

IRSTI 14.35.09

<https://doi.org/10.26577/EJPh2022202622>A.M. Kontek^{1*}, A.A. Kuzdybaeva²,F.K. Ismailova³, A.M. Saurikova³¹Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan²K. Zhubanov Aktobe Regional University, Aktobe, Kazakhstan³Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

*e-mail: aiym.kontekova@gmail.com

A STRUCTURAL-METHODOLOGICAL MODEL FOR PARALLEL TEACHING OF TWO FOREIGN LANGUAGES IN KAZAKHSTANI UNIVERSITIES

Parallel foreign language teaching in Kazakhstani universities requires not only the simultaneous inclusion of two foreign languages in the curriculum, but also their methodological coordination as interrelated components of one educational process. In teacher-training programmes such as "Foreign Language: Two Foreign Languages", English is usually studied as the first foreign language, while French, German, Chinese or another language is introduced as the second foreign language. In actual practice, however, the two languages are often taught as separate subjects, with different syllabi, unequal academic hours and insufficient coordination between teachers. This creates a methodological contradiction between the expected development of communicative competence in two foreign languages and the lack of mechanisms for cross-linguistic transfer, contrastive analysis and interference management.

The purpose of this article is to substantiate the methodological foundations of parallel foreign language teaching and to propose a structural-methodological model for coordinating English as the first foreign language and French as the second foreign language. The study is based on competence-based, communicative-cognitive, contrastive, integrative and metalinguistic approaches. The research methods include analysis of educational programmes and syllabi, diagnostic survey, oral questioning and theoretical modelling. The empirical part involved 83 respondents: 76 students and graduates and 7 teachers connected with the English-French language combination in the 2024-2025 academic year.

The findings indicate that the main difficulty is the absence of a coordinated methodological system. The article identifies key conditions for parallel teaching: topic synchronization, contrastive grammar and vocabulary tasks, metalinguistic awareness, transfer and interference management, teacher coordination and CEFR-based assessment. The proposed model includes target, content, organizational-methodological, processual and assessment-diagnostic components. Its practical value lies in its application to curriculum design, syllabus development and classroom practice.

Keywords: parallel foreign language teaching, methodological coordination, cross-linguistic transfer, metalinguistic awareness.

A.M. Контек^{1*}, А.А. Куздыбаева²,Ф.К. Исмаилова³ А.М. Саурикова³¹Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан²Қ. Жұбанов атындағы Ақтөбе өңірлік университеті, Ақтөбе, Қазақстан³Абай атындағы Қазақ Ұлттық педагогикалық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

*e-mail: aiym.kontekova@gmail.com

Қазақстан университеттерінде екі шет тілін қатар оқытудың құрылымдық-әдістемелік моделі

Қазақстан университеттерінде шет тілдерін қатар оқыту екі шет тілін оқу жоспарына бір мезгілде енгізумен ғана шектелмейді, ол оларды біртұтас білім беру үдерісінің өзара байланысты компоненттері ретінде әдістемелік тұрғыдан үйлестіруді қажет етеді. «Шетел тілі: екі шетел тілі» сияқты педагогикалық білім беру бағдарламаларында ағылшын тілі әдетте бірінші шет тілі ретінде, ал француз, неміс, қытай немесе басқа тіл екінші шет тілі ретінде оқытылады. Алайда нақты тәжірибеде екі тіл көбіне жеке пәндер ретінде жүргізіліп, олардың силабустары, академиялық сағат көлемі және оқытушылар арасындағы үйлестіру деңгейі әртүрлі болады. Бұл екі шет тілінде коммуникативтік құзыреттілікті дамыту мақсаты мен межділдiк тасымал,

және интерференцияны басқару тетіктерінің жеткіліксіздігі арасындағы әдістемелік қайшылықты туындатады.

Мақаланың мақсаты – шет тілдерін қатар оқытудың әдіснамалық негіздерін айқындау және ағылшын тілін бірінші шет тілі, француз тілін екінші шет тілі ретінде оқытуды үйлестіруге арналған құрылымдық-әдістемелік модель ұсыну. Зерттеу құзыреттілік, коммуникативтік-когнитивтік, контрастивтік, интегративтік және метатілдік тәсілдерге негізделеді. Зерттеу әдістері ретінде білім беру бағдарламалары мен силлабустарды талдау, диагностикалық сауалнама, ауызша сұрау және теориялық модельдеу қолданылды. Эмпирикалық зерттеуге 2024–2025 оқу жылында ағылшын-француз тілдік комбинациясымен байланысты 83 респондент қатысты: 76 студент пен түлек және 7 оқытушы.

Зерттеу нәтижелері негізгі қиындық үйлестірілген әдістемелік жүйенің болмауында екенін көрсетеді. Мақалада қатар оқытудың негізгі шарттары анықталды: тақырыптарды синхрондау, контрастивті грамматикалық және лексикалық тапсырмалар, метатілдік саналылық, тілдік тасымал мен интерференцияны басқару, оқытушылардың үйлестіруі және CEFR негізіндегі бағалау. Ұсынылған модель мақсаттық, мазмұндық, ұйымдастырушылық-әдістемелік, процессуалдық және бағалау-диагностикалық компоненттерден тұрады. Оның практикалық маңызы оқу бағдарламаларын жобалауда, силлабустарды әзірлеуде және аудиториялық жұмыста қолданылуымен байланысты.

Түйін сөздер: шет тілдерін қатар оқыту, әдістемелік үйлестіру, межтілдік тасымал, метатілдік саналылық.

А.М. Контек^{1*}, А.А. Куздыбаева²,
Ф.К. Исмаилова³ А.М. Саурикова³

¹Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан

²Актюбинский региональный университет имени К. Жубанова, Актюбе, Казахстан

³Казахский национальный педагогический университет имени Абая, Алматы, Казахстан

*e-mail: aiym.kontekova@gmail.com

Структурно-методическая модель параллельного обучения двум иностранным языкам в университетах Казахстана

Параллельное обучение иностранным языкам в университетах Казахстана требует не только одновременного включения двух иностранных языков в учебный план, но и их методической координации как взаимосвязанных компонентов единого образовательного процесса. В педагогических образовательных программах, таких как «Иностранный язык: два иностранных языка», английский язык обычно изучается как первый иностранный язык, тогда как французский, немецкий, китайский или другой язык вводится как второй иностранный язык. Однако на практике два языка часто преподаются как отдельные дисциплины, с разными силлабусами, неравным количеством академических часов и недостаточной координацией между преподавателями. Это создает методическое противоречие между ожидаемым развитием коммуникативной компетенции в двух иностранных языках и отсутствием механизмов межъязыкового переноса, контрастивного анализа и управления интерференцией.

Цель статьи – обосновать методологические основы параллельного обучения иностранным языкам и предложить структурно-методическую модель координации обучения английскому языку как первому иностранному и французскому языку как второму иностранному. Исследование основано на компетентностном, коммуникативно-когнитивном, контрастивном, интегративном и метаязыковом подходах. Методы исследования включают анализ образовательных программ и силлабусов, диагностическое анкетирование, устный опрос и теоретическое моделирование. Эмпирическая часть исследования охватила 83 респондента: 76 студентов и выпускников, а также 7 преподавателей, связанных с англо-французской языковой комбинацией в 2024–2025 учебном году.

Результаты исследования показывают, что основная трудность заключается в отсутствии координированной методической системы. В статье определены ключевые условия параллельного обучения: синхронизация тем, контрастивные грамматические и лексические задания, метаязыковая осознанность, управление переносом и интерференцией, координация между преподавателями и CEFR-ориентированное оценивание. Предложенная модель включает целевой, содержательный, организационно-методический, процессуальный и оценочно-диагностический компоненты. Ее практическая значимость заключается в возможности применения при проектировании учебных программ, разработке силлабусов и организации аудиторной работы.

Ключевые слова: параллельное обучение иностранным языкам, методическая координация, межъязыковой перенос, метаязыковая осознанность.

Introduction

The development of multilingual education is one of the important directions of higher education in Kazakhstan. Future specialists, especially students majoring in “Foreign Language: Two Foreign Languages”, are expected to master not only one foreign language, but also an additional foreign language that can support their academic mobility, professional competitiveness and intercultural communication. In this context, the teaching of two foreign languages is not a secondary element of professional training, but one of its core components.

In Kazakhstani universities, the first foreign language is usually English. It is introduced earlier, receives more academic hours and is supported by a more developed methodological tradition. The second foreign language, for example French, is generally introduced later and receives fewer academic hours. As a result, the expected learning outcomes for the second foreign language are more difficult to achieve, especially in oral communication, listening comprehension and spontaneous speech production. Survey responses and the analysis of educational programmes indicate that insufficient academic hours, limited communicative practice and weak methodological coordination are among the main factors affecting students’ progress in the second foreign language.

However, the problem should not be reduced only to the number of academic hours. The deeper methodological issue is that the first and second foreign languages are often taught independently from each other. Their syllabi may not be synchronized; grammar and vocabulary are not systematically compared; communicative topics are not coordinated; and teachers do not always plan cross-language tasks together. In such conditions, students do not fully use the knowledge gained in the first foreign language as a resource for learning the second. On the contrary, uncontrolled transfer may lead to interference, lexical confusion and grammatical errors.

Therefore, parallel foreign language teaching should be understood not as the mechanical simultaneous teaching of two languages, but as a scientifically grounded and methodologically coordinated process. Its aim is to organize the interaction between the first and second foreign languages in such a way that students consciously compare languages, use positive transfer, prevent interference and develop metalinguistic awareness.

The relevance of the study is determined by three factors. First, Kazakhstani higher education

needs specialists who are able to communicate in more than one foreign language. Second, existing curricula often include two foreign languages, but do not always provide methodological mechanisms for their integration. Third, the second foreign language remains the weaker component of training because of fewer hours, later introduction and insufficient communicative practice. These factors show the need for a model that can coordinate the teaching of the first and second foreign languages within one educational trajectory.

The purpose of this article is to substantiate the methodological foundations of parallel foreign language teaching in Kazakhstani universities and to propose a structural-methodological model for coordinating the teaching of English and French.

The study addresses the following research questions:

1. What methodological problems arise in the teaching of the first and second foreign languages in Kazakhstani universities?
2. What theoretical and methodological approaches can provide the basis for parallel foreign language teaching?
3. What components should be included in a structural-methodological model of parallel teaching of English and French?
4. What assessment indicators can be used to evaluate the implementation of a structural-methodological model of parallel teaching?

The study proceeds from the assumption that parallel foreign language teaching can become more effective when the two foreign languages are not taught as isolated subjects, but are coordinated through common themes, contrastive analysis, metalinguistic reflection, systematic management of transfer and CEFR-based assessment.

Materials and methods

The study was conducted in the context of Kazakhstani higher education programmes that train future specialists in two foreign languages. Its main focus was the organization of parallel teaching of English as the first foreign language and French as the second foreign language within the educational programme “Foreign Language: Two Foreign Languages”. The aim was to identify the main methodological problems of teaching two foreign languages within one curriculum and to develop a structural-methodological model for their coordination.

The study used a descriptive mixed-methods design combining document analysis, diagnostic

survey, oral questioning and theoretical modelling. The empirical materials included educational programmes, curricula and syllabi related to the specialty “Foreign Language: Two Foreign Languages”, as well as survey responses from students, graduates and teachers. These documents were analysed to determine the place of the first and second foreign languages in the curriculum, the number of academic hours, the semester of introduction, expected learning outcomes, target CEFR level, assessment forms and the presence or absence of methodological coordination between English and French courses.

The diagnostic survey involved 83 respondents: 76 students and graduates and 7 teachers connected with the English–French language combination. It was conducted during the 2024–2025 academic year through Google Forms and oral questioning. The student and graduate questionnaire focused on the sufficiency of academic hours for French, communicative practice, difficulties in grammar, vocabulary, listening and speaking, the influence of English on French learning, cases of lexical and grammatical interference and the need for coordinated tasks. The teacher questionnaire focused on the organization of the teaching process, the coordination between English and French courses, the use of contrastive tasks and the difficulties observed in students’ acquisition of French as the second foreign language.

The research was based on competence-based, communicative-cognitive, contrastive, integrative and metalinguistic approaches. The competence-based approach made it possible to consider parallel teaching as a process aimed at developing communicative, intercultural and metalinguistic competences. The contrastive and metalinguistic approaches helped analyse similarities and differences between English and French, transfer-related errors and students’ ability to use previous language-learning experience consciously.

The study was carried out in four stages. At the first stage, educational programmes and curricula were analysed. At the second stage, English and French syllabi were compared in terms of topics, communicative situations, vocabulary, grammar, contrastive tasks and assessment criteria. At the third stage, survey and oral questioning data were analysed to identify the main difficulties in learning French as the second foreign language. At the fourth stage, theoretical modelling was used to develop a structural-methodological model consisting of target, content, organizational-methodological, processual and assessment-diagnostic components.

The data were analysed through descriptive and interpretive methods. Survey responses were used to identify recurring tendencies, including insufficient hours for the second foreign language, limited communicative practice, weak coordination between English and French courses, positive and negative transfer, lexical and grammatical interference and the need for contrastive tasks. The reliability of the study was strengthened through triangulation of educational documents, syllabi, survey responses and oral questioning.

Ethical principles were observed during the survey. Participation was voluntary, the respondents were informed about the research purpose, no sensitive personal data were collected and the results were analysed in a generalized form.

The study has several limitations. The survey sample was limited to 83 respondents and cannot represent all Kazakhstani universities. The study also did not aim to prove the statistical effectiveness of the proposed model through a full-scale pedagogical experiment. Nevertheless, the collected data are sufficient for identifying key methodological problems and substantiating the need for a coordinated model of parallel foreign language teaching in higher education.

Literature review

The methodological foundations of parallel foreign language teaching should be analysed within the broader framework of multilingual education, plurilingual competence, third and additional language acquisition, cross-linguistic influence, metalinguistic awareness and tertiary language didactics. In contemporary language pedagogy, the learner is no longer viewed as a person who acquires several languages as isolated systems. Instead, the learner’s linguistic experience is understood as an integrated and dynamic repertoire in which previously acquired languages influence the acquisition of new ones (Herdina & Jessner, 2002; Jessner, 2006). This view is also supported by research on bilingual cognition. Cook (1992) introduces the concept of multi-competence, which refers to the knowledge of more than one language in one mind. It challenges the idea that English and French should be treated as fully separate systems in the learner’s mind. From this perspective, students learning two foreign languages develop an integrated linguistic repertoire, and teaching should help them use this repertoire consciously through comparison, transfer and reflection.

A central conceptual basis for this study is the distinction between multilingualism and plurilingualism. The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages defines language competence not simply as the separate mastery of individual languages, but as the development of a plurilingual and pluricultural repertoire (Council of Europe, 2001). The CEFR Companion Volume further strengthens this idea by emphasizing mediation, plurilingual and pluricultural competence, and the learner's ability to draw on the whole linguistic repertoire in communication and learning (Council of Europe, 2020). For the present study, this means that English and French should not be taught as fully isolated academic subjects. Their teaching should include points of connection, comparison and methodological coordination.

Cenoz (2009) also emphasizes that multilingual education should be understood not as the simple addition of several languages to the curriculum, but as an educational approach in which languages are connected through common pedagogical aims and coordinated instructional practices. This idea is relevant to the present study because the formal presence of English and French in one programme does not automatically create parallel teaching. Parallel teaching requires planned methodological links between the first and second foreign languages.

The idea of linguistic interdependence is also important for understanding the potential of parallel foreign language teaching. Cummins (1979) argues that competence developed in one language can support the development of another language if the educational context creates appropriate conditions for transfer. Although this theory was originally developed in relation to bilingual education, its logic is applicable to the teaching of two foreign languages in higher education. Students who have already developed reading strategies, grammatical concepts, academic vocabulary and communicative experience in English may use this knowledge when learning French. However, this support does not occur automatically. It requires explicit methodological organization, carefully designed tasks and teacher guidance.

Cummins (2007) further argues that monolingual instructional strategies may be insufficient in multilingual classrooms, because learners' previous linguistic knowledge can be used as a resource for learning. This position is important for parallel foreign language teaching because English should not be excluded from the process of learning French. Instead, it can be used pedagogically through com-

parison, explanation, mediation and reflection.

Research on instructed language learning shows that effective language development requires meaningful input, interaction, feedback and repeated opportunities for practice (Lightbown & Spada, 2013). This is important for parallel teaching because the coordination of English and French should be realized not only at the level of curriculum design, but also through classroom tasks that provide communication, comparison and feedback.

Research on bilingual and multilingual education also shows that the effectiveness of learning through more than one language depends not only on the presence of several languages in the curriculum, but also on the pedagogical organization of their interaction (Baker, 2011). This idea is important for the present study because parallel teaching of English and French requires a coordinated methodological system rather than the separate teaching of two language subjects.

The concept of cross-linguistic influence provides a more specific explanation of how previously learned languages affect the acquisition of a new language. Odlin (1989) defines transfer as the influence resulting from similarities and differences between the target language and any language that has been previously acquired. Later studies also show that transfer is not limited to grammar, but may involve vocabulary, pronunciation, discourse, pragmatics and cognitive strategies (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2008; Ringbom, 2007). In the context of parallel teaching, this means that English can support French learning through international vocabulary, academic discourse patterns and familiar communicative situations. At the same time, English may also become a source of interference if students mechanically transfer English word order, pronunciation patterns or lexical meanings into French.

Research on cross-linguistic influence in multilingual learners also shows that transfer is affected by several factors, including language distance, proficiency level, learning context and the learner's perception of similarity between languages (De Angelis & Dewaele, 2011). This is important for the English–French combination because students may rely on perceived lexical similarity, although similarity does not always lead to correct usage. Therefore, parallel teaching should include tasks that help students distinguish between useful transfer and interference-based errors.

General research in second language acquisition also confirms that repeated learner errors require focused instructional attention, feedback and opportu-

nities for meaningful practice (Ellis, 2008). In parallel teaching, this means that interference should not be treated only as an individual learner problem. It should be addressed through planned contrastive exercises, corrective feedback and reflective analysis of typical English-based errors in French.

Therefore, the methodological task is not to avoid transfer, but to manage it. Positive transfer should be activated, while negative transfer should be anticipated, explained and corrected. This is particularly important in English–French learning because these languages have many cognates and international lexical units, but also numerous false friends and structural differences. If students are not trained to notice such similarities and differences, the apparent closeness between the languages may lead to lexical confusion and grammatical errors.

Research on third and additional language acquisition is directly relevant to this issue. De Angelis (2007) emphasizes that the acquisition of an additional language differs from the acquisition of the first foreign language because learners already possess previous linguistic knowledge and experience of language learning. This means that a student who begins French after English should not be treated as an absolute beginner in methodological terms. Such a student already knows how to learn a foreign language, how to work with vocabulary, how to understand grammatical explanation and how to perform communicative tasks. Therefore, teaching French as a second foreign language should differ from teaching French as the first foreign language.

This position is supported by tertiary language didactics. Hufeisen and Neuner (2004) argue that the teaching of a third or subsequent language should be based on the learner's previous language-learning experience. Their model of "German after English" is significant because it shows that the first foreign language can become a didactic bridge to the second foreign language. The same principle can be adapted to the Kazakhstani context, especially in the English–French combination. English should not be viewed as a competing language that prevents French acquisition. On the contrary, if properly used, it can become a methodological resource for accelerating vocabulary acquisition, supporting reading comprehension and developing grammatical awareness.

The dynamic model of multilingualism proposed by Herdina and Jessner (2002) also provides an important theoretical basis for the present study. According to this model, multilingual development is not linear or additive. Languages in the learner's

repertoire interact, influence one another and develop unevenly. This idea is important because it challenges the traditional practice of teaching each foreign language independently. If multilingual competence is dynamic, then the educational process should include mechanisms for coordinating the interaction between languages. In other words, parallel foreign language teaching must not be reduced to the simultaneous presence of two languages in the curriculum; it must organize their interaction pedagogically.

Metalinguistic awareness is another key concept for the proposed model. Jessner (2006) shows that multilingual learners develop a specific ability to reflect on language, compare linguistic systems and use their previous language-learning experience more effectively. In parallel teaching, metalinguistic awareness becomes both a condition and a result of learning. Students should not only learn English and French separately; they should also understand how the two languages express meaning, how their grammatical systems differ and when transfer is helpful or harmful.

Jessner (2008) further emphasizes that third language teaching should rely on language awareness, comparison and strategy transfer. This is particularly relevant for future foreign language teachers, because they need to develop not only proficiency in English and French, but also the professional ability to explain similarities, differences and possible interference between languages. Thus, metalinguistic awareness should be considered both a learning outcome and a component of teacher training.

The idea that multilingual speakers should not be understood as several monolinguals in one person is also relevant here. Grosjean (1989) argues that bilingual competence has its own holistic nature. This view may be extended to learners of two foreign languages. A student studying English and French does not develop two completely isolated systems. Rather, both languages become part of one developing linguistic repertoire. For this reason, assessment and teaching should include not only separate language skills, but also the learner's ability to compare languages, use strategies consciously and control interference.

Recent studies in multilingual pedagogy also support the need for integrated approaches. Cenoz and Gorter (2011) propose the "Focus on Multilingualism" approach, which considers the multilingual speaker, the whole linguistic repertoire and the social context of language use. This approach is valuable because it moves language teaching away from

a monolingual norm and towards the development of integrated linguistic resources. Later, Cenoz and Gorter (2021) developed the concept of pedagogical translanguaging as a planned instructional strategy that uses the learner's whole linguistic repertoire to support learning. For parallel foreign language teaching, this idea is relevant not as uncontrolled code-switching, but as purposeful pedagogical use of English to support French through comparison, mediation, vocabulary analysis and reflection.

At the same time, parallel foreign language teaching should be distinguished from general multilingual education and translanguaging. Multilingual education usually refers to a broader institutional or policy framework in which several languages are present in the educational system. Translanguaging emphasizes the flexible use of linguistic resources in communication and learning (García & Wei, 2014). Parallel foreign language teaching is more specific. In this study, it refers to the coordinated teaching of the first and second foreign languages within one educational programme through synchronized content, contrastive tasks, teacher cooperation, transfer management and assessment procedures.

The Kazakhstani context gives this issue particular importance. The development of multilingual education in Kazakhstan has been studied in connection with language policy, trilingual education and the modernization of higher education (Zhetpisbayeva, 2008; Lekerova et al., 2020; Tussupbekova et al., 2018). Lekerova, Polatova and Osymova (2020) analyse theoretical approaches to multilingual education in domestic and foreign pedagogy and emphasize the importance of developing a multilingual educational environment in Kazakhstan. Kulibayeva (2002) also highlights the importance of internationally oriented language education and the formation of standard levels of foreign language proficiency. These studies are important because they create the general national and methodological background for multilingual education.

However, the existing Kazakhstani literature mostly discusses trilingual education, the interaction of Kazakh, Russian and English, CLIL, English-medium instruction and language policy. Recent studies on foreign language education in Kazakhstan also show that the modernization of language education requires attention to effective teaching methods, teacher training, the development of multilingual programmes and the improvement of foreign language learning conditions at different levels of education (Takuova et al., 2023). However, these studies mainly address the general problems of for-

eign language education and trilingual policy, while the methodological coordination of the first and second foreign languages within one teacher-training programme remains insufficiently developed. Less attention is paid to the specific problem of coordinating the first and second foreign languages in the educational programme "Foreign Language: Two Foreign Languages". This is a significant gap. Students in this programme are not simply participants of general multilingual education; they are future foreign language teachers whose professional training requires the systematic development of two foreign languages. Therefore, the second foreign language should not be treated as an additional minor discipline. It requires a specific methodology that takes into account its relation to the first foreign language.

The analysis of curriculum practice also shows that the first and second foreign languages often have unequal conditions. The first foreign language usually starts earlier, receives more academic hours and has a stronger methodological base. The second foreign language starts later and is often taught with fewer hours and less communicative practice. This creates a contradiction between expected learning outcomes and real instructional conditions. If students are expected to reach a sufficient communicative level in the second foreign language, then the limited number of hours should be compensated by methodological coordination with the first foreign language.

In this regard, parallel teaching may function as a compensatory and developmental mechanism. It can compensate for the limited number of hours in the second foreign language by using the already formed linguistic and strategic experience of students. For example, students can transfer reading strategies, academic vocabulary learning techniques, discourse organization and general communicative models from English to French. At the same time, the teacher must help students identify areas where transfer is impossible or dangerous, such as false friends, gender categories, verb agreement, articles, pronunciation and word order.

The literature also shows that learning several languages may increase cognitive load if the educational process is not properly structured (Herdina & Jessner, 2002; Jessner, 2006). Students may experience lexical confusion, grammatical interference and reduced confidence in the second foreign language. This is especially visible when languages are typologically or lexically close enough to create similarities, but different enough to produce errors.

Therefore, parallel teaching should include structured comparison, gradual sequencing and reflective activities. Such tasks may include contrastive grammar tables, bilingual vocabulary maps, analysis of false friends, parallel oral presentations, reflective diaries, error analysis and mediation tasks.

A complexity-oriented view of language learning also supports this interpretation. Larsen-Freeman (2018) argues that language development is dynamic, adaptive and dependent on the interaction of multiple factors. In the context of parallel teaching, the development of English and French cannot be understood as two separate linear processes. It should be viewed as a complex educational process in which linguistic experience, learner strategies, teacher coordination, curriculum structure and assessment practices interact.

From the reviewed literature, several methodological principles can be derived. First, the first and second foreign languages should be taught as interacting components of one educational trajectory, not as fully isolated subjects. Second, the first foreign language should be used as a resource for learning the second foreign language, but this use must be pedagogically controlled. Third, contrastive analysis should be integrated into classroom practice at lexical, grammatical, phonetic, discourse and cultural levels. Fourth, metalinguistic awareness should be treated as a specific learning outcome. Fifth, teachers of the first and second foreign languages should coordinate themes, tasks and assessment criteria. Sixth, the effectiveness of parallel teaching should be assessed not only through CEFR-based language proficiency, but also through indicators of transfer management, interference prevention and reflective learning strategies.

Thus, the reviewed literature demonstrates that the methodological foundations of parallel foreign language teaching are interdisciplinary. They combine plurilingual education, linguistic interdependence theory, cross-linguistic influence, tertiary language didactics, dynamic multilingualism and metalinguistic awareness. The analysis reveals a clear research gap in the Kazakhstani context: although multilingual and trilingual education have been widely discussed, the methodological coordination of the first and second foreign languages in higher education remains insufficiently developed. This gap justifies the need to design a structural-methodological model of parallel foreign language teaching for Kazakhstani universities.

Results and discussion

The analysis of educational programmes, curricula, syllabi and survey responses revealed that the main problem in the organization of teaching two foreign languages in Kazakhstani universities is not the formal absence of the second foreign language in the curriculum, but the insufficient methodological coordination between the first and second foreign languages. This finding corresponds to the modern understanding of plurilingual competence, according to which languages in the learner's repertoire should not be viewed as isolated systems, but as interrelated resources for communication and learning (Council of Europe, 2001; Council of Europe, 2020; Cenoz & Gorter, 2011).

The first important finding concerns the unequal position of the two foreign languages in the curriculum. English, as the first foreign language, is usually introduced earlier, receives more academic hours and is supported by a wider range of teaching materials, assessment tools and communicative practice. French, as the second foreign language, is introduced later and receives fewer hours. This creates unequal starting conditions for the development of communicative competence in the two languages. As a result, students tend to demonstrate stronger receptive and productive skills in English than in French, especially in speaking, listening and spontaneous communication.

The diagnostic survey involved 83 respondents: 76 students and graduates and 7 teachers connected with the English–French language combination in the educational programme “Foreign Language: Two Foreign Languages”. Since the survey was diagnostic and exploratory in nature, its results were not used for broad statistical generalization. Instead, they were used to identify recurring methodological difficulties in the organization of parallel foreign language teaching. The main tendencies revealed through the survey and oral questioning are summarized in Table 1.

As shown in Table 1, the difficulties identified by students, graduates and teachers are not limited to the amount of classroom time. They also concern the structure of the educational process itself. The second foreign language requires not only more practice, but also a more coordinated methodology that can use students' previous experience in English as a learning resource.

Table 1*Main diagnostic findings from the survey*

Identified difficulty	Respondent group	Methodological implication
Insufficient academic hours for French as the second foreign language	Students and graduates	The second foreign language requires stronger methodological support and coordination with the first foreign language
Limited communicative practice in French	Students and graduates	Parallel communicative tasks should be introduced to increase speaking and interaction
Difficulties in grammar and vocabulary	Students, graduates and teachers	Contrastive grammar and vocabulary exercises are needed
Weak connection between English and French courses	Students, graduates and teachers	Syllabi should include synchronized topics and related communicative situations
English-based lexical and grammatical interference	Teachers and students	Transfer should be consciously managed through comparison and reflection
Lack of regular contrastive tasks	Teachers and students	Metalinguistic awareness should be developed as a specific learning outcome

Note. Compiled by the authors based on the diagnostic survey and syllabus analysis

The second finding is related to the lack of content synchronization between English and French courses. The comparative analysis of syllabi showed that the two courses do not always have coordinated topics, related communicative situations or comparable grammar and vocabulary content. For example, students may study academic communication or professional topics in English, while the French course may focus on everyday themes at the same stage of study. Such separation limits the possibility of using knowledge acquired in English as a resource for learning French. In this case, the two languages exist in the curriculum simultaneously, but they do not function as methodologically connected components of one educational trajectory.

This problem is important because previous language-learning experience may support the acquisition of an additional language if the educational context creates favourable conditions for transfer. Cummins' theory of linguistic interdependence suggests that competence developed in one language can contribute to the development of another language under appropriate pedagogical conditions (Cummins, 1979). In the context of the present study, this means that English can support the learning of French, but only if teachers organize systematic comparison, reflection and transfer-oriented tasks.

The third finding concerns the insufficient use of contrastive tasks. The analysis showed that systematic comparison of English and French is rarely included as a planned element of instruction. How-

ever, such comparison is necessary because students learning French after English already possess certain linguistic knowledge and language-learning experience. Research on third and additional language acquisition shows that learners of an additional language differ from learners of the first foreign language because they already have experience of learning another language and can use previously developed strategies (De Angelis, 2007; Hufeisen & Neuner, 2004). Therefore, French as a second foreign language should not be taught in exactly the same way as French as the first foreign language.

The fourth finding is connected with cross-linguistic transfer. The survey and oral questioning indicated that English can function both as a resource and as a source of difficulty in learning French. On the one hand, students can use English to understand international vocabulary, academic terminology, reading strategies and general communicative models. On the other hand, direct transfer from English to French may cause errors in word order, pronunciation, article use, verb forms and lexical meaning. This corresponds to Odlin's understanding of transfer as the influence resulting from similarities and differences between the target language and previously acquired languages (Odlin, 1989). Later studies also show that cross-linguistic influence may affect not only grammar, but also vocabulary, discourse, pragmatics and cognitive processing (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2008; Ringbom, 2007).

Research on third language acquisition also shows that cross-linguistic influence becomes more

complex when more than two languages are involved. Cenoz, Hufeisen and Jessner (2001) emphasize that previously acquired languages may influence the acquisition of a third or additional language in different ways, depending on language distance, proficiency level and learning context. This is directly relevant to the English–French combination, because students' knowledge of English may support French learning through positive transfer, but may also create interference if similarities between the two languages are interpreted mechanically.

Therefore, the methodological task is not to prohibit the influence of English, but to make this influence conscious and pedagogically controlled. Positive transfer should be activated, while negative transfer should be anticipated, explained and corrected. This is especially important in the English–French pair because the two languages have many cognates and international lexical units, but also false friends, different article systems, different verb forms and different pronunciation patterns. If these similarities and differences are not made explicit, students may either fail to use the advantages of language similarity or produce interference-based errors.

The fifth finding concerns metalinguistic awareness. Students often experience difficulties not only because they do not know a particular French form, but because they do not clearly understand how this form differs from an English equivalent. This shows that language proficiency alone is not sufficient for parallel learning. Students also need the ability to reflect on language, compare linguistic systems and explain transfer-related errors. Jessner argues that multilingual learners develop specific linguistic and metalinguistic awareness that helps them manage

the interaction between languages (Jessner, 2006). In the context of this study, metalinguistic awareness should be considered one of the expected outcomes of parallel foreign language teaching.

The sixth finding concerns teacher coordination. The analysis showed that teachers of the first and second foreign languages often work independently. Their syllabi, tasks and assessment criteria are not always discussed together. This leads to fragmentation of the educational process. If the aim of the programme is to develop communicative competence in two foreign languages, then the teaching process should include at least partial coordination between teachers. Such coordination may include common macro-themes, parallel communicative tasks, contrastive exercises, common reflective tasks and shared criteria for evaluating language progress.

This finding is consistent with the dynamic model of multilingualism, according to which multilingual development is not linear or additive, but dynamic and interactional (Herdina & Jessner, 2002). If languages in the learner's repertoire interact, then the educational process should not ignore this interaction. On the contrary, it should organize it pedagogically. Parallel foreign language teaching should therefore be understood as a coordinated methodological system rather than the simple simultaneous teaching of two foreign languages.

On the basis of these findings, a structural-methodological model of parallel foreign language teaching was developed. The model includes five interrelated components: target, content, organizational-methodological, processual and assessment-diagnostic components. The model is presented in Table 2.

Table 2
Structural-methodological model of parallel foreign language teaching

Component of the model	Main content	Expected result
Target component	Development of communicative, intercultural and metalinguistic competence in two foreign languages	Clear methodological orientation of parallel teaching
Content component	Synchronization of themes, vocabulary, grammar and communicative situations	Stronger connection between English and French courses
Organizational-methodological component	Coordination between teachers, shared planning and contrastive tasks	Reduction of methodological fragmentation
Processual component	Diagnosis, coordinated instruction, comparison, reflection and assessment	Systematic organization of parallel learning
Assessment-diagnostic component	CEFR-based assessment and indicators of transfer and metalinguistic awareness	More objective evaluation of both language and cross-language outcomes

Note. Developed by the authors

The target component defines the general aim of parallel teaching: to develop students' communicative, intercultural and metalinguistic competence in two foreign languages through coordinated instruction. This component is based on the idea that students should not only acquire English and French separately, but also learn to compare them, use positive transfer and prevent interference. This corresponds to the CEFR view of plurilingual competence, where the learner's whole linguistic repertoire is treated as a resource for communication and learning (Council of Europe, 2020).

The content component includes the synchronization of themes, communicative situations, lexical fields and selected grammar topics. Full duplication of content is not required. However, the two language courses should contain related macro-themes that allow students to transfer knowledge and communicative experience from one language to another. For example, topics such as education, professional communication, travel, media, culture and academic life can be studied in both languages with different levels of complexity.

The organizational-methodological component includes cooperation between teachers of English and French. This component requires the coordination of syllabi, thematic modules, types of assignments and assessment criteria. Teacher cooperation is especially important for designing contrastive tasks, identifying typical interference errors and supporting students' metalinguistic reflection.

The processual component describes the stages of implementation. These stages include initial diagnosis of students' language levels, selection of coordinated topics, implementation of parallel and contrastive tasks, reflection on transfer and interference, and assessment of learning outcomes. This component ensures that parallel teaching is not a theoretical declaration, but a structured pedagogical process.

The assessment-diagnostic component includes two groups of indicators. The first group consists of traditional language indicators: listening, reading, speaking, writing, vocabulary range and grammatical accuracy. The second group includes indicators specific to parallel learning: ability to compare English and French, recognition of transfer-related errors, ability to use English as a support for learning French, and ability to reflect on language-learning strategies. This makes assessment more consistent with the aims of parallel teaching.

The model shows that parallel foreign language teaching should not be understood as the mechanical simultaneous teaching of two languages. Its meth-

odological essence lies in the coordinated interaction of two foreign language courses. In this sense, parallel teaching differs from traditional separate teaching because it deliberately creates links between languages and uses these links for educational purposes.

The results of the study also suggest that the second foreign language can be strengthened if the first foreign language is used as a pedagogical resource. This does not mean replacing French instruction with English or encouraging uncontrolled code-switching. It means using English strategically: for comparison, explanation, vocabulary analysis, mediation tasks and reflection. This approach corresponds to pedagogical translanguaging, which emphasizes the planned use of the learner's linguistic repertoire for educational purposes (Cenoz & Gorter, 2021; García & Wei, 2014).

The model takes into account the risk of interference. Since students may transfer English patterns into French incorrectly, parallel teaching must include special tasks aimed at identifying and correcting such errors. For example, students can compare English and French sentence structure, analyse false friends, classify cognates, compare tense forms, or explain why a direct translation is incorrect. These activities develop metalinguistic awareness and help students become more conscious language learners.

Thus, there is a need to move from separate teaching of two foreign languages to coordinated parallel teaching. The educational programme may formally include two foreign languages, but this alone does not guarantee effective multilingual development. The effectiveness of parallel teaching depends on the presence of methodological mechanisms: content synchronization, contrastive analysis, transfer management, teacher cooperation and assessment of metalinguistic awareness.

The proposed model has practical value for Kazakhstani universities. It can be used in syllabus design, lesson planning, development of contrastive exercises and improvement of assessment procedures. The model is especially relevant for programmes where English is taught as the first foreign language and French as the second foreign language, but it may also be adapted to other language combinations.

Overall, the results of the study show that parallel foreign language teaching should be interpreted as a coordinated methodological system. Its aim is not only to increase the number of languages studied by students, but to organize the interaction between these languages in a pedagogically meaningful way. Such an approach can contribute to the development

of students' communicative competence, metalinguistic awareness and ability to learn additional foreign languages more effectively.

Conclusion

The study examined the methodological foundations of parallel foreign language teaching in Kazakhstani universities, focusing on the English-French language combination in the educational programme "Foreign Language: Two Foreign Languages". The results show that the main problem is not the formal inclusion of two foreign languages in the curriculum, but the insufficient methodological coordination between the first and second foreign languages. English and French are often taught as separate subjects, with different syllabi, unequal academic hours, different starting points and limited cooperation between teachers.

The analysis of educational programmes, syllabi and survey responses revealed several key difficulties: the later introduction and fewer academic hours of the second foreign language, limited communicative practice in French, weak synchronization of English and French course content, insufficient use of contrastive tasks, and the presence of lexical and grammatical interference. At the same time, the positive potential of transfer from English to French is not fully activated.

The findings confirm the need to move from separate teaching of two foreign languages to coordinated parallel teaching. In this study, parallel foreign language teaching is understood as a methodologically organized process in which the first and second foreign languages are connected through common themes, contrastive analysis, transfer management, metalinguistic reflection and coordinated assessment. Such an approach allows the first foreign language to function as a pedagogical resource for learning the second foreign language.

On the basis of the obtained results, a structural-methodological model of parallel foreign language teaching was proposed. The model includes five interrelated components: target, content, organizational-methodological, processual and assessment-diagnostic. These components provide the development of communicative, intercultural and metalinguistic competence, the synchronization of themes and language material, cooperation between teachers, staged implementation of coordinated instruction, and CEFR-based assessment with indicators of transfer, interference management and metalinguistic awareness.

The scientific value of the study lies in clarifying parallel foreign language teaching as a coordinated methodological system rather than as the simple simultaneous teaching of two languages. Its practical value consists in the possibility of applying the proposed model in syllabus design, lesson planning, contrastive exercises and assessment procedures in foreign language teacher-training programmes.

The study has certain limitations, as the empirical part was based on a diagnostic survey of 83 respondents and did not include a full-scale pedagogical experiment. Future research should focus on experimental validation of the model, comparison of control and experimental groups, and analysis of students' progress in English and French. Overall, the study demonstrates that systematic coordination between the first and second foreign languages can help students use previous language-learning experience more consciously, reduce interference and improve communicative competence in the second foreign language.

Acknowledgement

The authors express gratitude to the students, graduates and teachers who participated in the diagnostic survey and contributed to the discussion of methodological problems in teaching two foreign languages in higher education.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Authors' contribution

Kontek Aiym – conceptualization of the study, development of the methodology, analysis of educational programmes and syllabi, collection and interpretation of empirical data, development of the structural-methodological model, writing of the original draft. Kuzdybaeva Akmaral – scientific supervision, refinement of the research design, methodological validation, participation in the discussion of results, scientific editing of the manuscript. Ismailova Fariza – expert consultation on the methodology of parallel foreign language teaching, participation in the comparative-methodological analysis, contribution to the international methodological framing of the article, manuscript editing. Saurikova Ainur – participation in the literature review, systematization of empirical materials, contribution to the interpretation of results, text formatting and editorial revision.

References

- Herdina, P., & Jessner, U. (2002). *A dynamic model of multilingualism: Perspectives of change in psycholinguistics*. Multilingual Matters.
- Jessner, U. (2006). *Linguistic awareness in multilinguals: English as a third language*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Cook, V. (1992). Evidence for multicompetence. *Language Learning*, 42(4), 557–591.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge University Press.
- Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment: Companion volume*. Council of Europe Publishing.
- Cenoz, J. (2009). *Towards multilingual education: Basque educational research from an international perspective*. Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Review of Educational Research*, 49(2), 222–251. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543049002222>
- Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(2), 221–240.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2013). *How languages are learned* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Multilingual Matters.
- Odlin, T. (1989). *Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jarvis, S., & Pavlenko, A. (2008). *Crosslinguistic influence in language and cognition*. Routledge.
- Ringbom, H. (2007). *Cross-linguistic similarity in foreign language learning*. Multilingual Matters.
- De Angelis, G., & Dewaele, J.-M. (Eds.). (2011). *New trends in crosslinguistic influence and multilingualism research*. Multilingual Matters.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- De Angelis, G. (2007). *Third or additional language acquisition*. Multilingual Matters.
- Hufeisen, B., & Neuner, G. (Eds.). (2004). *The plurilingualism project: Tertiary language learning — German after English*. Council of Europe Publishing.
- Jessner, U. (2008). Teaching third languages: Findings, trends and challenges. *Language Teaching*, 41(1), 15–56.
- Grosjean, F. (1989). Neurolinguists, beware! The bilingual is not two monolinguals in one person. *Brain and Language*, 36(1), 3–15.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2011). Focus on multilingualism: A study of trilingual writing. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 356–369. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01206.x>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2021). *Pedagogical translanguaging*. Cambridge University Press.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Жетписбаева, Б. А. (2008). *Полиязычное образование: теория и методология*. Алматы: Білім.
- Лекерова, Г. Ж., Полатова, С. Д., & Осымова, Г. У. (2020). Теоретические исследования полилингвального образования в отечественной и зарубежной педагогике. *Вестник КазНУ. Серия педагогические науки*, 65(4), 74–90. <https://doi.org/10.26577/JES.2020.v65.i4.07>
- Tussupbekova, M. Z., Idrissova, M. A., Smagulova, B. G., Nurmanova, Z. K., & Kulanova, K. K. (2018). Trilingual education development in universities of Kazakhstan. *Journal of Advanced Research in Social Sciences and Humanities*, 3(1), 37–45.
- Кулибаева, Д. Н. (2002). *Инновационная модель формирования международно-стандартных уровней владения иностранным языком в условиях школ международного типа*. Алматы: Казахский университет международных отношений.
- Такуова, З. С., Купеева, Ж. С., Тлеужанова, К. Т., Нашарбекова, И. С., & Мамытова, А. Е. (2023). Актуальные проблемы современного обучения иностранным языкам в Казахстане. *Вестник Карагандинского университета. Серия «Педагогика»*, 4(112), 140–145. <https://doi.org/10.31489/2021Ped2/140-145>
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2018). Complexity and ELF. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca* (pp. 51–60). Routledge.
- Cenoz, J., Hufeisen, B., & Jessner, U. (Eds.). (2001). *Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition: Psycholinguistic perspectives*. Multilingual Matters.

References

- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Multilingual Matters.
- Cenoz, J. (2009). *Towards multilingual education: Basque educational research from an international perspective*. Multilingual Matters.
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2011). Focus on multilingualism: A study of trilingual writing. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(3), 356–369. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01206.x>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2021). *Pedagogical translanguaging*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cenoz, J., Hufeisen, B., & Jessner, U. (Eds.). (2001). *Cross-linguistic influence in third language acquisition: Psycholinguistic perspectives*. Multilingual Matters.
- Cook, V. (1992). Evidence for multicompetence. *Language Learning*, 42(4), 557–591.

- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge University Press.
- Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment: Companion volume*. Council of Europe Publishing.
- Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Review of Educational Research*, 49(2), 222–251. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543049002222>
- Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(2), 221–240.
- De Angelis, G. (2007). *Third or additional language acquisition*. Multilingual Matters.
- De Angelis, G., & Dewaele, J.-M. (Eds.). (2011). *New trends in crosslinguistic influence and multilingualism research*. Multilingual Matters.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Grosjean, F. (1989). Neurolinguists, beware! The bilingual is not two monolinguals in one person. *Brain and Language*, 36(1), 3–15.
- Herdina, P., & Jessner, U. (2002). *A dynamic model of multilingualism: Perspectives of change in psycholinguistics*. Multilingual Matters.
- Hufeisen, B., & Neuner, G. (Eds.). (2004). *The plurilingualism project: Tertiary language learning — German after English*. Council of Europe Publishing.
- Jarvis, S., & Pavlenko, A. (2008). *Crosslinguistic influence in language and cognition*. Routledge.
- Jessner, U. (2006). *Linguistic awareness in multilinguals: English as a third language*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Jessner, U. (2008). Teaching third languages: Findings, trends and challenges. *Language Teaching*, 41(1), 15–56.
- Kulibayeva, D. N. (2002). *Innovatsionnaya model' formirovaniya mezhdunarodno-standartnykh urovnei vladeniya inostrannym yazykom v usloviyakh shkol mezhdunarodnogo tipa* [Innovative model of forming international-standard levels of foreign language proficiency in international-type schools]. Almaty: Kazakhskii universitet mezhdunarodnykh otnoshenii. (In Russian)
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2018). Complexity and ELF. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca* (pp. 51–60). Routledge.
- Lekerova, G. Zh., Polatova, S. D., & Osymova, G. U. (2020). *Teoreticheskie issledovaniya polilingvial'nogo obrazovaniya v otechestvennoi i zarubezhnoi pedagogike* [Theoretical studies of multilingual education in domestic and foreign pedagogy]. *Vestnik KazNU. Seriya pedagogicheskie nauki* [Bulletin of KazNU. Pedagogical Sciences Series], 65(4), 74–90. <https://doi.org/10.26577/JES.2020.v65.i4.07> (In Russian)
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2013). *How languages are learned* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Odlin, T. (1989). *Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ringbom, H. (2007). *Cross-linguistic similarity in foreign language learning*. Multilingual Matters.
- Takuova, Z. S., Kupeeveva, Zh. S., Tleuzhanova, K. T., Nasharbekova, I. S., & Mamytova, A. E. (2023). *Aktual'nye problemy sovremennogo obucheniya inostrannym yazykam v Kazakhstane* [Current problems of modern foreign language teaching in Kazakhstan]. *Vestnik Karagandinskogo universiteta. Seriya "Pedagogika"* [Bulletin of Karaganda University. Pedagogy Series], 4(112), 140–145. <https://doi.org/10.31489/2021Ped2/140-145> (In Russian)
- Tussupbekova, M. Z., Idrissova, M. A., Smagulova, B. G., Nurmanova, Z. K., & Kulanova, K. K. (2018). Trilingual education development in universities of Kazakhstan. *Journal of Advanced Research in Social Sciences and Humanities*, 3(1), 37–45.
- Zhetpisbayeva, B. A. (2008). *Poliyazychnoe obrazovanie: teoriya i metodologiya* [Multilingual education: Theory and methodology]. Almaty: Bilim. (In Russian)

Information about the authors:

Kontek Aiyim (corresponding author) – PhD student, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University (Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: aiyim.kontekova@gmail.com).

Kuzdybaeva Akmaral – Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor, K. Zhubanov Aktobe Regional University (Kazakhstan, Aktobe, e-mail: ulpen@mail.ru);

Ismailova Fariza – Postdoctoral Researcher, Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University (Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: fari1996@mail.ru).

Saurikova Ainur – Master, Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University (Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: a.saurikova@yandex.ru).

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Контэк Айым Майбекқызы – PhD докторант, Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті (Алматы, Қазақстан, e-mail: aiyim.kontekova@gmail.com).

Күздыбаева Ақмарал Аманбайқызы – педагогика ғылымдарының кандидаты, қауымдастырылған профессор, Қ. Жұбанов атындағы Ақтөбе өңірлік университеті (Ақтөбе, Қазақстан, e-mail: ulpen@mail.ru).

Исмаилова Фариза Кенжеғалиқызы – постдокторант, Абай атындағы Қазақ ұлттық педагогикалық университеті (Алматы, Қазақстан, e-mail: fari1996@mail.ru).

Саурикова Айнура Муратбековна – магистр, Абай атындағы Қазақ ұлттық педагогикалық университеті (Алматы, Қазақстан, e-mail: a.saurikova@yandex.ru).

Сведения об авторах:

Контек Айым Майбеккызы – PhD докторант, Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби (Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: aiym.kontekova@gmail.com).

Куздыбаева Акмарал Аманбаевна – кандидат педагогических наук, ассоциированный профессор, Актюбинский региональный университет имени К. Жубанова (Актобе, Казахстан, e-mail: ulrep@mail.ru).

Исмаилова Фариза Кенжегалиевна – постдокторант, Казахский национальный педагогический университет имени Абая (Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: fari1996@mail.ru).

Саурикова Айнура Муратбековна – магистр, Казахский национальный педагогический университет имени Абая (Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: a.saurikova@yandex.ru).

Date of receipt of the article: April 1, 2026

Accepted: June 10, 2026