, The University of Arizona, University of Reading, De Monfort University. Based on the Concept for the Development of Higher Education and Science in the Republic of Kazakhstan for the years 2023 to 2029 the goal is to open at least 13 branches of EMI universities in Kazakhstan.

Although developments in EMI creates opportunities for global participation and competition, they also raise concerns, particularly over linguistic ability and the possible disregard for indigenous languages and cultures. As a result, policymakers and educational institutions must strike a delicate balance. It is critical to ensure that the implementation of EMI policies does not reduce linguistic diversity or create barriers for non-native English-speaking students and staff members. The implementation of EMI into the educational system should be done cautiously, taking into account all individuals' linguistic capacities as well as the institution's cultural and linguistic milieu. This policy will make it easier to take advantage of the benefits of globalization in higher education while also protecting linguistic variety and guaranteeing equitable access to high-quality education for all.

A thorough review of the literature on EMI reveals a complex and diverse terrain with major theoretical and practical implications. The impact of EMI

extends to many facets of education, including language proficiency, cognitive ability, and general educational standards. Furthermore, students and educators' perceptions and firsthand experiences with EMI have a considerable impact on policy creation. It is critical to adapt EMI policies to local conditions in order to ensure equitable and high-quality education[18].

Regarding the Kazakhstani EMI HE policy context, Smagulova (2016) discusses the challenges faced by Kazakhstan's younger generation, who had to choose between 'Kazakh re-acquisition' and improving their English skills, while acknowledging the country's continued importance of the Russian language. These changes impacted both primary and secondary education levels, with courses like as physics, chemistry, biology, and computer science authorized to be taught in English, frequently utilizing partial or full immersion bilingual techniques. Only 818 of the 5,922 instructors who used EMI taught exclusively in English. Understanding the concept of trilingual education in Kazakhstan is crucial. According to Mehisto et al. (2014), this approach is based on using three languages as the principal method of instruction in educational institutions: Russian, Kazakh, and English. The early stages of this initiative included the implementation of EMI and the construction of universities with trilingual programs.

The crucial significance of English as a second language in bolstering the nation's future competitiveness. Similarly, the importance of English in the context of language education in Kazakhstan. It is viewed as a crucial element in the multilingual setting, alongside the diversity of languages and ethnicities present. According to Ahn and Smagulova (2022) the current situation underscores the impact of linguistic transformation in Central Asia, specifically concerning the availability, prospects, and engagement with the English language. English offers a fascinating perspective for examining the linguistic environment in these contexts. Access to the dominant language within a country establishes a connection between language and a particular sense of identity or citizenship. However, access to languages such as English (or Russian) provides opportunities that extend beyond national borders. Individuals in transitional environments can efficiently utilize their available resources to navigate these environments, thereby gaining access to global possibilities and industries. Given the intricate nature of this evolving situation,

it is essential to translate the experiences of native language speakers into well-informed policy discussions, particularly concerning the use of English as a Medium of Instruction. This approach should also influence teaching approaches and methodologies in the context of EMI to advance society towards concept of public multilingualism. The goal of this concept is to ensure that people have necessary access to widely spoken languages, such as English, within the framework of EMI, in order to reduce overall social inequality in educational institutions.

Kazakhstan's language education strategy plays a pivotal role in the nation's development by addressing linguistic diversity, implementing initiatives utilizing EMI, and enhancing human capital and competitiveness. The Kazakhstani government has increasingly emphasized the importance of English proficiency over the past decade, recognizing its pivotal role in modernization and development. Initially, in accordance with the 1997 Law on Languages of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Kazakh and Russian were designated as the official languages, with Kazakh as the state language and Russian for interethnic communication. The adoption of English as a medium of instruction was established in 2006 through the 'Trinity of Languages' program, with the goal of fostering well-educated individuals[19-23].

The "Kazakhstan-2050" plan, initiated by Nazarbayev in 2012, aims to position Kazakhstan among the thirty most competitive nations globally. The declarations within Kazakhstani national policy, encapsulated in the Kazakhstan 2050 Strategy, underscore the imperative of "achieving a breakthrough in English learning" and stress that the "proficient use of this language will provide every citizen of the nation with boundless new opportunities in life". Initially, it was envisioned that the proportion of international students in higher education would reach 5% by 2020. However, subsequent policy documents have outlined alternative targets for this demographic: 6% in 2021, 10% in 2025, and 20% in 2050 (MoES, 2016, p. 130). As of post-COVID, the number of international students enrolled in Kazakhstan's universities stood at 40,043, a significant increase compared to the previous year's figure of 21,727.

However, despite the significant increase in the number of international students, this progress is hindered by various obstacles. The provision of preparatory courses for international students is underdeveloped, and their

language proficiency remains inadequate. According to the analytical report on the implementation of the Bologna Process principles, faculty members who instruct in English face challenges.

In 2011, Kazakhstan's participation in the Bologna Process enabled higher education institutions to promote international cooperation by offering educational programs in multiple languages. As part of the 'Trilingual Education' project, 42 universities implemented specialized student groups that enrolled in courses taught in three different languages. Nevertheless, despite these commendable legislative changes, research conducted on the use of EMI in Kazakhstani universities underscores enduring language-related challenges. A significant issue in this context is the inadequate English language skills of both instructors and students, leading to suboptimal language proficiency and issues in language administration. Over 60% of students face linguistic barriers due to insufficient grammar comprehension and ineffective communication skills. In a study by Irsaliyev et al. (2017), it was revealed that a vast majority of students in multilingual groups, specifically 97%, exhibit inadequate English language proficiency, primarily at the A1 to A2 competency levels. These issues can be attributed to shortcomings in assessing English language skills in primary and secondary schools, as well as inadequate efforts to train teachers in language proficiency.

Furthermore, senior faculty members encounter difficulties when delivering instruction in English, contributing to resistance against EMI. In addition, although students in EMI programs improve their English vocabulary, they often rely on translanguaging during language activities. Aitzhanova (2020) found that students readily embrace translanguaging and acknowledge its positive impact on their self-confidence, contrary to the expectations for monolingual individuals. Manan et.al., (2023) aimed to analyze the EMI policy and investigate how STEM educators in various regions of Kazakhstan comprehend the procedures of policy development and execution. The study utilized the public sphere paradigm to suggest that LPP should be examined based on the intricate practices of local stakeholders/communities. The study is based on qualitative interviews conducted with 58 STEM teachers from six regions of Kazakhstan. According to Manan et al., (2023) evidence indicates that the policy was implemented suddenly without any systematic testing or

thorough examination of instructors' English language requirements and pedagogical issues. Despite the lack of adequate support, instructors exhibit self-reliance and responsive agency by creatively navigating and adapting to the policies. Manan et.al. highlight that a well-intentioned regulation can encounter an implementation crisis if instructors are solely responsible without being provided the essential support.Furthermore, examinations of institutional and national policy documents reveal prevailing ideological discourses emphasizing the prestige and importance of the English language, as well as EMI's integral role in the internationalization of higher education. This internationalization is seen as beneficial for enhancing the competitiveness of graduates, promoting the internationalization of education, and exporting educational services. Moreover, these findings corroborate previous studies conducted in other Asian countries where discourses of internationalization similarly shape EMI policies.

The implementation of EMI by university administrations in Kazakhstan is framed as an element of national policy-aligned internationalization strategies. Both faculty and students share the administration's perception of the necessity for EMI and internationalization. This congruence can be attributed to a compliance mentality and a top-down approach rooted in the Soviet era, which continues to influence the majority of reforms and policies implemented in Kazakhstan.

Despite the Kazakhstani government's efforts to address these concerns through training, funding for international scholars, and modifications to admissions criteria, it appears that these measures fall short in ensuring the overall quality of multilingual programs, particularly EMI. Further investigation is warranted to assess whether policy changes following 2019 and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic have influenced instructional practices.

In summary, Kazakhstan's EMI program, aimed at enhancing competitiveness and developing human capital, faces significant challenges. These challenges stem from a combination of insufficient English proficiency among both staff and students, resistance to implementing innovative teaching approaches, and limited support from administrative bodies. In conclusion, based on the information stated above to enhance the effectiveness of EMI and trilingual education, a more precise strategy is needed, focusing on teacher

preparation, effective language policy implementation, and comprehensive student support[21-29].

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Resistance from below: Students' shaping the course of of the policy

In the context of English Medium Instruction (EMI) policies at universities in Kazakhstan, resistance from students plays a critical role in shaping the course of the policy. Although EMI is designed to enhance students' English proficiency and improve their global competitiveness, the practical challenges faced by students often result in forms of resistance that influence the implementation of these policies. This resistance stems from a variety of factors, including students' low English proficiency, cultural identity, and their need to rely on multilingual resources to navigate their academic environment.

One key aspect of resistance is students' use of translanguaging as a coping mechanism in EMI classrooms. While the policy may promote an English-only environment, many students strategically integrate their native languages (Kazakh or Russian) to make sense of complex academic content. This resistance is not an outright rejection of EMI but rather an adaptation to the linguistic challenges imposed by the policy. As the findings suggest, translanguaging allows students to engage more effectively with course material and participate in class discussions, thus reshaping the language practices within the classroom despite the policy's monolingual intent.

Another form of resistance is students' critique of the disconnect between policy and practice. The EMI policy often assumes a level of English proficiency that many students do not possess, leading to anxiety and disengagement. Students expressed dissatisfaction with the lack of support structures, such as professional development for teachers or adequate learning resources, which hinders their academic progress. Through informal conversations, complaints, and feedback, students resist the top-down imposition of EMI by voicing their needs for a more flexible and supportive learning environment that accommodates their multilingual realities.

Moreover, students' resistance highlights the agency they exercise in language policy implementation. While the EMI policy is formulated at the top, students at the micro-level reshape its application through their daily linguistic choices. This bottom-up influence suggests that students are not passive

recipients of language policy; instead, they actively engage with and transform it in ways that align with their linguistic and academic needs. In doing so, they contribute to a more nuanced and localized form of EMI, one that better reflects the multilingual context of Kazakhstan.

In conclusion, resistance from students plays a pivotal role in the dynamic process of EMI policy implementation. Through practices like translanguaging and critical feedback, students challenge the idealized notions of English-only instruction and advocate for more flexible, contextually relevant approaches. This bottom-up resistance not only reshapes classroom practices but also signals the need for policymakers to consider local linguistic realities when designing and enforcing EMI policies.

Based on the findings of the study, and the emerging complexities around different stakeholders' different beliefs, language preferences, and their varied practices, it becomes clear that language policy can be a rather complex thing. Because different actors and implementors are involved at different levels in decision making at the macro-level (institutional), trying to take the policy at different directions and practices. Several other researchers working on language policy also used the same conceptual underpinning to explore and understand the policy from a 'multi-layered onion' lens . For instance, the university has EMI as an official language policy, which means all those programs that are declared as EMI, should use English as the main medium of instruction. The management wants teachers and students to implement the same. Similarly, teachers also show their preferences for an EMI policy, in which only English is used across all activities. But among teachers, there is a also some difference. One of the teachers (Assel) stated that not only English, but the local languages should also be used openly when they are needed. But other teachers maintain an idealized notion of EMI. They believe that EMI means only English language. To add further to the complexity, and the subtle tensions that underlie policy and practices, students on the other hand pull the policy in their ways. In one of the sections from the findings, I have referred to the same tension between teachers and students, where students apparently tend to resist the English-only policy teachers want to enforce. Several other examples from the data also report students' different language practices and preferences, seemingly opposed to the official language policy. As I discussed, the use of the local languages (Kazakh or

Russian) in defiance of policy directives naturally results from students' needs for clarity and effective learning, highlighting the ongoing negotiation and reinterpretation of policies at the ground level. Similarly, I also discussed the changing attitudes and practices of those teachers, who ideologically desire for language separation, and English-only policy. However, the realities of the classrooms, students, and other contextual issues make to adjust and adapt their language use in real classroom practices, where they find linguistic flexibility and translanguaging more useful practice in their contexts. Thus, the multilingualism they take recourse to, is a forced measure, not a desired practice they would have done if they had any other choice.

Thus, in my research the analogy of EMI policy as a "multi-layered onion" captures the complexity of a framework where language policies have multiple levels of influence, each affecting the others. This metaphor highlights how policies are interpreted and implemented across different layers from top-down policies to bottom-up practices, affecting different decisions and actions around language use or language abandonment around classroom interactions, teaching and learning. Each layer, for example, from institutional strategies and national language policies, interacts and impacts teachers and students. The interaction between policy interpretation and practice often takes a complex shape due to the dynamic and ever-evolving nature of these layers, the implementors, especially working at the micro-level.

My research data vividly showcases this intricate interaction through the contrast between teachers' enforcement of an English-only policy and the practical ways students use their native/local languages to communicate and understand. This tension stems from an apparent disjunction and gap between the internal realities of the classroom and the external mandates of institutional policy, which promotes the use of English-only ideology. In the meanwhile, students and teachers use their L1 and L2 to facilitate learning and comprehension in EMI classroom. This situation arises due to the inherent challenges and contradictions in implementing monolingual EMI policies within multilingual contexts. It also points to the different visions in which policymakers design policies with specific socio-economic and educational objectives, while teachers and students at the micro-level may not necessarily adjust with the same. Many a times, as in the case of my research, the real

implementers, and end-users of the policies struggle with these policies within the practical confines of their linguistic and academic environments. Previous research in Kazakhstan has also demonstrated the disadvantages of keeping a linguistically rigid and inflexible stance in a multilingual classroom context, and such research also confirm the benefits and efficacy of multilingual practices in the form of translation, using students L1, or using translanguaging as a constant pedagogical tool. Also, scholars in applied linguistics and language and education call for the acceptance of multilingual practices as a norm. For instance, while advocating for his framework labeled as multilingual turn.

In my research, through classroom observations and interviews with teachers and students, I noted how several participants emphasized the dynamics of their actions, particularly the need for policies that are adaptable yet prescriptive, considering the language needs of students within a multilingual context. Such an approach requires a deep understanding of the "multi-layered onion" of policy within EMI settings, where the unique challenges and contributions of each layer are acknowledged and integrated into a cohesive policy strategy.

CONCLUSION

Drawing on evidence from interviews, document analysis, and observations, this study demonstrates that stakeholders' perceptions (teachers, students, and university leadership) and understanding of the English as a Medium of Instruction (EMI) policy are shaped by a combination of institutional goals, practical constraints, and prevailing ideological viewpoints. The persistent focus on promoting English-medium education often leads stakeholders, particularly administrators and teachers, to advocate for educational approaches that prioritize English at the expense of Kazakh, Russian, and other local languages, underestimating their value as effective teaching tools. This disregard, rooted in a deficit language ideology, perpetuates the belief that non-English languages are inherently inferior, creating a system that undervalues the linguistic skills of local communities and students.

In this ideological framework, the "English medium idealism syndrome" emerges as a dominant mindset, leading university leadership and faculty members to advocate solely for English instruction while expressing disapproval of the local languages. This belief aligns with the "TESOL" or "ELT orthodoxy,"

which emphasizes a strict separation between native languages and English, advocating for the exclusive use of English in educational settings. The dominance of English-speaking nations in the Inner Circle significantly shapes these attitudes, leading to teaching theories that overlook the importance of local languages and perpetuate disparities in teaching methods.

The study identifies an element of neoliberal rationality in the implementation of EMI policy, which is highly valued by university leadership. This approach links EMI to broader market principles such as efficiency, competition, and independence. At the private university in Astana, the promotion of EMI serves not only its educational purpose, but also its strategic objectives such as improving global rankings and attracting international students through a market-oriented approach. Neoliberalism, initially deemed as purely an economic policy, is now deeply entrenched as an established global ideology that extends the logic of the market and profit to govern "all spheres of social life, education, language, urban space, and individuals' lives" (p. 544). Neoliberal rationality also influences the individuals' ways of thinking, doing, and planning.

REFERENCES:

1. Ahn, E. S., & Smagulova, J. (2022). English language choices in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan. *World Englishes*, *41*(1), 9–23.

2. Aitzhanova, K. (2020). *Perceptions and attitudes of students towards multilingual practices in an EMI STEM classroom at two Kazakhstani universities* (Master's thesis, Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education).

3. Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Multilingual matters.

4. Baldauf Jr, R. B. (2006). Rearticulating the case for micro language planning in a language ecology context. *Current issues in language planning*, *7*(2–3), 147–170.

5. Canagarajah, S. (2021). Materialising semiotic repertoires: Challenges in the interactional analysis of multilingual communication. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *18*(2), 206-225.

6. Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2022). Pedagogical translanguaging and its application to language classes. *RELC journal*, *53*(2), 342-354.

7. Chimbutane, F. S. (2009). *The purpose and value of bilingual education: A critical, linguistic ethnographic study of two rural primary schools in Mozambique* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Birmingham).

8. Cummins, J., Bismilla, V., Chow, P., Cohen, S., Giampapa, F., Leoni, L., & Sastri, P. (2006). ELL students speak for themselves: Identity texts and literacy engagement in multilingual classrooms. *Accessed November 19*, 2008.

9. Dumanig, F., & Symaco, L. (2020). Internationalization of higher education in Malaysia and the Philippines: A comparative analysis of mission and vision statements of selected universities. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 12(4), 1–13.

10. Fang, F., & Sah, P. K. (Eds.). (2023). *English-medium instruction pedagogies in multilingual universities in Asia*. Taylor & Francis Group.

11. Galloway, N., Numajiri, T., & Rees, N. (2020). The 'internationalisation', or 'Englishisation', of higher education in East Asia. *Higher Education*, *80*(3), 395-414.

12. García, O. (2017). Critical multilingual language awareness and teacher education. *Language awareness and multilingualism*, *263*, 280.

13. Goodman, B., Kambatyrova, A., Aitzhanova, K., Kerimkulova, S., & Chsherbakov, A. (2022). Institutional supports for language development through English-medium instruction: A factor analysis. *Tesol quarterly*, *56*(2), 713-749.

14. Goodman, B., & Karabassova, L. (2018). Bottom up and top down: Comparing language-in-education policy in Ukraine and Kazakhstan. In *Comparing post-socialist transformations: Education in Eastern Europe and Former Soviet Union* (p. 147). Symposium Books.

15. Goodman, B. A., Kerimkulova, S. I., & Montgomery, D. P. (2021). Translanguaging and transfer of academic skills: Views of Kazakhstani students in an English-medium university. *English-medium instruction and translanguaging*, 141–157.

16. Goodman, B., & Tastanbek, S. (2021). Making the shift from a codeswitching to a translanguaging lens in English language teacher education. *TESOL quarterly*, *55*(1), 29–53.

17. Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. *Handbook of qualitative research*, *2*(163-194), 105.

18. Han, Y., & Dong, J. (2024). Reproducing inequality while celebrating diversity: an ethnographic study of international students' EMI learning experiences in China. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *25*(1), 1-22.

19. Hornberger, N. H. (2015). Selecting appropriate research methods in LPP research: Methodological rich points. *Research methods in language policy and planning: A practical guide*, 9-20.

20. Irsaliyev, S., Karabassova, L., Mukhametzhanova, A., Adil, A., Bekova, M., & Nurlanov, Y. (2016). *Teaching in three languages: International experience and recommendations for Kazakhstan*. JCS Information Analytic Centre.

21. Karabassova, L., & San Isidro, X. (2023). Towards translanguaging in CLIL: A study on teachers' perceptions and practices in Kazakhstan. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *20*(2), 556–575.

22. Kerimkulova, S., Goodman, B., & Aitzhanova, K. (2023). EMI in higher education in Kazakhstan: Policy supports and challenges. In *Policies, politics, and ideologies of English-medium instruction in Asian universities* (pp. 15-32). Routledge.

23. Kirkpatrick, A., & Liddicoat, A. J. (Eds.). (2019). The Routledge international handbook of language *education policy in Asia*. Routledge.

24. 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.

25. Manan, S. A., & David, M. K. (2021). Deprescriptivising folk theories: Critical multilingual language awareness for educators in Pakistan. *The Language Learning Journal*, *49*(6), 668-685.

26. Manan, S. A., Tajik, M. A., Hajar, A., & Amin, M. (2023). From colonial celebration to postcolonial performativity:'guilty multilingualism'and 'performative agency'in the English Medium Instruction (EMI) context. Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 1–28.

27. Manan, S. A., Channa, L. A., & Haidar, S. (2023). Fostering the multilingual agenda in EMI: Researchers as reflective thinkers and stance shifters. In P. K. Sah & F. Fang (Eds.), English-Medium Instruction Pedagogies in Multilingual Universities in Asia: Routledge.

28. Manan, S. A., Tajik, M. A., Hajar, A., & Amin, M. (2023). From colonial celebration to postcolonial performativity: 'guilty multilingualism' and 'performative agency' in the English Medium Instruction (EMI) context. Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 1-28. doi:10.1080/15427587.2023.2242989

29. Manan, S. A., Mukhamediyeva, S., Kairatova, S., Tajik, M. A., & Hajar, A. (2024). Policy from below: STEM teachers' response to EMI policy and policy-making in the mainstream schools in Kazakhstan. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *25*(1), 89–

ҚАЗАҚСТАНДАҒЫ ЖЕКЕ УНИВЕРСИТЕТТІҢ КӨПТІЛДІК ЖАҒДАЙЫНДАҒЫ АҒЫЛШЫН ТІЛІ ОРТА НҰСҚАУ САЯСАТЫ МЕН ПРАКТИКАСЫ

Аңдатпа. Бұл мақалада әлемдегі жоғары білім беру саласында ағылшын тілінде оқытудың өсуі талқыланады. Бұл халықаралық интеграция мен ағылшын тілін басымдыққа қоятын неолибералдық саясаттардың нәтижесі болып табылады. Ағылшын тілінде оқыту саясаты жаһандық бәсекеге қабілеттілікті арттыруға және халықаралық студенттерді тартуға бағытталғанымен, оның жүзеге асырылуы ағылшын тілін қолдауға бағытталған идеологиялық бейтараптықтың болмауы, шектеулі ресурстар мен әділеттілік мәселелері сияқты проблемаларды тудырады. Мүдделі тараптар, соның ішінде оқытушылар мен студенттер, кеңес беру мен қолдаудың жеткіліксіздігінен қиындықтарға тап болады. Ағылшын тілінде оқыту саясатын қолдану кең таралған, әсіресе Қазақстан сияқты елдерде, мұнда үкімет үш тілде білім беруді белсенді түрде алға жылжытады. Дегенмен, тілдік әртүрлілік пен инклюзияға қатысты алаңдаушылықтар бар, өйткені ағылшын тілінің үстемдігі жергілікті тілдерді шеттетуі мүмкін. Бұл мәселелерді шешу үшін жергілікті тілдердің рөлі мен барлық мүдделі тараптардың мүдделерін мойындайтын неғұрлым инклюзивті саясат ұсынылады. Транслингвизм мен көптілділік оқушылардың тілдік репертуарын интеграциялау арқылы ағылшын тілінде оқыту саясатының тиімділігін арттыру жолдары ретінде ұсынылады. Зерттеу білім беру ортасының жергілікті контекстері мен күрделі шындықтарын ескеретін саясаттардың қажеттілігін атап көрсетеді.

Түйін сөздер: интернационализация, саясат, практика.

ПОЛИТИКА И ПРАКТИКА ОБУЧЕНИЯ АНГЛИЙСКОМУ СРЕДСТВУ В МНОГОЯЗЫЧНОМ КОНТЕКСТЕ ЧАСТНОГО УНИВЕРСИТЕТА В КАЗАХСТАНЕ

Аннотация. В публикации обсуждается рост преподавания на английском языке в высшем образовании по всему миру, обусловленный международной интеграцией и неолиберальными политиками, ставящими английский язык в приоритет. Хотя политика преподавания на английском языке направлено на повышение глобальной конкурентоспособности и привлечение международных студентов, его реализация порождает такие проблемы, как идеологические предвзятости в пользу английского, ограниченные ресурсы и вопросы справедливости. Заинтересованные стороны, включая преподавателей и студентов, сталкиваются с трудностями из-за недостаточного консультирования и поддержки. Использование политики преподавания английского языка широко распространено, особенно в таких странах, как Казахстан, где правительство активно продвигает трёхъязычное образование. Однако существует обеспокоенность по поводу языкового разнообразия и инклюзии, так как доминирование английского языка может маргинализировать местные языки. Для решения этих вопросов рекомендуется более инклюзивная политика, признающая роль местных языков и интересы всех заинтересованных сторон. Транслингвизм и многоязычие предлагаются как подходы для повышения эффективности политики преподавания на английском языке путем интеграции полного языкового репертуара учащихся. Исследование подчеркивает необходимость разработки политик, учитывающих местные контексты и сложные реалии образовательной среды.

Ключевые слова: интернационализация, политика, практика.

Information about the author: Aigerim Kazhigaliyeva, MA in Multilingual Education, PhD in Education Vice dean for Academic Affairs, Astana International University, Astana, Kazakhstan, aigerim.kazhigaliyeva@aiu.edu.kz

Автор туралы мәлімет: Кажгалиева Айгерим, Көптілді білім беру магистрі, PhD, Өнер және гуманитарлық ғылымдар жоғарғы мектебі деканының оқу ісі жөніндегі орынбасары, Астана халықаралық университеті, Астана, Қазақстан, aigerim.kazhigaliyeva@aiu.edu.kz

Сведения об авторе: Кажгалиева Айгерим, магистр полиязычного образования, PhD, заместитель декана по учебной работе Высшей школы искусств и гуманитарных наук, Международный университет Астана, Астана, Казахстан, aigerim.kazhigaliyeva@aiu.edu.kz