Extended Summary

It would not be wrong to call 21st century as that of systems. The notion system Justice system agglutinated with most words or phrases as in health system, address record system, hospital appointment system, highway prediction system forms also “education system” as an agglutination of the notion education. Education system defined as the process of creation of permanent and terminal behavior in an order has three principal elements: student, teacher and curriculum (Varış 1996). Since this study does not cover student dimension, we will focus more on teacher education and curriculum. In the study, Turkish teacher education curricula followed in Kazakhstan and Turkey were examined to reveal the possible unity from some universal principles. In this respect, the courses and credits in both curricula were compared. Besides, the research covered examination on literature, language skills, linguistics and grammar in both curricula.

The study consists of the curriculum of Turkish Teacher Education department in Turkey and the curriculum of Turkish-English Language Education department in Kazakhstan.

In collecting the data, theoretical background was scrutinized and books and journal articles were reached either in the library or electronically. The curricula that would constitute the base for the study were obtained through universities. The curriculum followed at Abai National Pedagogical University was taken into consideration while that followed in Erzincan University in Turkey was considered for examination. During the analysis of the data, since the curriculum of Turkish language education in Kazakhstan was in Russian and Kazakh, first it was translated into Turkish. Afterwards, as there was no classification in Kazakhstan in terms of field course, vocational course and liberal education course as in Turkey, the courses taught at Abai University Turkish-English Teacher Education department were sorted out like in Turkey. During the classification, in order to minimize the mistakes, the system was explained to three academic staff and they were asked for advice. Except for one course, no problem was encountered in classification. We took into consideration the majority’s decisions related to this course. In addition, after a detailed scrutiny of the data concerning the study, descriptive and content analysis were realized. The data summarized and interpreted in accordance with previously determined themes through descriptive analysis were exposed to a detailed process through content analysis (Yıldırım and Şimşek 2011). The courses included in the curriculum were examined via SPSS 15 program in terms of frequency and percentage analysis from different perspectives.

In the study, the distribution of courses related to proficiency areas was examined. While field courses cover 47% of the entire curriculum in Kazakhstan, this rate is 55.9% in Turkey. Liberal education courses constitute 4% while profession related courses compose 2.1% more in Turkish curriculum. As Turkish is given as minor in English Language bachelor degree programs in Kazakhstan, English language related courses constitute 15.2% of the entire curriculum.

Second dimension studied in both countries curricula is the distribution of course credits. While in Kazakhstan the total number of credits is 151 of which 118 credits are practical and 33 credits theoretical, in Turkey the total number is 162 of which 128 theoretical and 34 practical. That is, there is significant different between course credits in terms of theory and practice in Kazakhstan and Turkey.

Another point examined is that literature related courses are found in both curricula. Given both curricula, there are distinguishing differences. That is, in Turkey literature related courses consist of 13% of the entire curriculum whereas in Kazakhstan this rate is only 1.4%.
In Turkey, 6 different courses, totally 21 credits, exist related to literature but in Kazakhstan there is a general course related to “Turkish Literature”, only 2 credits.

There are also differences between linguistics and grammar courses taught in both universities though not as much as literature course. The first is that grammar course is taught 7.4% more in Turkey than in Kazakhstan (4.8%). Second one is that there is no “linguistics” in Kazakh curriculum. In addition, grammar in both countries is taught heavily theoretically. Languages courses with five different names in both countries comprise 12 hours in Turkey and 7 hours in Kazakhstan.

The last dimension to be considered is the place of language skills in courses in both curricula. The results of the study show that significant differences exist in the place of language skills in the curricula. While in Turkey the number of courses related to language skills is 27, this is 15 in Kazakhstan. This means 6.5% difference between two curricula. While in Kazakhstan almost all the courses related to language skills are practical, in Turkey such courses are 10.4% theoretical and 6% practical.

As a result, teaching Turkish both as a mother tongue and as a foreign language is important enough not to give way to probability. Teachers of Turkish should have some standard principles and teach consequently. Considering abovementioned curricula of both countries, significant differences that would lead to contradictions are seen from course credits to proficiency areas, field course to distribution of courses. These differences are to be revised following a guideline.