A NEW DIDACTIC PARADIGM FOR ANALYZING AND TEACHING BORROWINGS IN LINGUISTIC CONTEXT

Kariyev Adlet Dyusembayevich – *postdoctoral researcher, Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor*
adlet.kariyev@gmail.com
Kazakh national pedagogical university named after Abai
Yeskermessova Gulnar Amangeldievna – *Doctor of Philosophy in Philological Sciences, Senior Lecturer*
gulnar_9.12.81@mail.ru
Kazakh National Women's Teacher Training University

LINGVISTIK KONTEKSTLARDA O'ZLAShMALARNI TAHLIL QILISh VA O'QITIShNING YANGI DIDAKTIK PARADIGMASI

Kariyev Adlet Dyusembayevich – *postdoktorant, pedagogika fanlari nomzodi, dotsent*
Abay nomidagi Qozoq milliy pedagogika universiteti
Yeskermesova Gulnar Amangeldiyevna – *filologiya fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori, katta o'qituvchi*
Qozoq milliy xotin-qizlar pedagogika universiteti

НОВАЯ ДИДАКТИЧЕСКАЯ ПАРАДИГМА АНАЛИЗА И ПРЕПОДАВАНИЯ ЗАИМСТВОВАНИЯ ЗАИМСТВОВАНИЙ В ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИХ КОНТЕКСТАХ

Кариев Адлет Дюсембаевич – *постдокторант, кандидат педагогических наук, доцент*
Казахский национальний педагогический университет имени Абая
Ескермесова Гульнар Амангельдиевна – *доктор философии по филологическим наукам, старший преподаватель*
Казахский национальний женский педагогический университет

Tayanch so'zlar: lisoniy dekolonizatsiya, kod almashinuvi, o'zlashma so'zlar, OTM metodikasi, lingvistik paradigma, termin yasash, lisoniy moslashuv, singarmonizm, kasbiy kommunikatsiya, lingvistik imperializm.

Rezyume. Maqolada qozoq tilining lisoniy dekolonizatsiya kontekstidagi leksik transformatsiyalari ko'rib chiqiladi. Talabalar nutqidagi kod almashinuvi va o'zlashmalar, jumladan, rus tili orqali kirib kelgan xalqaro terminlar hamda anglisizmlar tahlil qilinadi. Ularni mexanik kalkalashdan qochgan holda qozoq tilining ichki qonuniyatlariga moslashtirish usullari taklif etiladi. R. Fillipson va N. va Tiongo konsepsiyalari Qozog'iston sharoitiga tatbiqan qayta talqin qilinadi. Funksional-kommunikativ ta'limga o'tish zarurati asoslanib, talabalarning kasbiy nutqini rivojlantirishga qaratilgan amaliy mashqlar taklif etiladi. Tadqiqot natijalari qozoq tilining maqomini mustahkamlash va milliy terminologik fondni tizimlashtirishga xizmat qiladi.

Ключевые слова: языковая деколонизация, переключение кодов, заимствованные слова, методика вуза, лингвистическая парадигма, терминообразование, языковая адаптация, сингармонизм, профессиональная коммуникация, лингвистический империализм.

Резюме. В статье рассматриваются лексические трансформации казахского языка в контексте языковой деколонизации. Анализируются переключение кодов и заимствования в речи студентов, в том числе интернациональные термины и англицизмы, проникшие через русский язык. Предлагаются способы их адаптации к закономерностям казахского языка без механического калькирования. Концепции Р.Филлипсона и Н.ва Тхионго переосмысливаются применительно к Казахстану. Обосновывается переход к функционально-коммуникативному обучению и предлагаются практические упражнения для развития профессиональной речи студентов. Результаты исследования способствуют укреплению статуса казахского языка и систематизации национального терминофонда.

Key words: linguistic decolonization, code-switching, loanwords, university methodology, linguistic paradigm, terminology, linguistic adaptation, vowel harmony (syngarmonism), professional communication, linguistic imperialism.

Summary. The article examines lexical transformations in the Kazakh language in the context of linguistic decolonization. It analyzes code-switching and lexical borrowings in students' speech, including international terms and Anglicisms introduced through Russian. Methods are proposed for adapting these borrowings to the internal rules of the Kazakh language without mechanical calquing. The concepts developed by R. Phillipson and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o are reinterpreted in the context of Kazakhstan. The article substantiates the transition to a functional-communicative approach to language teaching and proposes practical exercises for developing students' professional communication skills. The findings contribute to strengthening the status of the Kazakh language and systematizing national terminology.

Introduction. Language processes in the age of globalization, together with Kazakhstan's evolving political and cultural orientation, pose new challenges for Kazakh linguistics and language-teaching methodology. Linguistic decolonization requires investigation not only at the ideological level but also in strictly linguistic and methodological terms. Within a decolonial framework, the development of Kazakh entails restoring the language's internal structural and systemic regularities, including vowel harmony and native patterns of word formation, while reducing the influence of intermediary languages.

The current patterns of lexical borrowing and loanword use among university students indicate that their linguistic consciousness is undergoing substantial transformation. Internationalisms and Anglicisms mediated by Russian frequently enter Kazakh without being adapted to its articulatory and grammatical system. This weakens what may be described metaphorically as the language's natural «immunity» and contributes to indiscriminate language mixing, known in Kazakh as «til şūbarlyq». It is therefore particularly important to develop innovative paradigms for teaching loanwords in higher education and to incorporate mechanisms of linguistic decolonization into educational content.

Object of the study – the lexico-semantic system of Kazakh under conditions of linguistic decolonization and

the processes of lexical borrowing in university students' speech.

Aim of the study – to explain the linguistic nature of borrowing in the context of linguistic decolonization and to substantiate an effective methodological model for teaching loanwords at universities. The following objectives were formulated:

1. to examine the sociolinguistic meaning of linguistic decolonization on the basis of international and Kazakhstani scholarship;
2. to analyze the use of borrowings and unassimilated foreignisms at the phonological and morphological levels;
3. to identify barriers and challenges in teaching loanwords at universities and propose innovative paradigms for addressing them.

Scientific novelty lies in treating linguistic decolonization not merely as a political factor but as an internal reassessment and adaptation of the language system, and in linking this process directly to university-level teaching methodology.

Materials and methods. An integrated set of linguistic methods was used to address the research objectives. The descriptive method served to collect, classify, and characterize actual instances of borrowing and unassimilated foreignisms in students' speech. Comparative analysis was used to contrast the theoretical approaches to linguistic decolonization and borrowing developed by international scholars (R.Phillipson and S.Poplack) and Kazakhstani scholars (E.Suleimenova and Sh.Kurmanbayuly), thereby identifying both convergent and divergent positions. Direct observation was employed to document language use in educational settings and students' reception of foreign terminology. Phonomorphological analysis was conducted to determine the extent to which loanwords conform to the internal regularities of Kazakh, particularly vowel harmony. Sociolinguistic analysis was applied to the pragmatic and psychological factors that influence students' code-switching, including prestige, academic necessity, and restricted lexical resources.

The methodological procedure began with the collection and synthesis of theoretical material, continued with an examination of university teaching practices, and concluded with the formulation of the findings as a set of new pedagogical paradigms.

Literature Review. Linguistic decolonization and borrowing have been examined from various perspectives in both international and Kazakhstani scholarship. The terms borrowing and lexical transfer are used in more than one sense. Many linguists distinguish the process of borrowing from its outcome, the loanword, and use borrowing in relation to interlanguage influence. Other scholars do not consistently maintain this distinction and associate the term primarily with loanwords. In Kazakh linguistics, for example, «kirme söz (кірме сөз)» (loanword) is often used as an umbrella term for linguistic units of foreign origin, including words, phrases, morphemes, and syntactic structures [1]. This resembles the interchangeable use of the expressions «speech culture» and «language culture» in current Kazakh discourse. In Russian linguistics, by contrast, «zaimstvovanie (заимствование)» (borrowing) may refer broadly to all units transferred from another language, whereas «zaimstvovannoe slovo (заимствованное слово)» (borrowed word) denotes a lexical unit of foreign origin.

Treating borrowing as a type of language contact, S.V.Kudryashova summarizes the terminological ambiguity as follows: «Some linguists understand borrowing as a process, whereas others view it as the result of a process. Many scholars describe borrowing as a process whereby a linguistic unit passes from one language into another. Others use the term for foreign-language elements that remain in a recipient language after contact has ceased, that is, as the consequences of interlanguage contact» [2:68].

Research on the issue can be grouped into three principal strands.

1. International research in linguistics and language pedagogy

Since the mid-twentieth century, code-switching and borrowing have been examined extensively in Western linguistics by Uriel Weinreich, John Gumperz, Shana Poplack, and others. These scholars clarified both the linguistic boundaries of the phenomena and their social motivations. From a pedagogical perspective, Colin Baker discusses bilingual language practices in relation to translanguaging. Such practices are understood not as the arbitrary mixing of two languages but as the learner's strategic use of a complete linguistic repertoire. Drawing on the work of Welsh educator Cen Williams, Baker helped introduce and popularize the English term translanguaging [3]. This approach supports learners' use of all available linguistic resources. Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o's decolonial position differs substantially: he advocates freeing education from the dominance of the colonizer's language, a process that may be described as pedagogical decolonization [4]. This perspective promotes the use of local epistemic models in education rather than relying solely on international terminology.

2. Research in Kazakh linguistics

Since Kazakhstan gained independence, linguistic decolonization has become an object of study for such scholars as B.Khasanuly, E.Suleimenova, N.Uali, Sh.Kurmanbayuly, K.Kuderinova, G.Omarbekova, and A.Abasilov. In terminology studies, Sh.Kurmanbayuly has addressed terminological decolonization and developed a scholarly basis for replacing calques mediated by Russian with Kazakh equivalents [5].

From the standpoint of linguistic adaptation, K.Kuderinova has examined the history of loanwords and their representation in Kazakh writing. Her work argues that a central condition of decolonization is the representation of words in accordance with the phonological regularities of Kazakh [6]. These studies provide a theoretical foundation for teaching loanwords at universities.

3. Emerging trends in language-teaching methodology

In recent years, university-level Kazakh language teaching has increasingly emphasized functional literacy and professional communication. The works of F.Orazbayeva, K.Kadasheva, Zh.Dauletbekova, and other methodology scholars have developed communicative technologies for teaching language as a means of interaction [7; 8; 9].

In our view, however, a new decolonial paradigm requires further research in two areas:

1. developing students' critical attitudes toward loanwords, or terminological reflection, a dimension that remains underdeveloped in methodological research;
2. preparing evidence-based guidelines on how code-switching and the accompanying use of foreignisms, borrowings, and loanwords across Kazakh, Russian, and English should be used productively or limited in educational settings.

In comparative terms, international research tends to emphasize equitable interaction among languages, whereas Kazakhstani scholarship prioritizes protection of the internal system of the state language and the removal of colonial residues. A new university teaching paradigm should identify common ground between these orientations: preserving the national linguistic code while integrating into global scholarship.

Results and Discussion. From a sociolinguistic perspective, linguistic decolonization entails revising a language hierarchy, reducing the exoglossic pressure exerted by a dominant language, and restoring the sociopolitical, scholarly, and communicative status of the national language. International and Kazakhstani schools of thought display both similarities and differences in their approaches to this process.

In international sociolinguistics, the issue is commonly addressed through the concepts of linguistic imperialism, associated with Robert Phillipson, and linguistic rights. Phillipson criticizes the structural and cultural displacement of other languages by dominant languages, particularly English, and presents decolonization as a struggle against linguistic inequality [10:47]. Kenyan writer and scholar Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o interprets linguistic decolonization as the decolonization of the mind, arguing that the colonizer's language functions not only as a means of communication but also as an ideological instrument [4:28]. The principal concern in this line of scholarship is the preservation of local linguistic ecologies amid the expansion of global languages.

In Kazakhstani sociolinguistics, including the works of E.Suleimenova, B.Khasanuly, G.Omarbekova, and A.Abasilov, the issue is examined as a means of overcoming post-Soviet diglossia and expanding the functional domains of the state language. According to E.Suleimenova, linguistic decolonization is not simply the natural evolution of languages in a competitive environment; it is the outcome of consciously implemented language policy [11, p. 115]. This position resonates with William Labov's sociolinguistic account of social stratification, according to which changes in linguistic norms are closely related to shifts in social prestige. In Sh.Kurmanbayuly's work, the contemporary decolonial paradigm in Kazakh linguistics is also reflected in the effort to free term formation from externally imposed linguistic models. Whereas Western scholarship frequently frames decolonization in terms of resistance, Kazakhstani research often treats it as structural renewal and a reassessment of the language's internal resources [5].

Table 1. Comparative Analysis of Scholarly Perspectives

Basis for comparison	International scholarship (R.Phillipson, Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o)	Kazakhstani scholarship (E.Suleimenova, Sh.Kurmanbayuly)
Primary objective	Counter linguistic imperialism and preserve linguistic diversity	Transform the language situation and reinforce the status of Kazakh as the state language
Mechanism of decolonization	Shift education and literature toward the mother tongue	Standardize terminology on a national basis and transition to the Latin script
View of lexical transfer	An indicator of the dominant language's cultural expansion	An intermediate stage of linguistic transformation and a need to assimilate new vocabulary

Comparison of international and Kazakhstani perspectives indicates that the common objective of linguistic decolonization is linguistic sovereignty. International scholars tend to focus on the influence of English, whereas Kazakhstani scholars emphasize the sociopsychological aspects of reducing Russian mediation.

In Kazakhstani scholarship, the pursuit of linguistic independence consequently acquires a practical dimension through its close association with university teaching methodology, national standards of term formation, and the transformation of linguistic consciousness.

To analyze university students' speech practices under conditions of linguistic decolonization, it is essential to distinguish code-switching from borrowing. In sociolinguistics, these phenomena are important indicators of the extent to which a linguistic system is undergoing transformation.

Shana Poplack describes intrasentential code-switching as alternation between two linguistic systems subject to grammatical constraints. In her approach, a loanword is a unit that has been integrated into the morphological and phonological system of the recipient language [12]. Kazakhstani linguist B. Khasanuly examines the process through the concept of linguistic interference and warns that indiscriminate lexical transfer may disrupt a language's internal structure [13].

In the context of linguistic decolonization, borrowing manifests itself systemically rather than only at the lexical level:

1. *Phonological borrowings.* The phonemes *в [v], ф [f], х [kh], ц [ts], and ч [ch]*, introduced largely through Russian, are argued to have affected the articulatory base of Kazakh. Within the decolonial paradigm adopted here, forms may therefore be adapted through native phonological resources, for example *в [v] > у [u/w] or б [b]* and *ф [f] > п [p]*, in accordance with principles associated with A.Baitursynuly.

2. *Borrowed morphological elements.* The affixes -изм [-izm], -ция [-tsiya], and -ика [-ika] are highly productive in scholarly discourse. Sh.Kurmanbayuly argues that their role as part of an 'international terminological inventory' should be defined without undermining the national system of word formation [5].

3. *Syntactic calques.* These include constructions modeled on Russian or English, such as the inappropriate use of indefinite pronouns or the excessive use of passive constructions.

Contemporary Kazakh linguistic theory and teaching methodology frequently conflate loanwords with what this article terms unassimilated foreignisms, traditionally described as barbarisms. Within this framework, and in line with distinctions found in early structuralist descriptions such as those of Leonard Bloomfield, a foreignism is an element that has entered a language but has not yet been assimilated and therefore remains stylistically marked as foreign.

Comparative analysis in Kazakhstani scholarship defines a loanword as a grammatically integrated unit that has entered the lexical system and fulfils a communicative need, for example мектеп [mektep] (school), кітап [kitap] (book), and компьютер [kompyuter] (computer). An unassimilated foreignism, by contrast, is a word that remains incompatible with the recipient language's structural conventions and is used either for stylistic effect or because of limited linguistic competence, for example фидбэк [fidbek] (feedback), дэдлайн [dedlain] (deadline), and хайп [haip] (hype).

Table 2. International and Kazakhstani Approaches: A Comparative Overview

Category	International scholarship (U.Weinreich, S.Poplack)	Kazakhstani scholarship (A.Baitursynuly's legacy, K.Kuderinova)
Integration	Emphasizes the frequency and patterns of loanword use.	Prioritizes conformity with vowel harmony and phonological adaptation.
Unassimilated foreignism	Treats it as a marker of cultural expansion and prestige.	Regards it as a manifestation of indiscriminate language mixing and a residue of colonial consciousness.
Lexical transfer	Views it as a natural outcome of bilingualism.	Views it as evidence of limitations in the communicative reach of the state language.

A new paradigm for teaching loanwords at universities should therefore explain the distinction between an unassimilated foreignism, which is temporary and structurally unadapted, and a loanword, which has become integrated into the recipient language. Combining the functional approach of international scholarship with the normative-adaptive orientation of Kazakhstani scholars can provide a stronger scholarly basis for linguistic decolonization.

The university classroom is a major site of linguistic decolonization. In the development of students' professional language, the use of loanwords and foreignisms reveals a tension between linguistic norms and pragmatic need. Lexical transfer in contemporary students' repertoires occurs at two levels:

1. Academic level. Students use Russian or English subject-specific terms even when established Kazakh equivalents are available, for example «Бұл мәселенің дедлайны қашан?» [Bul mäselenіñ dedlainy qaşan?] (When is the deadline for this task?) or «Келесі аптада презентация жасаймыз» [Kelesi aptada prezentatsiya jasaimyz] (We will give a presentation next week).

2. Communicative level. Students engage in hybridized informal speech, in which unassimilated foreignisms predominate.

An unassimilated foreignism is a word that has entered usage as a temporary fashion or item of jargon without being adapted to the grammatical and phonological system of the recipient language. Its excessive use in university teaching generates several problems:

1. Reduced linguistic resilience. Students make little effort to identify an available Kazakh equivalent.

2. Erosion of stylistic differentiation. Formal academic language becomes mixed with colloquial or street slang.

3. Lack of conceptual clarity. The simultaneous use of Kazakh, Russian, and English variants for the same concept creates terminological inconsistency in students' linguistic consciousness.

Two opposing approaches to teaching loanwords can currently be observed in higher education:

1. Conservative approach. Loanwords and foreignisms are rejected wholesale, and only officially approved terms are accepted. This may reduce students' interest in the language and create a barrier associated with an overly artificial register.

2. Liberal or passive approach. Teachers do not intervene in students' lexical transfer and leave errors uncorrected. This impedes linguistic decolonization.

New Paradigms for Teaching Loanwords in Higher Education.

Teaching loanwords at universities is therefore not simply a matter of vocabulary instruction; it is a process of developing students' linguistic worldview. The following scholarly and practical proposals may serve as a basis for new paradigms of teaching loanwords in the context of linguistic decolonization.

1. Scholarly and theoretical recommendations

1. Develop adaptation-oriented linguistics. Instruction should move beyond the principle of accepting loanwords unchanged and teach the scholarly foundations of adapting them phonomorphologically to Kazakh vowel harmony. Historical patterns of adaptation, such as философия [filosofiya] > пәлсапа [pälsapa], самовар [samovar] > самаурын [samauryn], and кровать [krovat'] > кереует [kereuet], should be reconsidered.

2. Borrow directly, without an intermediary language. A theoretical model should be developed for adapting international terms directly from their source languages, including English, Latin, and Greek, to the sound system of Kazakh rather than adopting their Russian graphic forms.

3. Develop a framework for overcoming diglossia. To challenge the stereotype that Russian and English are languages of science while Kazakh is limited to everyday communication, the terminological capacity of Kazakh to express complex concepts must be demonstrated systematically.

2. Practical and methodological recommendations

1. Introduce dedicated course units. The courses Kazakh Language and Professional Kazakh should include topics that distinguish loanwords from unassimilated foreignisms. Students should also conduct etymological analyses of loanwords to determine whether they entered Kazakh directly or through a colonial intermediary, thereby developing decolonial reflection.

2. Introduce innovative exercise types. Using a «linguistic filter» exercise, students may identify Anglicisms and foreignisms in a text and propose three types of equivalent: a native Kazakh equivalent or translation; a phonetically adapted form reflecting Kazakh pronunciation; and an international form.

3. Use a word-formation constructor. Students should practice coining terms through the internal resources of Kazakh, including derivational suffixes and compounding, rather than relying automatically on loanwords. Examples include English insight (инсайт) > Kazakh tüisinu (түйсіну) (to perceive or comprehend) and marketing (маркетинг) > naryqtau (нарықтау) (to market).

4. Use digital and media resources. Through 'terminological monitoring,' students can examine indiscriminate language mixing on social media and in mass media and develop editing projects informed by linguistic decolonization. An interactive glossary can also be used to compile a decolonized glossary of loanwords for individual fields such as information technology, economics, and law, supplying either phonetically adapted forms or native Kazakh equivalents.

Key Recommendation.

The teaching paradigm in higher education should transform the student from a passive recipient into a specialist

with strong linguistic resilience. To achieve this objective, the conventional textbook rule that 'international terms are written unchanged' should be replaced by a principle of linguistic independence and linguistic adaptation.

Conclusion. A comprehensive consideration of borrowing and the assimilation of loanwords in the context of linguistic decolonization leads to the following conclusions:

1. Linguistic decolonization is not merely the renewal of a lexicon; it is a process of reducing the influence of an intermediary language on university students' linguistic consciousness and revitalizing the national linguistic code. Comparison of international and Kazakhstani scholarship suggests that this process should strengthen the language's internal resilience and adapt international terminology to the native regularities of Kazakh, particularly vowel harmony.

2. Although code-switching may serve pragmatic needs in university education, it frequently results in indiscriminate language mixing. Code-switching by students and instructors is often associated with terminological gaps and the expansion of unassimilated foreignisms. Universities therefore require dedicated instructional components that clarify the stylistic and semantic distinctions between loanwords and foreignisms.

3. The proposed teaching paradigms seek to develop students' critical reflection on borrowed vocabulary. Rather than accepting loanwords as fixed forms, students should learn to apply the phonological and morphological filters of Kazakh and to prioritize appropriate native equivalents.

Practical implications and recommendations

1. Introduce a dedicated module entitled Language Adaptation and Terminological Culture into university programs for Kazakh Language and Professional Kazakh;

2. in teaching loanwords, give priority not only to semantic translation but also to their phonomorphological assimilation, including principles associated with the school of A. Baitursynuly;

3. establish norms and principles of linguistic ethics for the use of international terminology in students' research.

In summary, linguistic decolonization should become an integral part of university education. This strategic orientation can support the development of Kazakh not only as a means of communication but also as a flexible, internally coherent, and powerful language of contemporary science and technology.

References

1. Isakova S. Kirme terminderdi qabyldaudyn sheteldik tazhiribesi [Foreign experience in the adoption of borrowed terms]. In: Terminzhasam qaghidattary zhane ulttyq terminologiia maseleleri [Principles of term formation and issues of national terminology]: Proceedings of the Republican Scientific and Theoretical Conference. – Astana: 2018. – P. 40-46.

2. Kudryashova S.V. Protsess zaimstvovaniya kak raznovidnost yazykovogo kontakta [The borrowing process as a form of language contact]. Izvestiya vysshikh uchebnykh zavedenii. Povolzhskii region. Gumanitarnye nauki [University Proceedings. Volga Region. Humanities], 2015, no. 4 (36), -P. 66-75. (In Russian).

3. Baker C., Wright W.E. Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism. 6th ed. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 2017. –P. 512.

4. Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature. London: James Currey, 1986. –P.114.

5. Kurmanbayuly Sh. Qazaq terminologiiasy: zertteuler, oqulyq, sozdik, bibliografiia [Kazakh terminology: Studies, textbook, dictionary, and bibliography]. Almaty: Sardar, 2014.

6. Kuderinova Q. Qazaq zhazuynyn teoriialyq negizderi [Theoretical foundations of Kazakh writing]. 2nd ed. Almaty: Memlekettik tildi damytu ortalygy, 2010. 380 p.

7. Orazbayeva F. Sh. Tildik qatynas: teoriiasy zhane adistemesi [Language communication: Theory and methodology]. Almaty: Respublikalyq baspa kabineti, 2000.

8. Kadasheva Q. Qazaq tilin oqytu adistemesi [Methods of teaching the Kazakh language]. Almaty: Murager, 2005. 176 p. (In Kazakh).

9. Dauletbekova Zh.T. Soz madenieti – tildik bilim natizhesi [Speech culture as a result of language education]. Almaty: KBTU, 2010. 240 p. (In Kazakh).

10. Phillipson R. Linguistic Imperialism. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

11. Suleimenova E.D. Yazykovye protsessy i politika [Language processes and policy]. -Almaty: Qazaq universiteti, 2011. 117 p. (In Russian).

12. Poplack S. Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español: Toward a typology of code-switching. Linguistics, 1980, vol. 18, no. 7–8, pp. 581–618. https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1980.18.7-8.581

13. Hasanuly B. Tildik qatynas negizderi [Foundations of language communication]. Almaty: Qazaq memlekettik qyzdar pedagogika instituty, 2006.

****Funding source:***

The article was written within the framework of the scientific project AP26103505, funded by the Science Committee of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan, titled: «Scientific and methodological foundations of linguistic independence in the post-Soviet countries and the application of linguistic decolonization practices in it to the language policy of Kazakhstan»