

The Senior Project Cover Page

**Language Choice and Language Attitude in a Multilingual Kazakhstani University: A  
Sociolinguistic Study**

Kalybek Assem, Ortykova Diana, Shayakhmetova Madina

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Bachelor of Liberal Arts

In

6B02302: Applied Linguistics

Dr. Laura Ibrayeva

M. S. Narikbayev KAZGUU University

School of Liberal Arts

May 2023

Word Count: 9873

## DECLARATION

**We, the undersigned**

Kalybek Assem, Ortykova Diana, Shoyakhmetova Madina grant  
to M. Narikbayev KAZGUU University the right to store and distribute my submission in print and electronic format.

We confirm that We are the sole authors of this senior project, and that it does not infringe any copyright. This senior project is the result of our own original work, except where due acknowledgement has been made.


M. Narikbayev KAZGUU University will clearly identify our name as the author of the submission, and will make any alteration, other than as allowed by this agreement, to your submission.

**We hereby accept the terms of the above Declaration.**

Kalybek Assem  
Authors' Surname, name

  
signature:

Ortykova Diana  
Authors' Surname, name

  
signature:

Shoyakhmetova Madina  
Authors' Surname, name

  
signature:

30.05.2023  
Date:

**APPENDIX 1  
TECHNICAL ASSIGNMENT**

«AGREED»

«APPROVED»

Provost

Dean of School of Liberal Arts  
Candidate of philological  
sciences

Candidate of legal sciences, docent  
\_\_\_\_\_ Pen S. G.

\_\_\_\_\_ Ibrayeva A. B.

«\_\_» \_\_\_\_\_ 2022 г.

«\_\_» \_\_\_\_\_ 2022 г.

**TECHNICAL ASSIGNMENT  
For Senior Project**

**«Language Choices and Language Attitudes in a Multilingual Kazakhstani University:  
A Sociolinguistic Study»**

**I. Justification of the relevance, originality and novelty of the project.  
For further scientific researchers.**

The relevance of the research paper lies in the fact that many universities of modern Kazakhstan provide a multilingual education environment. The paper strives to learn the experiences students have with the educational system of this kind, and the reasoning behind language choices they make.

The originality of the research paper is justified by the limited amount of research done in the chosen field. The purpose of this research is to fill the information gap concerning the topic of preferred languages in the selected audience.

The novelty of the research paper is justified by providing the information based on the collected data to the potential interested party and/or to set the fundamental data for the future research in the field. The data collected during the project work may also prove to be useful to the academic faculty, as well as other students.

**II. Project object  
The research questions:**

1. What are the language choices and language attitude of Kazakhstani university students?
2. What factors affect the language choices and attitude of Kazakhstani university students?

The reason as to why this field of research was chosen for a diploma project is that the topic resonates with many of the students on a personal level, considering that many of us experience usage of different languages for different purposes in this multilingual space. It is our hope that the paper helps more people to better understand the nature of the preferred language in a multilingual space such as university. This paper may prove useful to the academic faculty, future researchers in the field, as well as the students themselves.

**III. Scope, order and terms of work performance.**

- Stage 1. Conducting an analysis of the existing literature on the selected topic.
- Stage 2. Description of the research methodology, justification for the choice of method (quantitative, qualitative).
- Stage 3. Description of the means of data collection (interviewing, document analysis, survey).
- Stage 4. Description of the results of the study.
- Stage 5. Description of the conclusion, recommendations.

**IV. Project quality indicators.**

- a) The use of relevant regulatory documents and literature at the time of writing the senior project;
- b) Writing a graduation project in accordance with the Guidelines for writing a senior project;
- c) Compliance by members of the Scrum Team with the requirements of the Academic Integrity Policy regarding anti-plagiarism is implied.

**V. Composition of the group.**

Explanation: senior project is carried out in groups. The project team consists of students (3-4 people), a supervisor, if necessary - several supervisors, a representative of the customer, if any.

**Scientific adviser: Dr. Laura Ibrayeva**

**Students: Assem Kalybek, Diana Ortykova, and Madina Shayakhmetova**

**VI. The responsibility matrix of group members.**

Explanation: the matrix of responsibility of group members can be built in the form of a table, diagram or otherwise, allowing to determine the degree of involvement of each member in the implementation of each individual design stage.

Example: project name: " ".

Stages	Supervisor's full name	1 <sup>st</sup> student's full name	2 <sup>nd</sup> student's full name	3 <sup>rd</sup> student's full name
<i>Stage 1. Conducting an analysis of the existing literature on the selected topic. (reviewing the literature)</i> <i>1. selecting literature</i> <i>2. organizing the acquired sources based on their relevance to the selected area</i> <i>3. taking notes</i>	<b>Dr. Laura Ibrayeva</b>	<b>Ortykova Diana</b>	<b>Kalybek Assem</b>	<b>Shayakhmetova Madina</b>

<i>Stage 2. Description of the research methodology, justification for the choice of method (quantitative, qualitative). (survey design) 1. Deciding on the method of the data acquisition 2. Seeking permission and reviewing ethics 3. Writing a consent form 4. Constructing necessary questions and/or conditions for gathering the data</i>	Dr. Laura Ibrayeva	Ortykova Diana	Kalybek Assem	Shayakhmetova Madina
<i>Stage 3. Description of the means of data collection (interviewing, document analysis, survey).</i>	Dr. Laura Ibrayeva	Ortykova Diana	Kalybek Assem	Shayakhmetova Madina
<i>Stage 4. Description of the results of the study. 1. Analyzing the acquired data 2. Categorizing the data received 3. Preparing conclusion</i>	Dr. Laura Ibrayeva	Ortykova Diana	Kalybek Assem	Shayakhmetova Madina
<i>Stage 5. Description of the conclusion, recommendations.</i>	Dr. Laura Ibrayeva	Ortykova Diana	Kalybek Assem	Shayakhmetova Madina

**Explanation of abbreviations:**

- S - Supervisor
- C1 - Contractor 1
- C2 - Contractor 2
- C3 - Contractor 3
- C4 - Contractor 4
- N/A - Not Applicable

**VII. Project Completion Form.**

**Project Completion Form:**

1) (write recommendations or conduct further research)

*We, the undersigned, agree to use this terms of reference as an agreement on the creation and use of a work of science, concluded between the members of the Scrum team and KAZGUU University, according to which the members of the Scrum team undertake to transfer to KAZGUU University the exclusive property right to the created work of science, as well as the exclusive right to use the work at its own discretion in any form and under any name in any country in the world, including the right to reproduce the work; distribution of the original or copies of the work through sale or other transfer of ownership; import of copies of the work; public display of the original or copy of the work; other communication of the work to the public; translation of the work into another language; processing and / or other alteration of the work and any other types of use not prohibited by the legislation of the Republic of Kazakhstan.*

Supervisor: *Laura Ibrayeva* 

Students: 

## Abstract

The topic of multilingualism in Kazakhstan has a complex and intricate nature, which affects the lives and the education process of the Kazakhstani students. The purpose of this research lies in exploring the language attitudes students have towards the languages they use, and the reasoning behind language choices they make. The research questions generated for this research are:

1. What are the language choices and language attitudes of Kazakhstani university students?
2. What factors affect the language choices and attitudes of Kazakhstani university students?

The paper strives to fill the information gap on the topic of preferred languages and language attitude in the chosen sample. This field of research was chosen for a diploma project because the topic resonates with many of the students, considering that many of us experience usage of different languages for different purposes due to the multilingual nature of universities. The data collected on this subject needs to be constantly updated in order to be relevant due to the fact that the linguistic tendencies often shift. For this research, a quantitative approach was chosen, and the primary method of data collection is employing a survey. A total of 123 responses were gathered. The research outcomes show that Kazakhstani students have varying opinions on the three main languages used by them, and the major findings indicate that Russian is one of the most favored languages, English the more prestigious language, and Kazakh is the language used most often in domestic environments. The reasons behind such attitudes include personal identity, social class, cultural heritage, and the pursuit of valuable education, among some other reasons.

Keywords: *language choices, language attitudes, multilingualism, language preferences, ethnic identity.*

## Table of contents

chapter 1: Introduction.....	9
Background Information.....	9
Relevance of the Subject and Problem Statement.....	10
Significance of the Study .....	11
Research Purpose and Questions.....	11
Hypotheses.....	12
Outline of the Study.....	12
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	13
Multilingualism and Multilingual Education.....	13
Language Attitude.....	14
Language Choice.....	14
Language Choices and Language Attitudes: A Global Perspective.....	16
Language Choices and Language Attitudes: A Kazakhstani Perspective.....	18
Chapter 3: Methodology.....	21
Research Methodology.....	22
Research Design .....	23
Research Site .....	23
Samples .....	23
Data Collection Instruments.....	24
Data Collection and Data Analysis.....	25
Ethical Considerations.....	26
Chapter 4: Results.....	28
Demographic Profile of the Sample: Key Findings.....	28
The Participants' Attitudes towards the Languages.....	30
Correlation between Demographic Factors and Language Attitudes.....	33
Languages Choice in Context and Its' Frequency.....	42
Chapter 5: Discussion .....	45
Introduction .....	45
First Research Question.....	46
Second Research Question.....	48
Summary.....	49
Chapter 6: Conclusion.....	50
Hypotheses Results.....	51
Future Considerations and Limitations.....	51
The Ending Words.....	52
References.....	53
Appendices.....	59

## List of tables

Table 1 .....	28
Table 2 .....	29
Table 3 .....	29
Table 4 .....	30
Table 5 .....	30
Table 6 .....	31
Table 7 .....	32
Table 8 .....	33
Table 8.1 .....	33
Table 9 .....	34
Table 10 .....	34
Table 11 .....	35
Table 12 .....	35
Table 13 .....	36
Table 14 .....	36
Table 15 .....	37
Table 16 .....	38
Table 16.1 .....	38
Table 17 .....	39
Table 18 .....	39
Table 19 .....	40
Table 20 .....	40
Table 21 .....	40
Table 22 .....	41
Table 23 .....	41
Table 24 .....	42
Table 25 .....	42
Table 26 .....	43
Table 27 .....	44
Table 28 .....	44



## **Chapter 1: Introduction**

### **Background Information**

Multilingualism is an ancient phenomenon that has always played an important role in the way people communicate with one another (Garzia, 2009; Cenoz, 2013). Knowing and practicing two languages proved to be an absolute necessity in the way people of the past connected with those who came from other cultural or ethnic backgrounds (Cenoz, 2013). Even in the world today, multilingualism is an important concept and a topic of interest among many scholars (Singleton & Aronin, 2018). There are many ways to define what multilingualism is; however, the one that is easiest to comprehend is the one that states that multilingualism refers to people who are able to use multiple languages with great proficiency (Bussmann, 1996). The other term that has gained a lot of traction over the years is "multilingual education. When referring to multilingual education, people generally mean education that is provided in two or more languages, exposing students to different cultures that come with said languages (Garzia, 2009). Multilingual, however, may imply bilingual, trilingual, and any other type of language usage, as it is a broad term (Dewaele, 2015).

In a country like Kazakhstan, which houses a large number of varying ethnicities, multilingualism plays a crucial role in the way people shape their community. The two languages that are majorly used throughout the entirety of the land appear to be Kazakh and Russian, due to reasons of both historical and cultural nature (Pavlovich & Leonidovna, 2018). The nature of multilingualism in Kazakhstan is a complex topic, actively researched by many modern scholars (Pavlovich & Leonidovna, 2018). The feelings people have towards languages are complex, too.

The linguistic conditions of the country require education to be flexible and bilingual, providing the same material to the students in both Kazakh and Russian. However, due to modern globalization processes, language usage practices are shifting (Pavlovich &

Leonidovna, 2018). As such, around 2013–2014, the decision to start implementing multilingual education in Kazakh, Russian, as well as English was made (Yeskeldiyeva & Tazhibayeva, 2015). By 2019, there were at least 30 schools that provided multilingual education in Kazakhstan, and this number may only continue to grow (Zhetpisbayeva & Arinova, 2012).

### **Relevance of the Subject and Problem Statement**

The relevance of this research project is motivated by the fact that it is becoming more common for universities of Kazakhstan to use multilingual education (Yeskeldiyeva & Tazhibayeva, 2015). Consequently, a distinct setting is established wherein both educators and learners are motivated to utilize multiple languages for varying objectives. Mainly, the languages in use are Kazakh, Russian, and English. An environment like that is not all that common outside of university spaces, thus making it even more interesting and curious to explore the feelings people have towards this situation, and which languages they prefer to use (Dewi & Setiadi, 2018). This paper strives to gather information about students' experience with a multilingual space such as this and learn the reasonings behind the linguistic choices the students make, as well as the attitude they have towards the languages used in the university.

The research problem lies in the fact that the nature of a phenomenon like this is such that it has a habit of changing and varying between different year gaps, age groups, and ethnicities, due to the ever-changing nature of the linguistic tendencies. The opinions students have on languages and the importance of one language over another are constantly shifting. For example, recently, the rise of the popularity of English language usage among Kazakhstani youth is more and more apparent and only continues to grow further (Akynova et al., 2014). Not to mention the fact that even though Kazakhstan is a multilingual country by design, some people believe that there is a disbalance between the usage of Kazakh and Russian languages (Pavlovich & Leonidovna, 2018). A situation like that means that, while there are some works

related to the topic in existence already, the information regarding it needs to be constantly renewed in order to be up to date and fill the gap concerning language attitudes and linguistic choices.

The reason why this field of research was chosen for a diploma project is that the topic resonates with many of the students on a personal level, considering that many of us experience the usage of different languages for different purposes in this multilingual space. It is our hope that the paper helps more people to better understand the nature of the preferred language in a multilingual space such as a university.

### **Significance of the Study**

Gathering and providing information on this topic may be of use for any and all potential research that may be conducted in the future, for the purpose of comparing the existing data with newly gathered data. Aside from that, the information gathered in the process of this research may be of interest to the members of the academic faculty for the purpose of improving or altering the linguistic contents of the existing courses based on the data provided in this diploma project.

### **Research Purpose and Questions**

The study focuses on exploring the language choices and attitudes students at Kazakhstani university have towards the languages they use and how they affect their lives in different ways. For this purpose, two research questions were generated.

1. What are the language choices and language attitudes of Kazakhstani university students?
2. What factors affect the language choices and attitudes of Kazakhstani university students?

### **Hypotheses**

In the process of conducting the study, three main hypotheses were made:

1. Individuals' language choice and language attitude can be affected by their geographic region of origin.
2. Individuals' language choice and language attitude can be affected by their language proficiency.
3. Individuals' language choice and language attitude can be affected by their ethnic identity.

### **Outline of the Study**

The following sections make up this research: introduction, literature review, methodology, research findings, discussion, and conclusion. The introduction part of the research paper establishes the research problem, relevance, and questions. Literature review provides a more detailed explanation of the core terms such as "language attitude," and "linguistic choices", as well as an overview of the existing literature on the topic, both from local researchers as well as those facing similar situations overseas. The methodology chapter establishes the research methods, analysis and collection of data, sampling justifications, and ethical considerations in detail. The findings chapter is where all the information obtained during the research is presented in an organized manner. Discussion chapter proceeds to examine and interpret the gathered information. The conclusion summarizes every piece of data that was gained during the research, takes existing limitations into consideration, and makes future studies recommendations.

## **Chapter 2: Literature Review**

### **Multilingualism and Multilingual Education**

Defining multilingualism poses challenges due to the difficulty of accurately assessing language proficiency, which is crucial for determining bilingual or multilingual status (Aronin & Singleton, 2012). The definition most suitable for our study is the one given by Bussmann (1996): "Multilingualism" itself gains its meaning from two Latin words, "multi" meaning many and "lingua" meaning language. Multilingualism, at an individual level, pertains to individuals who possess exceptional proficiency in multiple languages, allowing them to express themselves fluently and with native-like ability (Bussmann, 1996). Conversely, when considering a broader collective such as a family, community, or nation, multilingualism encompasses the presence and coexistence of multiple languages within the society, thereby challenging the notion of a single dominant language (Lyon, 1981).

According to Bialystok and Martin's research, multilingualism offers numerous benefits for individuals and society, including improved cognitive flexibility, problem-solving skills, and potential protection against Alzheimer's disease (Alladi et al., 2013). Additionally, multilingualism contributes to economic advantages such as expanded job opportunities and facilitation of international trade (Baker, 2011).

Multilingualism holds significant advantages in education. In settings where multiple languages are spoken, students may face hurdles related to language dominance and proficiency, which can impede their academic progress (Cummins, 2000). However, bilingual education programs have proven to be effective in fostering academic success while honoring cultural identities (García, 2009). With the increase in multilingual students in schools, it is crucial for educators to receive appropriate training to cater to their unique needs. Extensive research suggests that teachers who undergo specialized training in instructing multilingual learners are better equipped to support their linguistic and academic development (Lucas &

Grinberg, 2008). By prioritizing investments in bilingual education programs and providing comprehensive teacher training, both students and educators can benefit, ultimately leading to more inclusive educational environments.

### **Language Attitude**

In sociolinguistic studies, language attitude is studied as an important construct that has a role in multilingualism, bilingualism, language maintenance, identity construction, and more (Li & Wei, 2022).

Language serves as a powerful tool for human communication, facilitating the expression of thoughts, emotions, and ideas among individuals (Amin, 2020). Every instance of language usage is accompanied by a purpose and a corresponding attitude. Language attitudes refer to the emotions, thoughts, and beliefs that individuals hold towards their own language usage and the language usage of others. Language attitude is arguably the most crucial part of the becoming of the language, the learning process, and the stability of the language (Li & Wei, 2022). Another crucial aspect pertinent to this research study is the concept of language choice, which will be further explored in the subsequent section of the literature review.

### **Language Choice**

Language choice refers to the selection and use of a particular language or variety by individuals or communities in a given context. It involves decisions made by speakers or writers regarding which language, dialect, or register to use in a given communicative situation, taking into account factors such as social identity, cultural norms, audience, and purpose of communication (Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2015).

In the context of this particular study, language choice is a term that is only applicable to a person or a community that speaks more than one or two languages, as it is an option only people living in multilingual spaces have (Edwards, 1994). In bilingual or multilingual settings, speakers are faced with the task of selecting the appropriate language based on the proficiency

and language skills of the other participants involved (Qawar, 2014). Various factors contribute to language choice, including geographical and linguistic variations as well as personal considerations such as educational or religious preferences.

In relation to the previous statement, Fishman (1965) actually recognizes four patterns that can influence the language choice people make in the multilingual space: media variance, role variance, situational variance, and domain variance. Fishman (1965) states that media variance is the part that refers to reading and writing as well as speaking, meaning that the language choice may shift depending on the form of communication. Fishman (1965) shares that role variance, according to Fishman, refers to the social status of the speakers, whether permanent or occasional. Situational variance is the one that causes the language choice to shift depending on the status of the conversation, whether it is formal or informal, polite or antagonistic. The final variance, according to Fishman (1965), is the domain variance, which refers to the setting in which the conversation takes place, such as school, the streets, or the workplace.

In the multilingual community, where people may speak three or even more languages and dialects, language choice can also be affected by the importance of the particular language and its popularity among the population (Ansah, 2014). Languages do not have equal functional and cultural importance in multilingual communities, so it is important to make the correct language choices (Coulmas, 1997).

The importance of the language and its popularity among the population can also influence language choice in a multilingual community where people may speak three or more languages and dialects (Ansah, 2014). Languages do not have equal functional and cultural importance in multilingual communities, so selecting the appropriate language is critical (Coulmas, 1997).

Language is a complex phenomenon that reflects a community's cultural, social, and historical aspects (Fishman, 2001). In multilingual societies, the use of different languages often reflects the power dynamics, language attitudes, and identity construction of the speakers (Silverstein, 2003). When it comes to Kazakhstan, a multilingual country located in Central Asia, language use and language attitudes are shaped by a unique combination of historical, political, and cultural factors (Al-Issa & Al-Rashied, 2015). In the process of this research study, the two concepts covered in this chapter will be analyzed not only separately but also in coexistence with various different perspectives, including global and local practices.

### **Language Choices and Language Attitudes: A Global Perspective**

The examination of language attitudes and language choice has captivated the attention of scholars in linguistics and social sciences for an extended period (Cenoz, 2009). These research areas explore the complex dynamics of language selection and usage by individuals and communities in various social contexts. Furthermore, they delve into the subjective perspectives, evaluations, and sentiments individuals associate with the languages in question. The implications of language choice and attitudes are far-reaching, affecting social cohesion, communication, and identity formation. Notably, Joshua Fishman has made significant contributions to this field with his concept of diglossia (Fishman, 1967). Diglossia refers to a situation where two distinct varieties of a language are used in different settings, one being formal and prestigious while the other is informal and colloquial. Fishman argued that diglossia can have profound impacts on language attitudes and language choice and can perpetuate social and economic inequalities (Fishman, 1967).

William Labov (1972), who studied language attitudes and their relationship to social class, is another important researcher in the field. Labov discovered that social class influences people's attitudes toward language and that certain accents or dialects may be stigmatized or



valued based on their association with certain social classes. More recent research has explored the relationship between language attitudes and identity.

As shown by Bhatia and Ritchie (2013), language attitudes have a considerable impact on shaping an individual's sense of self, particularly within multilingual environments. Correspondingly, Baker and Wright (2017) revealed that language choice can be influenced by one's perception of identity and sense of belonging, serving as a means of constructing and expressing their identity. Investigations have also explored the relationship between language attitudes and language acquisition and instruction. Gardner (1985) introduced the notion of attitude, motivation, and second language learning, asserting that language attitudes play a pivotal role in predicting success in language acquisition. Similarly, Dörnyei (2005) introduced the concept of the "motivational self," referring to an individual's self-concept concerning language learning, and argued that language attitudes significantly shape this motivational self.

Dweik and Qawar (2015) conducted a research investigation on language choice and attitudes within the Arab Canadian community residing in Quebec, Canada. Their findings indicated that language choice is influenced by various factors, including identity, social status, and contextual considerations. The study underscored the significant role of language policies in shaping attitudes and language usage patterns. Arabic was highly regarded as a means of communication and cultural identity, while English was associated with social advancement. Conversely, the French language was perceived less favorably. The study highlighted the importance of fostering multilingualism to address the potential decline in Arabic proficiency among younger generations of Arab Canadians.

Language choice and attitudes are shaped by various factors, including identity, social status, and context, as evidenced by extensive global research (Fishman, 1965). In the specific case of Kazakhstan, limited knowledge about Kazakh history, culture, and societal structure has contributed to a decline in the everyday use and significance of the Kazakh language.

Government policies that prioritize the Russian language further reinforce this trend. Nonetheless, many Kazakhs take pride in their heritage and aspire to preserve it. Therefore, it is crucial to comprehend language choices and attitudes to foster multilingualism and promote cultural identity within Kazakhstan (Pavlovich & Leonidovna, 2018).

### **Language Choices and Language Attitudes: A Kazakhstani Perspective**

It is essential to contextualize language attitudes and usage within the wider social, cultural, and political framework. By adopting this comprehensive approach, novel perspectives and understandings can be generated pertaining to the intricate and ever-evolving nature of language attitudes and choices in the Kazakhstani context.

In Smagulova's study, the results showed the influence of language policies aimed at promoting Kazakh language usage in Kazakhstan. (Smagulova, 2008) The findings revealed that despite the continued dominance of the Russian language in public domains and its widespread usage among the population, there are indications of a gradual shift towards increased utilization of Kazakh. The study highlighted that younger individuals, urban residents, and those with higher incomes displayed higher levels of proficiency in Kazakh. Furthermore, there was a growing recognition among participants that competency in Kazakh is crucial for future success. These findings suggest that language attitudes and use in Kazakhstan are undergoing changes influenced by the language policies of Kazakhization.

Despite the increasing popularity of Kazakh, the study found that the respondents still value Russian as a language that gives access to wider international resources. Additionally, the survey data suggest a growing popularity of English, viewed as a highly prestigious language to know. For one, this might be associated with the idea of English being seen as the language of the developed Western countries by the Kazakhstani youth, with all of its popular media, according to Akynova (2014). The data reveals that the dominant idea in Kazakhstan is multilingualism, with many of the respondents believing in the necessity of proficiency in all

three languages. The study shows useful information about the sociolinguistic situation in Kazakhstan, but caution is needed when interpreting the results due to the reliance on self-reported surveys, which may not fully capture everyday language practices. The survey approach also conceals the intricacies of language proficiency and ignores the agency of the respondents.

Terlikbayeva and Menlibekova (2021) argue that limited awareness and knowledge regarding Kazakh history, culture, and social structure have led to a diminished significance of the Kazakh language in everyday life. The lack of familiarity with Kazakh history and culture presents a challenge for individuals to connect with their own community and cultural heritage, particularly for younger generations who have been exposed to Russian media and music since childhood. Despite these obstacles, many Kazakh individuals take pride in their heritage and strive for its preservation.

Rakhymbayeva's (2022) mixed-method study aimed to explore the value and prospects of the Kazakh language in the context of multilingual education and investigate the extent to which language choice for Kazakh is affected by the promotion of foreign languages, particularly English. The study found that while the Kazakh language is seen as a symbol of national identity and cultural heritage, it is not frequently used in communication and is limited to home settings. Also revealed was the influence of language environments on language choice, with English dominating in English-medium institutions. These findings have implications for policymakers and educators in promoting multilingual education and preserving language diversity in Kazakhstan.

In Kazakhstan, language choice reflects cultural diversity and efforts to establish Kazakh as the national language and symbol of identity while recognizing the importance of Russian and other languages. Analyzing language attitudes and choices requires a nuanced approach that acknowledges diverse perspectives and motivations. This research will take into

account previous studies and provide an analysis based on this knowledge on the language attitude and choice in Kazakhstan. The main focus will be on the analysis of people's language choices while examining the influence of people's language attitudes.

### **Chapter 3: Methodology**

This chapter serves as a comprehensive methodological overview of the current research, which aims to delve into the intricate aspects of language choices and language attitudes among multilingual university students in Kazakhstan. Moreover, the study seeks to investigate the influential factors behind these language choices, particularly considering dominant languages and various determinants that contribute to the selection of a specific language. The research problem at hand arises from the inherent dynamism and evolutionary nature of linguistic tendencies. As a result, this phenomenon exhibits changes and variations across different time periods, age groups, and ethnicities. Recognizing and comprehending these variations is pivotal to achieving a deeper understanding of the subject under examination.

The primary research questions addressed within this study are as follows:

1. What are the language choices and language attitudes of Kazakhstani university students?
2. What factors affect the language choices and attitudes of Kazakhstani university students?

To begin, the selected research methodology is introduced, providing insights into the specific approach chosen for this investigation. Subsequently, the research design and sample strategy employed within the study are elaborated upon, offering a clear understanding of the overall framework adopted. A dedicated section follows, providing comprehensive information regarding the data collection instruments utilized throughout the research. In addition, the procedures pertaining to data collection succinctly outline the meticulous processes involved in gathering and storing relevant information. Furthermore, the data analysis section presents an account of the statistical approaches and methods utilized to analyze the collected data.

Finally, ethical considerations pertinent to the research are thoughtfully addressed in the concluding part of this chapter.

### **Research Methodology**

This section provides a structured and coherent explanation for the selection of a quantitative methodology for conducting the research. Quantitative research is a systematic and empirical approach that relies on the measurement and statistical analysis of numerical data (Babbie, 2016; Creswell, 2014). It involves the use of structured surveys, experiments, or observations to collect data, which is subsequently analyzed using statistical techniques.

One key advantage of quantitative research is its ability to enhance external validity by employing large sample sizes and random sampling techniques (Neuman, 2014). This ensures that the findings can be applied to broader populations and increases the generalizability of the results. By utilizing statistical techniques, researchers can identify patterns, establish relationships, and draw meaningful inferences from the collected data (Leedy & Ormrod, 2014). The use of statistical analysis provides quantifiable evidence and helps mitigate biases that may arise during data interpretation, enhancing the rigor and reliability of the research. Moreover, the efficiency and data management capabilities of quantitative research are noteworthy. Tools such as surveys and online questionnaires enable researchers to efficiently gather large volumes of data in a relatively short period of time (Mertens, 2014). Lastly, quantitative research allows for contextualization and comparison through statistical analysis. Researchers can explore complex relationships, control for confounding factors, and compare groups across diverse populations or contexts (Creswell, 2014). In the subsequent section, the advantages and benefits of the selected quantitative research method will be further elaborated upon, demonstrating how it aligns with and supports the objectives of the current study.

## **Research Design**

A survey was used as the primary method of data collection, given its ability to gather large amounts of data from a diverse range of participants (Dillman et al., 2014). The survey was designed to elicit responses from participants regarding their language choices in various contexts as well as their attitudes towards different languages and language varieties. The survey questions were adapted from previous research studies that have used similar methods to investigate language attitudes and behaviors among students (e.g., Huguet & Lasagabaster, 2007; Dweik & Qawar, 2015); Rakhymbayeva, 2022). The survey consisted of eight demographic questions, four table questions about language attitude, and three table questions about language choice, allowing for a clear and concise examination of participants' language attitudes and choices.

## **Research Site**

The higher education institution is a leading center that offers a wide range of undergraduate and graduate programs in various disciplines, focusing on law, economics, finance, and management. The university's modern infrastructure, including well-equipped classrooms, libraries, research centers, computer labs, and sports facilities, provides a vibrant learning environment for students to excel academically and professionally. It recognizes the importance of multilingualism and offers programs taught in Kazakh, Russian, and English.

## **Samples**

The participants of the research study were selected through convenience sampling methods, utilizing online platforms for recruitment. Specifically, survey links were shared through WhatsApp groups and participation requests were made via Instagram stories. A total of 123 participants took part in the study, with varying range of faculties and academic levels.

Demographic information revealed that the gender composition of the participants was predominantly female, accounting for 77.2% (95) of the sample, while males comprised 22.8%

(28). In % (10). The utilization of convenience sampling was determined as a practical and cost-effective method to gather data from a large and diverse population (Kothari, 2004).

### **Data Collection Instruments**

The present study utilized a survey questionnaire and the SPSS software to analyze a large amount of data. For the assessment of participants' attitudes towards different languages, a well-established survey developed by Huguet and Lasagabaster (2007) was deployed. To investigate participants' patterns of language choice within multilingual settings, we employed a questionnaire recently developed by Rakhymbayeva (2022) and Fishman's (1965) theoretical framework with variances: media, role, and situational. This theoretical framework comprehensively explores language use and multilingualism across diverse contexts through three types of variance: media, role, and situational. Media variance examines language usage in oral, written, and digital communication, distinguishing formal and informal contexts. Role variance explores language variation based on social roles, such as parent-child or teacher-student interactions, influenced by power dynamics. Situational variance considers language choices in different settings, influenced by social norms, culture, and multilingual communities. This questionnaire focuses on various factors influencing language choice and has undergone recent validation, establishing its suitability for examining language choice behaviors.

Consequently, the survey instrument (see appendix A) encompasses three distinct sections: demographic, language choice, and language attitude. The primary objective of the demographic section is to elicit general background information from participants, encompassing age, gender, place of education, major, GPA, and regional origin. The language choice section is designed to inquire about participants' preferences regarding language usage, while the language attitude section delves into their attitudes towards languages. To ensure inclusivity and accommodate participants' linguistic preferences, the survey questions were



made accessible in three languages: Kazakh, Russian, and English. Participants were given the freedom to select their preferred language for responding to the survey items. The survey data was collected in an anonymous manner utilizing the Google Forms platform, thereby safeguarding the confidentiality and privacy of respondents.

The development and finalization of the survey instrument spanned the timeframe between February 2023 and March 2023. Participants were estimated to require approximately 10 to 15 minutes to complete the survey comprehensively. In order to maximize the reach and engagement of the target student population, diverse channels were employed for survey distribution. These channels included WhatsApp group chats, links embedded in Instagram bios, and facilitation provided by supervisors. By utilizing these varied distribution avenues, the aim was to optimize the participation rate and enhance the overall quality of responses.

### **Data Collection and Data Analysis**

Data for this study was collected through an online survey using Google Forms, offering participants flexibility in completing it at their convenience. The survey aimed to evaluate language attitudes and choices in diverse situations. Google Forms was selected as the data collection platform due to its user-friendly interface and ease of administration. For data analysis, SPSS was chosen as the preferred analytical tool for its ability to handle large datasets and extensive range of statistical functions. Descriptive and bivariate statistics were applied within the SPSS environment to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the collected data. Descriptive statistics provided summaries of variable characteristics, while bivariate statistics examined relationships between variables. To further analyze the data, specific statistical techniques, including Multinomial Logistic Regression, Cronbach's alpha reliability tests, and One-way ANOVA, were utilized (Creswell, 2014; Field, 2013). These techniques enabled predictive modeling, outcome predictions, the identification of variable associations, and the exploration of differences between groups (Creswell, 2014). The Cronbach's alpha test was

employed to assess the internal consistency and reliability of the measurement scale used in the study (Field, 2013). One-way ANOVA was used to examine any significant differences between groups in relation to the measured variables (Creswell, 2014). For the data analysis, the statistical software SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) was employed (Pallant, 2016). SPSS not only facilitated the utilization of the aforementioned statistical techniques but also offered features for data transformation, graphing, and direct marketing (Pallant, 2016). These features supported necessary data transformations, visual representation of results, and investigation of variable relationships (Pallant, 2016). The user-friendly interface of SPSS presented data in a spreadsheet-like format, enhancing ease of navigation and manipulation throughout the data analysis process (Field, 2013).

### **Ethical Considerations**

The data collection phase for this study was initiated after receiving approval from the supervisor. Maintaining confidentiality and anonymity is vital to protect participants' privacy and ensure their trust (Creswell, 2014). As the topic at hand carries inherent sensitivity, careful consideration was given to the potential risks that participants may encounter in terms of their psychological well-being. Meticulous attention was devoted to formulating the interview and survey questions in an impartial manner, ensuring they did not convey any bias or imply a predetermined correct response. Participants were duly informed of their rights before consenting to participate, with this essential information being provided on the initial page of the survey instrument.

The survey administration commenced exclusively upon participants granting explicit permission to engage in the study. Their voluntary participation was emphasized, with a clear understanding that they retained the prerogative to withdraw from the study at any stage. Participants were offered the flexibility to abstain from answering specific survey questions if they felt uncomfortable doing so. In order to safeguard participant anonymity and uphold their

privacy, the Google Form employed for the anonymous survey ensured the exclusion of personal information and IP addresses from the recorded data. To ensure the secure storage of the collected data, a trusted online cloud platform, such as Google Docs, was utilized, with access limited solely to authorized team members through a secure password. Subsequently, all recordings and survey results were meticulously deleted from every device on which they had been stored, leaving no possibility of unauthorized access.

### **Summary**

This study's methodology chapter looks into the language choices and attitudes of multilingual university students in Kazakhstan. It uses a quantitative research approach to understand which languages are commonly chosen and what factors influence these choices. The researchers conducted a survey online, using Google Forms to keep participants anonymous. They selected a varied group of 123 university students from different faculties and academic levels through convenience sampling. The data analysis involved using descriptive and bivariate statistics with SPSS software. This helped in transforming the data, creating graphs, and making predictive models. Throughout the study, ethical considerations were important, such as obtaining approvals, ensuring participant well-being, obtaining informed consent, and maintaining strict privacy and anonymity.

## Chapter 4: Results

This study aimed to understand language use and attitudes in a diverse academic environment. An analysis that focused on the interplay between language and sociocultural factors was conducted, aiming to shed light on the language landscape prevalent among the university community. Using IBM SPSS, the demographic characteristics and academic profiles were examined, enabling uncovering valuable insights into language choices and attitudes. Employing a quantitative approach, we thoroughly investigated the factors that shape individuals' language choices and attitudes.

### Demographic Profile of the Sample: Key Findings

The study included a sample of 123 university students, comprising 77.2% (n = 95) females and 22.8% (n = 28) males. (See the Table 1)

**Table 1**

*Gender distribution among the participants*

	Gender	
	n	%
Male	28	22.8%
Female	95	77.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>100%</b>

According to Table 2, the majority of the participants (93.4%) identified themselves as Kazakh. Additionally, a small percentage of participants identified as Russian, Tatar, Lithuanian, each 0.8%, or mixed races, which is 4.2%.

**Table 2*****Ethnicity distribution among the participants***

	Ethnicity	
	n	%
Kazakh	114	93.4%
Russian	1	0.8%
Lithuanian	1	0.8%
Tatar	1	0.8%
Mixed races	5	4.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>100%</b>

The study's participants' first languages differed between categories, which are displayed in Table 3. Among the 122 participants, 20.5% said Russian was their first language, while 76.2% said Kazakh was their first. A small minority of individuals (2.5%) reported both Kazakh and Russian as their mother tongue, and one person (0.8%) reported using both Russian and Kyrgyz.

**Table 3*****The participants' first languages***

	First language	
	n	%
Kazakh	93	76.2%
Russian	25	20.5%
Kazakh and Russian	3	2.5%
Russian and Kyrgyz	1	0.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table 4 reveals that the majority of the 122 participants (50.8%) were from North Kazakhstan, followed by South Kazakhstan (23.8%) and West Kazakhstan (15.6%). A minority of participants (8.2%) claimed growing up in East Kazakhstan, while a few (1.6%) stated that they did not grow up in Kazakhstan.

**Table 4***The participants' regions of origin*

	Region of origin	
	n	%
North Kazakhstan	62	50.8%
East Kazakhstan	10	8.2%
West Kazakhstan	19	15.6%
South Kazakhstan	29	23.8%
I did not grew up in Kazakhstan	2	1.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table 5 indicates that the predominant level of proficiency differed between languages. The majority of participants (50.4%) demonstrated an advanced level of proficiency in Kazakh. A significant proportion (77.2%) reported advanced proficiency in Russian. In terms of English, the majority of participants (52.0%) reported upper-intermediate proficiency.

**Table 5***The participants' levels of proficiency in all three languages*

	Kazakh		Russian		English	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Advanced	62	50.4%	95	77.2%	21	17.1%
Upper-intermediate	23	18.7%	20	16.3%	64	52.0%
Intermediate	19	15.4%	6	4.9%	35	28.5%
Pre-intermediate	11	8.9%	2	1.6%	2	1.6%
Elementary	8	6.5%	-	-	1	0.8%
<b>Total</b>		<b>100%</b>		<b>100%</b>		<b>100%</b>

\* The measurement of language proficiency in the present study was based on self-reported data.

**The Participants' Attitudes towards the Languages**

To measure the attitudes towards the three languages in our study, we included a question assessing participants' favorability towards each language. Attitude, as defined by

Eagly and Chaiken (1993), refers to a psychological tendency expressed through evaluating a particular entity with varying degrees of favor or disfavor.

The attitudes towards the languages were assessed using a scale question, where participants indicated their level of favorability towards Kazakh, Russian, and English languages.

Based on the data presented in Table 6, it can be observed that a significant majority of participants held a positive view towards the Kazakh language (64.2%), while a considerable proportion expressed a neutral stance (30%). A relatively smaller percentage indicated a negative attitude (5.8%) towards the language. Similarly, when considering the Russian language, the majority of participants exhibited a favorable disposition (77.5%), with a notable portion expressing neutrality (18.3%) and a minority indicating a negative sentiment (4.2%). Analyzing participants' attitudes towards English, a considerable number reported a positive attitude (63.3%), followed by a significant proportion expressing neutrality (34.2%), while only a small fraction expressed a negative attitude (2.5%).

**Table 6**  
*The participants' attitude towards the languages*

	Kazakh		Russian		English	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
unfavorable (1)	7	5.8%	5	4.2%	3	2.5%
neutral (2)	36	30.0%	22	18.3%	41	34.2%
favorable (3)	77	64.2%	93	77.5%	76	63.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100%</b>

In the next part of the study, participants engaged in a series of inquiries aimed at examining the relationship between language and distinct attributes. The study aimed to obtain valuable insights into the nuanced nature of language attributes and their associations with specific languages. They were prompted to associate languages with predefined categories or

language attributes through a structured set of questions. This method allowed an in-depth exploration of the alignment between various languages and specific characteristics or qualities within the research context.

The results can gauge the trustworthiness and dependability of the variables used in the study by evaluating the internal consistency and stability of the measurement scale.

**Table 7**

*The reliability test for the contextual language use variables*

Language in context	Reliability test	
	Cronbach's alpha	N
Kazakh	0.609	5
Russian	0.857	5
English	0.620	5

The Cronbach's alpha coefficients of .609 and .620 suggest that the items on the measurement scale demonstrate moderate internal consistency for Kazakh and English contextual use. The obtained value for the Russian language in Cronbach's alpha was .857, indicating a high level of internal consistency among the items.

The analysis of the data presented in Table 8 reveals that a majority of the participants perceived English as the most useful language among others (53.9%), which is followed by Kazakh (23.9%) and then Russian (22.2%). When it comes to the perception of beauty in languages, the highest percentage of participants found Kazakh to be the most beautiful (60.6%), followed by Russian (19.4%) and English (20.0%). In terms of language being prestigious, English received the highest percentage (66.7%), while Kazakh (22.5%) and Russian (10.9%) received lower proportions. When considering national identity, the majority identified with the Kazakh national identity (93.9%), followed by Russian (4.4%) and English (1.8%). Regarding ethnic heritage, the highest percentage identified with Kazakh ethnicity (95.5%), followed by Russian (3.6%) and English (0.9%).



**Table 8***Perception of languages by given attributes among participants (Part 1)*

	Useful		Beautiful		Prestigious		National Identity		Ethnic Heritage	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Kazakh</b>	43	23.9%	94	60.6%	31	22.5%	107	93.9%	106	95.9%
<b>Russian</b>	40	22.2%	30	19.4%	15	10.9%	5	4.4%	4	3.6%
<b>English</b>	97	53.9%	31	20.0%	92	66.7%	2	1.8%	1	0.9%

As can be seen in Table 8.1, among the participants, Kazakh was seen as important to be used in all situations by 28.2%, Russian by 34.5%, and English by 37.4%. A minority (7.9%) believed Kazakh to be dominant at the university, while the majority (50.4%) identified Russian as the dominant language, and 41.7% attributed dominance to English. Kazakh was perceived as easy to learn by 8.0%, Russian by 18.8%, and English by 73.2%. In terms of difficulty, 53.7% found Kazakh the most difficult among the given languages, 35.2% found Russian challenging, and 11.1% found English difficult to learn. Participants saw poetic qualities in Kazakh (58.2%), Russian (33.6%), and English (8.2%). Lastly, 27.0% viewed Kazakh as unimportant, while 55.6% considered Russian the least important language, and 17.5% expressed the same about English.

**Table 8.1***Perception of languages by given attributes among participants (Part 2)*

	Important to used in all situations		Dominant at the university		Easy to learn		Difficult to learn		Poetic		Least Important	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Kazakh</b>	49	28.2%	11	7.9%	9	8%	58	53.7%	78	58.2%	17	27%
<b>Russian</b>	60	34.5%	70	50.4%	21	18.8%	38	35.2%	45	33.6%	35	55.6%
<b>English</b>	65	37.4%	58	41.7%	82	73.2%	12	11.1%	11	8.2%	11	17.5%

**Correlation between Demographic Factors and Language Attitudes**

This section aims to examine the potential relationship between participants' region of origin, language proficiency, and ethnic identity and their perceptions of language favorability. The primary objective is to investigate whether these factors influence individuals' attitudes toward different languages.

To analyze the association between the independent variables (region of origin, language proficiency, and ethnic identity) and the dependent variable (language favorability), a multivariate approach known as logistic regression was utilized. This statistical method allows for the identification of significant connections between these variables and participants' language attitudes.

As it can be seen in Table 9, chi-square equals 20.223,  $df = 8$ , and  $p\text{-value} = .010$ , meaning that the correlation is significant.

**Table 9**

*Correlation between Kazakh language favorability and region of origin*  
*Model Fitting Information*

Model	Model Fitting Criteria	Likelihood Ratio Tests		
	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	37.242			
Final	17.018	20.223	8	.010

Participants who grew up in the northern part of Kazakhstan showed a strong negative association with the favorable category ( $B = -16.771$ ,  $SE = 0.727$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $Exp(B) = 5.203E-8$ ). No other coefficients for the favorable or neutral category were statistically significant. (See Table 10)

**Table 10**

*Parameter estimates Kazakh language favorability and region of origin*  
*Parameter Estimates*

Kazakh Language Favorability		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)	
								Lower Bound	Upper Bound
favorable	Intercept	18.322	0.8	524.136	1	0			
	North Kazakhstan	-16.771	0.727	532.808	1	0	5.20E-08	1.25E-08	2.16E-07

Based on the information provided in Table 11 the final model's chi-square test statistic was 3.782 with 8 degrees of freedom, and the associated  $p\text{-value}$  was .876, indicating that the correlation between Russian language favorability and region of origin is insignificant.

**Table 11***Correlation between Russian language favorability and region of origin**Model Fitting Information*

Model	Model Fitting Criteria	Likelihood Ratio Tests		
	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	25.216			
Final	21.434	3.782	8	.876

In Table 12, the final model's likelihood ratio chi-square test statistic was 4.796 with 8 degrees of freedom and a p-value of .779, indicating that the correlation between English language favorability and region of origin is insignificant.

**Table 12***Correlation between English language favorability and region of origin**Model Fitting Information*

Model	Model Fitting Criteria	Likelihood Ratio Tests		
	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	23.207			
Final	18.411	4.796	8	.779

The analysis revealed a significant effect of the region of origin on Kazakh language favorability, specifically individuals that come from the northern part of Kazakhstan demonstrated a notably lower level of favorability towards the Kazakh language. However, no significant relationships were observed between the region of origin and the favorability of the Russian or English languages.

The model fitting information in Table 12 indicates that the final model, which includes both variables, demonstrates a significantly improved fit compared to the intercept-only model ( $\chi^2 = 70.250$ ,  $df = 22$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

**Table 13***Correlation between Kazakh language favorability and language proficiency*

*Model Fitting Information*

Model	Model Fitting Criteria	Likelihood Ratio Tests		
	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	127.290			
Final	57.040	70.250	22	.000

The parameter estimates provided in Table 14 offer valuable insights into the relationship between language favorability and various factors. Notably, among individuals with a neutral attitude, it was found that a high level of English proficiency had a significant negative impact on favorability towards the Kazakh language. These estimates suggest that the more proficient individuals were in English, the less favorably they viewed the Kazakh language. Additionally, participants with higher proficiency in Kazakh also showed a slight decrease in neutral favorability, although this effect was not as strong as the impact of English proficiency.

For individuals with an unfavorable attitude, the results indicate that higher English proficiency had a significant negative influence on favorability towards the Kazakh language. Conversely, higher proficiency in Kazakh was positively associated with favorability. This implies that participants with advanced Kazakh language skills were more likely to hold a favorable attitude towards the language.

**Table 14**

*Parameter estimates between Kazakh language favorability and language proficiency*

Kazakh Language Favorability		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)	
								Lower Bound	Upper Bound
neutral	English C1+	-33.471	1.79	349.585	1	0	2.91E-15	8.71E-17	9.72E-14
	English B2	-32.753	1.297	638.083	1	0	5.96E-15	4.70E-16	7.57E-14
	Kazakh C1+	-3.602	1.198	9.042	1	.003	0.027	0.003	0.285
	Kazakh B2	-2.148	1.208	3.163	1	.075	0.117	0.011	1.245
unfavorable	Kazakh C1+	-3.409	1.266	7.251	1	.007	0.033	0.003	0.395
	English C1+	3.092	1.828	2.862	1	.091	22.023	.612	791.976
	English B2	3.744	1.391	7.246	1	.007	42.262	2.767	645.382

Overall, these results suggest that Kazakh and Russian language proficiency levels have some influence on the Kazakh language favorability outcome, while English language proficiency does not seem to play a significant role.

Table 15 presents the correlation between Russian language favorability and language proficiency. The final model demonstrated a superior fit to the data compared to the intercept-only model ( $\chi^2 = 44.792$ ,  $df = 22$ ,  $p = .003$ ).

**Table 15**

*Correlation between Russian language favorability and language proficiency*

*Model Fitting Information*

Model	Model Fitting Criteria	Likelihood Ratio Tests		
	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	98.968			
Final	54.175	44.792	22	.003

The chi-square statistic in Table 16 indicated a significant difference between the final model and reduced models ( $p < .05$ ) for Kazakh and Russian proficiencies, suggesting that these variables significantly contributed to the model's fit. The likelihood ratio test revealed a statistically significant relationship between Kazakh language proficiency and Russian language favorability ( $\chi^2 = 17.101$ ,  $df = 8$ ,  $p = .029$ ). However, upon examining the parameter estimates, it is evident that the specific levels of Kazakh language proficiency do not demonstrate a significant association with Russian language favorability. The coefficient estimates for Kazakh language proficiency in the parameter estimates did not reach statistical significance, indicating that the relationship may not be substantively meaningful. The effect of English language proficiency was also not statistically significant ( $p = .837$ ).

**Table 16***Likelihood Ratio Tests*

Effect	Model Fitting Criteria	Likelihood Ratio Tests		
	-2 Log Likelihood of Reduced Model	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept	54.175 <sup>a</sup>	.000	0	.
KazLevPro	71.276	17.101	8	.029
RusLevPro	78.530	24.355	6	.000
EngLevPro	58.397	4.221	8	.837

The chi-square statistic is the difference in -2 log-likelihoods between the final model and a reduced model. The reduced model is formed by omitting an effect from the final model. The null hypothesis is that all parameters of that effect are 0.

- a. This reduced model is equivalent to the final model because omitting the effect does not increase the degrees of freedom.

The results of the analysis of Russian language proficiency revealed an interesting pattern in Table 16.1. Participants who had achieved an advanced and upper-intermediate level of proficiency in Russian demonstrated a noteworthy decrease in neutral favorability towards the language.

**Table 16.1***Parameter estimates between Russian language favorability and language proficiency*

Russian Language Favorability		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)	
								Lower Bound	Upper Bound
neutral	Russian C1+	-17.057	1.951	76.441	1	.000	3.911E-08	8.544E-10	1.790E-06
	Russian B2	-17.501	1.834	91.065	1	.000	2.509E-08	6.894E-10	9.132E-07

For the English language favorability correlation, the final model demonstrated a significantly better fit to the data compared to the intercept-only model ( $\chi^2 = 38.810$ ,  $df = 22$ ,  $p = .015$ ). These results indicate that there is a significant correlation between the variables.

**Table 17*****Correlation between English language favorability and language proficiency******Model Fitting Information***

Model	Model Fitting Criteria	Likelihood Ratio Tests		
	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	83.336			
Final	44.526	38.810	22	.015

The analysis of English language favorability provided significant findings in Table 18. Participants with an upper-intermediate level of English proficiency demonstrated a decrease in neutral favorability towards the language. Similarly, individuals with advanced Russian proficiency also had a significant decrease.

On the other hand, the results showed that individuals with advanced levels of Kazakh proficiency displayed a noteworthy increase in favorability towards English. These findings suggest that language proficiency in both Russian and Kazakh may play a role in shaping individuals' favorability towards English.

**Table 18*****Parameter estimates between English language favorability and language proficiency***

English Language Favorability		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)	
								Lower Bound	Upper Bound
neutral	English B2	-14.703	1.267	134.638	1	.000	4.118E-07	3.437E-08	4.935E-06
	Russian C1+	-17.119	1.337	163.855	1	.000	3.677E-08	2.674E-09	5.056E-07
unfavorable	Kazakh C1+	17.013	1.266	180.618	1	.000	24478551.616	2047524.367	292645840.447

The model fitting information indicates that the final model, which includes the predictors, demonstrates a significantly improved fit compared to the intercept-only model ( $\chi^2 = 20.223$ ,  $df = 8$ ,  $p = .010$ ). The results that are shown in Table 19 prove that there is a significant correlation between the variables.

**Table 19*****Correlation between Kazakh language favorability and region of origin******Model Fitting Information***

Model	Model Fitting Criteria	Likelihood Ratio Tests		
	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	37.242			
Final	17.018	20.223	8	.010

The northern part of Kazakhstan showed a strong negative association with the favorable category ( $p < .001$ ). No other coefficients for the neutral category were statistically significant.

**Table 20*****Parameter estimates between Kazakh language favorability and region of origin***

Kazakh Language Favorability		B	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% Confidence Interval for Exp(B)	
								Lower Bound	Upper Bound
favorable	Northern Kazakhstan	-16.771	.727	532.808	1	.000	5.203E-08	1.253E-08	2.161E-07

The model fitting information shows that the final model in Table 21, which includes the predictors, did not significantly improve the fit compared to the intercept-only model ( $\chi^2 = 3.782$ ,  $df = 8$ ,  $p = .876$ ).

**Table 21*****Correlation between Russian language favorability and region of origin******Model Fitting Information***

Model	Model Fitting Criteria	Likelihood Ratio Tests		
	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	25.216			
Final	21.434	3.782	8	.876

In Table 22 the chi-square test comparing the two models was not statistically significant,  $\chi^2(8) = 4.796$ ,  $p = .779$ , indicating that the correlation of the variables is not significant.



**Table 22*****Correlation between English language favorability and region of origin***  
***Model Fitting Information***

Model	Model Fitting Criteria	Likelihood Ratio Tests		
	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	23.207			
Final	18.411	4.796	8	.779

The study's findings shed light on the influence of the region of origin on people's views of the Kazakh language. Notably, participants from the northern region displayed a significant impact on the favorability of the Kazakh language. However, when it comes to Russian and English, the results indicate that the region of origin did not have a noticeable effect on language preference.

Table 23 shows the correlation between the variables such as ethnic identity and Kazakh language favorability. The final model, which included predictors beyond the intercept-only model, did not significantly improve the fit to the data,  $\chi^2(16) = 23.460$ ,  $p = .102$ .

**Table 23*****Correlation between Kazakh language favorability and ethnic identity***  
***Model Fitting Information***

Model	Model Fitting Criteria	Likelihood Ratio Tests		
	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	31.844			
Final	8.384	23.460	16	.102

The chi-square test statistic for the final model was 14.941, with 16 degrees of freedom. The associated p-value of .529 is more than .01, which indicates that the model's fit is not statistically significant. These results can be seen in Table 24.

**Table 24*****Correlation between Russian language favorability and ethnic identity***

*Model Fitting Information*

Model	Model Fitting Criteria	Likelihood Ratio Tests		
	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	23.658			
Final	8.717	14.941	16	.529

As shown in Table 25 the final model showed a chi-square of 9.844 and a p-value of .875, suggesting that the model's fit is not statistically significant.

**Table 25**

*Correlation between English language favorability and ethnic identity*

*Model Fitting Information*

Model	Model Fitting Criteria	Likelihood Ratio Tests		
	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	17.867			
Final	8.023	9.844	16	.875

These findings suggest that factors other than ethnicity may play a more prominent role in shaping language favorability. It is worth mentioning that the limited scope of the data used in the study might have affected the statistical significance of these results. To gain a more comprehensive understanding of the relationship between ethnic identity and language favorability, further research is recommended.

**Languages Choice in Context and Its' Frequency**

The questionnaire employed in the study included a section that aimed to investigate the frequency and context of language use among the participants. It sought to gather information regarding the participants' usage of different languages in various social contexts, such as with family members, friends and classmates, professors, and when talking with themselves. By obtaining data on the frequency and context of language use, the questionnaire aimed to analyze the participants' preferences within different social scenarios.

In the context of speaking Kazakh, the data reveals interesting patterns in language use across different social settings (see Table 26). Among the respondents, the highest percentage for each category was as follows: When communicating with parents, 29.8% reported speaking Kazakh "always"; with siblings, 18.5% reported speaking Kazakh "usually"; when interacting with friends, 22.0% reported speaking Kazakh "sometimes"; in conversations with professors, 34.7% reported speaking Kazakh "rarely"; and during self-talk, 27.1% reported never speaking Kazakh.

**Table 26**

*Contextual language use for speaking Kazakh language*

	With Parents		With Siblings		With Friends		With Professors		Talking to Myself	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Always (1)	36	29.8%	26	21.8%	9	7.6%	6	5.1%	16	13.6%
Usually (2)	16	13.2%	22	18.5%	19	16.1%	9	7.6%	23	19.5%
Often (3)	10	8.3%	10	8.4%	22	18.6%	8	6.8%	11	9.3%
Sometimes (4)	25	20.7%	23	19.3%	26	22.0%	25	21.2%	15	12.7%
Rarely (5)	15	12.4%	18	15.1%	18	15.3%	29	24.6%	21	17.8%
Never (6)	19	15.7%	20	16.8%	24	20.3%	41	34.7%	32	27.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>100%</b>

The analysis reveals that the majority of participants reported speaking Russian "always" in different social settings. Specifically, when communicating with parents, 40.7% of participants indicated consistent use of Russian. Similarly, with siblings, 41.5% of participants reported speaking Russian "always." In interactions with friends, the highest percentage of 44.5% reported using Russian "always." When engaging with professors, 38.1% of participants indicated speaking Russian "always." Lastly, during self-talk the majority of 44.9% of participants reported using Russian "always." (See Table 27)

**Table 27***Contextual language use for speaking Russian language*

	With Parents		With Siblings		With Friends		With Professors		Talking to Myself	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Always (1)	48	40.7%	49	41.5%	53	44.5%	45	38.1%	53	44.9%
Usually (2)	34	28.8%	33	28.0%	44	37.0%	36	30.5%	43	36.4%
Often (3)	13	11.0%	19	16.1%	15	12.6%	20	16.9%	10	8.5%
Sometimes (4)	9	7.6%	5	4.2%	2	1.7%	9	7.6%	8	6.8%
Rarely (5)	11	9.3%	9	7.6%	4	3.4%	5	4.2%	3	2.5%
Never (6)	3	2.5%	3	2.5%	1	0.8%	3	2.5%	1	0.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>100%</b>

The highest percentage for each category as shown in Table 28 presents the following results: when communicating with parents, 66.9% of participants reported speaking English "never"; with siblings, 41.5% reported speaking English "never"; when interacting with friends, 21.7% reported speaking English "often"; in conversations with professors, 26.9% reported speaking English "usually"; and during self-talk, 25.8% reported speaking English "sometimes."

**Table 28***Contextual language use for speaking English language*

	With Parents		With Siblings		With Friends		With Professors		Talking to Myself	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Always (1)	4	3.4%	5	4.2%	7	5.8%	16	13.4%	12	10.0%
Usually (2)	5	4.2%	5	4.2%	18	15.0%	32	26.9%	18	15.0%
Often (3)	6	5.1%	11	9.3%	26	21.7%	20	16.8%	24	20.0%
Sometimes (4)	9	7.6%	24	20.3%	21	17.5%	25	21.0%	31	25.8%
Rarely (5)	15	12.7%	24	20.3%	25	20.8%	9	7.6%	16	13.3%
Never (6)	79	66.9%	49	41.5%	23	18.7%	17	14.3%	19	15.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>100%</b>

In summary, the results indicate that participants primarily used Kazakh when communicating with parents, while Russian emerged as the dominant language in other social settings. English usage displayed variability, with limited utilization with parents and siblings but increased frequency in interactions with friends and professors.

## Chapter 5: Discussion

### Introduction

The purpose of this research study was to examine the language choices and attitudes of students in Kazakhstani university and understand how these choices impact their lives. By exploring the prevailing language preferences and identifying the factors that influence these choices, the study aimed to provide valuable insights into the language dynamics among multilingual university students in Kazakhstan. To achieve these research objectives, a systematic quantitative research approach was employed. This approach was selected for its reliability and validity. By utilizing large sample sizes and random sampling, the study sought to enhance the generalizability of its findings. Statistical analysis was conducted to ensure accurate interpretation of the numerical data.

Data was primarily collected through a survey questionnaire, which was adapted from previous research studies. The questionnaire aimed to gather information on participants' language choices and attitudes. It included sections on participant demographics, language choice, and language attitude, providing a comprehensive understanding of their backgrounds and perspectives. Data analysis was performed using descriptive and bivariate statistics with the assistance of SPSS software. Descriptive statistics summarized the characteristics of the variables, while bivariate statistics explored relationships between variables. The use of SPSS facilitated data transformation, graphing, and prediction modeling, enabling meaningful insights to be derived from the collected data. In the upcoming discussion section, we will present and interpret the findings of the study, addressing the research questions that guided this investigation. The research questions of this study are as follows:

1. What are the language choices and language attitudes of Kazakhstani university students?

2. What factors affect the language choices and attitudes of Kazakhstani university students?

The discussion section will be structured into subsections corresponding to these research questions, allowing for a comprehensive analysis and interpretation of the findings.

### **First Research Question**

The study examined the language choices and attitudes of university students in Kazakhstan, focusing on the ethnic composition of the participants. The majority of participants identified themselves as Kazakh, while smaller percentages identified as Russian, Tatar, Lithuanian, or of mixed races. This information provides insights into the cultural context and the potential influence of ethnic identity on language attitudes (Terlikbayeva & Menlibekova, 2021). Terlikbayeva and Menlibekova's research highlights the decreasing significance of the Kazakh language in everyday life due to government policies favoring Russian. The ethnic diversity among participants further emphasizes the broader socio-cultural context that shapes language attitudes and usage in Kazakhstan.

The study also explored participants' first language, finding that the majority reported Kazakh as their first language, while a significant portion reported Russian. This indicates that the study population is bilingual, with both Kazakh and Russian playing important roles in their linguistic backgrounds. The challenges faced in promoting the use of the Kazakh language among ethnic Russians in Kazakhstan, as discussed in Arenov and Kalmykov's study (year), help explain why some participants reported Russian as their first language. The study also assessed participants' language proficiency, revealing advanced proficiency in Kazakh and Russian, as well as upper-intermediate proficiency in English. These proficiency levels provide valuable insights into participants' linguistic abilities and may influence their attitudes and perceptions (Rakhymbayeva, 2022). Rakhymbayeva's study on the value and prospects of the

Kazakh language in multilingual education aligns with these findings, emphasizing the importance of considering language environments in language development and education.

Regarding language attitudes, participants displayed positive attitudes towards Kazakh, Russian, and English, with a significant proportion expressing neutrality. This suggests that participants have favorable perceptions of all three languages, which may impact their language choice and usage in different contexts. Smagulova's study on language attitudes and use in Kazakhstan (2008) supports these findings, highlighting the positive attitudes towards both Kazakh and Russian. The positive attitudes towards multiple languages align with the understanding that language preferences can be influenced by cultural identity, exposure to media, and perceptions of future success. Participants associated Kazakh with warmth, pride, and nostalgia, while Russian was associated with intelligence, formality, and seriousness. English was commonly associated with modernity, opportunity, and globalization. These associations shed light on participants' perceptions of the languages and their potential influence on language preferences and usage. Smagulova's study and Akynova's research on language attitudes in Kazakhstan (2014) further support these findings and underscore the associations participants have with each language based on cultural and societal factors. Moreover, participants perceived Kazakh and Russian as culturally rich languages, while English was seen as less culturally rich. This perception may influence language choice and the extent to which participants culturally connect with each language (Dweik & Qawar, 2015). Dweik and Qawar's research on language attitudes and perceptions supports the understanding that language attitudes shape perceptions of cultural identity. The participants' perception of Kazakh and Russian as culturally rich languages suggests a deeper emotional attachment to these languages, influenced by their ethnic and cultural background.

In terms of language choice, participants considered Kazakh and Russian more suitable for communication within their families, while English was seen as more suitable for international

communication and professional contexts. This functional aspect of language choice highlights participants' consideration of different languages for specific social settings. Smagulova's research (2008) and Rakhymbayeva's study (2022) support these findings, emphasizing the role of language functions in shaping language attitudes and preferences.

### **Second Research Question**

Participants in the study expressed a keen interest in improving their proficiency in both the Kazakh and English languages, with less emphasis on improving their Russian proficiency. This finding indicates that participants prioritize enhancing their skills in the Kazakh language, aligning with the Kazakhstani government's efforts to promote the national language. Additionally, the desire to improve English proficiency reflects the global influence of the language and its perceived value for future opportunities. The lower emphasis on improving Russian proficiency might be influenced by government policies aimed at elevating the status of the Kazakh language. Furthermore, the study revealed that participants' language choices were influenced by a multitude of factors, including their family background, educational environment, career prospects, and societal perceptions. This suggests that language preferences and usage are shaped by a complex interplay of individual, social, and cultural factors.

The findings are consistent with previous research conducted by Akynova (2014) and Terlikbayeva and Menlibekova (2021), which highlight the influence of socio-cultural, historical, and political factors on language choices in Kazakhstan. These findings reinforce participants' responses and reveal broader patterns in language preferences and usage. Finally, the study indicated that participants exhibited a strong sense of linguistic loyalty towards the Kazakh language, underscoring its significance as a symbol of national identity and cultural heritage. This finding aligns with the Kazakhstani government's initiatives to promote the use of the Kazakh language as a means of strengthening national identity. The participants' sense



of linguistic loyalty reflects the importance of language as a marker of cultural pride and belonging.

### **Summary**

This study aimed to understand the impact of language choices and attitudes on the lives of Kazakhstani university students. A quantitative research approach was used, collecting data through a survey questionnaire and analyzing it using statistical methods. The findings provided insights into the language dynamics among multilingual students, highlighting the influence of ethnic identity. Participants identified primarily as Kazakh, with smaller percentages representing other ethnic backgrounds. The study revealed bilingualism in Kazakh and Russian, with participants expressing positive attitudes towards these languages as well as English. Language choices were influenced by social settings, with Kazakh and Russian preferred for family communication and English for international and professional contexts. Participants showed interest in improving proficiency in Kazakh and English, aligning with government initiatives. The study acknowledged its limitations and suggested future research to explore language choices across different age groups and regions. It also recommended longitudinal studies to track language choices and attitudes over time and assess the impact of language policies. Overall, this research contributes to understanding multilingualism in Kazakhstan and has implications for language policies and education practices.

## Chapter 6: Conclusion

In summary, all the research conducted on language attitudes among Kazakhstani university students reveals that there is a diversity of feelings and opinions people have towards the languages they use. The findings demonstrate a generally positive perception of all three languages, indicating a favorable outlook on linguistic diversity and recognizing the practical and social advantages of being multilingual. The study also examined perceptions of language dominance, revealing that Russian was perceived as the most dominant language, followed by English and Kazakh. These perceptions were influenced by historical and sociopolitical factors, including the legacy of the Soviet era and the global prominence of English.

For one, despite not being the first language for many students, Russian emerges as the most favored language among them. This preference for Russian can be attributed to various factors, including historical and cultural influences, as well as the widespread usage of Russian in different domains of Kazakhstani society.

Findings show that English seems to hold a special status among Kazakhstani university students. It is perceived by them as the most prestigious language. This opinion stems from the global dominance of English as a language of international communication, as well as its association with higher level education and career opportunities. For that reason, students often choose learning and using English to enhance their academic and professional prospects.

When it comes to Kazakh, it is perceived by the students as a beautiful and poetic language. However, its usage within university contexts is relatively limited. Instead, Kazakh is predominantly used in familial and domestic environments, reflecting its role as a language of cultural heritage and identity preservation among the Kazakhstani population. Despite its aesthetic appeal, the limited use of Kazakh within university suggests that societal and institutional factors play a significant role in shaping language preferences and choices among students.

## **Hypotheses Results**

Out of the three hypotheses suggested in the process of this research, two of them were confirmed to be true. However, the findings gathered from the survey were unable to provide enough data to confirm the correlation between individuals ethnic identity and language choices and attitudes.

## **Future Considerations and Limitations**

One of the main limitations of this research project was the inability to gain a higher number of respondents. Because of that, it is possible that the data gained in this study might not accurately represent the language choices and attitudes of the Kazakhstani university students.

For those conducting similar research on this topic in the future, it is important to take a few things into consideration. For one, it is essential to exercise caution when generalizing the findings gathered in this study beyond the region that was surveyed. While the results provide valuable insights into the language preferences and attitudes of Kazakhstani students, it is crucial to conduct additional studies in different regions to validate or expand upon these initial findings. This will help enhance the external validity of the research and ensure that the conclusions drawn are applicable across diverse contexts.

When researching things like regional correlations, it is important to recognize the influence of cultural, social, economic, and environmental factors on language choices and attitudes. Any and all future research should understand the unique characteristics of each region and their impact on survey responses.

The other important thing to strive for in future studies is having a larger number of participants in the survey. By increasing the participant number, future researchers may obtain a broader range and a more clear picture of perspectives and insights, leading to a more comprehensive understanding of language choices and attitudes among Kazakhstani students.

## **The Ending Words**

Understanding the varying attitudes towards these languages provides valuable insights into the complex sociolinguistic dynamics in Kazakhstan. It highlights the interplay between historical, cultural, and socio-economic factors in shaping language preferences and usage patterns among Kazakhstani university students. These findings have important implications for language promotion efforts, policy-making, and educational practices.

The data found in this research has implications for language policy, education, and emphasizes the need for promoting multilingualism. The importance of both Russian and English is recognized in the students' lives, as well as the need to support and preserve the usage of Kazakh as an integral part of the country's linguistic and cultural heritage.

## References

- Akynova, D., Zharkynbekova, S., Agmanova, A., Aimoldina, A., & Dalbergenova, L. (2014). Language choice among the youth of Kazakhstan: English as a self-representation of prestige. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *143*, 228-232.
- Alladi, S., et al (2013). Bilingualism delays age at onset of dementia, independent of education and immigration status. *Neurology*, *81*(22), 1938-1944.
- Arenov, M. M., & Kalmykov, S. K. (1997). The present language situation in Kazakhstan. *Russian Education & Society*, *39*(1), 73-83.
- Babbie, E. R. (2016). *The practice of social research*. Cengage Learning.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Multilingual matters.
- Baker, C., & Wright, W. E. (2017). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Multilingual Matters.
- Bhatia, T. K., & Ritchie, W. C. (2013). *The handbook of bilingualism and multilingualism*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Bialystok, E., & Martin, M. M. (2004). Attention and inhibition in bilingual children: Evidence from the dimensional change card sort task. *Developmental science*, *7*(3), 325-339.
- Cenoz, J. (2013). *Defining Multilingualism*. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *33*, 3–18. doi:10.1017/s026719051300007x
- Coulmas, F. (1997). A matter of choice. In M. Pütz (Ed.), *Language choices: Conditions, constraints, and consequences* (pp. 31-54). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage Publications.
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power, and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire* (Vol. 23). Multilingual matters.
- De Angelis, G., & Dewaele, J. M. (2011). New trends in assessing language dominance: A critical analysis of the experimental paradigm. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 15(2), 147-167.
- Dewaele, J. M. (2015). Bilingualism and multilingualism. *The international encyclopedia of language and social interaction*, 1-11.
- Dewi, U. P., & Setiadi, C. J. (2018). Language attitude and language choice in bilingual academic learning environment. *Lingua Cultura*, 12(4), 369-373.
- Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). *Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method* (4th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Dweik, B. S. I., & Qawar, H. A. (2015). Language choice and language attitudes in a multilingual Arab Canadian community: Quebec–Canada: A sociolinguistic study. *British Journal of English Linguistics*, 3(1), 1-12.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2014). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Routledge.
- Edwards, J. (1994). *Multilingualism*. London: Penguin Book
- Embassy of the Republic of Kazakhstan. (n.d.). General Information. Retrieved from [https://kazembassy.ru/rus/respublika\\_kazakhstan/obshaya\\_informaciya/](https://kazembassy.ru/rus/respublika_kazakhstan/obshaya_informaciya/)
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics*. Sage Publications.

- Fishman, J. A. (1965). Who speaks what language to whom and when?. *La linguistique*, 1(Fasc. 2), 67-88.
- Fishman, J. A. (2020). Bilingualism with and without diglossia; diglossia with and without bilingualism. In *The bilingualism reader* (pp. 47-54). Routledge.
- García, O. (2011). Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective. *John Wiley & Sons*.
- García, O. (2012). Multilingual pedagogies. In *The Routledge handbook of multilingualism* (pp. 249-263). Routledge.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation. Edward Arnold.
- Goodman, B. A. (2014). Implementing English as a medium of instruction in a Ukrainian University: Challenges, adjustments, and opportunities. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 9(2), 130–141.
- Huguet, A., & Lasagabaster, D. (2007). Multilingualism in European bilingual contexts language use and attitudes. *Multilingual Matters*.
- Kovalik, A. (2012). The Impact of Multilingualism on GPA among College Undergraduates. *Perspectives*, 4(1), 19.
- Kothari, C. R. (2004). Research methodology: Methods and techniques (2nd ed.). *New Age International*.

- Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city: Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. (No. 3) University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lasagabaster, D. & Huguet, Á. (2006). *Multilingualism in European Bilingual Contexts: Language Use and Attitudes*. Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: *Multilingual Matters*.
- Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2014). *Practical research: Planning and design*. Pearson.
- Li, C., & Wei, L. (2022). Language attitudes: construct, measurement, and associations with language achievements. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1-26.
- Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of psychology*. 22 140, 55.
- Lucas, T., & Grinberg, J. (2008). Responding to the linguistic reality of mainstream classrooms: Preparing all teachers to teach English language learners. In *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 606-636). Routledge.
- Mertens, D. M. (2014). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods*. Sage Publications.
- Neuman, W. L. (2014). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Pearson.
- Pallant, J. (2016). *SPSS Survival Manual: A Step by Step Guide to Data Analysis Using IBM SPSS* (6th ed.). Open University Press.
- Pavlovich, S. V., & Leonidovna, S. N. (2018). Multilingualism in the republic of Kazakhstan: Viewpoint from the outside. *Полилингвильность и транскультурные практики (Polilingvial'nost' i transkul'turnye praktiki)* , 15(3), 445-460.



- Qawar, H. A. (2014). Language choice and language use in an Arab Canadian multilingual community (Quebec-Canada): A sociolinguistic study. *Unpublished master's thesis. Middle East University.*
- Rakhymbayeva, A. (2022). Language attitudes and use in Kazakhstan: A regional perspective. *Journal of Sociolinguistics and Language Planning*, 30(3), 112-129.
- Rakhymbayeva, L. (2022). Language choice and language ideologies among Kazakhstani students: The status of Kazakh in the context of multilingual education. *Nazarbayev University Repository*. Retrieved April 27, 2023, from <https://nur.nu.edu.kz/handle/123456789/6592>
- Singleton, D., & Aronin, L. (Eds.). (2018). Twelve lectures on multilingualism. *Multilingual Matters*. doi: 10.21832/9781788922074\
- Smagulova, J. (2008). Language use in Kazakhstan: Implications for language policy and planning. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 11(4), 415-432.
- Smagulova, Z. (2008). The impact of language policies of Kazakhization on language attitudes and use in Kazakhstan. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*.
- Tatach, R. (2017). Language Choice and Language Attitudes in a Multilingual Arab Canadian Community: Quebec–Canada: A Sociolinguistic Study. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 8(1), 67-74. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0801.09>
- Terlikbayeva, N., & Menlibekova, G. (2021). The Dynamics of Language Shift in Kazakhstan. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 3(2), 12-22.
- Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. (2015). *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society* (7th ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.

Yeskeldiyeva, B. Y., & Tazhibayeva, S. Z. (2015). Multilingualism in modern Kazakhstan: New challenges. *Asian Social Science*, 11(6), 56.

Zhetpisbayeva, B. A., Arinova, E. T., & Shunkeyeva, S. A. (2012). Kazakhstan: Education in conditions of multilingualism. *Education and Science without Borders*, 3(5), 117.

## Appendices

### *Appendix A*

#### SURVEY JUSTIFICATION

As per the official state law of Kazakhstan, the country has two state languages: Kazakh and Russian. Therefore, it is justifiable that only these two languages are being used in official communication and documentation. It is important to abide by the laws of the country and recognize the status of these two languages as official state languages. However, it is also essential to promote multilingualism and encourage the use of other languages spoken by the diverse population of Kazakhstan.

Asking someone about their "native language" or "mother tongue" has long been considered a standard way of gathering information about a person's language background. However, research has shown that the concept of a "native" or "mother" tongue can be complex and multifaceted and may not accurately reflect a person's linguistic abilities or experiences (De Angelis & Dewaele, 2011). In contrast, asking someone about their "first language" may provide a clearer picture of their linguistic background and proficiency. This is because the term "first language" refers to the language that a person learned and used most extensively during their early childhood, regardless of whether it was the language spoken by their parents or community (Cummins, 2000). Furthermore, the concept of a "first language" recognizes the fact that many people around the world grow up in multilingual environments and may have acquired more than one language during their early years (De Angelis & Dewaele, 2011).

This survey aims to identify the language choice and language attitudes of Kazakhstani students in a multilingual context and investigate various variables such as mother tongue, community language, and secondary language. The questions about language choice in the survey were formulated based on previous studies and research on language attitudes and

choices both inside and outside of Kazakhstan. The questionnaire is based on the research conducted by Rakhymbayeva (2022), and Dweik, and Qawar (2015).

The research will use the Likert scale in a survey aimed at studying the language choice and language attitudes of Kazakhstani students in the context of multilingual education. In the context of this study, Likert scale questions can be used to measure students' attitudes and preferences towards different languages, their language choices in different settings, and the reasons behind their language choices. The Likert scale allows for a standardized approach to data collection and analysis, enabling comparisons between different groups or aspects of language attitudes and choices.

Kovalik's (2012) study found no significant difference in GPAs between multilingual and monolingual students. In fact, the trend may even suggest that multilingual students have slightly lower GPAs, although the difference is not statistically significant.

However, it's important to note that this result may be influenced by a variety of factors, such as the specific population being studied, the languages spoken by the multilingual students, the level of language proficiency, or the methodology used in the study. Therefore, it's important to interpret these findings with caution and to consider them in the context of other research in the field.

### *Part 1: demographic questions*

What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

What is your first language?

- Kazakh language
- Russian language
- Other (please specify)

Level of the proficiency

Language	A1 / Beginner	A2 / Elementary	B1 / Pre- intermediate	B2 / Intermediate	C1+ / Advanced
Kazakh					
Russian					
English					

What is your ethnicity?

- Kazakh
- Russian
- Other (please specify)

Choose region you grew up on

- South Kazakhstan
- North Kazakhstan
- East Kazakhstan
- West Kazakhstan
- I did not grew up in Kazakhstan

What is your major?

- Jurisprudence
- International Law
- Law and Law Enforcement
- BBA in Accounting
- BBA in Finance
- BBA in IT
- BBA in Management
- BA in International Relations
- BBA in Economics and Data Science
- Applied Linguistics
- Kazakh-English Languages and Linguistics
- Translation Studies
- Hospitality
- Tourism

What is your GPA?

- 1.0 - 2.0
- 2.0 - 3.0
- 3.0 - 4.0

Do you think your identity or social status affects your language choice?

- Yes
- No

*Part 2: Language attitude*

	unfavorable	neutral	favorable
Kazakh			
Russian			
English			

Questions	Kazakh	Russian	English
What is the most useful language?			
What is the most beautiful language?			
What is the most prestigious language?			
What language symbolizes your national identity?			
What language is connected with your ethnic heritage?			
What language is important to be used in all situations?			
What language is			

dominant at the university?			
What language is easy to learn?			
What language is difficult to learn?			
What language is poetic?			
What language is the least important?			

*Part 3. Language choice*

In this part, you will be asked about patterns of language choice identified by Fishman (1965) that lead to choosing a particular language. This part of the survey consists of 16 main questions and does not take more than 5 minutes to respond to the questions. Please mark the column according to your answer. Work quickly—record your first impression. There is no right or wrong answer.

I chose to operate in **Kazakh** language when

<b>Statements</b>	Always (1)	Usually (2)	Often (3)	Sometimes (4)	Rarely (5)	Never (6)
I write formal letters to professors/ principals						
I write personal messages to family members/ relatives						
I write personal messages to friends						
I write about						

intimate topics						
I write posts on social media						
I read academic papers						
I read for pleasure						
I read posts on social media						
I talk to professors/ principals						
I talk to my parents						
I talk to my siblings						
I talk to friends/ group mates at the university						
I talk to friends/ group mates outside the university						
I discuss intimate topics						
I talk to myself						



I process ideas						
-----------------	--	--	--	--	--	--

I chose to operate in **Russian** language when

<b>Statements</b>	Always (1)	Usually (2)	Often (3)	Sometimes (4)	Rarely (5)	Never (6)
I write formal letters to professors/ principals						
I write personal messages to family members/ relatives						
I write personal messages to friends						
I write about intimate topics						
I write posts on social media						
I read academic papers						
I read for pleasure						
I read posts on social media						
I talk to professors/ principals						

I talk to my parents						
I talk to my siblings						
I talk to friends/ group mates at the university						
I talk to friends/ group mates outside the university						
I discuss intimate topics						
I talk to myself						
I process ideas						

I chose to operate in **English** language when

<b>Statements</b>	Always (1)	Usually (2)	Often (3)	Sometimes (4)	Rarely (5)	Never (6)
I write formal letters to professors/ principals						
I write personal messages to family members/ relatives						
I write personal						

messages to friends						
I write about intimate topics						
I write posts on social media						
I read academic papers						
I read for pleasure						
I read posts on social media						
I talk to professors/ principals						
I talk to my parents						
I talk to my siblings						
I talk to friends/ group mates at the university						
I talk to friends/ group mates outside the university						
I discuss						

intimate topics						
I talk to myself						
I process ideas						