

Ye.Ye. Khairusheva* , **Zh.Kh. Salkhanova** 

Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, Almaty,

*e-mail: khairusheva@mail.ru

BILINGUAL EDUCATION: MODELS AND ASPECTS OF LEARNING

The article deals with the problem of multilingualism, analyzes the models of bilingual education. It is noted that multilingualism as an object of research covers linguistic, psychological, sociological, pedagogical and other aspects. The process of parallel learning of several languages provides for additive, parity, duplication and displacement models. The article argues that the most promising are the additive and parity teaching models as meaningfully and procedurally relevant to the goals of the modern teaching system for the disciplines of the language cycle, contributing to the fulfillment of a social order in the preparation of a competent linguistic personality who speaks the languages most in demand in society.

The presented learning models can serve as the basis for the development of a comprehensive model for the development of communicative language competence, the formation of a bilingual personality capable of equally carrying out speech activity and fulfilling communicative needs through language and speech.

The existence of modified immersion models is noted, in which it becomes possible to use a second language as a foreign one, at least at the initial stage of training. Effective models are those that objectively compare different methods and aspects of the use of one or more languages, and also assess the benefits of these methods for a specific audience.

Key words: multilingualism, bilingualism, pedagogical aspects, additive model, parity model.

Е.Е. Хайрушева*, Ж.Х. Салханова

Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.,

*e-mail: khairusheva@mail.ru

Билингвалдық оқыту: модельдер және оқыту аспектілері

Мақалада көптілділік мәселесі қарастырылып, қос тілді оқыту модельдері талданады. Көптілділік зерттеу нысаны ретінде лингвистикалық, психологиялық, социологиялық, педагогикалық және басқа аспектілерді қамтитыны атап өтілген. Бірнеше тілді қатар оқыту процесі аддитивті, паритетті, қосарлану және орын ауыстыру модельдерін қарастырады. Мақалада қазіргі заманғы оқыту жүйесінің мақсаттарына тілдік цикл пәндері үшін мағыналы және процедуралық тұрғыдан сәйкес келетін аддитивті және паритетті оқыту модельдері ең перспективті болып табылады, бұл қоғамда ең көп сұранысқа ие тілдерде сөйлейтін құзыретті лингвистикалық тұлғаны дайындаудағы әлеуметтік тапсырысты орындауға ықпал етеді деп тұжырымдайды.

Ұсынылған оқыту модельдері коммуникативті тілдік құзыреттілікті дамытудың, сөйлеу әрекетін бірдей жүзеге асыруға және тіл мен сөйлеу арқылы коммуникативті қажеттіліктерді қанағаттандыруға қабілетті екі тілді тұлғаны қалыптастырудың кешенді моделін жасауға негіз бола алады.

Өзгертілген иммерсиялық модельдердің бар екендігі атап өтілді, онда екінші тілді шет тілі ретінде оқытудың бастапқы кезеңінде, ең болмағанда қолдануға болады. Тиімді модельдер дегеніміз – бір немесе бірнеше тілді қолданудың әр түрлі әдістері мен аспектілерін объективті түрде салыстыратын және осы әдістердің белгілі бір аудитория үшін артықшылықтарын бағалайтын модельдер.

Түйін сөздер: көптілділік, қостілділік, педагогикалық аспектілер, аддитивті модель, паритетті модель.

Е.Е. Хайрушева*, Ж.Х. Салханова

Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Казахстан, г. Алматы,

*e-mail: khairusheva@mail.ru

Билингвальное образование: модели и аспекты обучения

В статье рассматривается проблема полиязычия, анализируются модели билингвального образования. Отмечается, что полиязычие как объект исследования охватывает лингвистический, психологический, социологический, педагогический и другие аспекты. Процесс параллельного обучения нескольким языкам предусматривает аддитивную, паритетную, дублирующую и вытесняющую модели. В статье утверждается, что наиболее перспективными являются аддитивная и паритетная модели обучения как содержательно и процессуально соответствующие целям современной системы обучения дисциплинам языкового цикла, способствующие выполнению социального заказа в подготовке компетентной языковой личности, владеющей наиболее востребованными в обществе языками.

Представленные модели обучения могут служить основой для выработки комплексной модели развития коммуникативной языковой компетенции, формирования двуязычной личности, способной в равной степени осуществлять речевую деятельность и реализовывать коммуникативные потребности посредством языка и речи.

Отмечается существование модифицированных моделей погружения, в которых становится возможным использование второго языка в качестве иностранного хотя бы на начальном этапе обучения. Эффективными моделями признаются модели, которые объективно сравнивают различные методы и аспекты использования одного или нескольких языков, а также оценивают преимущества этих методов для конкретной аудитории.

Ключевые слова: полиязычие, билингвизм, педагогические аспекты, аддитивная модель, паритетная модель.

Introduction

Reforms in the educational sphere, especially in the past few decades, reveal a number of prerequisites for the successful formation of functioning parameters that are new for this system. We are talking about the process of democratization of education at all levels of this system, the humanization of process of education and differentiation of the content and procedural aspects of education is carried out. At the same time, the problem of changing the educational paradigm is widely discussed in Russian and foreign psychological and pedagogical literature. Instead of the existing cognitive paradigm of education, a personality-oriented paradigm is being introduced.

The main reason for the need to change the educational paradigm is that there is currently a contradiction between the state of social and scientific and technological progress and the educational systems that have developed in recent years. We need a fundamentally new approach to defining the goals, objectives, and principles of education. We need to review the content of education, which is implemented by academic disciplines at different levels of the education system, from a new conceptual perspective. We need qualitatively new models of education that are adequate to the political, economic and social priorities of sovereign Kazakhstan, and a gradual transition from a closed to an open education system.

Modern language education is associated with the emergence and development of an anthropocentric paradigm in pedagogy and linguodidactics, which understands language as a product of society development, a means of forming thinking and mentality, bringing to the fore such concepts as “man in language”, “language and cognitive consciousness”, “multilingual educational space”, “subject of intercultural communication”, “language and speech personality”, “secondary language personality”, “student autonomy” and others.

Linguistic knowledge is in demand in the twenty-first century, which is determined by many connections – political, economic, scientific, cultural, etc. In Kazakhstan, the development of linguistic knowledge, due to the multinationality of the country, has become a matter of state importance. Leader of the Nation N.A. Nazarbayev, who initiated the question of the trinity of languages, noted the triune policy in the field of language as one of the priority areas for state development (Nazarbayev, 2010).

In the field of education and teaching of the humanities, the state creates the conditions necessary for multilingual education.

Experiment

The purpose of teaching language cycle disciplines should be maximally adapted to the social order with the priority of the state language, aimed

at the formation of not only functional literacy, but also competence in the language in real communication. The organization and functioning of a full-fledged system of teaching languages, which is an important part of social culture, is the most important condition for productive language development. The content of language education, since it is social in nature, must be viewed through the prism of modern trends in the development of society.

In Russian science, issues related to the communicative function of language, which brought to life the communicative approach and strengthened the speech orientation of the phenomena of linguistics, are becoming more and more relevant. This direction is widely reflected in the methodology of teaching Russian and Kazakh languages, the development of new technologies in this area, in the aspect of teaching communication on the basis of foreign languages in the works of methodologists (Burgumbayeva, 2009; Bulatbayeva, 2015; Ekshembeyeva, 2010; Murzalinova, 2012; Oralbayeva, 1998; Orazbayeva, 1991; Salkhanova, 2017; Shakhanova, 2012).

Recognizing the contribution to science made by these scientists, we note, however, that in most works, the technology of teaching a particular language is considered in a narrowly pragmatic aspect, they solve particular methodological problems, or develop ideas for the comparative study and teaching of two languages. Meanwhile, the recognition of communication as a leading methodological concept puts the focus on communication goals and programs, communication strategies and technologies designed for the integral study of a block of disciplines in the language cycle, requires the development of a unified methodological approach for the formation of speech communication in three languages: native, second, and foreign.

Results and discussion

Currently, the definitions “linguistic education”, “polylinguistic education”, “polylinguistic personality”, “bilingual education” are more than widely used. Often, these concepts, perceived in their meaning as opposite, are considered by the training participants as different concepts. We, based on our experience, offer the following definition. Multilingual education is education in which two or more languages are used.

In the methodological literature, these concepts are considered identical. And the use of this or that definition is explained by the communicative situation. As an object of research, multilingualism, or

multilingualism, covers a number of aspects – linguistic, methodological, psychological, social, etc.

From a linguistic point of view, the study of multilingualism includes the study of the relationship and interaction of structural linguistic elements of all levels. Then the features of each language are revealed, their general and specific features in phonetics, vocabulary and grammar are noted. Cases of transposition are noted and their reasons are explained. The main method for studying two or more languages is the comparative typological method.

From a psychological point of view, notes the importance of considering the impact of bilingualism and multilingualism on development of speech, and intelligence in general. To note how the unity of thinking and language affects the foreign language perception, how the process of functioning of the native and non-native languages takes place at different stages of bilingualism and multilingualism and what are their distinctive features.

From the point of view of the sociological aspect, the general functions of languages come to the fore. The common functions include primarily the national language, as well as such functions of the language as the language of instruction, a means of communication, international and interethnic, and spheres, linguistic, scientific, educational and others. And it is the social aspect that largely determines the language policy of the state.

Scientists note the ambiguity of the functioning of languages in society. Kazakh philologist E.D. Suleymenova, who has been dealing with the problems of language policy for many years, drew attention to the repeatedly revealed discrepancy between the current status of the language and the development of the language of statehood in Kazakhstan. At the same time, the researcher noted the continued relevance of the promotion and teaching of the Kazakh language to the present. to this day (Suleymenova, 1989).

The methodological content of pedagogy in the study of multilingualism is of interest. Starting with the question of productive time for learning two or more languages, ending with effective techniques, methods and technologies of teaching at different levels of mastering the native and non-native languages.

At the moment, bilingual teaching models are actively used at different levels. Let’s highlight the main models.

First, it is a duplicate or companion model. This model, which is usually used at the initial stage of training, represents the same language

units in both the native and non-native (second) languages. The duplicate model contributes to the accumulation of content resources of the language. As a result, students are able to establish stable associative relationships between the resource and the set of language tools. Due to duplication, not all phenomena may be represented in both native and non-native languages. The duplication process turns out to be simplified and limiting the needs of native speakers; this model is not universal.

Secondly, the additive or complementary model. This model makes it possible to present to the available material in the native language and additional information from foreign sources in a non-native language. This can be oral and written text, audio or video. The additive model allows you to strengthen the associative relationship between various kinds of material and develops such specific features as linguistic flair and linguistic consciousness of the student.

Third, the parity model, which assumes equal teaching of the mother tongue and non-native language. Provided that students develop lexical competence, this model allows to reveal the content of the academic subject, its conceptual apparatus, as well as knowledge of the required volume of linguistic terminology. The use of this model ultimately leads to the formation of a bilingual learner, which is the main goal of bilingual education.

The next model is a substitution model that allows a non-native (second) language to take a dominant position in relation to the native language. The model assumes that if you use active forms of training, we mean, first of all, educational projects, then this process in the near future will be able to contribute to the optimization of the entire educational process. In this case, it should be noted that this model can achieve efficiency only in the case of a high level of language education and is realizable in a bilingual or multilingual society. The study Russian language during the Soviet Union is an example of this, when the native languages were supplanted by the Russian language.

At present, the positive results of the language training of students of Kazakh-Turkish lyceums are due to the specific conditions of education in boarding schools, that is, a long immersion in the language environment. Another advantage of the Kazakh-Turkish lyceums is the training of experienced specialists in the field of bilingual and multilingual education in foreign countries, in particular, in Turkey and the United States, who are fluent in English.

In European countries, the problem of achieving multilingualism in a relatively short time is urgent. In this regard, two models of mastering a second language are widespread.

The model of receptive acquisition of a second language, successfully implemented in the Scandinavian countries, Poland, Ukraine, Belarus. Each participant in the educational process, speaking in his native language, understands a partner who speaks a language other than his own. The model does not require a significant amount of time to learn a language, and therefore it is successful for teaching related languages. The experience of these countries makes it possible to identify the conditions for the successful study of the second and third languages. According to psychologists, it is preferable to start learning the first language from the first grade, the second – from the fifth grade, and the third – from the tenth grade. These data undermine our understanding of the benefits of learning a second language earlier in school.

Of greater interest to us is the second immersion model of mastering a foreign language. In the methodological science of Western countries, the concepts of “foreign language” and “second language” differ. The second language is the language studied in the country of the given language, and the foreign language is studied outside the country of the given language.

This model is the model of a bilingual school popular in Europe. This model is currently being actively implemented in schools in Germany, France, Belgium, Switzerland, etc. In our opinion, in the case of using individual components of this model in Kazakhstan, it is possible to build a productive system of multilingual education in our country. According to this model, that is, the immersive learning model, a number of subjects, mainly of the humanities, should be studied in a non-native language, which would also be the language of communication.

Learning, according to this model, begins in the learner’s native language. In the second year of study, a foreign language is introduced, which from the fifth grade becomes the language of instruction in all humanitarian disciplines. History and literature of England, for example, are taught from the textbooks of this country, etc. The organization and content of education are determined by the curricula and programs of secondary schools in England, Germany and France. There are “English”, “German” and “French” classes in schools. The ultimate goal of studying at the European Bilingual School (EDSH) is to educate a resident of Europe in the XXI century,

who is fluent in two European languages, European culture and functional competence.

Bilingual education (BE) in the US has its own history and is rooted in the beginning of the 1600s the Federal law since 1968, launched a bilingual policy in US schools. With the Advent of the new World, immigrants began to organize schools that taught in English or other languages. English was not immediately recognized as the official language. The choice of this language was determined by political circumstances, especially in the early years of American history. German was recognized as the official language. Many immigrant groups in the early nineteenth century. Without a legal framework, it was allowed to include bilingual education in the curriculum of educational institutions. Bilingual education in the United States was designed to ensure that children of immigrants who do not speak English can learn two languages at an equally high level (native and English), thereby contributing to their assimilation into American society (Davidson, 2009; Mead, 2008; Grice, 2005).

In 1970, the next phase of government policy in the field of bilingual education began. The issue of education for representatives of linguistic minorities was raised. Parents of students belonging to linguistic minorities have filed lawsuits alleging that schools did not meet the language needs of their children. In their opinion, bilingual children were not always treated fairly. In response to this situation, on May 25, 1970, the Department of Civil Rights was forced to publish a memorandum. The memorandum dealt with the responsibilities of schools. The changes were made in accordance with the fourth paragraph of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This is how the law on bilingual education was laid. In 1973, the support of the Senate and Congress was obtained, which, naturally, contributed to a significant increase in the amount of financial support. Foundations that appeared soon provided funding for new programs that were innovative in their content, including alternative programs (“Special Alternative Education Program”) that do not involve the use of the mother tongue in school. Thus, the model of bilingual education in the United States, aimed at assimilating the children of immigrants for whom English was not their first language, did not involve learning their native language at school.

In recent years, the European Council has successfully implemented the Erasmus program, in parallel with which the Lingua program has been operating in Europe for more than 10 years, the goal of which is real trilingualism already in secondary schools. This increases the opportunities for

graduates to continue their education and increase their competitiveness in the labor market. Within the framework of the above-mentioned programs, a foreign language as such is only partially a subject of study. It acquires the status of a language in which other subjects are taught, or “replaces” the native language. One of the first subjects to be taught in a second language in this program is mathematics, which is very different from the prevailing attitudes about the primacy of so-called nature-like disciplines such as music, drawing as more accessible to bilingual approaches. There is nothing supernatural here, because mathematics, unlike other subjects, is much less in touch with the world of the senses, where the role of language is great, and belongs to the realm of logic, where feelings are secondary. In addition, a smaller set of words is sufficient for teaching mathematics, and this vocabulary is mostly international.

Conclusion

In our opinion, the functioning of these models in the practice of teaching is legitimate not only in relation to bilingual, but also polylingual training. The most promising models are additive and parity models that correspond to the goals of teaching language disciplines in a modern school. The logical result of the application of these models is the preparation of a competent linguistic personality – the social order of society.

The learning models presented above could serve as the basis for a comprehensive education model necessary for the formation of a personality, and which would be capable of fully realizing communicative needs with the help of language.

Recently, a communicative approach has been relevant in the process of language learning. At the same time, analysts point to the absence or insufficient development of the competence-based approach, which is understood as result-oriented education in the form of competencies (Khasanov, 1987; Berdenova, 2006).

There are modified models of immersion, in which, in our opinion, it becomes possible to use a second language as a foreign language at least at the initial stage of training. However, the student’s answer in the second language must be followed by a translation of the answer in the native language given by the teacher, and the student should repeat this answer. In the case of “full immersion”, the teacher continuously forces the student to use only the second language, repeating that at this time and place the first language should be excluded from use.

It is obvious that in the case of poorly expressed motivation, this approach is not just fruitless, but can even cause hostility to the second language. For example, in the Baltic States, there is evidence that when a teacher who taught a subject in Russian was simply replaced by a teacher who taught only in Latvian, students did not perceive the subject at all – even those who were proficient in Latvian to a certain extent. The tragedy of the situation was that these were, in theory, the most integrating subjects – history and cultural history. Subsequently, this dilettante approach caused a flurry of complaints about bilingual education, although in fact it had nothing in common with bilingual education. Using the immersion method in a normal classroom, the teacher unconsciously chooses the path of least resistance, focusing only on children who are proficient in a second language.

Thus, the lesson really takes place in a second language, but there is no individual approach to students. This violates the basic postulates of bilingual education – the language does not carry information and is not learned with pleasure, i.e. most students are spiritually discriminated against. There is no feedback mechanism that leads to profanation of bilingual education in General. In the future, there may be a great argument for possible speculation about the discriminatory effect of bilingual education. The immersion method can be very effective in highly motivated groups. We believe that the method of partial immersion is more acceptable for mass public schools. In our research, effective models are those that objectively compare different methods and aspects of using one or more languages, as well as evaluate the advantages of these methods for specific audiences.

References

- Новое десятилетие – новые экономический подъем – новые возможности: Послание Президента РК Н.Н. Назарбаева народу Казахстана. – Астана, 2010. – 36 с.
- Бургумбаева Ж.А. Қосымша білім беру жүйесінде ересектер арасындағы педагогикалық қарым-қатынасты жетілдіру. – Алматы, 2009. – 30 б.
- Булатбаева К.Н. Функционально-коммуникативный подход к обучению русскому языку в казахской школе (5-9 кл.): Дисс. ... докт. пед. наук. – Павлодар, 2015. – 525 с.
- Екшембеева Л.В. Языковые модули и овладение языком. – Алматы, 2010. – 41 с.
- Мурзалинова А.Ж. Методические основы формирования функциональной грамотности учащихся-казахов при обучении русскому языку в X-XI кл. школы нового типа. – Алматы: Қазақ университеті, 2012. – 306 с.
- Оралбаева Н.О. Орыс тіліндегі мектептерде қазақ тілін оқыту әдістемесі. – Алматы: Ана тілі, 1998. – 208 б.
- Оразбаева Б.К. Отбор и моделирование речевых ситуаций в процессе обучения русскому языку в начальных классах национальной школы. – М., 1991. – 143 с.
- Салханова Ж.Х. Компетентность и компетенции. – Алматы: Қазақ университеті, 2017. – 306 с.
- Шаханова Р.Ә. Техникалық жоғары оқу орындарының орыс бөлімдерінде қазақ тілін мамандыққа қатысты оқуының ғылыми әдістемелік негіздері. – Алматы, 2012. – 327 б.
- Сүлейменова Ә.Д. Понятие смысла в современной лингвистике. – Алматы: Наука, 1989. – 160 с.
- Дэвидсон Д. Функционирование русского языка: методический аспект. – М.: Русский язык, 2009. – 27 с.
- Mid J. Conversational Style. – New Jersey, 2008. – 34 p.
- Grice H.P. Logic in conversation // Syntax and semantics, 3: Speech acts. – NY, 2005. – 160 p.
- Хасанов Г.Н. Казахско-русское двуязычие: социолингвистический аспект. – Алматы: Наука, 2007. – 196 с.
- Берденова С.Ж. Формирование коммуникативной компетенции полиязычной личности. – Алматы, 2006. – 27 с.

References

- Berdenova S. Zh. (2006). Formirovanie kommunikativnoy kompetentsii poliyazychnoy lichnosti. [Formation of the communicative competence of a multilingual person]. Almaty. 27 p. (In Russian)
- Bulatbaeva K.N. (2015). Funktsional'no-kommunikativniy podkhod k obucheniyu russkomu yazyku v kazakhskoi shkole (5-9 kl.) [Functional-communicative approach to teaching the Russian language in a Kazakh school (grades 5–9)]. Diss. ... dokt. ped. nauk. Pavlodar. 525 p. (In Russian)
- Burgumbaeva Zh.A. (2009). Kosymsha bilim beru zhyiesinde eresekter arasyndary pedagogikalyk qarym-qatynasty zhetildiru. [Improving pedagogical relations between adults in the system of additional education]. Almaty. 30 p. (In Kazakh)
- Dehvidson D. (2009). Funktsionirovanie russkogo yazyka: metodicheskiy aspekt. [The functioning of the Russian language: methodological aspect]. M.: Russkiy yazyk. 27 p. (In Russian)
- Ekshembееva L.V. (2010). Yazykovye moduli i ovladenie yazykom. [Language Modules and Language Skills]. Almaty. 41 p. (In Russian)
- Grice H.P. (2005). Logic in conversation // Syntax and semantics, 3: Speech acts. NY. 160 p. (In English)

- Khasanov G. N. (2007). Kazakhsko-russkoe dvuyazychie: sotsiolingvisticheskiy aspekt. [Kazakh-Russian bilingualism: socio-linguistic aspect]. Almaty: Nauka. 196 p. (In Russian)
- Mid J. (2008). Conversational Style. – New Jersey, 2008. 34 p. (In English)
- Murzalinova A.Zh. (2012). Metodicheskie osnovy formirovaniya funktsional'noy gramotnosti uchashchikhsya-kazakhov pri obuchenii russkomu yazyku v X-XI kl. shkoly novogo tipa. [Methodological foundations of the formation of functional literacy of Kazakh students in teaching Russian in the X-XI classes of a new type of school]. Almaty: Kazak universitety. 306 p. (In Russian)
- Nazarbayev N.N. (2010). Novoe desyatiletie – novye ekonomicheskiy pod'em – novye vozmozhnosti: Poslanie Prezidenta RK narodu Kazakhstana. [New decade – new economic rise – new opportunities: a message from the President of RK to people of Kazakhstan]. Astana. 36 p. (In Russian)
- Orazbaeva B.K. (1991). Otkor i modelirovanie rechevykh situatsiy v protsesse obucheniya ruskomu yazyku v nachal'nykh klassakh natsional'noy shkoly. [Selection and modeling of speech situations in the process of teaching the Russian language in the elementary grades of the national school]. M. 143 p. (In Russian)
- Oralbaeva N.O. (1998). Orys tilindegi mektepterde kazak tilin okytu adistemesi. [Methods of teaching the Kazakh language in Russian-language schools]. Almaty: Ana tili. 208 p. (In Kazakh)
- Salkhanova Zh.Kh. (2017). Kompetentnost' i kompetentsii. [Competence and competencies]. Almaty: Kazak universitety. 306 p. (In Russian)
- Suleymenova E. D. (1989). Ponyatie smysla v sovremennoy lingvistike. [The Concept of meaning in modern linguistics]. Almaty: Science. 160 p. (In Russian)
- Shakhanova R.A. (2012). Tekhnikal'nykh zhogary oku oryndarynyn orys bolimderinde kazak tilin mamandykka katysty okutyduy gylymi edistemelik negizdery. [Scientific and methodological bases of teaching the Kazakh language in the Russian departments of technical universities]. Almaty. 327 p. (In Kazakh)