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Background of the study

• “95 per cent of the population must speak Kazakh, 90 per cent must speak Russian, and 20 per cent must speak English by 2020” (State Program of Functioning and Development of Languages in the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2011-2020, 2011, p. 8)

• NIS received a new legal status and became the Autonomous Education Organization (AEO NIS), and were given full autonomy and academic freedom (Law ‘On the status of the Nazarbayev Intellectual Schools’, 2011)

• AEO NIS is developing its own curricula, teaching materials, and teacher training programs (AEO NIS, 2013, p. 4)

• NIS has adopted CLIL to create a trilingual environment to help students build their linguistic competence (AEO NIS, 2013, p. 13)
Problem of the study

• Although the targets have been set, there is a current shortage of teachers who can teach content matter in English

• CLIL implementation has been studied worldwide, but has not been studied in the context of Kazakhstan

• CLIL teachers in NIS schools are applying this approach, but there is no qualitative evidence on how they use CLIL, how they perceive it, and how they address its possible challenges
Purpose of the study and research questions

To explore teachers’ perceptions of CLIL, their practices in using the CLIL approach, and challenges they experience in using it and the way they address these challenges

What are the teachers’ perceptions of the CLIL approach?
What are teachers’ practices in using the CLIL approach?
What challenges do teachers experience with CLIL and how do they address them?
Literature Review: main concepts: multi/trilingual education

• ‘Multilinguals’ are speakers of more than one language; bilingual individuals as speakers of two languages; and those who use three and more languages are called trilinguals, quadrilinguals, and so forth (Goral & Conner, 2013, p. 1)

• Multilingual education aims at making more “just and democratic societies” because it applies and acknowledges more than one language in learning; recognizes intercultural awareness and communication; considers student prior knowledge, and fosters their active participation in society (Hornberger, 2009, p. 2)

• Trilingualism in Kazakhstan: presence of Kazakh as the national language, Russian as the language of interethnic communication, and English as the language of successful integration in the global economy (Nazarbayev, 2007, p. 38)
Marsh (1994) defines **CLIL** as “situations where subjects, or parts of subjects, are taught through a foreign language with dual-focussed aims, namely the learning of content and the simultaneous learning of a foreign language” (as cited in Cekrezi, 2011, p. 2)
Literature review: Main concepts: perception

- Having considered different definitions (Dalton-Puffer and Smit, 2013; Attneave, 1962; Clopper, Rohrbeck, & Wagner, 2012; Pinget, et al., 2014; Yurdakula, 2015), the researcher developed a cumulative definition of ‘perception’:

  a capacity for understanding and judgment, which rests on experience and interaction with different objects, events, and situations, and is also closely connected with one’s attitudes and views
Literature review: conceptual framework: the 4Cs Framework for CLIL (Coyle, 2006)
Literature review: teachers’ perceptions of CLIL, their practices, and challenges in using CLIL

**Perceptions**

- provides authenticity of communication (Denman, Tanner, & de Graaff, 2013)
- increases learners’ motivation (Leone, 2015; Hunt, 2011)
- raises learner autonomy, confidence, and cultural awareness (Coyle, 2007)
- extends vocabulary (Dalton-Puffer, 2008)
- does not affect writing skills (Young & Gosling, 2014)

**Practices**

- use of learner L1 (Coonan, 2007; Roiha, 2014)
- use of various teaching methods (audial, visual, kinesthetic, group work) (Hunt, 2011; Vasquez, Molina, Lopez, 2015)
- cognitive challenge fosters HOTs (Coonan, 2007; Coyle, 2007)
- facilitate intercultural learning (Sudhoff, 2010)
- team teaching (Guillamon-Suesta & Renau, 2015)

**Challenges**

- lack of teaching materials (Pladevall-Ballester, 2015)
- the low proficiency in the foreign language of both teachers and learners (Aguilar & Rodriguez, 2012)
- lack of institutional support (Pladevall-Ballester, 2015)
- lack of cooperation between team teachers (Roiha, 2011; Catelly, 2011)
Methodology

- **Design**: qualitative single instrumental case study
- **Sampling**: purposeful maximal variation sampling
- **Characteristics**: teach different subjects in English; local and foreign staff; different ages
- **Participants and site**: seven high school teachers at one NIS school
- **Instruments**:
  - semi-structured one-on-one interviews
  - document analysis
- **Data analysis**: transcribing, coding, developing themes
- **Ethics**: consent form, anonymity
Findings and Discussion: RQ1: What are the teachers’ perceptions of the CLIL approach?

**CLIL as a beneficial approach:**
1) increase in vocabulary
2) improves English language proficiency of local teachers
3) Increase learner autonomy

**Potential for CLIL use in mainstream schools:**
4) Necessary approach
5) Necessity for earlier start

1) CLIL allows contact with target language (Leone, 2015; Hunt, 2011; Vazquez, Molina, & Lopez, 2015)
2) CLIL improves English language proficiency (Aguilar & Rodríguez, 2012)
3) CLIL develops HOTs (Coyle, 2006)
4) Positive perception of CLIL (Guillamon-Suesta & Renau, 2015)
5) Positive perception of CLIL at primary schools (Pladevall-Ballester, 2015)
Findings and Discussion: RQ2: What are teachers’ practices in using the CLIL approach?

**CLIL teaching approaches:**
1) Use of various teaching methods
2) Possibility for code-switching
3) Development of HOTs
4) Culture focus at lesson (link subject matter to KZ context and other cultures)

**Planning and team teaching:**
5) Importance of collaboration between team-teachers
6) Detailed planning of a lesson

1) multimodal strategies for a multilingual classroom (Fortanet-Gómez, 2013)
2) no strict rules regarding code-switching (Coonan, 2007)
3) cognitively undemanding work does not enhance language learning (Coyle, 2007)
4) CLIL facilitates learning about other cultures (Fortanet-Gómez, 2013)
5) Mutual support and learning from each other (Guillamon-Suesta & Renau, 2015)
6) Need to co-plan before the lesson (Coonan, 2007)
Findings and Discussion: RQ3: What challenges do teachers experience with CLIL and how do they address them?

**Challenges in CLIL:**

1. Low level of English of teachers and learners
2. Lack of collaboration among team teachers
3. Lack of joint seminars
4. Lack of textbooks

**Dealing with challenges:**

5. Providing differentiation of tasks and scaffolding
6. Individual tutoring

2. Shamshidinova, Ayubayeva, and Bridges (2014); Roiha (2014); Banegas (2012)
6. Uncommon strategy
Conclusion

• CLIL is positively perceived by the participants and has a considerable potential to be used in Kazakhstani education because it increases learner vocabulary and their autonomy, improves English proficiency of local teachers.

• Pursuing multimodality and student-centered learning, teachers use various (audial, visual, kinesthetic, group work) teaching methods, code-switching, developing HOTs and intercultural communication, and team teaching.

• Teachers experience a number of challenges in using CLIL, such as the low English proficiency of some local teachers and students, the lack of joint seminars and CLIL materials, and the lack of collaboration between team teachers. Some of the challenges are addressed by applying differentiation, scaffolding strategies, and tutoring.
Limitations and recommendations for further research

• **Limitations:**
  - an under-representative number of the participants
  - Lack of time for collecting the data (one week)
  - An under-representative number of sites

• **Recommendations for further research:**
  - A larger sampling size of different stakeholders
  - More than one site
  - More time available for data collection
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