

Value-Based Language Education: A Classroom-Level Comparison of Linguo-Axiological Awareness and Attitudes Toward National Values

Gulzhanat Mukhiddinova¹, Kalbike Yessenova², Aiman Koblanova³ & Gulzhakhan Snassapova⁴

Abstract

This study examined whether two participating 11th-grade classrooms differed in linguo-axiological awareness and attitudes toward national values following a six-week instructional period. The study used a quasi-experimental pretest–posttest control-group design. Sixty-four students from a state school in Kyzylorda Province participated. Two intact classrooms were randomly assigned at the classroom level to the experimental and control conditions; students were not individually randomized. The experimental classroom received a system of linguo-axiological tasks integrating Kazakh linguistic axiology, cultural linguistics, and task-based language teaching, whereas the control classroom continued regular instruction. The Linguo-axiological Awareness Scale and the Attitudes Towards National Values Scale were used for data collection. Student-level ANCOVA models were conducted as exploratory baseline-adjusted comparisons of posttest scores. The experimental classroom showed higher adjusted student-level posttest scores on both outcomes. Because each condition was represented by only one intact classroom, instructional condition and classroom membership could not be completely separated, and the analyses were not interpreted as estimates of a causal intervention effect. Future research should include multiple classrooms per condition, clustering-aware analyses, unfamiliar outcome materials, applied performance tasks, and delayed assessments.

Keywords: *Linguoaxiology, Value-based language education, National values; Task-based language teaching, Kazakh language education, Classroom-level comparison*

Introduction

Language is the most fundamental cultural tool that transmits a society's worldview, values, and collective memory from generation to generation (Daurenbek et al., 2025; Sjoberg, 1993). This elevates language teaching far beyond simply acquiring communicative skills. It transforms language into a tool for identity construction and value acquisition (Antonova et al., 2022; Sultan et al., 2026). This becomes even more significant in multilingual and multicultural societies. In its

¹ Korkyt Ata Kyzylorda University, guljdil@mail.ru

² Corresponding Author, Kazakh National Pedagogical University named after Abai, kalbike.yesenova@bk.ru,

³ Kazakh National Pedagogical University named after Abai, r.sheripov82@mail.ru

⁴ Kyzylorda «Bolashak» University, Gul.snassapova@mail.ru

post-Soviet transformation, Kazakhstan has repositioned the Kazakh language not only as a means of communication but also as a carrier of national identity and cultural sovereignty (Smagulova, 2019).

Studies on language policies show that education policies in Kazakhstan have created some issues at both institutional and societal levels. There is a disconnection between policy texts and classroom reality (Agbo et al., 2025; Aubakirova et al., 2019; Imanova et al., 2025; Sarmurzin et al., 2023; Yelubayeva et al., 2025; Zhumay et al., 2021). Research examining the classroom and societal repercussions of policy reveals that these practices generate unexpected tensions across a wide range of areas, from the Latinization of the alphabet to parent language ideologies, institutional resistance and the effects of social media (Bekzhanova & Makoelle, 2022; Kambatyrova, 2024; Kamalova, 2025; Kucherbayeva & Smagulova, 2023; Tazhibayeva et al., 2026; Yedgina et al., 2023). Studies on linguistic worldview and cultural identity argue that incorporating the layers of cultural meaning found in the vocabulary of Kazakh into teaching processes is possible and necessary (Amirbekova et al., 2024; Kabylov et al., 2024; Karagulova et al., 2025; Sultan et al., 2024; Tlepbergen et al., 2025; Turlybekova & Nurkenova, 2024).

Although language policy, cultural identity and linguistic worldview are interrelated issues, they are studied largely differently in the literature. A systematic teaching design based on linguistic principles that integrates these elements in a holistic manner in teaching the Kazakh language has not yet been developed. Although educational programs include achievements related to national values and cultural identity, sufficient pedagogical guidance cannot be provided on how to transform these abstract goals into concrete linguistic units and teaching tasks. In this context, the research aims to develop a system of value-oriented tasks based on linguistic principles for developing students' linguo-axiological awareness and attitudes toward national values and to examine the outcomes associated with this system.

Axiological Foundations of Language Education

The idea that language teaching cannot be limited solely to communicative skills is gaining more attention with theoretical developments in the field of axiology. Axiology, as a systematic field of study in value philosophy, argues that teaching processes also operate within a moral, cultural and value-based framework. Thus it is redefining language teaching from this perspective. The literature shows in various contexts that language teaching materials and teaching tasks possess a

value-laden quality and directly shape students' identity and value development (Doszhan et al., 2026; Feng, 2019; Krupchenko et al., 2020; Lovat et al., 2023; Ouladhadda, 2025; Rezaee & Esfandyari, 2023; Widodo et al., 2018). These studies show that the language classroom is not only a space for the development of communicative skills, but also for the construction of values, cultural awareness and consciousness of identity.

This understanding, strongly grounded at the theoretical level, is also gaining increasing attention regarding classroom application. It appears that teachers find value transmission meaningful but lack sufficient knowledge on how to implement it pedagogically (Chung & Ho, 2026; Gluchshenko et al., 2026; Munandar & Newton, 2021; Rezaee & Esfandyari, 2023; Zhang et al., 2022). These findings reveal that language teaching is a normative endeavor and this should be guided by conscious pedagogical decisions.

School textbooks and instructional materials are not merely vehicles for conveying academic content; they are also pedagogical resources that carry social and cultural representations. Textbook research indicates that instructional materials can implicitly reproduce particular values and stereotypes (Papadakis, 2018). This underscores the pedagogical importance of carefully considering how cultural and value-laden content is represented in language teaching.

In Kazakhstan, language teaching is a strategic pedagogical field where national values, cultural identity and national consciousness are passed down from generation to generation. In this context, restructuring Kazakh language teaching is not merely a technical curriculum issue, but a matter of deeper axiological choice and educational philosophy. Systematically incorporating value-laden language units into teaching processes may provide a useful pedagogical approach to simultaneously develop students' linguistic competence and engagement with value-laden language (Karagulova et al., 2025; Sultan et al., 2024; Turlybekova & Nurkenova, 2024).

Linguoaxicology and the Formation of the Conceptosphere of Values in Kazakh Linguistics

In Kazakh linguistics, linguoaxicology is gaining increasing attention as a unique field of research. It argues that linguistic units reflect a society's perception of the world, its value priorities and its cultural memory. From this perspective, idioms, kinship terms, proverbs, and cultural concepts in Kazakh emerge as fundamental carriers of national values. Studies comparing Kazakh and English idiomatic units reveal that idiomatic structures in Kazakh contain social values and cultural codes

with a unique intensity. Linguistic units associated with kinship terms encode family values and social norms with distinctly different patterns in different languages (Amirbekova et al., 2024; Karagulova et al., 2025). A study examining national idiomatic units from the perspective of speech behavior also highlights the function of these structures in carrying social interaction norms and cultural values (Turlybekova & Nurkenova, 2024). In the context of Kazakh-Russian bilingualism, it has been found that code mixing functions not only as a grammatical tool but also as a means of identity and value management (Zharkynbekova & Chernyavskaya, 2022).

The formation of the value-concept atmosphere in the Kazakh language is considered a process directly linked to the cultural and philosophical depth of the language and reflecting this process in teaching practices is highlighted as a critical necessity. Studies examining the revitalization process of Kazakh in school discourse and language ideologies in digital environments consistently show that the teaching of this language inevitably carries an axiological dimension (Kamalova, 2025; Smagulova, 2019). Research addressing the position of Kazakh in higher education and language policy within the framework of international comparisons also questions the strategic role of the Kazakh language in national identity construction and the effects of linguistic restructuring on value systems (Kucherbayeva & Smagulova, 2023; Yedgina et al., 2023). When all these findings are considered together, it is seen that developing a linguoaxiological framework in Kazakh linguistics and adapting this framework to language teaching at the secondary level represents a potentially valuable direction from both a linguistic and educational policy perspective.

Value-Oriented Language Teaching and Task-Based Instruction in Secondary Education

At the secondary education level, the development of students' awareness of the value dimensions of language and their orientations toward national values is an important educational concern. In this process, language functions not only as a means of communication but also as the fundamental basis for perceiving, interpreting, and understanding the cultural world. Therefore, the reflection of a linguistic worldview in teaching practices is conceptually and methodologically being examined (Antonova et al., 2022).

Linguo-axiological awareness and attitudes toward national values represent conceptually distinct educational outcomes. Linguo-axiological awareness refers to students' ability to attend to language as an object of reflection and analysis and to recognize how linguistic forms are related

to cultural meanings (Byram, 2012; Karimova et al., 2023; Roehr-Brackin, 2024). Attitudes toward national values, by contrast, refer to an evaluative orientation toward a particular value object (Eagly & Chaiken, 2007). In the present study, this orientation is examined through students' self-reported endorsement of national-value statements. Greater awareness of value-laden language does not necessarily imply stronger endorsement of particular national values, and stronger endorsement should not be interpreted as evidence of greater linguistic awareness. The two constructs are therefore examined separately.

The literature addresses the issue from several perspectives. It has been demonstrated in various national and international contexts that young people's linguistic worldviews are deeply influenced by their cultural context, and that teaching practices should take this fact into consideration (Barczewska et al., 2016; Kilinc & Tarman, 2022; Plaatjies, 2025). Longitudinal studies also support the existence of a strong and mutually determining interaction between value orientations and national identity formation. This finding indicates that patriotism and identity education needs to be restructured both pedagogically and theoretically (Benish-Weisman et al., 2024; Bogouta et al., 2024; Kayiran, 2026). Studies specific to the Kazakh educational context show that unique pedagogical approaches produce measurable effects on students' sense of identity and that literary texts carry a strong potential for value transmission (Bekpenbetova et al., 2025; Kabylov et al., 2024). Studies examining the effect of identity-focused pedagogical interventions in multilingual contexts consistently report that these practices positively transform students' linguistic identities and self-confidence (Forbes et al., 2021; Forbes et al., 2025). In this context, it is seen that the national worldview can be developed not through abstract narration and passive reception, but via tasks requiring active participation like text analysis, idiom interpretation, comparison and discussion.

Task-based language instruction (TBLI) represents a radical transformation in language teaching with its pedagogical structure that confronts students with real-life problems and emphasizes meaning-oriented communication. In this approach, knowledge and skills are internalized not through abstract transfer, but through holistic and contextual experiences. Extensive studies on the theoretical foundations and classroom applications of TBLI consistently demonstrate that it strengthens student autonomy, makes significant contributions to structural language learning and produces positive effects on speaking fluency and communicative competence (Ahmadian & Long, 2021; Albino, 2017; Bao & Du, 2015; Ellis et al., 2019; Ji & Pham, 2020). The contributions

of technology-supported task structures to student motivation and language acquisition also reinforce these findings (Bhandari et al., 2025).

The intersection of TBLL (Text-Based Language Learning) with value transmission and cultural identity education is increasingly gaining prominence in research. It has been observed that culturally sensitive tasks reinforce students' cultural awareness and understanding of values. Besides, language learning motivation is shaped through a complex interaction with value perceptions (Calafato, 2021; Lee et al., 2023). These findings indicate that task types such as text analysis, proverb interpretation, comparison, discussion, writing, and presentation offer a much more powerful pedagogical tool for developing students' awareness of value-laden language than abstract narrative alone.

Research Objective and Questions

The aim of the present study was to examine the pretest-to-posttest change patterns and posttest differences between two participating 11th-grade classrooms in linguo-axiological awareness and attitudes toward national values following a six-week instructional period.

RQ1. How did linguo-axiological awareness scores change from pretest to posttest in the two participating classrooms, and what posttest difference was observed between them?

RQ2. How did attitudes toward national values change from pretest to posttest in the two participating classrooms, and what posttest difference was observed between them?

Method

This section details the study design, participant characteristics, intervention, data collection instruments, and statistical procedures used in the analysis.

Research Design

This study employed a quasi-experimental pretest–posttest control-group design to examine changes associated with the implementation of value-based language education, delivered through a system of linguo-axiological tasks, among 11th-grade students in Kazakhstan. Because the natural classroom structure of the participating school was maintained, students could not be

individually randomly assigned to the experimental and control conditions. Instead, two intact 11th-grade classrooms were included and randomly assigned at the classroom level to the experimental and control conditions. Thus, no individual-level random assignment was conducted. Both groups completed a pretest before the instructional period and a posttest immediately after the six-week intervention. No follow-up measurement was conducted. A symbolic representation of the research design is presented in Table 1.

In this study, the unit of assignment was the classroom rather than the individual student. Two intact 11th-grade classrooms were randomly assigned at the classroom level to the experimental and control conditions; therefore, students were not individually randomly assigned.

Table 1

Quasi-experimental design of the research.

Group	Pretest	Intervention	Posttest
Experimental Group	M1	X (Value-based linguoaxiological tasks)	M2
Control Group	M3	Regular Instruction	M4

M1 and M3 = pretest (administered to both groups); X = value-based linguo-axiological task system (six-week program); – = regular instruction continued in the control group; M2 and M4 = posttest (administered immediately after the program).

The purpose of this design was to examine differences in the pretest-to-posttest change patterns observed in the experimental and control classes in relation to the value-based linguo-axiological task system. However, because each condition consisted of only one intact class, the effects of the instructional condition could not be completely separated from class membership. Therefore, the findings should not be interpreted as definitive evidence of a causal intervention effect; rather, they should be understood as a comparison of the pretest-to-posttest changes observed in the two participating classes.

Research Group / Participants

The study group consisted of 11th-grade students attending a state school in Kyzylorda Province, Republic of Kazakhstan. The existing classroom structure of the school was maintained, and two intact 11th-grade classrooms were randomly assigned at the classroom level to the experimental and control conditions. Students were not individually randomly assigned.

A total of 64 students participated in the study, with 32 students in the experimental group and 32 in the control group. No student was excluded during the research process, and the analyses were conducted using data from all 64 participants. Of the participants, 33 were female (51.56%) and 31 were male (48.44%). The experimental group included 17 female students (53.13%) and 15 male students (46.88%), whereas the control group included 16 female students (50.00%) and 16 male students (50.00%). Kazakh was the native language of 30 students (93.75%) in the experimental group and 31 students (96.88%) in the control group; overall, 61 participants (95.31%) were native Kazakh speakers. Participation was voluntary. Written parental consent was obtained for the minor participants, and the students were informed about the purpose and procedures of the study. They were informed that they could decline participation or withdraw from the study at any stage without providing a reason. All participant data were kept anonymous and confidential, and no personally identifying information was used in the analyses.

The study was conducted with administrative permission from the Kyzylorda Regional Education Department and in cooperation with the participating school administration. Written informed consent was obtained from parents, and students provided consent to participate. Participation was voluntary, students could decline participation or withdraw at any stage without academic penalty, and all data were kept anonymous and confidential. Because the researcher also served as the teacher, students were informed that participation decisions would not affect their grades or their relationship with the teacher. Participant characteristics are presented in Table 2.

Table 2*Participant Characteristics*

Features	Experimental Group (n = 32)	Control Group (n = 32)	Total (N = 64)
Female	17 (53.13%)	16 (50.00%)	33 (51.56%)
Male	15 (46.88%)	16 (50.00%)	31 (48.44%)
Age	15.70 (0.46)	15.80 (0.52)	15.75 (0.49)
Native Kazakh speakers	30 (93.75%)	31 (96.88%)	61 (95.31%)

Independent samples t-tests and chi-square tests were used to examine whether there were significant differences between the groups regarding pre-test scores, age, gender distribution. No statistically significant baseline differences were detected between the groups ($p > .05$).

Experimental Intervention

The experimental intervention was conducted over 6 weeks (2 hours per wk, a total of 12 classes) within the scope of the Kazakh Language and Literature course. The same curriculum topics were covered in both the experimental and control groups, but the methods and materials used were different.

Experimental Instructional Condition: A Multicomponent Value-Based Language Program

In the experimental group, a program developed by the researcher and called "Value-Based Language Education: Linguoaxiological Task System" was implemented. The theoretical framework of this program is based on linguistic axiology, cultural linguistics, and task-based language teaching. The program aims for students to achieve the following learning outcomes:

Because value-based language education involves culturally and normatively loaded content, the instructional process may simultaneously influence students' ability to recognize cultural meanings and the evaluative positions they express toward those meanings. These processes are analytically distinct. The present study does not treat increased endorsement of national values as equivalent to increased linguistic or cultural understanding.

The experimental condition should be understood as a multicomponent instructional program rather than as an isolated manipulation of linguo-axiological content. In addition to value-based linguistic content, the program incorporated structured reflection, individual and paired analysis, classroom discussion, learning journals, exit cards, feedback opportunities, and a final project. Therefore, the instructional condition differed from regular instruction in several pedagogical dimensions simultaneously.

- Recognizing words and expressions with national value in the Kazakh language,
- Analyzing the axiological meanings of these linguistic units depending on the context,
- Consciously using value-laden linguistic elements in one's own expressions,
- Structuring the basic concepts of the Kazakh cultural worldview (such as Zher, Til, Ata, Qonaq) at the linguistic level.

The program consists of 6 thematic weeks, each focusing on a concept of national values (see Table 3).

Table 3

6-Wk Experimental Application Program

Week	Theme (Concept)	Types of Linguo-Axiological Tasks	Sample Activity
Week 1	Introduction: The Relationship Between Language and Values	Concept definition, value code decoding	Creating a network of meanings for the word 'Kieli' in different contexts.
Week 2	Zher (Homeland / Territory)	Ecological language awareness, symbolic meaning field analysis.	Discussing the layers of value mentioned in the proverb 'Tugan zherin – golden cradle'
Week 3	Language (Identity)	Value judgment transformation, metaphor analysis	Restructuring a neutral sentence with value-laden expressions.
Week 4	Ancestors (Lineage)	Etymological axiology, value mapping.	Comparing the value connotations of the word 'ancestor' in biological, spiritual, and social contexts.
Week 5	Qonaq (Hospitality)	Pragmatic tasks, cultural scenario analysis.	A comparative evaluation of different hospitality patterns at an axiological level.
Week 6	Project: 'Tildik Dunietyanym – Menin Kazakstanım'	Multitasking set, value synthesis.	Creating a digital story or poster that linguistically represents a new national value of Kazakhstan.

In the experimental group, each lesson was taught in the following structure:

- Introduction (5-7 min): Sharing from the previous wk's values journal
- Linguo-axiological Task (20-25 min): Individual or paired linguistic analysis exercises on the determined core concept
- Reflection and Sharing (10-12 min): Discussing the task results with the class
- Exit Card (3-5 min): Written response to the question "Which word has value for me today?"

The experimental group was not given any grammar memorization or definition tests. The assessment was process-oriented and task-based.

6-Week Experimental Application Program: Developing Linguo-Axiological Awareness Through Value-Based Language Education

This six-week experimental program in Kazakh language and literature aims to develop students' linguo-axiological awareness and engagement with value-laden language within the framework of linguoaxiology. Throughout the program, students learned by experiencing language as a carrier of value, going beyond traditional grammar or text-reading activities.

Week 1: Introduction – The Relationship Between Language, Culture, and Values

During the first week of the program, students were introduced to the idea that language is not merely a means of communication, but also a living entity carrying a nation's values, worldview and cultural codes. The lesson began by asking students, "When you speak Kazakh or read a Kazakh text, what are the first three values that come to mind?" The answers were written on the board and discussed. Then, students were asked to examine the uses of the word *kieli* (sacred) in different contexts. For example, they compared the expressions "*kieli zher*" (sacred land), "*kieli tul*" (sacred widow), and "*kieli söz*" (sacred word). They discussed which values this word elevated in which situations. At the end of the week, they were asked to choose a "value-laden word" from their own lives and write it down in their values journal to bring to the next class.

Week 2: The Value of Zher (Homeland/Territory)

The focus concept for the second week was *zher* (homeland/territory). This week, students linguistically analyzed the spiritual meanings attributed to land in Kazakh poetry and proverbs. The lesson began with the proverb "Tugan zherin – altın besik" (The land where you were born is a golden cradle). They were asked to analyze the value connotations of each word in this proverb. Next, the expression "qaragym zher" (the land is the apple of my eye) from a poem was studied. They were asked to understand why students examined how land was represented as a valued cultural concept in the selected linguistic materials like the "apple of the eye." Furthermore, the semantic fields of adjectives used with the word *zher* (*sary zher* – yellow land, *baqytty zher* – happy land, etc.) were mapped. At the end of the week, students were asked to write a short text

describing the land of their own region, including at least three expressions with significant meanings.

Week 3: Language (Identity) Value

In the third week, the relationship of language between identity and independence was explored. Through a text themed “My mother tongue – my dream,” students examined how language was represented in relation to identity and cultural belonging. One of the activities was a “value transformation” exercise. They were given a neutral sentence and asked to transform it by adding value-laden expressions.

Week 4: Ancestral Culture and Awareness of Lineage

The fourth week examined linguistic and cultural representations of ancestry and lineage, awareness of lineage, and the transmission of tradition. Starting from the saying “Ata joly – aqyl” (The path of the ancestors is wisdom), students analyzed why the words of ancestors are valued so highly in oral tradition. At the end of the week, they shared an ancestral story they had heard from their own families with the class and listed the linguistic value indicators in that story.

Week 5: Qonaq (Hospitality) and Social Solidarity

The focus of the fifth week was on hospitality. How is the Kazakh culture's view of a guest as "a blessing from God" reflected in linguistic patterns? To answer this question, students compared different dialogues for welcoming guests. They acted out a conversation that takes place when an unexpected guest arrives at a home and shared with the class which values (respect, generosity, sincerity) were highlighted by the linguistic patterns they used. Additionally, Kazakh hospitality was briefly compared to hospitality patterns from other cultures (e.g., Russian or English).

Week 6: Project Week – “Tildik Dunietanym: Menin Kazakstanım” (My Linguistic Worldview: My Kazakhstan)

In the sixth and final week, students prepared a project that reflected the value awareness and linguistic axiology skills they had gained in the previous five weeks. The projects were displayed in class and they evaluated each other's work using structured feedback forms.

Control Group Intervention: Regular Instruction

In the control group, instruction followed the regular Kazakh Language and Literature curriculum and the routine instructional practices used in the participating school. The same thematic topics covered in the experimental group, including Zher, Til, Ata, and Qonaq, were also addressed in the control group. Instruction was primarily based on teacher explanations, textbook-based reading activities, vocabulary work, grammar exercises, and practice activities included in the regular curriculum.

Students worked with the same general thematic content; however, the structured linguo-axiological task system implemented in the experimental group was not used in the control condition. In particular, the control group did not receive the systematic value-analysis, reflection, comparison, and production tasks specifically developed for the intervention. For example, within the Zher theme, students completed regular language and grammar activities based on the course materials, whereas the experimental group additionally engaged in structured analysis of the value-related meanings associated with the concept. Similarly, within the Qonaq theme, the control group worked with dialogue and language-use activities included in regular instruction, while the experimental group completed additional linguo-axiological tasks focusing on the cultural and value-related dimensions of hospitality.

The two conditions therefore differed not only in linguo-axiological content but also in instructional format, interaction opportunities, reflective activity, feedback, novelty, and project-based work. No independent implementation-fidelity assessment, external lesson observation, systematic fidelity checklist, or equivalent-attention control condition was used. Consequently, differences in instructional attention, classroom interaction, novelty, feedback intensity, teacher expectancy, or teacher enthusiasm cannot be ruled out as alternative explanations, and any observed classroom difference cannot be attributed specifically to the linguo-axiological task system or to any single component of the experimental program.

Data Collection Tools

Both instruments were developed for the present research program and should be interpreted as preliminary researcher-developed measures rather than as fully established measures of the underlying constructs. The psychometric analyses conducted in the present program provide preliminary evidence regarding internal structure and internal consistency only.

Linguo-axiological Awareness Scale (LAAS)

LAAS is a 5-point Likert-type scale (1= Strongly disagree, 5= Strongly agree) developed by the researcher to measure students' levels of recognizing, comprehending and interpreting national values in language. The scale consists of 20 items and aims to measure the ability to recognize value-laden words, interpret cultural symbols at the linguistic level, perform value-based linguistic analysis, and use values in their own expressions.

A review of the literature reveals the absence of a valid and reliable measurement tool that directly assesses value awareness in language teaching. Existing scales generally measure cultural awareness or general value orientations and do not specifically address the axiological dimension of language (the value codes carried by words, idioms and proverbs). Therefore, there is a need to develop a measurement tool with a strong theoretical foundation and high psychometric properties that is suitable for the purpose of the current research.

The scale development process included a literature review, item pool generation, expert opinion and content validity analyses, pilot application, exploratory factor analysis (EFA), reliability analyses (internal consistency), and the creation of the final form. All stages were conducted in accordance with the "Standards for Educational and Psychological Measurement" published by the American Association for Educational Research (AERA), the American Psychological Association (APA) and the National Council for Educational Measurement (NCME).

The theoretical basis of the scale rests on linguistic axiology (linguoxiology), cultural linguistics, and value-based educational approaches. In the process of creating the item pool, national value concepts considered central to Kazakh culture were first identified. Then, proverbs, idioms, quotations from literary texts and samples of everyday language use reflecting these concepts were examined. Then 5-point Likert-type items were written to measure students' level of awareness and interpretation of these values. Initially, a pool of 30 items was created.

The created pool of 30 items was presented to a panel of eight experts to ensure content validity. The expert panel consists of three academicians studying linguoaxiology in the field of linguistics, three academicians working in the field of Kazakh language and literature education and 2 academicians in the field of measurement and evaluation. All 20 retained items had CVR values above the critical value of .750 for an eight-member expert panel.

The 20-item scale form, finalized after expert opinion, was administered to 132 11th-grade students attending a pilot school that represented the main research population but was not included in the study. The pilot application was conducted in a classroom setting under the supervision of the researcher, lasting approximately 20 minutes.

An exploratory factor analysis was conducted using data obtained from 132 participants to obtain preliminary evidence regarding the internal structure of the Linguo-axiological Awareness Scale. Principal Axis Factoring was used as the factor extraction method. The suitability of the data for factor analysis was assessed using the Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) measure and Bartlett’s test of sphericity. The KMO value was .906, and Bartlett’s test was statistically significant, $\chi^2(190) = 2261.24$, $p < .001$, indicating that the data were suitable for factor analysis. Given the theoretically proposed unidimensional structure of the scale, a one-factor solution was evaluated. Factor loadings ranged from .629 to .843, and all items exceeded the minimum loading criterion of .40. The retained factor explained 55.93% of the total variance. The scale score was calculated as the arithmetic mean of the 20 items, with higher scores indicating higher levels of linguo-axiological awareness.

The exploratory factor analysis conducted with 132 students provides preliminary evidence regarding the internal structure of the LAAS. However, no independent confirmatory factor analysis, test–retest reliability assessment, convergent validity study, or criterion-related validity evidence was available. Therefore, the reported factor structure and coefficient alpha should not be interpreted as establishing the construct validity of the scale.

The scale items are conceptually close to the value-laden words, idioms, proverbs, and linguistic units carrying cultural meanings addressed during the intervention. Therefore, the posttest scores obtained from the scale may partly reflect students’ mastery of the intervention content and the task types associated with this content. This measurement alone does not demonstrate that linguo-axiological awareness can be transferred to broader and different content.

The coefficient obtained from the pilot data was .95, indicating high internal consistency within the pilot sample; however, internal consistency alone does not establish construct validity.

Attitude Scale Towards National Values

The Attitudes Towards National Values Scale was developed by researchers to determine the attitudes of 11th-grade students in Kazakhstan towards national values in the Kazakh language. The development process of the scale consisted of literature review, item pool creation, expert opinion, pilot application and final form determination.

Before developing the scale, a comprehensive literature review was conducted on linguistics, cultural linguistics and Kazakh cultural values. In line with the established conceptual framework, an initial pool of 20 attitude statements was formed. Care was taken to ensure that the statements were appropriate for the language level of 11th-grade students. To ensure content validity, the 20 items were presented to an expert panel. The expert panel consisted of (a) three academics working in the field of linguistics, (b) three experienced teachers of Kazakh language and literature and (c) two academics with doctoral degrees in measurement and evaluation. The experts were asked to rate each item as "accurately represents national value attitudes," "partially represents," or "does not represent," and to provide any suggestions in writing for each item.

Based on expert evaluations, the Content Validity Ratio (CVR) was calculated. According to the Lawshe technique, the minimum CVR value was determined to be .75 for eight experts. As a result of the evaluation, it was determined that 5 out of 20 items had a CVR value below .75 and these items were removed from the pool and the number of items was reduced to 15.

The 15-item attitude scale form, finalized after expert opinion, was administered to 90 11th-grade students attending a pilot school that represented the main research population but was not included in the study. The pilot application was conducted in a classroom setting with a supervisor present and a 20-minute time limit. Factor analysis and reliability analyses were performed on the data obtained from the pilot application to obtain preliminary evidence regarding internal structure and internal consistency. The responses to the scale, developed using a 5-point Likert scale, were: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Undecided, Agree and Strongly Agree.

An exploratory factor analysis was conducted using data obtained from 90 participants to examine the construct validity of the Attitudes Towards National Values Scale. Principal Axis Factoring was used as the factor extraction method. The suitability of the data for factor analysis was assessed using the Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) measure and Bartlett's test of sphericity. The KMO value

was .836, and Bartlett's test was statistically significant, $\chi^2(105) = 916.10$, $p < .001$. Parallel analysis supported a one-factor structure, as only the first observed eigenvalue exceeded the corresponding random-data threshold, whereas the subsequent eigenvalues remained below their respective threshold values. This result, together with the theoretical framework and the common content of the items, supported the retention of a unidimensional solution. Factor loadings ranged from .452 to .763, and communalities ranged from .204 to .582. The retained factor explained 40.26% of the common variance. Item retention was based on factor loadings above .40 and the theoretical relevance of the items. Corrected item–total correlations ranged from .445 to .703. The scale score was calculated as the arithmetic mean of the 15 items, with higher scores indicating more positive attitudes toward national values.

The exploratory factor analysis conducted with 90 students provides preliminary evidence regarding the internal structure of the 15-item measure. However, the sample size is limited for establishing stable dimensionality, and no independent confirmatory sample, test–retest reliability assessment, convergent validity evidence, or criterion-related validity evidence was available. Accordingly, the measure is treated as a preliminary researcher-developed indicator of self-reported attitudes toward national values.

Data Analysis Techniques

Descriptive statistics were first calculated, and the assumptions relevant to the planned baseline-adjusted comparisons were examined. Independent-samples *t* tests were used to describe baseline differences between the two classrooms. Paired-samples *t* tests were conducted to describe pretest-to-posttest changes within each classroom; these comparisons were not used to infer differences between conditions.

The ANCOVA models were used only to obtain baseline-adjusted descriptive estimates for the two participating classrooms. Because each instructional condition was represented by a single classroom, instructional condition was perfectly confounded with classroom membership, and the 64 student observations cannot be regarded as independent experimental replications. Accordingly, the adjusted means, adjusted mean differences, and their 95% confidence intervals are interpreted as conditional descriptions of these two classrooms rather than as estimates of a population-level or causal intervention effect. Student-level *p* values and partial eta-squared values were not used as the basis for substantive inference.

To assess the assumptions of the ANCOVA models, the distributional characteristics of the pretest and posttest scores, the homogeneity of group variances, and the Group $\times$ Pretest interaction were examined. A nonsignificant Group $\times$ Pretest interaction supports the homogeneity-of-regression-slopes assumption. The significance level was set at $\alpha = .05$ for all analyses.

Findings

The findings compare the two participating classrooms on linguo-axiological awareness and attitudes toward national values at pretest and posttest. The results are presented in Tables 4–9.

Table 4

Normality and Homogeneity Test Scores for the Groups' Linguo-axiological Awareness and Attitudes Towards National Values Scores

	<i>Skewness</i>	<i>Kurtosis</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Linguo-axiological Awareness Scale (Pretest)	0.91	0.84	0.04	.850
Attitudes Towards National Values Scale (Pretest)	-1.30	2.86	0.38	.540

Distributional characteristics were evaluated using skewness and kurtosis values. Homogeneity of variance was assessed using Levene's test.

For the Linguo-axiological Awareness Scale, the skewness (0.91) and kurtosis (0.84) values were within the ± 2 range. For the Attitudes Towards National Values Scale, the skewness value (-1.30) was within this range, whereas the kurtosis value (2.86) was slightly above it. When the more flexible ± 3 criterion is considered, both measures fall within an acceptable range. Levene's tests were nonsignificant for both the pretest scores of the Linguo-axiological Awareness Scale, $F = 0.04$, $p = .850$, and the Attitudes Towards National Values Scale, $F = 0.38$, $p = .540$, indicating homogeneity of variance between the groups.

Table 5

Group Means and Standard Deviations for Pretest and Posttest Scores

Measure	Group	n	Pretest M	Pretest SD	Posttest M	Posttest SD
Linguo-axiological awareness	Experimental	32	3.65	0.45	4.12	0.39
Linguo-axiological awareness	Control	32	3.70	0.42	3.88	0.54
Attitudes toward national values	Experimental	32	3.50	0.38	4.01	0.34
Attitudes toward national values	Control	32	3.57	0.30	3.70	0.33

Note. M = mean; SD = standard deviation. Scores are based on the 1–5 response scale.

The descriptive results showed that, following the intervention, the experimental group achieved higher mean scores than the control group on both scales. Linguo-axiological awareness scores increased from 3.65 to 4.12 in the experimental group and from 3.70 to 3.88 in the control group. Attitudes toward national values increased from 3.50 to 4.01 in the experimental group and from 3.57 to 3.70 in the control group. However, descriptive mean differences alone do not establish an intervention effect; the primary comparison was based on the ANCOVA results in Table 9, which accounted for baseline scores.

Table 6

Independent-Samples *t* Tests for Baseline Group Differences

Measure	df	t	p	Cohen's d
Linguo-axiological awareness	62	-0.51	.609	-0.13
Attitudes toward national values	62	-0.84	.407	-0.21

Note. The independent-samples *t* tests were used to examine baseline differences between the experimental and control groups.

No statistically significant baseline differences were detected on the two measured outcomes between the experimental and control classrooms. These comparisons describe baseline comparability on the measured outcomes and do not resolve the classroom-level confounding.

Table 7

Paired-Samples *t* Tests of Within-Group Pretest–Posttest Change

Measure	Group	N	t	p	Cohen's dz
Linguo-axiological awareness	Experimental	32	4.95	< .001	0.87
Linguo-axiological awareness	Control	32	1.55	.131	0.27
Attitudes toward national values	Experimental	32	10.79	< .001	1.91
Attitudes toward national values	Control	32	2.37	.024	0.42

Note. Cohen's dz was calculated as $t/\sqrt{n}$. These tests are supplementary and do not test whether change differs between groups

The experimental group showed a significant increase in linguo-axiological awareness, $t(31) = 4.95$, $p < .001$, $d_z = 0.87$. The experimental group also showed a significant increase in attitudes toward national values, $t(31) = 10.79$, $p < .001$, $d_z = 1.91$. In the control group, the change in linguo-axiological awareness was not significant, $t(31) = 1.55$, $p = .131$, $d_z = 0.27$, whereas the change in attitudes toward national values was significant, $t(31) = 2.37$, $p = .024$, $d_z = 0.42$. These findings describe within-group changes. A difference between the changes in the experimental and

control groups cannot be inferred from these tests alone; accordingly, the primary inference was based on the ANCOVA results.

Table 8

Assumption Checks for the ANCOVA Models

Measure	Pretest skew.	Pretest kurt.	Levene pre F	p	Levene post F	p	Group × pretest F	p
Linguo-axiological awareness	0.91	0.84	0.04	.850	2.83	.098	0.01	.916
Attitudes toward national values	-1.30	2.86	0.38	.540	0.25	.617	0.24	.624

Note. Skewness and kurtosis are reported for the pretest scores. The Group × pretest term was tested to assess homogeneity of regression slopes.

The pretest skewness and kurtosis values were within generally acceptable ranges, with the more flexible ± 3 criterion applied to the attitude measure. Nonsignificant Levene tests were consistent with the assumption of equal variances between the groups. In addition, the Group × Pretest interactions were nonsignificant for linguo-axiological awareness, $F(1, 60) = 0.01$, $p = .916$, and attitudes toward national values, $F(1, 60) = 0.24$, $p = .624$. The nonsignificant interactions indicate that the regression slopes did not differ between the groups and support the homogeneity-of-regression-slopes assumption of the ANCOVA models. These checks supported the assessed distributional, variance, and regression-slope assumptions; however, they did not address the dependence arising from classroom clustering.

Table 9

Baseline-Adjusted Descriptive Estimates for the Two Participating Classrooms

Outcome	Experimental adjusted M	95% CI	Control adjusted M	95% CI	Adjusted mean difference	95% CI
Linguo-axiological awareness	4.13	[3.96, 4.29]	3.88	[3.71, 4.05]	0.25	[0.01, 0.48]
Attitudes toward national values	4.03	[3.94, 4.13]	3.68	[3.58, 3.77]	0.36	[0.22, 0.49]

Note. Estimates were obtained from student-level ANCOVA models with the corresponding pretest score as the covariate. The adjusted means and mean differences are reported with 95% confidence intervals. Because each condition included one classroom, these estimates are conditional descriptions of the two participating classrooms and should not be interpreted as causal intervention effects.

After adjustment for baseline scores, the experimental classroom showed a higher adjusted mean than the control classroom on both measured outcomes. These adjusted means and differences are reported descriptively for the two participating classrooms. Because instructional condition and classroom membership were inseparable, the estimates should not be interpreted as evidence that the instructional program caused the observed differences. For linguo-axiological awareness, the adjusted mean was 4.13 (95% CI [3.96, 4.29]) in the experimental classroom and 3.88 (95% CI [3.71, 4.05]) in the control classroom; the adjusted mean difference was 0.25 (95% CI [0.01, 0.48]). For attitudes toward national values, the corresponding adjusted means were 4.03 (95% CI [3.94, 4.13]) and 3.68 (95% CI [3.58, 3.77]), respectively, with an adjusted mean difference of 0.36 (95% CI [0.22, 0.49]). These intervals describe the uncertainty of the student-level adjusted estimates within the present data and do not quantify uncertainty across classrooms or schools.

Discussion

This study examined the association between value-based language instruction, implemented through a system of linguo-axiological tasks, and linguo-axiological awareness and attitudes toward national values among 11th-grade students in Kazakhstan. After controlling for pretest scores, the analyses showed that the experimental group achieved significantly higher posttest scores than the control group on both measured outcomes. Nevertheless, the findings should be interpreted within the context of a study conducted at one school with two intact classes.

The present analyses describe baseline-adjusted differences between two classrooms. They do not identify the independent contribution of the instructional program because classroom membership and instructional condition were completely confounded. The awareness and attitude outcomes should also be interpreted differently: a higher awareness score concerns recognition and interpretation of value-laden linguistic material, whereas a higher attitude score reflects stronger self-reported endorsement of national-value statements. The latter should not automatically be interpreted as evidence of improved linguistic awareness or as an inherently superior educational outcome.

The findings related to the first research question suggest that the value-based linguo-axiological task system was associated with higher posttest linguo-axiological awareness scores. This result is consistent with previous research emphasizing that language is not only a communicative tool but

also a structure that carries cultural meanings, values, and social experiences. Amirbekova et al. (2024) showed that the semantic features of phraseological units in Kazakh are related to their cultural representational capacity and that these meaning fields can be addressed through instruction. The tasks used in the present study enabled students to examine value-laden words, idioms, and proverbs in context, interpret their cultural meanings, and use these meanings in their own expressions. In this respect, the present findings support Amirbekova et al.'s (2024) conclusion that the cultural meanings of linguistic units can be made more explicit through instruction. Similarly, Antonova et al. (2022) emphasized that the linguistic worldview can be modeled through systematic instruction and that this approach has both conceptual and practical potential for language education. Whereas much of the previous literature has addressed the relationship between language, culture, and values at a theoretical or descriptive level, the present study provides an applied example of addressing this relationship through classroom tasks. The findings should not, however, be interpreted as direct evidence of national or cultural identity development; they are limited to linguo-axiological awareness as measured in this study.

The findings related to the second research question suggest that the value-based linguo-axiological task system was positively associated with students' attitudes toward national values. The higher posttest attitude scores observed in the experimental group indicate that addressing value-laden linguistic units through active and task-based activities was associated with higher posttest attitude scores. This result suggests that attitudes toward national values may be addressed not only through direct explanation and transmission, but also through learning processes that enable students to actively examine linguistic and cultural meanings.

This finding is broadly consistent with Benish-Weisman et al. (2024), who reported an association between value orientations and national identification. However, whereas that study focused on the relationship between value orientations and national identification, the present study directly measured students' attitudes toward national values. Kabylov et al. (2024) showed that innovative pedagogical approaches may be associated with outcomes related to students' cultural identity awareness, while Forbes et al. (2021) drew attention to the possible influence of identity-focused pedagogical interventions on students' linguistic identities. These studies provide a theoretical and contextual basis for comparison, but the findings of the present study should not be interpreted as evidence of national, cultural, or linguistic identity development. They should be understood as

evidence concerning the relationship between the linguo-axiological task system and students' attitudes toward national values.

The findings of this study offer theoretical and practical contributions to the axiological foundations of language education. Previous studies have emphasized that language-teaching materials and classroom tasks can address not only communicative skills but also cultural meanings, value orientations, and cultural awareness (Feng, 2019; Lovat et al., 2023; Rezaee & Esfandiyari, 2023; Widodo et al., 2018). Krupchenko et al. (2020) addressed the axiological dimension of language education at a theoretical level, while Antonova et al. (2022) argued that the linguistic worldview can be modeled through systematic instruction. Amirbekova et al. (2024) further showed that the cultural representational capacity of Kazakh phraseological units is related to their semantic features and that these meaning fields can be addressed instructionally. The distinctive contribution of the present study is its consideration of these theoretical issues in a classroom application based on structured linguo-axiological tasks within Kazakh language and literature instruction. The findings provide limited but practice-based evidence that such tasks may be related to students' linguo-axiological awareness and attitudes toward national values.

From a practical perspective, the six-week task system provides an example of an instructional framework that can be used by Kazakh language and literature teachers. Addressing culturally meaningful concepts such as Zher, Til, Ata, and Qonaq through words, idioms, proverbs, texts, and communicative tasks may help translate abstract value-related goals into classroom language activities. This approach is also consistent with task-based teaching, which involves students in comparison, interpretation, discussion, and production rather than limiting instruction to the explanation of cultural content (Ahmadian & Long, 2021; Bao & Du, 2015). The applicability of the model across different schools and with a larger number of classes should be examined in future research. Because the present study was conducted at one school with two intact classes, it provides a contextual example of how linguo-axiological tasks may be structured in language education rather than definitive evidence of a general intervention effect.

Several limitations should be considered when evaluating the findings. First, the study was conducted at a single state school in Kyzylorda Province with two intact 11th-grade classes, and the participants were selected through convenience sampling. Therefore, the generalizability of the findings to other schools, regions, and student populations is limited. Students were not

individually randomly assigned, and the use of the existing classroom arrangement means that the effects of the instructional condition cannot be completely separated from class membership. In addition, because only one class represented each condition, class-level variation could not be statistically controlled through multilevel modeling. The six-week intervention and the administration of the posttest immediately after the intervention also prevent conclusions about the long-term persistence of changes in linguo-axiological awareness and attitudes toward national values. The exclusive use of quantitative instruments also limited a deeper understanding of students' interpretive processes, emotional responses, and meaning construction regarding value-laden language. Finally, because the researcher also implemented the program as the teacher, expectation effects and implementation bias cannot be ruled out. These limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings.

The measurement evidence should also be interpreted cautiously. Both instruments were developed within the research program and were examined primarily through exploratory factor analysis and internal-consistency estimates. Independent confirmatory validation, temporal stability, convergent validity, and criterion-related validity were not established. These limitations are particularly important for the LAAS because of its conceptual and procedural proximity to the instructional content. Future validation studies should employ independent samples, confirmatory factor analysis, test-retest designs, convergent and criterion measures, unfamiliar linguistic materials, applied performance tasks, and delayed assessments.

A further substantive limitation concerns the multicomponent nature of the experimental condition. The program combined linguo-axiological content with structured reflection, journals, paired analysis, discussion, feedback opportunities, exit cards, and project work. No equivalent-attention control condition, independent implementation-fidelity assessment, external lesson observation, or systematic fidelity checklist was available. The study therefore cannot isolate the active ingredient responsible for the observed classroom differences. In addition, the researcher served as the teacher, so teacher expectancy and enthusiasm effects cannot be ruled out.

Conclusion & Recommendations

This study compared two intact 11th-grade classrooms using baseline-adjusted descriptive estimates of linguo-axiological awareness and attitudes toward national values. The adjusted

means and 95% confidence intervals describe the two participating classrooms; they do not establish a causal intervention effect because each condition was represented by one classroom.

The instructional model brings together linguoaxiology, cultural linguistics, and task-based teaching in a classroom framework. Addressing culturally meaningful concepts such as Zher, Til, Ata, and Qonaq through linguistic tasks may help translate abstract educational goals related to national values into classroom activities. Nevertheless, the findings do not constitute direct evidence of national or cultural identity development because these constructs were not directly measured in the study.

The study was conducted at one school with two intact classes, which limits the generalizability and causal interpretability of the findings. Future research should examine the linguo-axiological task system across different schools, a larger number of classes, and more diverse samples. Follow-up measurements would help determine the long-term persistence of changes in awareness and attitudes. Combining quantitative measures with interviews, focus groups, classroom observations, or discourse analysis could provide a more comprehensive understanding of how students interpret value-laden linguistic units. Although the present findings are supportive, broader research is needed to evaluate the applicability of the task system in Kazakh language and literature education.

References

- Agbo, S. A., Pak, N., Akbarov, A., Madiyeva, G., & Saurykov, Y. (2025). Global competitiveness myths and ideals: English language policy in universities in Kazakhstan. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 34(3), 515–542. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10567879221137572>
- Ahmadian, M. J., & Long, M. H. (Eds.). (2021). *The Cambridge handbook of task-based language teaching* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108868327>
- Akbana, Y. E., & Yavuz, A. (2022). Global issues in a series of EFL textbooks and implications for end-users to promote peace education through teaching English. *Journal of Peace Education*, 19(3), 373–396. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17400201.2022.2140403>
- Albino, G. (2017). Improving speaking fluency in a task-based language teaching approach: The case of EFL learners at PUNIV-Cazenga. *Sage Open*, 7(2), 2158244017691077. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244017691077>

- Amirbekova, A., Talgatqyzy, G., Kulmanov, S., Sovetova, Z., & Biyazdykova, A. (2024). Semantic valence and cultural representation of phraseological units (Kazakh and English). *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 6(5), 65–82. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v6i5.6865>
- Antonova, M., Baranovskaya, T., Zakharova, A., & Li, S. (2022). Modelling the linguistic worldview: Subject field scoping review. *Journal of Language and Education*, 8(3), 150–166. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2022.14433>
- Aubakirova, B., Mandel, K. M., & Benkei-Kovacs, B. (2019). European experience of multilingualism and the development of multilingual education in Kazakhstan. *Hungarian Educational Research Journal*, 9(4), 689–707. <https://doi.org/10.1556/063.9.2019.4.56>
- Bao, R., & Du, X. (2015). Implementation of task-based language teaching in Chinese as a foreign language: Benefits and challenges. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 28(3), 291–310. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2015.1058392>
- Barczewska, S., Wileczek, A., & Barańska, P. (2016). 'School? You go because you have to'. The linguistic worldview of 'school' in Polish and American teen Internet discourse. *L1 Educational Studies in Language and Literature*, 16, 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.17239/L1ESLL-2016.16.01.08>
- Bekpenbetova, S., Satkenova, S., Ibrayeva, Z., Zholdybayev, O., Yerzhanova, S., & Borash, R. (2025). Intertextuality in modern Kazakh prose: Enhancing cultural identity and academic success in higher education. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies*, 12(5), 62–85. <https://doi.org/10.29333/ejecs/2408>
- Bekzhanova, Z., & Makoelle, T. M. (2022). Latinization of the Kazakh alphabet: Implications for education, inclusion, and social cohesion in Kazakhstan. *Sage Open*, 12(4), 21582440221138820. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221138820>
- Benish-Weisman, M., Daniel, E., Elizarov, E., Sverdlik, N., & Titzmann, P. F. (2024). Values and national identification in minority and majority youth: Longitudinal multi-study findings. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 53(8), 1757–1773. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-024-01965-0>
- Bhandari, L. P., Dahal, N., Awasthi, J. R., & Dhungana, S. (2025). Technology-mediated task-based language teaching: A systematic review. *Cogent Education*, 12(1), 2560051. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2560051>
- Bogouta, V., Naida, I., Mykhailichenko, M., Kornienko, A., & Machuskyi, V. (2024). Critical strategies for strengthening the patriotic education framework for youth. *Multidisciplinary Reviews*, 8, 2024spe075. <https://doi.org/10.31893/multirev.2024spe075>
- Byram, M. (2012). Language awareness and (critical) cultural awareness: Relationships, comparisons and contrasts. *Language Awareness*, 21(1–2), 5–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2011.639887>

- Calafato, R. (2021). "I'm a salesman and my client is China": Language learning motivation, multicultural attitudes, and multilingualism among university students in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan. *System*, 103, 102645. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102645>
- Charter, R. A. (1999). Sample size requirements for precise estimates of reliability, generalizability, and validity coefficients. *Journal of clinical and experimental neuropsychology*, 21(4), 559-566. <https://doi.org/10.1076/jcen.21.4.559.889>
- Chung, A. H. S., & Ho, S. K. (2026). Hong Kong primary teachers' perceptions and attitudes towards the infusion of values education in English language teaching. *Cogent Education*, 13(1), 2610031. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2610031>
- Daurenbek, S., Açıık, F., & Ryskulbek, D. (2025). The Impact of Contrastive Analysis on Turkish Linguistic Competence: An Empirical Investigation Among Students in Kazakhstan. *Journal of Culture and Values in Education*, 8(2), 97-123. <https://doi.org/10.46303/jcve.2025.21>
- Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (2007). The advantages of an inclusive definition of attitude. *Social Cognition*, 25(5), 582–602. <https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.2007.25.5.582>
- Ellis, R., Skehan, P., Li, S., Shintani, N., & Lambert, C. (2019). *Task-based language teaching: Theory and practice* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108643689>
- Feng, W. D. (2019). Infusing moral education into English language teaching: An ontogenetic analysis of social values in EFL textbooks in Hong Kong. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 40(4), 458–473. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2017.1356806>
- Forbes, K., Evans, M., Fisher, L., Gayton, A., Liu, Y., & Rutgers, D. (2021). Developing a multilingual identity in the languages classroom: The influence of an identity-based pedagogical intervention. *The Language Learning Journal*, 49(4), 433–451. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2021.1906733>
- Forbes, K., Evans, M., Fisher, L., Gayton, A., Liu, Y., & Rutgers, D. (2025). 'I feel like I have a superpower': A qualitative study of adolescents' experiences of multilingual identity development during an identity-based pedagogical intervention. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 46(9), 2841–2856. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2024.2313564>
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2010). *IBM SPSS statistics 29 step by step: A simple guide and reference*. routledge.
- Gluchshenko, Y., Dalbergenova, L., Yessengaliyeva, A., Rudik, Z., Mikhailova, T., & Cesur, K. (2026). Preparing Future Teachers for a Multicultural World: Sociocultural Competence as the Foundation of Pre-Service English Language Teachers' Professional and Personal

- Development. *Journal of Culture and Values in Education*, 9(2), 1-36. <https://doi.org/10.46303/jcve.2026.18>
- Doszhan, Z., Mussayeva, G., Yersultanova, G., & Kulnazarova, G. (2026). Religious Semantics and Mythologeme-Based Worldviews in Kazakh and English Traditions: A Systematic Contrastive Review. *Journal of Culture and Values in Education*, 9(2), 100-138. <https://doi.org/10.46303/jcve.2026.22>
- Imanova, D., Akzhigitova, A., & Zabrodskaia, A. (2025). Language-in-education policy for English language teaching in public schools of Kazakhstan: Top-down vs. bottom-up approaches. *Education Sciences*, 15(1), 66. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15010066>
- Ji, Y., & Pham, T. (2020). Implementing task-based language teaching (TBLT) to teach grammar in English classes in China: Using design-based research to explore challenges and strategies. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 14(2), 164–177. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2018.1545021>
- Johansson, E., Emilson, A., & Puroila, A.-M. (Eds.). (2018). *Values education in early childhood settings: Concepts, approaches and practices* (Vol. 23). Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-75559-5>
- Kabylov, A., Anes, G., Kamarova, N., Burkitbaeva, A., Zhailovov, B., & Shokhayev, M. (2024). Cultural identity of public consciousness in Kazakhstan literature education: Effects of a new teaching method. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies*, 11(1), 119–141. <https://doi.org/10.29333/ejecs/1954>
- Kaiser, H. (1974). *An index of factorial simplicity*. Psychometrika.
- Kamalova, A. (2025). Speak Kazakh: Language ideologies in Kazakhstan's social media in times of Russian–Ukrainian War. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 29(3), 182–193. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12699>
- Kambatyrova, A. (2024). Parents' language ideologies in the context of trilingual education policy in Kazakhstan. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 21(3), 1201–1217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2022.2153850>
- Karagulova, B. S., Mulkamanova, A. Z., Salikhova, A., Vakhitova, T. F., & Kadyrova, B. M. (2025). The linguocultural feature of phraseological units of kinship terms (on the materials of Kazakh, Russian, and English languages). *Forum for Linguistic Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i3.8510>
- Karimova, B., Bazylova, B., Makasheva, A., Nurlanbekova, Y. & Ailauova, Z. (2023). Students' Linguocultural Competence: Insights from Internationalization at Home, *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 14(4), 379-405. <https://jsser.org/index.php/jsser/article/view/5450/653>

- Kayiran, D. (2026). Exploring Young Minds: Metaphorical Conceptualizations of Core Values among Primary School Students. *Theory and Practice in Child Development*, 6(1), 60–79. <https://doi.org/10.46303/tpicd.2026.4>
- Kilinc, E. & Tarman, B. (2022). Citizenship types, social media use, and speaking foreign language as predictors of global competence, *Citizenship Teaching & Learning*, 17:1, 49–62. https://doi.org/10.1386/ctl_00081_1
- Krupchenko, A., Zharkova, T., & Inozemtseva, K. (2020). Axiology of foreign language education. *European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 467–474. <https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2020.08.55>
- Kucherbayeva, D., & Smagulova, J. (2023). Language revitalization: Challenges for Kazakh in higher education. *Journal of Eurasian Studies*, 14(2), 166–178. <https://doi.org/10.1177/18793665231189326>
- Lee, T.-Y., Ho, Y.-C., & Chen, C.-H. (2023). Integrating intercultural communicative competence into an online EFL classroom: An empirical study of a secondary school in Thailand. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 8(1), 4. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-022-00174-1>
- Lovat, T., Toomey, R., Clement, N., & Dally, K. (Eds.). (2023). *Second international research handbook on values education and student wellbeing*. Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-24420-9>
- Munandar, M. I., & Newton, J. (2021). Indonesian EFL teachers' pedagogic beliefs and classroom practices regarding culture and interculturality. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 21(2), 158–173. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2020.1867155>
- Ouladhadda, A. (2025). Whose values are we teaching? A critical discourse analysis of Moroccan EFL textbooks. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, 7(4), 484–552. <https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v7i4.2289>
- Plaatjies, B. (2025). Analysing the Influence of Principal Classroom Supervision on Literacy Instruction: Some Critical Perspectives. *Research in Educational Policy and Management*, 7(1), 65-81. <https://doi.org/10.46303/repam.2025.4>
- Papadakis, S. (2018). Gender stereotypes in Greek computer science school textbooks. *International Journal of Teaching and Case Studies*, 9(1), 48–71. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJTCS.2018.090196>
- Rezaee, A. A., & Esfandyari, M. (2023). Iranian in-service EFL teachers' perceptions of values education: A mixed methods study. *Issues in Language Teaching*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.22054/ilt.2023.73052.760>

- Roehr-Brackin, K. (2025). Measuring children's metalinguistic awareness. *Language Teaching*, 58(1), 27–43. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444824000016>
- Sarmurzin, Y., Amanzhol, N., Toleubayeva, K., Zhunusova, M., Amanova, A., & Abiyr, A. (2023). Challenging aspects of Kazakhstan's trilingual education policy: Evidence from a literature review. *Asia Pacific Education Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-023-09823-7>
- Sjoberg, A. F. (1993). Language structure and cultural identity: A historical perspective on the Turkic peoples of Central Asia. *Central Asian Survey*, 12(4), 557–564. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02634939308400838>
- Smagulova, J. (2019). Ideologies of language revival: Kazakh as school talk. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 23(3), 740–756. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006916684920>
- Sultan, Y., Yessenova, K., Seyitova, B., Baltabayeva, Z., Koblanova, A., & Ismailova, F. (2024). Fostering cultural awareness and academic engagement through poetry analysis in Kazakh educational contexts. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies*, 11(4), 124–147. <https://doi.org/10.29333/ejecs/2294>
- Sultan, Y., Bazarbek, B., Bekbenbetova, K., & Dautova, G. (2026). The Effects of Artificial Intelligence Applications in Dramatic and Improvisational Poetic Performance. *Journal of Culture and Values in Education*, 9(2), 441-463. <https://doi.org/10.46303/jcve.2026.36>
- Tazhibayeva, S., Kanatkerey, A., Mamayeva, G., Kemberbay, R., Beisenuly, Z., & Buribayeva, M. (2026). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence Applications on Linguistic and Literary Connections Among Turkic Peoples Based on Ethnocultural Codes. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies*, 13(3), 207-228. <https://doi.org/10.66815/ejecs/3042>
- Tlepbergen, D., Akzhigitova, A., & Zabrodskaia, A. (2025). Kazakh–English bilingualism in Kazakhstan: Public attitudes and language practices. *Languages*, 10(5), 102. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages10050102>
- Turlybekova, I., & Nurkenova, S. (2024). National phraseological units of speech behavior in the Kazakh, Russian and English languages. *Zeitschrift für Slawistik*, 69(1), 70–82. <https://doi.org/10.1515/slwg-2024-0004>
- Widodo, H. P., Perfecto, M. R., Van Canh, L., & Buripakdi, A. (Eds.). (2018). *Situating moral and cultural values in ELT materials* (Vol. 9). Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63677-1>
- Xiong, T., Feng, D., & Hu, G. (Eds.). (2022). *Cultural knowledge and values in English language teaching materials: (Multimodal) representations and stakeholders*. Springer Nature Singapore. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-1935-0>

- Yedgina, G., Dzhumabekov, D., Zuyeva, L., Dosova, B., & Kozina, V. (2023). Language policy in Kazakhstan in the context of world practice. *Journal of Nationalism, Memory & Language Politics*, 17(1), 76–96. <https://doi.org/10.2478/jnmlp-2023-0004>
- Yelubayeva, P., Khamidova, A., Berkinbayeva, G., & Avakova, R. (2025). Addressing language education challenges in Kazakhstan for sustainable development. *European Journal of Language Policy*, 17(1), 65–96. <https://doi.org/10.3828/ejlp.2025.5>
- Zhang, Q., Saharuddin, N. B., & Aziz, N. A. B. A. (2022). The analysis of teachers' perceptions of moral education curriculum. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 967927. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.967927>
- Zharkynbekova, S. K., & Chernyavskaya, V. E. (2022). Kazakh-Russian bilingual practice: Code-mixing as a resource in communicative interaction. *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*, 13(2), 468–482. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2299-2022-13-2-468-482>
- Zhumay, N., Tazhibayeva, S., Shaldarbekova, A., Jabasheva, B., Naimanbay, A., & Sandybayeva, A. (2021). Multilingual education in the Republic of Kazakhstan: Problems and prospects. *Social Inclusion*, 9(1), 56–62. <https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v9i1.3561>