

**A.Ye. Agmanova***L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University  
Astana, Kazakhstan* <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9285-0824>email: [agmanova@mail.ru](mailto:agmanova@mail.ru)**D.B. Akynova***L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University  
Astana, Kazakhstan* <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9451-0033>email: [akynova\\_db@enu.kz](mailto:akynova_db@enu.kz)**INSTITUTIONAL AND PEDAGOGICAL CHALLENGES IN IMPLEMENTING  
ENGLISH-MEDIUM INSTRUCTION IN KAZAKHSTANI HIGHER  
EDUCATION**

**Abstract.** This article explores the key challenges associated with the implementation of English-Medium Instruction (EMI) in Kazakhstani universities. While EMI has gained institutional support and is seen as a tool for internationalization, its practical implementation reveals a set of persistent barriers. Drawing on empirical data collected from faculty and students at five universities, the paper highlights issues such as limited proficiency in English, insufficient academic preparation, lack of pedagogical support, and the misalignment between policy ambitions and actual classroom practices. The findings show that many instructors are not adequately prepared to teach in English and often lack sufficient professional training and methodological resources. Students, in turn, report difficulties in understanding subject content and participating in academic discussions. These obstacles reduce the effectiveness of EMI and hinder the achievement of its stated objectives. The authors argue that more flexible institutional strategies, teacher professional development programs, and student-centered planning are required to adapt EMI practices to local educational needs. Practical recommendations are offered to address the gap between global aspirations and national realities.

**Keywords:** English-Medium Instruction (EMI); language barriers; academic support; instructors; student perceptions

**Conflict of interests:**

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

**Article history:**

Received: 29.09.2025

Accepted: 26.01.2026

### Introduction

In recent years, English has become an essential component of higher education in Kazakhstan. As part of the national trilingual policy, promoting Kazakh, Russian, and English, and broader efforts to internationalize the system, universities have increasingly introduced English-Medium Instruction (EMI) across disciplines. These reforms are aligned with national strategic documents on the development of education and science, which emphasize internationalization, academic mobility, and the integration of Kazakhstani universities into the global academic space (Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2023a; 2023b; Nazarbayev, 2007, 2013). At the same time, these policy initiatives explicitly stress the importance of preserving national languages and cultural identity alongside the growing role of English. However, implementing EMI in practice presents a range of challenges. Both students and instructors often face language-related difficulties that affect classroom participation and overall academic performance. Instructors, especially in STEM fields, may lack methodological training, making it hard to balance subject teaching with language support (Manan & Hajar, 2024). In multilingual societies like Kazakhstan, English can also be read not only as a medium of global communication but as a cultural marker, raising concerns about the preservation of local linguistic identities. As Agbo, et al. (2022) note, in multilingual contexts the dominance of English may provoke resistance, as it is perceived as distancing people from national languages and values. This is particularly sensitive in Kazakhstan, where Kazakh is a key symbol of national identity and Russian continues to function as a language of interethnic communication (Agbo & Pak, 2017; Ahn & Smagulova, 2022; Smagulova, 2008, 2016).

Beyond these immediate concerns, the wider scholarship shows that EMI implementation varies significantly depending on linguistic, cultural, and institutional conditions. A useful lens is the ROAD-MAPPING framework (Dafouz & Smit, 2016), which treats EMI as the intersection of a set of interrelated dimensions: the roles of English (RO), academic disciplines (AD), language management (M), agents (A), practices and processes (PP), and internationalization/globalization (ING). While this framework offers a comprehensive perspective, its practical application in developing and transitional contexts remains challenging. In settings such as Kazakhstan, the uneven integration of language support, pedagogical training, and institutional resources often limits the effectiveness of EMI in everyday teaching practice.

Other typologies converge on similar fault lines. Bradford (2016) groups EMI difficulties into four categories: linguistic, cultural, administrative, and institutional, patterns that reappear across regions. In Kazakhstan, ambitious trilingual policy targets come up against basic constraints: insufficient language preparation among both students and teachers affects learning quality and perceptions of EMI, while a small number of elite institutions (e.g., Nazarbayev University) showcase successes that remain exceptions rather than the norm.

Comparative research from Central Asia underscores persistent resource limitations and gaps in teacher preparation (Bezborodova & Radjabzade, 2022). Sociocultural reservations are also well-documented: when EMI is read as a threat to local identity, acceptance declines (Belhiah & Elhami, 2015). Similar dynamics are visible elsewhere. In China, Hu and Lei (2014) report that EMI can heighten educational inequality, as students with stronger English reap most of the benefits; access also skews toward urban centers,

leaving rural students at a disadvantage. In the Gulf States, EMI supports global economic integration but fuels debates about preserving Arabic as a core identity marker (Belhiah & Elhami, 2015). In Kazakhstan, the trilingual policy provides a formal framework for EMI, yet the perception of English as competing with Kazakh (and the established role of Russian) remains a significant challenge.

Within this broader picture, the Kazakhstani case brings the issues into sharp relief. Despite ambitious goals, EMI faces linguistic and academic obstacles: many students have limited English proficiency, which complicates academic reading, writing, and lecture comprehension (Tajik et al., 2023; Yessenbekova, 2023). Learning through EMI is often perceived as more demanding than studying in Kazakh or Russian (Karabassova, 2020). The decline in perceived quality is tied not only to language but also to gaps in institutional support: limited preparatory courses, insufficient language assistance, and a misalignment between policy and classroom practice. As Yessenbekova (2023) notes, programs advertised as EMI are frequently delivered in blended form, creating a mismatch between expectations and outcomes.

A top-down reform dynamic compounds these issues: changes are introduced without consistently accounting for local resources and the preparedness of teachers and students (Tajik, et al., 2023; Tajik, et al., 2024). Methodological materials are unevenly distributed, and opportunities remain concentrated in urban universities, widening regional disparities (Ahn & Smagulova, 2022). Teacher training is a critical bottleneck; many instructors lack the methodological grounding needed to teach effectively in English, particularly in STEM (Manan & Hajar, 2024). Evidence from secondary education also suggests that reforms work best when language training, pedagogical support, and resource provision are designed as an integrated package (Karabassova, 2021).

Cultural questions sit alongside these structural concerns. In a multilingual environment, some participants view EMI as eroding the status of Kazakh or crowding out Russian in academic domains, fueling resistance to EMI's expansion (Agbo, et al., 2022; Agbo & Pak, 2017; Ahn & Smagulova, 2022; Smagulova, 2016). Taken together, Kazakhstan's experience illustrates a complex interplay between global educational goals and local realities: EMI opens clear academic and professional prospects by fostering analytical thinking, research skills, and global competitiveness, yet faces systemic challenges that produce gaps between policy ambitions and classroom practice.

Against this backdrop, the guiding question for this study is straightforward: **What specific challenges do students and instructors face in EMI-based programs in Kazakhstan's universities?** Drawing on empirical data from five universities, the study explores how academic, methodological, psychological, and sociocultural factors shape everyday EMI practices. To structure the analysis, the identified categories of challenges are interpreted through the ROAD-MAPPING framework, allowing for a more systematic understanding of how institutional policies, classroom practices, and participant experiences intersect in a multilingual educational environment.

### **Materials and methods**

This study utilized a mixed-methods design, combining a structured survey and semi-structured interviews to investigate EMI implementation challenges. The same sample of participants (252 students and 18 instructors from five universities) was used as in a companion study on EMI benefits, ensuring comparability while shifting the focus

to challenges. This approach provided both quantitative breadth and qualitative depth in examining the multifaceted obstacles.

The participants were 252 undergraduate students and 18 instructors from five multilingual universities in Kazakhstan. All were actively involved in EMI courses (students were enrolled in at least one English-taught course, and instructors were teaching content in English). The sample spanned various academic disciplines and year levels, reflecting a diverse range of EMI experiences. Most participants were non-native English speakers (primarily Kazakh or Russian as a first language) using English for academic purposes. They were recruited through university coordination and volunteered with informed consent.

Data collection consisted of two components: a questionnaire survey for quantitative data and follow-up interviews for qualitative data.

Quantitative data were collected first via a structured questionnaire targeting perceived barriers to EMI. The survey included sections on major challenge domains:

- **Language Difficulties:** limited English proficiency hindering comprehension and expression in coursework.
- **Lack of Support:** inadequate institutional resources or training to support EMI teaching and learning.
- **Cultural Discomfort:** feelings of unease or reduced confidence adapting to an English-medium academic environment.

Participants rated items related to each category on a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) indicating how much they experienced that challenge. The internal consistency of the questionnaire was examined prior to analysis and was found to be acceptable for exploratory research, indicating a satisfactory level of reliability. Basic demographic and language background information was also gathered. The questionnaire was administered online and completed anonymously by respondents over a two-week period.

Following the survey, semi-structured interviews were conducted to gain in-depth qualitative insights. All 18 instructors and a purposive sample of student volunteers were interviewed. The interview questions were aligned with the same thematic areas as the survey (linguistic, institutional, and cultural challenges) but allowed participants to elaborate on their personal experiences and perceptions. Each interview lasted approximately 45–60 minutes and was conducted in English. With participants' consent, interviews were audio-recorded and then transcribed verbatim for analysis.

Both quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed using appropriate techniques, as follows: Survey response data were entered into SPSS for statistical analysis. Descriptive statistics (e.g., mean ratings and frequencies) were computed for each type of challenge to identify overall trends. Additionally, independent-samples t-tests were used to compare student and instructor responses, examining whether perceptions of challenges differed significantly between the two groups. In addition, chi-square tests were applied to explore associations between selected variables related to students' perceived confidence and academic performance ( $\chi^2$  with corresponding degrees of freedom and sample size are reported in the Results section).

Interview transcripts were examined using thematic analysis to identify recurring themes related to EMI challenges. The researchers coded the transcripts inductively, grouping similar codes into broader themes corresponding to the key challenge areas (while also allowing new themes to emerge beyond the predefined categories). To enhance

reliability, two researchers cross-checked the coding of selected transcripts and reached consensus on theme definitions. Qualitative data analysis software (NVivo) was used to organize the codes and supporting excerpts. Finally, the quantitative and qualitative findings were compared and integrated during interpretation to provide a holistic understanding of the challenges.

Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the relevant university ethics committee. Participation was voluntary (with the option to withdraw at any time) and based on informed consent. To protect confidentiality, the survey was anonymous and interview responses were anonymized: participants were assigned codes or pseudonyms, and any identifying details were removed from transcripts. All collected data were stored securely (in password-protected files accessible only to the research team) and used solely for research purposes. These measures ensured that participants' privacy was safeguarded and that they felt comfortable discussing sensitive challenges faced in EMI.

### Results and Discussion

In the context of Kazakhstan, we identified four broad categories of challenges in implementing English-medium instruction (EMI): academic, psychological and social, methodological, and national and cultural. This categorization reflects the specific multilingual and institutional context of Kazakhstani higher education and is consistent with previous typologies of EMI challenges (Bradford, 2016). At the same time, these categories were interpreted through the ROAD-MAPPING framework (Dafouz & Smit, 2016), which enabled a systematic examination of how challenges relate to the Roles of English (RO), Academic Disciplines (AD), Agents (A), Practices and Processes (PP), Management (M), and Internationalization and Glocalization (ING).

Our study found that both students and faculty encounter issues in all four areas (see Table 1). For instance, academic challenges were reported by about 53% of students and 47% of faculty (with an average importance of  $M=0.68$ ,  $SD=0.47$ ). Psychological and social challenges affected roughly 48.9% of students and 42% of faculty ( $M=0.61$ ,  $SD=0.45$ ). Methodological challenges were noted by around 38.2% of students and 35% of faculty ( $M=0.55$ ,  $SD=0.42$ ). National and cultural challenges were cited by about 37% of students and 30% of faculty ( $M=0.50$ ,  $SD=0.40$ ). Below, we discuss each category in detail, including direct perspectives from students and teachers.

Table 1. EMI challenges

Challenge Categories	Students (%)	Faculty (%)	Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)
Academic	53	47	0.68	0.47
Psychological and social	48.9	42	0.61	0.45
Methodological	38.2	35	0.55	0.42
National and cultural	37	30	0.50	0.40

**Academic Challenges.** Language barriers are the biggest academic obstacle in EMI. Over half of the students (about 53%) admitted struggling to understand academic vocabulary in their courses. Many students also have trouble speaking coherently and giving oral presentations in English. This suggests that they are not fully prepared to work with English-language materials at an academic level. Teachers notice the same

issue, often pointing out that students need additional language training to handle subject-specific terminology. It's no surprise, then, that academic challenges had a high prevalence (average importance  $M=0.68$ ,  $SD=0.47$  in our survey). As one student put it:

*"I waste hours just trying to translate one page. By the time I finally understand, the class has already moved on. It's frustrating. I can't finish assignments properly, and I feel left out in discussions."* (male student, 19, second year)

Another academic issue is the quality of teaching materials. Some instructors use texts that were translated into English from Kazakh or Russian, and students complain these translations can be clunky or error-ridden. Poor translations make it hard for students to grasp the content. In such cases, instead of engaging with the material, students end up passively copying notes. A female student in her second year (18 years old) shared her frustration:

*"The teacher often brings us translations into English, and honestly, they sound awkward. Sometimes the sentences don't even make sense. She just reads them, we copy, but I don't really understand anything. It feels pointless."*

Students also find academic writing in English to be challenging. About 38.2% of students reported difficulties with writing essays, reports, and other papers. This stems from a limited academic vocabulary in English and a lack of experience structuring texts in a non-native language. A third-year female student (20 years old) confessed:

*"Writing essays in English is the hardest thing. I start, then stop, because I don't know the right word. I lose track of the structure and just feel lost. Every time I hand in a paper, I'm not confident at all."*

These language-related difficulties carry over into assessment. Teachers struggle with a fundamental question: when grading, should they focus on the student's understanding of the content or on their English language proficiency? For example, a 38-year-old female science teacher described a common scenario where a student clearly knows the material and can solve problems, but can't explain the answer well in English. She mused, *"And then I wonder, what should I grade: their knowledge or their language?"* This ambiguity in evaluation criteria is frustrating for both sides.

In summary, academic challenges in EMI largely come down to students' low English proficiency, inadequate teaching materials, and unclear grading criteria. To address these issues, universities might introduce specialized academic writing courses and provide preparatory training in English for specific fields. It would also help to develop or adapt course materials to fit the local context (rather than relying on awkward translations). Finally, assessment methods should be made more flexible, for instance, using rubrics that account for both the student's subject knowledge and their language use, so that neither aspect is neglected unfairly.

Viewed through the ROAD-MAPPING framework, these academic challenges are primarily linked to the dimensions of the Roles of English (RO) and Academic Disciplines (AD), where insufficient academic language proficiency constrains students' ability to engage fully with subject content delivered through English.

**Psychological and Social Challenges.** Implementing EMI can take a psychological toll on students. Language anxiety, low self-confidence, and increased stress due to the heavier cognitive load are all common. Nearly half of the students (about 48.9%) reported feeling anxious about their fluency and oral skills in English ( $M=0.61$ ,  $SD=0.45$ ). This indicates a high level of pressure, especially on those who have never

studied subjects in English before. One second-year student (17 years old) shared how daunting it felt to suddenly learn core subjects in English:

*“Studying physics in English was a disaster. I used to be one of the top students in school, but now I feel like I can’t keep up. City students speak English so well, they answer quickly, get high marks... and I just sit there feeling like I’m not good enough. It’s unfair.”*

This personal account highlights a confidence gap that often falls along urban-rural lines. Students from rural areas, like the one quoted, often haven’t had the same exposure to quality English instruction as urban students. When they enter an EMI program, they can feel disadvantaged and start doubting their abilities, seeing classmates from better-resourced schools excel. This sense of inequity and isolation can further undermine their confidence and motivation.

Access to resources and support plays a big role here. Those who feel left behind often lack additional support like tutoring, language workshops, or even simple encouragement. Our findings underscore this: for example, a chi-square test in our study ( $\chi^2$  (df=1, n=252)=5.161, p=.023) showed a significant relationship between a student’s confidence level and their academic performance in EMI courses. In plainer terms, students who felt more confident tended to perform better. This result isn’t surprising, but it confirms that psychological support is just as important as academic support in EMI settings. To improve outcomes, universities should consider programs to reduce language anxiety such as public speaking clubs, mentoring, or counseling and to build up students’ self-confidence in using English. Helping students feel more secure about their language skills can directly contribute to better academic performance.

Within the ROAD-MAPPING framework, these psychological and social challenges relate mainly to the dimension of Agents (A), highlighting how students’ and instructors’ emotions, confidence, and prior learning experiences shape their engagement with EMI.

**Methodological Challenges.** Methodological challenges refer to issues in the way EMI is delivered and managed. The preparedness of teachers is one key factor. Some instructors are simply not fully ready to teach their subject in English, which can lead to awkward classes or a reversion to the local language. Ineffective assessment methods (as noted earlier) and inconsistent use of English in the classroom are also problems in this category. Our data suggest that teachers are more aware of these methodological issues than students are. In fact, teachers rated methodological challenges higher on average compared to students. This makes sense, because teachers see the difficulties, like planning lessons in English or designing fair tests, whereas students mainly experience the outcomes (like confusion or unclear grading).

A noticeable issue is the gap between EMI policy and classroom reality. Officially, courses are supposed to be taught entirely in English. In practice, however, many classes end up being bilingual. Students observe that not all courses are truly fully in English. If they struggle to understand, teachers often switch to Kazakh or Russian to help explain. This pragmatism helps comprehension but deviates from the EMI policy. A second-year female student (18 years old) described it candidly:

*“Not every course is really in English. If we look confused, teachers switch to Kazakh or Russian. It helps us understand, but then I ask myself: is this still EMI, or just a mix of languages?”*

From the teachers’ perspective, using some Kazakh or Russian (a practice known as translanguaging) can indeed be an effective way to help students grasp difficult concepts.

However, there are currently no clear guidelines on how or when to mix languages in an EMI setting. Without institutional guidance, each teacher is left to improvise, which can lead to inconsistency. A 39-year-old male lecturer in the social sciences commented on this flexibility:

*“Of course, mixing languages helps. If I explain only in English, many students don’t get it. Switching to Kazakh or Russian makes things clearer. But we need proper rules on when to do it, how much. Otherwise, every teacher just makes it up as they go.”*

This suggests that while a mixed-language approach can be beneficial, it needs to be supported by official strategy. Institutional support and training are crucial here. Universities should develop clear policies for bilingual teaching strategies and offer comprehensive training programs so that teachers feel equipped to deliver content in English effectively. By doing so, the gap between the EMI ideal and the on-the-ground practice can be narrowed. In short, addressing methodological challenges involves providing better teacher preparation, clearer guidelines for using students’ native languages when necessary, and refining assessment methods. These steps would help align the EMI initiative’s goals with what actually happens in classrooms, thereby improving the overall quality of instruction in a multilingual context like Kazakhstan.

From a ROAD-MAPPING perspective, methodological challenges reflect tensions within the Practices and Processes (PP) and Management (M) dimensions, where institutional policies promoting EMI are not always matched by clear pedagogical guidelines or sufficient professional support for instructors.

**National and Cultural Challenges.** National and cultural challenges revolve around the preservation of the Kazakh language and identity in the face of expanding English instruction. Both students and teachers (especially in rural areas) have voiced concerns that emphasizing English might sideline the Kazakh language and local culture. On average, respondents gave a relatively high importance to these challenges ( $M=0.50$ ,  $SD=0.40$ ), showing this is not a trivial worry. Some teachers perceive EMI as a potential threat to the development of the Kazakh language, fearing that if English dominates academia, the progress made in elevating Kazakh could stall or even regress.

The crux of this challenge is finding a balance between globalization and local identity. English is seen as a gateway to global knowledge and opportunities, but there’s a strong sentiment that it shouldn’t come at the cost of one’s national language and heritage. A 45-year-old female lecturer in social sciences argued for a measured approach and offered a possible compromise:

*“Why not first translate the best English books into Kazakh and use them? We’ve only just started strengthening our language, and now suddenly everything must be in English. I think we should focus on Kazakh and our culture first, and then bring in other languages.”*

Her suggestion underlines a practical solution: translation and adaptation of quality materials into Kazakh. This way, students can learn modern content and skills without abandoning their native language. Such a strategy could serve dual purposes – enhancing students’ academic knowledge while also nurturing national identity.

In essence, the national and cultural challenges of EMI are about protecting linguistic and cultural heritage amid the push for internationalization. To overcome these challenges, policymakers and educators should strive for a middle ground. That might include offering parallel resources in Kazakh, incorporating local examples and cultural

context in EMI curricula, and reassuring stakeholders that English is being used as a tool for advancement rather than a replacement for the native language. By doing so, Kazakhstan can reap the benefits of English-medium education and preserve the rich cultural and linguistic tapestry that is central to its identity.

These concerns correspond most closely to the Internationalization and Glocalization (ING) dimension of the ROAD-MAPPING framework, illustrating the ongoing negotiation between global academic integration through English and the preservation of national languages and cultural identity.

### **Conclusion**

Despite the potential benefits of English-medium instruction (EMI) for internationalization, this study revealed significant challenges in the Kazakhstani context. Students often struggle with academic English vocabulary and with oral and written communication, indicating a need for additional language support. Many also experience psychological barriers, such as language anxiety and the cognitive stress of learning in a second language, which can hinder their academic performance. On the instructional side, methodological issues are evident: some instructors lack adequate preparation, assessment methods do not effectively measure learning, and high-quality English-language instructional resources are scarce. Finally, national and cultural concerns persist, as the expansion of EMI is perceived by some as a threat to the status of the Kazakh language and to cultural identity.

To address these issues, several measures are recommended for improving EMI implementation in Kazakhstan. First, universities should establish comprehensive language support programs, including specialized academic English courses, conversation clubs, and tutoring services tailored to different proficiency levels to help students develop the necessary academic language skills. Second, faculty development must be strengthened through training in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) and other professional development initiatives, which can enhance instructors' dual expertise in subject matter and language pedagogy. Third, teaching and assessment practices should be made more flexible and inclusive. In particular, instructors can adopt translanguaging, the strategic use of multiple languages in instruction, to help students comprehend complex material, and assessment methods should be refined to evaluate both subject knowledge and language proficiency so that student progress is measured fairly.

Another critical consideration is maintaining support for multilingualism and cultural identity alongside EMI. Educational programs should strive for a balance between English and the national languages (Kazakh and Russian) so that adopting EMI does not diminish the role of local languages. For example, translating key textbooks and learning materials into Kazakh can help preserve the national language even as English is used for instruction. Additionally, institutional support structures should be strengthened. For instance, universities could establish academic support centers and develop clear language policies to guide the use of translanguaging and bilingual practices in EMI classrooms. Addressing these challenges will require a comprehensive, system-wide approach involving all key stakeholders: universities, educators, policymakers, and students. By implementing these recommendations, Kazakhstan can fully harness the benefits of EMI to enhance the quality of higher education and strengthen its position in the global academic arena.

Nevertheless, this study has several limitations. First, the sample included only five universities, which limits the generalizability of the findings. Second, by focusing on participants' perceptions, this study may not capture objective measures of EMI effectiveness. In addition, employing a mixed-methods approach carries the risk of subjective bias in interpreting qualitative data. Moreover, Kazakhstan's unique trilingual language environment means these results may not directly apply to other countries. Finally, the relatively short time frame of the study makes it difficult to assess long-term impacts of EMI. For these reasons, future research should include larger-scale, longitudinal studies across more Kazakhstani universities to evaluate the long-term effectiveness and sustainability of EMI as a strategy for internationalizing higher education.

### References

- Agbo, S.A. & Pak, N. (2017). Globalization and educational reform in Kazakhstan: English as the language of instruction in graduate programs. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 26(1), 14–43. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105678791702600102>
- Agbo, S.A., Pak, N., Akbarov, A., Madiyeva, G., & Saurykov, Y. (2022). Global competitiveness myths and ideals: English language policy in universities in Kazakhstan. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 34(3), 515–542. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10567879221137572>
- Ahn, E.S. & Smagulova, J. (2022). English language choices in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan. *World Englishes*, 41(1), 9–23. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12552>
- Belhiah, H. & Elhami, M. (2015). English as a medium of instruction in the Gulf: When students and teachers speak. *Language Policy*, 14, 3–23. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-014-9336-9>
- Bezborodova, A. & Radjabzade, S. (2022). English in higher education in the Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan. *World Englishes*, 41(1), 72–91. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12556>
- Bradford, A. (2016). Toward a typology of implementation challenges facing English-medium instruction in higher education: Evidence from Japan. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 20(4), 339–356. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315316647165>
- Dafouz, E. & Smit, U. (2016). Towards a dynamic conceptual framework for English-medium education in multilingual university settings. *Applied Linguistics*, 37(3), 397–415. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amu034>
- Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan. (2023a). Ob utverzhdenii Kontseptsii razvitiia vysshego obrazovaniia i nauki v Respublike Kazakhstan na 2023–2029 gody [On approval of the Concept for the development of higher education and science in the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2023–2029]. Resolution No. 248 of March 28, 2023. Retrieved 27 September 2025 from <https://adilet.zan.kz/rus/docs/P2300000248>. (in Russ.).
- Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan. (2023b). Ob utverzhdenii Kontseptsii razvitiia iazykovoii politiki v Respublike Kazakhstan na 2023–2029 gody [On approval of the Concept for the development of language policy in the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2023–2029]. Resolution No. 914 of October 16, 2023. Retrieved 27 August 2025 from <https://www.gov.kz/memleket/entities/kyzylorda-sayasat/press/article/details/206305?lang=ru>. (in Russ.).

- Hu, G. & Lei, J. (2014). English-medium instruction in Chinese higher education: A case study. *Higher Education*, 67, 551–567. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-013-9661-5>
- Karabassova, L. (2020). Understanding Trilingual Education Reform in Kazakhstan: Why Is It Stalled? In: D. Egea (Ed.), *Education in Central Asia A Kaleidoscope of Challenges and Opportunities* (pp. 37–50). Springer Nature. <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-030-50127-3>
- Karabassova, L. (2021). English-medium education reform in Kazakhstan: Comparative study of educational change across two contexts in one country. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 22(5), 553–573. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2021.1884436>
- Manan, S.A. & Hajar, A. (2024). Understanding English medium instruction (EMI) policy from the perspectives of STEM content teachers in Kazakhstan. *TESOL Journal*, 15(4), e847. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.847>
- Nazarbayev, N. (2007). New Kazakhstan in a New World: Address of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan Nursultan Nazarbayev to the people of Kazakhstan. Retrieved 27 August 2025 from [https://www.akorda.kz/ru/addresses/addresses\\_of\\_president/poslanie-prezidenta-respubliki-kazahstan-nazarbaeva-narodu-kazahstana-28-fevralya-2007-g](https://www.akorda.kz/ru/addresses/addresses_of_president/poslanie-prezidenta-respubliki-kazahstan-nazarbaeva-narodu-kazahstana-28-fevralya-2007-g)
- Nazarbayev, N. (2013). Address by the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Leader of the Nation “Strategy Kazakhstan-2050”: New political course of the established state. Retrieved 27 August 2025 from [https://www.akorda.kz/en/events/astana\\_kazakhstan/participation\\_in\\_events/address-by-the-president-of-the-republic-of-kazakhstan-leader-of-the-nation-nazarbayev-strategy-kazakhstan-2050-new-political-course-of-the-established-state-1](https://www.akorda.kz/en/events/astana_kazakhstan/participation_in_events/address-by-the-president-of-the-republic-of-kazakhstan-leader-of-the-nation-nazarbayev-strategy-kazakhstan-2050-new-political-course-of-the-established-state-1)
- Smagulova, J. (2008). Language policies of Kazakhization and their influence on language attitudes and use. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 11(3–4), 440–475. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050802148798>
- Smagulova, J. (2016). The Re-Acquisition of Kazakh in Kazakhstan: Achievements and Challenges. In: E. Ahn & J. Smagulova (Eds.), *Language Change in Central Asia* (pp. 89–108). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781614514534-009>
- Tajik, M.A., Manan, S. A., Schamiloglu, U., & Namyssova, G. (2024). Gaps between policy aspirations and enactment: Graduate students’ struggles with academic English amidst a turbulent transition to the EMI environment in Kazakhstani universities. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 25(2), 212–235. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2023.2283651>
- Tajik, M.A., Namyssova, G., Shamatov, D., Manan, S.A., Zhunussova, G., & Antwi, S.K. (2023). Navigating the potentials and barriers to EMI in the post-Soviet region: Insights from Kazakhstani university students and instructors. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 22(2), 990–1010. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2023.2265428>
- Yessenbekova, K. (2023). English as a medium of instruction in Kazakhstani higher education: A case study. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 24(2), 141–159. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2022.2043064>

Ә.Е. Ағманова, Д.Б. Ақынова

*Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті  
Астана, Қазақстан*

### ҚАЗАҚСТАН ЖОҒАРЫ БІЛІМ БЕРУ ЖҮЙЕСІНДЕ АҒЫЛШЫН ТІЛІНДЕ ОҚЫТУДЫ ЕНГІЗУДЕГІ ИНСТИТУЦИОНАЛДЫҚ ЖӘНЕ ПЕДАГОГИКАЛЫҚ ҚИЫНДЫҚТАР

**Аңдатпа.** Мақалада Қазақстан университеттерінде ағылшын тілінде оқытуды (English-Medium Instruction (EMI)) енгізуге байланысты негізгі қиындықтар қарастырылады. EMI институционалдық қолдауға ие болып, интернационалдандыру құралы ретінде қарастырылғанына қарамастан, оның тәжірибелік іске асырылуы бірқатар тұрақты кедергілерді айқындайды. Бес жоғары оқу орнының оқытушылары мен студенттері арасында жиналған эмпирикалық деректер негізінде ағылшын тілін меңгеру деңгейінің жеткіліксіздігі, академиялық даярлықтың әлсіздігі, педагогикалық қолдаудың жеткіліксіздігі және білім беру саясатының мақсаттары мен аудиториялардағы нақты тәжірибе арасындағы сәйкессіздік сияқты мәселелер айқындалды. Нәтижелер көптеген оқытушылардың ағылшын тілінде сабақ жүргізуге дайын еместігін және кәсіби даярлық пен әдістемелік ресурстардың жетіспеушілігін жиі сезінетінін көрсетеді. Студенттер, өз кезегінде, оқу материалын түсінуде және академиялық пікірталастарға қатысуда қиындықтарға тап болатынын атап өтеді. Бұл кедергілер EMI тиімділігін төмендетіп, қойылған мақсаттарға қол жеткізуге тосқауыл болады. Авторлар EMI тәжірибесін жергілікті білім беру қажеттіліктеріне бейімдеу үшін неғұрлым икемді институционалдық стратегиялар, оқытушылардың кәсіби дамуына арналған бағдарламалар және студенттік орталықтандырылған жоспарлау қажет екенін алға тартады. Ғаламдық ұмтылыстар мен ұлттық шынайылық арасындағы алшақтықты еңсеруге бағытталған тәжірибелік ұсынымдар ұсынылады.

**Түйінді сөздер:** English-Medium Instruction (EMI); тілдік кедергілер; академиялық қолдау; оқытушылар; студенттердің қабылдауы.

А.Е. Ағманова, Д.Б. Ақынова

*Евразийский национальный университет им. Л.Н. Гумилева  
Астана, Казахстан*

### ИНСТИТУЦИОНАЛЬНЫЕ И ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКИЕ ТРУДНОСТИ РЕАЛИЗАЦИИ АНГЛОЯЗЫЧНОГО ОБУЧЕНИЯ В ВЫСШЕМ ОБРАЗОВАНИИ КАЗАХСТАНА

**Аннотация.** В статье рассматриваются основные трудности, связанные с внедрением англоязычного обучения (English-Medium Instruction (EMI)) в университетах Казахстана. Несмотря на то, что EMI получило институциональную поддержку и рассматривается как инструмент интернационализации, его практическая реализация выявляет ряд устойчивых барьеров. На основе эмпирических данных, собранных среди преподавателей и студентов пяти вузов, выделены такие проблемы, как недостаточный уровень владения

английским языком, слабая академическая подготовка, недостаточный уровень педагогической поддержки и несоответствие между задачами образовательной политики и реальной практикой в аудиториях. Результаты показывают, что многие преподаватели не готовы вести занятия на английском языке и часто испытывают нехватку профессиональной подготовки и методических ресурсов. Студенты, в свою очередь, отмечают трудности в понимании учебного материала и участия в академических дискуссиях. Эти препятствия снижают эффективность ЕМІ и препятствуют достижению поставленных целей. Авторы утверждают, что для адаптации практики ЕМІ к местным образовательным потребностям необходимы более гибкие институциональные стратегии, программы профессионального развития преподавателей и студентоцентрированное планирование. Предлагаются практические рекомендации, направленные на преодоление разрыва между глобальными устремлениями и национальными реалиями.

**Ключевые слова:** English-Medium Instruction (EMI); языковые барьеры; академическая поддержка; преподаватели; восприятие студентов.

#### **Authors' contributions**

**Agmanova A.Ye.** – Conceptualization; Formal Analysis; Supervision; Validation; Writing – Review and Editing.

**Akynova D.B.** – Conceptualization; Data Curation; Investigation; Methodology; Resources; Software; Writing – Original Draft.