

Zykrina Symbat Zhumabayevna* – PhD, Deputy Director for scientific and methodological work, Nazarbayev Intellectual schools, Republic of Kazakhstan, 020000 Kokshetau, 59 Tleulin Str., tel.: +7-777-040-13-69, e-mail: szykrina@gmail.com.

Kostangeldinova Alma Akzhanovna – Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor, Head of the Department of mathematics, physics and computer science, Sh.Ualikhanov Kokshetau University, Republic of Kazakhstan, 020000 Kokshetau, 76 Abai Str., tel.: +7-701-731-93-74, e-mail: alma_a2006@mail.ru.

Beisenbayeva Galiya Karipollayevna – Mathematics teacher, Nazarbayev Intellectual schools, Republic of Kazakhstan, 020000 Kokshetau, 59 Tleulin Str., tel.: +7-701-530-82-45, e-mail: beisenbayeva_g@kt.nis.edu.kz.

IRSTI 14.01.45

UDC 371.14=111

<https://doi.org/10.52269/RWEP2522120>

SCHOOL-BASED ENGLISH TEACHER SUPPORT: NEEDS AND PROVISIONS

Kandalina Y.M.* – Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, acting Associate Professor of the Department of foreign philology, Akhmet Baitursynuly Kostanay Regional University, Kostanay, Republic of Kazakhstan.

Zyryanova N.S. – Bachelor of Education, Master of Economics and Business Administration, Vice President of KazAELT (Kazakhstani Association of English Language Teachers), Astana, Republic of Kazakhstan.

Golovchun A.A. – Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor of the Department of methodology of foreign language education, Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations & World Languages, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan.

Kabysheva M.O. – Master of Pedagogical Sciences, Director of the Department for academic program development and quality assurance, Kazakh National Women's Teacher Training University, Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan.

This study explores key elements of Continuous Professional Development (CPD) for English language teachers in Kazakhstan, focusing on the support they require and actually receive for ongoing professional growth. Data were collected from 560 teachers through a quantitative survey, examining their preferred CPD areas and formats, as well as their perceptions of current program effectiveness. The research identifies gaps between teachers' professional development needs and the institutional support provided, offering evidence-based insights for strengthening CPD systems. Findings reveal that teachers prioritize technological integration (62.5%), student communication skills (59.3%), and motivational strategies (44.3%), yet existing CPD programs often do not align with these priorities. While most participants prefer face-to-face training (67.7%), online courses are more commonly available (50.7%). A significant gap is observed in mentorship, with 28.9% of teachers reporting no interaction with district methodologists, despite their critical role. Nevertheless, 90.3% of respondents noted positive outcomes from CPD when well-structured and relevant. This research contributes to the field by empirically linking teacher needs with institutional practices, highlighting the importance of context-responsive, practice-oriented CPD. Practical implications include recommendations for localized CPD policies, enhanced mentoring systems, and diverse training formats aimed at improving teaching quality and learner outcomes. The study underscores the need to bridge the gap between teacher aspirations and CPD provision for sustainable professional growth.

Key words: continuous professional development (CPD), English language teachers, teacher needs, training format, professional growth.

АҒЫЛШЫН ТІЛІ МҒАЛІМДЕРІНЕ ҚОЛДАУ КӨРСЕТУ: ҚАЖЕТТІЛІКТЕРДІ ТАЛДАУ ЖӘНЕ ҚОЛЖЕТІМДІ КӨМЕК ТҮРЛЕРІ.

Кандалина Е.М.* – педагогика ғылымдарының кандидаты, Шетел филологиясы кафедрасының профессоры ассистентінің м.а., Ахмет Байтұрсынұлы атындағы Қостанай өңірлік университеті, Қостанай қ., Қазақстан Республикасы.

Зырянова Н.С. – педагогика бакалавры, Экономика және бизнес әкімшілігі магистрі, Қазақстандық Ағылшын тілі оқытушылары қауымдастығының (KazAELT) вице-президенті, Астана қ., Қазақстан Республикасы.

Головчун А.А. – педагогика ғылымдарының кандидаты, шет тілді білім беру әдістемесі кафедрасының профессоры, Абылай Хан атындағы Қазақ Халықаралық Қатынастар және Әлем Тілдері Университеті, Алматы қ., Қазақстан Республикасы.

Қабышева М.О. – педагогика ғылымдарының магистрі, академиялық бағдарламаларды әзірлеу және сапаны қамтамасыз ету департаментінің директоры, Қазақ ұлттық қыздар педагогикалық университеті, Алматы қ., Қазақстан Республикасы.

Бұл зерттеуде Қазақстандағы ағылшын тілі мұғалімдерінің үздіксіз кәсіби дамуының негізгі элементтері қарастырылады, сондай-ақ олардың тұрақты кәсіби дамуына қажетті және алынып жатқан қолдау түрлеріне ерекше назар аударылады. Деректер 560 мұғалімнен сандық зерттеу әдіснамасы – сауалнама арқылы жиналды, қалаулы салаларға және үздіксіз кәсіби даму (ҮҚД) стильдеріне баса назар аударып отырып, сондай-ақ қолданыстағы бағдарламалардың нәтижелігін қабылдауына көңіл бөлінді. Зерттеудің мақсаты – Қазақстандағы ағылшын тілі мұғалімдерінің кәсіби дамуға қатысты сұраныстары мен институционалдық механизмдер арасындағы алшақтықты анықтап, кәсіби даму жүйесін жетілдіруге арналған тиімді ұсыныстар беру. Зерттеулер көрсеткендей, мұғалімдер келесі тақырыптардың өзектілігін атап көрсетеді: білім беру үдерісіне технологияларды енгізу (62,5%), оқушылардың коммуникативтік дағдыларын дамыту (59,3%) және шетел тілін үйренуге деген мотивацияны арттыру (44,3%), ал қазіргі кәсіби даму көбінесе осы басымдықтарға сәйкес келмейді. Күндізгі оқу ең қолайлы әдіс ретінде таңдалса да (67,7%), онлайн-курстар қолжетімділік бойынша басымдыққа ие (50,7%). Тәлімгерлік саласында айтарлықтай алшақтық бар: олардың маңызды рөлін ескергеніне қарамастан, мұғалімдердің 28,9%-ы аудандық немесе қалалық әдіскерлермен ешқашан байланысқа шықпайды. Қатысушылардың 90,3%-ы кәсіби дамудың тиімділігін атап өтіп, дұрыс ұйымдастырылған жағдайда оның нәтижелі екендігін көрсеткені қуантады. Бұл зерттеу педагогикалық ғылымға өз үлесін қосады, эмпирикалық түрде мұғалімдердің талаптарын институционалдық қолдаумен сәйкестендіре отырып, практикаға бағытталған жеке үдерісті үздіксіз кәсіби дамытудың қажеттілігін атап өтеді. Авторлар оқытудың тиімділігін арттыру мақсатында кәсіби даму ауқымы, кеңейтілген тәлімгерлік және әртүрлі оқыту әдістері бойынша ұсыныстар береді. Зерттеу мұғалімдердің қажеттіліктерін кәсіби даму шындығымен сәйкестендіру қажеттілігін атап өтіп, бұл тұрақты кәсіби өсуге ықпал ету үшін маңызды екенін көрсетеді.

Түйінді сөздер: үздіксіз кәсіби даму (ҮҚД), ағылшын тілі мұғалімдері, мұғалімдердің қажеттіліктері, оқыту форматы, кәсіби өсу.

ПОДДЕРЖКА УЧИТЕЛЕЙ АНГЛИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА: АНАЛИЗ ПОТРЕБНОСТЕЙ И ДОСТУПНЫХ ФОРМ ПОМОЩИ

Кандалина Е.М.* – кандидат педагогических наук, и.о. ассистента профессора кафедры иностранной филологии, Костанайский региональный университет имени Ахмет Байтұрсынұлы, г. Костанай, Республика Казахстан.

Зырянова Н.С. – бакалавр педагогики, магистр экономики и бизнес-администрирования, вице-президент Казахстанской ассоциации преподавателей английского языка (KazAELT), г. Астана, Республика Казахстан.

Головчун А.А. – кандидат педагогических наук, профессор кафедры Методики иноязычного образования, Казахский университет международных отношений и мировых языков им. Абылай хана, г. Алматы, Республика Казахстан.

Кабышева М.О. – магистр педагогических наук, директор департамента разработки академических программ и обеспечения качества, Казахский национальный женский педагогический университет, г. Алматы, Республика Казахстан.

В данном исследовании рассматриваются ключевые элементы непрерывного профессионального развития (НПР) учителей английского языка в Казахстане с акцентом на поддержку, в которой они нуждаются и фактически получают для своего профессионального роста. Данные были собраны у 560 учителей с использованием количественного анкетирования, охватывающего их предпочтительные направления и форматы НПР, а также восприятие эффективности существующих программ. Целью исследования является выявление расхождений между профессиональными потребностями учителей и институциональной поддержкой с целью выработки обоснованных рекомендаций по совершенствованию систем НПР. Результаты показывают, что учителя придают наибольшее значение интеграции технологий (62,5%), развитию коммуникативных навыков у учащихся (59,3%) и мотивационным стратегиям (44,3%), тогда как действующие программы НПР часто не соответствуют этим приоритетам. Несмотря на то, что большинство опрошенных предпочитают очные формы обучения (67,7%), в реальности чаще доступны онлайн-курсы (50,7%). Выявлен также разрыв в наставничестве: 28,9% учителей не взаимодействуют с районными методистами, несмотря на их важную роль. Тем не менее, 90,3% участников отметили положительное влияние НПР при его качественной организации и практической направленности. Исследование вносит вклад в педагогическую науку, устанавливая связь между потребно-

стями учителей и практиками поддержки, и подчеркивает необходимость контекстно-ориентированного, практико-ориентированного подхода к НПР. Практические рекомендации включают разработку локальных политик, развитие системы наставничества и разнообразие форматов обучения для повышения качества преподавания и учебных результатов.

Ключевые слова: непрерывное профессиональное развитие (НПР), учителя английского языка, потребности учителей, формат обучения, профессиональный рост.

Introduction. In the swiftly changing realm of global education, the effective communication in English enhances access to international opportunities and bolsters both individual and national competitiveness. Thus, guaranteeing superior English language instruction has been a crucial aspect of Kazakhstan's educational reforms. Nonetheless, the provision of successful English language education is heavily reliant on the ongoing professional development (CPD) of educators – a field that remains under examined despite its clear significance.

This research employs a constructivist approach on professional learning, rooted in sociocultural theory, to enhance the study's context and interpretative potential. This theoretical perspective stresses the social, situational, and continuous nature of teacher development, viewing CPD as a developing process impacted by interaction, reflection, and context-specific practice. We consider Continuing Professional Development (CPD) as persistent, collaborative, and practice-oriented learning opportunities that enable educators to enhance pedagogical expertise, adapt to changing educational demands, and improve student outcomes.

Continuous Professional Development (CPD) is a universally recognized challenge, crucial for the enhancement of teachers' skills, knowledge, and professional agency. Effective continuing professional development encompasses various components, including ongoing training, specialized workshops, mentoring, and institutional support systems designed to address the changing needs of educators. In various educational settings, collaborative opportunities, including peer learning, professional networks, and informal collegial dialogue, are recognized as the most accessible and effective forms of support [1,2]. The mechanisms are enhanced by mentoring systems, a supportive school culture, and context-responsive activities that align with the specific realities of educators' professional environments.

The allocation of adequate time and resources is a crucial factor affecting the success of CPD initiatives worldwide. Financial and non-financial support, such as technical assistance and monetary incentives, are equally significant in promoting meaningful engagement with professional learning [3]. Practical considerations, including flexible scheduling and the elimination of structural barriers such as gender-specific constraints, improve the accessibility and effectiveness of continuing professional development (CPD).

CPD must align with teachers' pedagogical beliefs and classroom realities to be effective. Cooper R, Fitzgerald A, Loughran J, Phillips M, Smith K. highlight the importance of aligning professional development with educators' personal conceptions of learning and teaching [4]. Training that is specific to a subject and the cultivation of distinct skills, as suggested by Goodnough K, Pelech S, Stordy M. and Harju, V., & Niemi, H., guarantees relevance and practical applicability [5, 6]. Moreover, sustained professional growth is best achieved through long-term, coherent, and well-supported strategies, as opposed to fragmented, isolated events [7]. The findings highlight the widespread agreement that Continuous Professional Development (CPD) requires strategic planning, sufficient resources, and integration into the daily professional practices of educators.

Drawing on Desimone's (2009) model of effective professional development, we view CPD as a dynamic process requiring: content focus: subject-specific pedagogical expertise (e.g., English language teaching approaches); active learning: (cooperative workshops, peer observation, and reflective practice); coherence: alignment with teachers' values, curricular aims, and national reforms; duration: continuous involvement beyond singular training sessions; collaborative engagement: educational institution-based communities of practice.

The context of Kazakhstan offers distinct challenges and opportunities for continuing professional development (CPD). Kazakhstan has pursued ambitious initiatives to modernize its education system, resulting in significant collaborations, including those between Nazarbayev University, Nazarbayev Intellectual Schools, and Cambridge University. Since 2012, these institutions have collaboratively led extensive initiatives to reform the educational landscape, focusing on the thorough analysis of teacher development processes [8]. This collaborative initiative highlights a dedication to promoting lifelong learning among educators, facilitating their adaptation to emerging pedagogical trends, effective technology integration, and the development of essential 21st-century skills in students.

Despite these notable advancements, investigations into teacher continuing professional development in Kazakhstan identify several deficiencies and areas necessitating additional focus. An extensive search through databases such as Google Scholar and Wiley Library resulted in around 350 articles pertaining to continuous education for teachers. Nonetheless, a considerable number of these studies employ a broad, survey-based methodology, frequently neglecting to explore the intricate challenges encountered by English educators. Furthermore, an examination of government grant funding reports from the last five years did not

identify any publicly funded research grants specifically allocated for CPD in the English language instruction [9,10,11]

The main sources of information regarding CPD for English teachers include national reports and a limited number of academic articles. These articles frequently originate from research conducted as part of master's or doctoral dissertations [11]. A comprehensive monograph by "Orleu," a prominent educational course provider, discusses issues related to enhancing teacher qualifications, specifically in rural school contexts [12]. Despite these contributions, a notable gap persists in publicly available research on the effectiveness of continuous training programs, as indicated in comparative reviews of CPD in Kazakhstan and Russia [13].

Recent research has highlighted several critical needs and resources related to support for English teachers in schools. A study by Ismagulova A. et al. involving 328 English teachers demonstrated a variety of professional interests [14]. Teachers demonstrated considerable interest in enhancing communication skills (69.8%) and addressing challenges associated with material adaptation (51.8%). Confidence in utilizing digital tools such as Google Docs was high; however, familiarity with specialized applications like COCA was notably low. Additionally, a significant proportion of teachers, specifically 54%, indicated a need for improved skills in course design, while expressing confidence in their ability to define clear course objectives. The findings highlight the need for continuous evaluations of educators' needs to maintain curriculum relevance and improve the quality of English education in Kazakhstan [14].

While international models (e.g., British Council recommendations) emphasize teacher-led collaboration and technology integration [15], Kazakhstan's CPD landscape reveals critical discrepancies: rural-urban divides persist, with "Orleu" reports highlighting inadequate infrastructure in non-urban schools [12]; current CPD evaluations prioritize attendance over classroom impact, diverging from global best practices that link training to student outcomes [4, 15]; teachers express high demand for communication skills training [14]. These discrepancies underscore the importance of rethinking CPD delivery in Kazakhstan to better reflect the principles of collaboration, contextualization, and continuity. Without such alignment, even well-intentioned reforms risk failing to translate into improved classroom practice.

British Council reports further corroborate these insights, emphasizing disparities in English language knowledge among teachers, particularly in speaking skills. The current CPD framework is critiqued for inadequately measuring actual classroom performance and English proficiency. There is a call for alternative models of CPD, including teacher-led collaboration, school-based learning, mentoring, peer supervision, instructional inquiry, and teacher communities of practice. These recommendations align with the broader consensus that CPD should foster a supportive ecosystem where teachers can continuously learn, share best practices, and innovate in their teaching methodologies [15].

In the light of these considerations, this research article aims to delve deeper into the specific needs and provisions of school-based English teacher support in Kazakhstan. By synthesizing existing literature, analysing empirical data, and drawing upon expert insights, the article seeks to address the following questions: What are the current gaps in school-based support for English teachers? What support do teachers receive for their continuous professional development?

Through a comprehensive exploration of these issues, the article hopes to contribute meaningfully to the discourse on enhancing English language teaching in Kazakhstan, ultimately paving the way for more equitable and high-quality educational outcomes. This research builds upon recent studies and reports, leveraging their findings to propose actionable recommendations. For instance, the work by Chernobay E and Tashibaeva D. provides valuable comparative insights into CPD practices in Kazakhstan and Russia [13], while Syurmen O. and Mirzoyeva L emphasize the imperative of constructing specialized qualifications frameworks for English educators [9]. Collectively, these resources inform a nuanced understanding of the challenges and opportunities inherent in CPD for English teachers in Kazakhstan.

To bridge theory and practice, we propose a "CPD Discrepancy Model", which maps:

- inputs: policy mandates, international partnerships (e.g., Cambridge collaborations [8]).
- processes: teacher needs (e.g., digital tools training) vs. institutional offerings.
- outcomes: measured shifts in pedagogical competence and student performance.

If the model shows low mentorship uptake (process gap), policymakers may launch a hybrid peer-coaching system (input intervention) and track teacher retention.

This study **aims** to investigate the support required and received by teachers for their continuous professional development (CPD), aiming to find discrepancies between current offerings and the real professional learning needs of teachers in varied educational settings.

To achieve this aim the following **objectives** will be implemented: to ascertain the sorts of support that educators regard as vital for effective ongoing professional development, encompassing institutional, collaborative, and individual elements; to assess the existing varieties and degrees of support offered to educators for Continuing Professional Development across diverse educational environments; to evaluate the disparity between teachers' stated continuing professional development needs and the support they receive, thereby identifying areas for enhancement and guiding future policy and practice in teacher professional development.

The main research questions are focused on teachers' needs and support for their CPD.

1. What support do teachers need for their CPD?

2. What support do teachers receive for their CPD?

Methods. The novice and experienced teachers from different regions of Kazakhstan representing private, state, rural and urban types of schools were the participants of our study. There was no special identification of the survey participants. We went through the following stages of study: survey designing and its approval; teachers' surveying via questionnaire link; data analysis and report compiling. The data has been collected by means of quantitative methods through single-choice questionnaire using Google form link for the teachers via WhatsApp chats, representing teachers' associations or school communities. Personal data of participants was not collected. The closed questionnaire items were analyzed using Jamovi Soft and Excel Pearson Correlation Statistics. Researchers followed the Code of ethics for educational researchers in Kazakhstan adhering to data protection laws and regulations, ensuring that participant data is collected, stored, and processed securely and only used for the intended purpose. The stages of study were timetabled and distributed among all four members of research group. Involvement of teachers in the survey, date coding was the biggest challenge for members of research group.

A survey approach was adopted, focusing on each participant as an individual unit of analysis and seeking to capture their experiences relevant to the above research questions as holistically as possible. The study was thus wholly quantitative in nature.

The criteria for the selection of participants in this study involved the following: being novice or experienced teachers of the English language of the secondary school; the teachers of the English language represented private, state, rural and urban types of secondary school.

With these criteria in mind, information about the study for participation was disseminated through personal contacts of research members' groups with the help of British Council support.

Significant time was invested in the development of the questionnaire, in the belief that research findings are of little value unless the means through which they are generated are sound. For example, we reviewed the literature on the continuous professional development of English teachers, replete with an intricate analysis of the contemporary landscape and prescriptive recommendations, resides in national reports and a modest collection of articles. These articles, in turn, emanate from research endeavors embedded within the context of master's or doctoral dissertations [11]. Furthermore, a comprehensive monograph authored by "Orleu," a leading provider of educational courses, articulates issues germane to the augmentation of teacher qualifications, with a particular emphasis on rural school contexts [12]. The nucleus of ongoing research endeavors converges substantially upon the English teacher model. This underscores the imperativeness of constructing a specialized qualifications framework, tailor-made for English educators [9,10,11]. We also reviewed British Council report on "Secondary English language teaching in Kazakhstan" providing insights into the state of professional development (CPD) opportunities for English teachers in Kazakhstan. Items addressing all these issues were included in the questionnaire. One final source of guidance was the research methods literature, where much advice is available on how to improve the design of questionnaires [16]. The analysis of questions led to considerable further revision; some questionnaire items were deleted, others reworded, and there were also cases where, while the question remained unchanged, the options for answering it were revised. The final version of the questionnaire had 3 sections. Section 1 of the survey delved into the preferences of the English language teachers regarding professional development. Participants were asked to indicate their preferred venue, type, of professional development, identifying role of district methodologists, content needs and their attitude to CPD. Section 2 asked teachers questions about opportunities they have to participate in professional development activities and types of support they get from the part of school and district administration. Section 3 analyses how teachers perceive the quality of the professional development support provided, whether the resources provided by methodologists are regarded helpful, and how teachers assess the impact of their PD activities on their teaching practice. Additionally, teachers were asked about two non-measured outcomes of PD activities in their teaching: motivation and confidence.

Research group strive for honesty in scientific communications, avoiding bias in data analysis and personnel decisions. We avoided any form of coercion or manipulation to ensure participants' voluntary involvement. The questionnaire informed participants that the survey they take part in is part of the British Council and the Ministry of Enlightenment project focusing on the CPD issues English language teachers face.

Some limits of the current study include scope, depth and diversity of participants' geography.

Results. The survey encompassed 563 respondents, comprising 81.4% urban and 18.6% rural English language teachers hailing from 20 regions across Kazakhstan.

This study explored two key research questions regarding teachers' continuous professional development (CPD):

1) What support do teachers need for their CPD? The four needs areas were examined: content of CPD, formats, supporters, venue for CPD activities:

Teachers identified the following areas where they need the most support:

- Technology in language teaching (62.5%)
- Developing students' communication skills (59.3%)

- Student motivation strategies (44.3%)
 - Designing/adapting teaching materials (32.5%)
 - Assessment and feedback techniques (31.8%)
 - Classroom management strategies (23.4%)
- Teachers expressed a strong preference for:
- Face-to-face training courses (67.7%)
 - Online courses (35.7%)
 - One-day workshops/seminars (33.8%)
 - Collaborative lesson planning (lesson study) (32.3%)

Support Expected from District Methodologists

Teachers sought the following forms of assistance:

- Advice on professional development opportunities (55.2%)
- Ready-made lesson plans (15.9%)
- Personalized coaching/mentoring (14.3%)
- Standardized assessments (8%)
- Classroom observations (5.7%)

Venue Preferences for CPD Activities

- Own school (34.8%)
- No location preference (23%)
- Special district venue (19.8%)
- Nearby school (10.9%)

The acquired data on the frequency, types of CPD, support by school and district/city administration, perceived quality of CPD, impact of CPD on teaching practice also helped to answer the second research question: What support do teachers receive for their CPD?

Current CPD Participation Frequency

- 60.9% attend CPD 1–2 times/year
- 15.9% participate 3–4 times/year
- 15.4% had no CPD access in the past year

Types of CPD Activities Available

The most commonly available formats were:

- Online courses (50.7%)
- One-day workshops/seminars (43.8%)
- Face-to-face training (42.1%)
- 6% reported no access to any CPD activities

Support from School Administration

- 40.7% discuss PD goals once a year
- 30.9% have discussions monthly
- 17.7% receive support weekly
- 10% never discuss PD with administrators

Support from District Methodologists

- 52% interact with methodologists 1–2 times/year
- 28.9% never discuss PD with them
- Only 3.2% receive weekly support

Perceived Quality of CPD Support

- School Administrators:
 - 72.3% rate support as 'good/excellent'
 - 8.6% consider it 'inadequate'
- District Methodologists:
 - 81.4% find resources 'somewhat to very adequate'
 - 19.6% report 'inadequate' support
 - 33.4% view methodologists as 'very supportive'
 - 15.5% feel 'unsupported'

Impact of CPD on Teaching Practice

- Effectiveness:
 - 90.3% report PD improves teaching ('29.1% somewhat, 61.2% significantly')
 - 9.7% find it 'ineffective'
- Confidence & Motivation:
 - 79.1% say PD boosts confidence
 - 82.8% report increased motivation
 - ~20% remain neutral or dissatisfied

The survey revealed that most of in-service teachers – 80% acknowledge the need and positive impact of continuous professional development, many do not have regular or customized chances for

continuing professional development. Teachers do not apply for the help of methodologists at city/district education department more than 28% of instructors never communicate with district methodologists. The support in CPD is not always provided for school administrators: ten percent of instructors are completely ignored, even though the majority receive some professional development assistance.

Discussion. This study's findings offer significant insights into the professional development requirements of English language educators and the degree to which these requirements are fulfilled. This study identifies significant discrepancies and potential for enhancement in teacher development programs by analyzing the assistance teachers need for their continuous professional development (CPD) against the support they actually receive. The discourse is organized around two research inquiries: the support teachers require for Continuous Professional Development (CPD) and the support they actually receive for CPD. This is succeeded by implications for policy and practice, limitations, and suggestions for further study.

Distribution of the interest among six suggested areas for professional development emphasized three domains, notably 'technology in language instruction (62.5%)', 'enhancing students' communication abilities (59.3%)', and 'strategies for student motivation (44.3%)' as the most significant. These findings correspond with international educational trends, highlighting the growing emphasis on digital literacy and communicative language teaching [17]. The significant demand for technology-related training indicates that educators see the increasing importance of digital technologies in education, yet may be inadequately trained to incorporate them effectively.

The focus on 'student motivation' is particularly significant, as it highlights overarching difficulties in engaging learners in language acquisition. Research demonstrates that student motivation is intricately connected to teacher instructional strategies [18], suggesting that educators who undergo specialised training in motivating techniques may see enhanced classroom results.

Notably, 'classroom management (23.4%)' and 'assessment approaches (31.8%)' were less commonly emphasised. This differs from research in other circumstances where classroom management frequently emerges as a significant issue [19]. A potential reason is that the teachers in this study may possess confidence in these domains, regard them as subordinate to pedagogical innovation or unified national approach to summative assessment.

The preferred format of CPD is 'in-person training (67.7%)', succeeded by 'virtual courses (35.7%)' and 'workshops (33.8%)'. This indicates that although digital learning modalities are becoming increasingly popular, conventional in-person training continues to be the most reliable format as it allows deepening into the content. Besides, the inclination towards interactive forms (e.g., workshops, collaborative lesson preparation) rather of passive ones (e.g., peer observation, teaching contests) signifies that educators prioritise 'practical, experiential learning opportunities'.

The limited interest in 'peer observation (8.8%)' and 'teaching contests (16.8%)' may be attributed to cultural or institutional influences. Peer observation, however beneficial in certain settings [20], may be regarded as evaluative rather than developmental. Likewise, teaching competitions may be perceived as stressful instead of supportive.

Defining the role of district methodologists in professional development, teachers anticipated that they would offer 'guidance on professional development opportunities (55.2%)', 'ready-made lesson plans (15.9%)', and 'personalised coaching (14.3%)'. This suggests that methodologists are perceived as essential enablers of professional development; however, their present function may lean more towards administrative tasks than developmental activities. The demand for personalised coaching indicates a necessity for individualised support, transcending generic training sessions.

In response to the initial research question, we conclude that in-service English teachers favour in-person training, see personal advice in continuing professional development as a crucial resource, and exhibit no preference for the location of professional development activities.

We evaluated data about the frequency and accessibility of continuing professional development (CPD), the assistance provided by school or district/city levels, and the perceived impact of CPD, in light of the support that English teachers receive for their professional development.

More than sixty percent of instructors indicated participation in continuing professional development events one to two times year, whereas fifteen point four percent had no access to any professional development in the preceding year. This disparity prompts apprehensions over equitable access to professional development opportunities. The prevalence of 'online courses (50.7%)' as the most widely offered format indicates that institutions are utilising digital platforms to expand professional development; nevertheless, this does not correspond with instructors' preference for 'in-person contacts.' The possible reason for these data may include budget constraints, fewer partnerships with training providers, or logistical challenges (classes schedule, internet connection, mode/quality of online courses), besides if school does not support teachers, they may not be able to manage their PD due to heavy teaching loads and administrative duties or lack of information about training.

The survey data demonstrate that school/district/city administration/methodologist do not encompass all English teachers in professional development planning: a notable percentage of teachers (40.7%) engage in discussions regarding professional development goals with school administrators only once annually,

whereas 10% do not participate in such discussions at all. The absence of structured feedback mechanisms may impede ongoing professional development. Furthermore, 28.9% of teachers do not engage with district methodologists, despite the latter's essential function in professional development coordination.

The observation that 33.4% of teachers perceive methodologists as "very supportive," whereas 15.5% report feeling unsupported, indicates a disparity in mentorship quality. This is consistent with findings indicating that the effectiveness of professional development is significantly influenced by local leadership and follow-up support [21].

Encouragingly, 90.3% of instructors indicated that professional development favorably influences their teaching, affirming its function in boosting teaching quality. This widespread recognition validates ongoing investment in organized and sustained professional development systems. The elevated effectiveness ratings (61.2%) highlight the potential of professional development when it corresponds with teachers' classroom reality and professional growth paths. This underscores the significance of organized professional development programs. Nonetheless, '9.7% deemed professional development unproductive,' suggesting potential discrepancies between training content and the real requirements of educators. The substantial proportion of teachers indicating heightened 'confidence (79.1%)' and 'motivation (82.8%)' following professional development implies that effectively structured programs enhance teacher well-being, self-efficacy, and professional identity. Nonetheless, the '20% who expressed neutrality or dissatisfaction.' This percentage likely encompasses seasoned educators who see no novelty in the training, as well as individuals in certain contexts (e.g., early childhood, special education, rural environments) for whom the content was inadequately tailored. This outcome underscores the necessity for more customized and pertinent professional development experiences.

Key discrepancies between requirements and actuality include: mismatch in professional development content: for instance, whereas educators emphasize 'technology and student motivation,' current professional development frequently concentrates on more general pedagogical competencies. Numerous educators 'seldom or never' interact with district methodologists, so forfeiting potential for tailored assistance; besides professional development discussions with school administrators are infrequent for some teachers, diminishing responsibility and follow-through; although educators choose in-person instruction, online courses prevail among accessible professional development opportunities and it may become demotivating factor for professional development.

This analysis allows for the formulation of recommendations aimed at enhancing conditions for various stakeholders. Policymakers may enhance funding for in-person workshops and mentoring programs to better align with teacher preferences. encourage the development of localized professional development frameworks that cater to specific needs and establish minimum participation standards to guarantee equitable access.

School leaders should schedule regular professional development goal-setting meetings, including individual meetings with English teachers, promote peer collaboration through structured lesson study groups, and advocate for district methodologists to adopt a more active coaching role instead of merely providing administrative oversight.

Teacher trainers, including universities, can develop modular professional development programs that enable teachers to choose pertinent topics, such as technology tools and motivational strategies. Integrate more practical, classroom-relevant activities instead of theoretical lectures. conduct classroom observations or coaching to reinforce learning.

This research is constrained by self-report bias; teachers' perceptions of professional development effectiveness may not accurately reflect observable changes in the classroom. Additionally, the data reveal an uneven distribution of survey participants throughout Kazakhstan. Future studies should incorporate 'classroom observations' or 'student performance data' and encompass a broader range of data from all regions of Kazakhstan. Furthermore, comparative studies across regions could enhance validity. Most professional development assessments concentrate on short-term results; therefore, longitudinal research could evaluate enduring enhancements in teaching methodologies.

Considering the proposed a "CPD Discrepancy Model", the results of the research empowered us to propose to link funding to teacher-needs audits (based on annual skill gap surveys): to offer modular CPD (e.g., teachers choose from communication skills, corpus tools, or mentoring courses) at institutional level; at the community level unite in teachers' associations to create localised mentorship norms.

Conclusion. This study highlights the necessity of aligning continuous professional development programs with the actual needs and preferences of teachers. Although numerous educators gain advantages from current professional development frameworks, notable deficiencies persist – especially in areas such as individualized assistance, content applicability, and availability of mentorship. Addressing these gaps enables educational leaders to establish more effective and sustainable professional development systems that improve teacher performance and student learning outcomes.

Future research should investigate innovative professional development models, such as micro-credentials and blended learning, as well as the long-term effects of professional development on student achievement. Qualitative studies may yield deeper insights into the preferences for specific PD formats and the strategies to overcome institutional barriers.

REFERENCES:

- 1 Penuel W.R., Fishman B.J., Yamaguchi R., Gallagher L.P. What makes professional development effective? Strategies that foster curriculum implementation. *American Educational Research Journal*, 2007, 44(4), pp. 921-958. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831207308221>.
- 2 Watson R., Manning A. Factors influencing the transformation of new teaching approaches from a programme of Professional Development to the classroom. *International Journal of Science Education*, 2008, 30(5), pp. 689-709. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500690701854881>.
- 3 Ilgan A., Aktan O., Üztemur S. Focusing on sustainable development of teachers. *Discourse and Communication for Sustainable Education*, 2022, 13(1), pp. 17-36. <https://doi.org/10.2478/dcse-2022-0003>.
- 4 Cooper R., Fitzgerald A., Loughran J., Phillips M., Smith K. Understanding teachers' professional learning needs: What does it mean to teachers and how can it be supported? *Teachers and Teaching*, 2020, 26(7-8), pp. 558-576. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2021.1900810>.
- 5 Goodnough K., Pelech S., Stordy M. Effective Professional Development in STEM Education: The Perceptions of Primary/Elementary Teachers. Available at: <https://www.mun.ca/tia/dissemination.html> (accessed 2 April 2025).
- 6 Harju V., Niemi H. Newly qualified teachers' needs of support for professional competences in four European countries: Finland, the United Kingdom, Portugal, and Belgium. *Potrebe na novo usposobljenih učiteljev za podpora pri strokovnih kompetencah v štirih evropskih držav*, Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal, 2016, 6(3), pp. 77-100.
- 7 Spencer P., Harrop S., Thomas J., Cain T. The professional development needs of early career teachers, and the extent to which they are met: a survey of teachers in England. *Professional Development in Education*, 2018, 44(1), pp. 33-46. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2017.1299028>.
- 8 The Faculty of Education. Available at: <https://www.educ.cam.ac.uk/networks/eril-casestudies/kazakhstan/researching/> (accessed 7 April 2025).
- 9 Syurmen O.V., Mirzoyeva L.Yu. Teachers' continuous professional development and Education Quality Improvement. *Bulletin Series of Pedagogical Sciences*, 2020, 67(3), pp. 34-40. <https://doi.org/10.51889/2020-3.1728-5496.04>.
- 10 Sulkarnayeva A., Branch K., Sulkarnayeva A.R. Foreign language education in Kazakhstan: paradigms and trends. *ProSoc*, 2017, 3, pp. 18-24.
- 11 Zhunussova G., Cortazzi M., Jin L. Roles and models of English teachers in Kazakhstan. *World Englishes*, 2021, 41(1), pp. 104-114. <https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12558>.
- 12 Ualieva N.T., Almagambetova L.S., Mursalinova A.Zh. Nepreryvnoe professional'noe razvitiye uchitelei sel'skih shkol dlya umen'sheniya obrazovatel'nogo neravenstva [Continuous professional development of rural school teachers to reduce educational inequality]. Petropavlovsk, FAO «NCPK «Orleu» «IPR po SKO», 2022, 125 p. (In Russian)
- 13 Chernobay E., Tashibaeva D. Teacher Professional Development in Russia and Kazakhstan. Evidence from TALIS-2018. *Educational Studies*, Moscow, 2020, (4), pp.141-164. <https://doi.org/10.17323/1814-9545-2020-4-141-164>.
- 14 Ismagulova A.E., Ryspayeva D.S., Zholdabayeva A.S., Kandalina Y.M., Furman O.V. Professional development needs of english teachers in Kazakhstan. *Bulletin of the Karaganda university Pedagogy series*, 2023, 110(2), pp. 154-164. doi:10.31489/2023ped2/154-164.
- 15 Secondary English language teaching in Kazakhstan. Available at: <https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/publications/case-studies-insights-and-research/secondary-english-language-teaching-kazakhstan> (accessed 6 April 2025).
- 16 De Vaus D. *Surveys in social research*. 5th ed. London, Routledge, 2002.
- 17 Hockly N. Blended learning. *ELT Journal*, 2018, 72(1), pp. 97-101. doi:10.1093/elt/ccx058.
- 18 Dörnyei Z., Ushioda E. *Teaching and researching motivation*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2021.
- 19 Marzano R.J., Marzano J.S., Pickering D. *Classroom management that works research-based strategies for every teacher*. Vancouver, Access and Diversity, Crane Library, University of British Columbia, 2009.
- 20 Bell A., Mladenovic R. The benefits of peer observation of teaching for tutor development. *Higher Education*, 2007, 55(6), pp. 735-752. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-007-9093-1>.
- 21 Desimone L.M. Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational Researcher*, 2009, 38(3), pp. 181-199. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X08331140>.

Information about the authors:

Kandalina Yelena Mikhailovna* – Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, acting Associate Professor of the Department of foreign philology, Akhmet Baitursynuly Kostanay Regional University, Republic of Kazakhstan, 110000 Kostanay, 24 Abai Ave., apt. 25, tel.: +7-777-379-55-79, e-mail: kandalina.em@ksu.edu.kz.

Zyryanova Natalya Sergeyevna – Bachelor of Education, Master of Economics and Business Administration, Vice President of KazAELT (Kazakhstani Association of English Language Teachers), Republic of Kazakhstan, 010000 Astana, 36/1 Bukhar Zhyrau Str., office 245, tel.: +7-705-281-90-41, e-mail: natalyazyryanova04@gmail.com.

Golovchun Alefina Anatoliyevna – Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor of the Department of methodology of foreign language education, Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations & World Languages, Republic of Kazakhstan, 050026 Almaty, 268 Bogenbai Str., apt. 6, tel.: +7-707-221-59-61, e-mail: al_tina@inbox.ru.

Kabysheva Mariya Olegovna – Master of Pedagogical Sciences, Director of the Department for academic program development and quality assurance, Kazakh National Women's Teacher Training University, Republic of Kazakhstan, 050000 Almaty, 142 Bogenbai Batyr Str., tel.: +7-700-393-01-07, e-mail: kabysheva.m@qyzpu.edu.kz.

Кандалина Елена Михайловна* – педагогика ғылымдарының кандидаты, Шетел филологиясы кафедрасының профессор ассистенті м.а., Ахмет Байтұрсынұлы атындағы Қостанай өңірлік университеті, Қазақстан Республикасы, 110000 Қостанай қ., Абай даңғ. 24, 25 пәт., тел.: +7-777-379-55-79, e-mail: kandalina.em@ksu.edu.kz.

Зырянова Наталья Сергеевна – педагогика бакалавры, Экономика және бизнес әкімшілігі магистрі, Қазақстандық Ағылшын тілі оқытушылары қауымдастығының (KazAELT) вице-президенті, Қазақстан Республикасы, 010000 Астана қ., Бұқар жырау көш. 36/1, 245-кеңсе, тел.: +7-705-281-90-41, e-mail: natalyazyryanova04@gmail.com.

Головчун Алефтина Анатольевна – педагогика ғылымдарының кандидаты, шет тілді білім беру әдістемесі кафедрасының профессоры, Абылай Хан Атындағы Қазақ Халықаралық Қатынастар және Әлем Тілдері Университеті, Қазақстан Республикасы, 050026 Алматы қ., Бөгенбай батыр көш. 268, 6 пәт., тел.: +7-707-221-59-61, e-mail: al_tina@inbox.ru.

Қабышева Мария Олеговна – педагогика ғылымдарының магистрі, академиялық бағдарламаларды әзірлеу және сапаны қамтамасыз ету департаментінің директоры, Қазақ ұлттық қыздар педагогикалық университеті, Қазақстан Республикасы, 050000 Алматы қ., Бөгенбай батыр көш. 142, тел.: +7-700-393-01-07, e-mail: kabysheva.m@qyzpu.edu.kz.

Кандалина Елена Михайловна* – кандидат педагогических наук, и.о. ассистента профессора кафедры иностранной филологии, Костанайский региональный университет имени Ахмет Байтұрсынұлы, Республика Казахстан, 110000 г. Костанай, пр. Абая 24, кв. 25, тел.: +7-777-379-55-79, e-mail: kandalina.em@ksu.edu.kz.

Зырянова Наталья Сергеевна – бакалавр педагогики, магистр экономики и бизнес-администрирования, вице-президент Казахстанской ассоциации преподавателей английского языка (KazAELT), Республика Казахстан, 010000 г. Астана, ул. Бухар Жырау 36/1, офис 245, тел.: +7-705-281-90-41, e-mail: natalyazyryanova04@gmail.com.

Головчун Алефтина Анатольевна – кандидат педагогических наук, профессор кафедры Методики иноязычного образования, Казахский университет международных отношений и мировых языков им. Абылай хана, Республика Казахстан, 050026 г. Алматы, ул. Бөгенбай батыра 268, кв. 6, тел.: +7-707-221-59-61, e-mail: al_tina@inbox.ru.

Қабышева Мария Олеговна – магистр педагогических наук, директор департамента разработки академических программ и обеспечения качества, Казахский национальный женский педагогический университет, Республика Казахстан, 050000 г. Алматы, ул. Бөгенбай батыра 142, тел.: +7-700-393-01-07, e-mail: kabysheva.m@qyzpu.edu.kz.

МРТИ: 14.85.25

УДК 373.3

<https://doi.org/10.52269/RWEP2522129>

ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ ЦИФРОВОЙ КУЛЬТУРЫ БУДУЩИХ УЧИТЕЛЕЙ НАЧАЛЬНЫХ КЛАССОВ В УСЛОВИЯХ ЦИФРОВОЙ ТРАНСФОРМАЦИИ ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ

Койшыгулова Г.У.* – докторант PhD, Актюбинский региональный университет имени К. Жубанова, г. Актобе, Республика Казахстан.

Туребаева К.Ж. – доктор педагогических наук, профессор кафедры педагогики, Актюбинский региональный университет имени К. Жубанова, г. Актобе, Республика Казахстан.

Наурызбаева Э.К. – кандидат исторических наук, ассоциированный профессор кафедры истории Казахстана, Костанайский региональный университет имени Ахмет Байтұрсынұлы, г. Костанай, Республика Казахстан.