



A comparison of Kazakhstani and Turkish English language teacher education curricula

Zhanar Baimbetova ^{a *}, Cemal Çakır ^b

^a Gazi University, Graduate School of Education, Besevler, Ankara, 06560, Turkey

^b Gazi University, Gazi Faculty of Education, Besevler, Ankara, 06560, Turkey

Abstract

The current paper reports the findings of a comparative study about the curricula designed for the English language teacher education programs (ELTEPs) in two countries, namely Kazakhstan and Turkey. The comparative analysis of the curricula focuses on the specific courses taken by the prospective teachers of English in each country. The courses are grouped under the categories of linguistic competence/L2 proficiency, pedagogic competence, and managerial competence to analyze the similarities, and differences between the two curricula. The findings show that the ELTEP curriculum in Turkey offers a substantial number of pedagogic courses whereas it offers considerably fewer courses related to improving student teachers' linguistic competence. Although the Kazakhstani ELTEP curriculum incorporates and balances the linguistic and pedagogic competencies to a certain degree, less importance is attached to foreign language teaching methodology courses. The study highlights the need of increasing the number of foreign language teaching methodology courses addressing the pre-service teacher's pedagogic competence in the Kazakhstani ELTEP. Furthermore, the study reveals the non-course-related similarities and differences between the ELTEPs in Turkey and Kazakhstan in the following variables: the length of education, the total number of credits needed for graduation, the practicum length, the school types where graduates can work after graduation, and the steps they have to take to start teaching officially.

Keywords: Turkey; Kazakhstan; English language teacher education curriculum; pre-service teacher

© 2016 IJCI & the Authors. Published by *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction (IJCI)*. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (CC BY-NC-ND) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Education plays a central role in determining the place of a country in the world. Many curricula and syllabi are designed and implemented to help citizens develop personally, socially, culturally, and professionally. All educational policies and practices primarily

* Zhanar Baimbetova. Phone.: +7-702-789-7777
E-mail address: zhanar.baimbetova@gazi.edu.tr

aim at enabling individuals to think critically, to express themselves in written and oral genres, to read and interpret texts of all kinds, to apply acquired knowledge to life, and to communicate effectively with others (Kolaç, 2007). Foreign language teaching (FLT) curricula have the potential to help realize the afore-mentioned goals. A considerable portion of the FLT curricula is formed by English language teacher education (ELTE) curricula geared towards training competent English language teachers. Many countries often make reforms in their curricula to improve the status of English language teaching and learning. However, in practice, these changes may not always suffice to attain the objectives and the targets of the planners and initiators of these changes. Öztürk and Aydın (2019) agree to the studies about ELTE in Turkey that despite the fact many reforms have been made so far to restructure the ELTE, the need for further restructuring will still prevail. When we look at the issue from a global perspective, international comparative studies can contribute to the improvement of the English Language Teacher Education Programs (ELTEPs), shedding more light on the national education system, and helping borrow strong aspects of the education systems of the other countries. There are various comparative studies conducted in different countries to draw conclusions and make suggestions for the improvement of the ELTEPs. Wieczorek (2008), comparing the USA and the Japanese educational systems and schools, reports significant differences between the afore-mentioned countries in terms of educational perspectives and visions, and of the way reform is executed in both countries. The study suggests that the Japanese education system, through an effective curriculum closely integrated through all subjects, helps teachers motivate student learning, engaging learners, and developing strong classroom relationships. Wieczorek points to a sharp contrast between the USA and Japan in that whereas the former prioritize common standards and benchmarks, more standardized assessment, and school reform based on standards, the latter seem to follow a different strand, with more focus on every learner's interests and potential, with no uniformity sought. Thus, Wieczorek (2008) suggests that expanding motivation-building principles is the key to success in education. Nguyen (2013) compared the ELTE curricula in Australian and Vietnamese universities. She analyzed the structures of the two curricula, compared and contrasted them, and examined how distinctive contextual factors helped develop the curricula. The study revealed that contextual factors had an impact on great variation across and within the two curricula in terms of structure and content. Specifically, the former university's curriculum was found to be strong with respect to contextual knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and skills while the latter university's curriculum mostly covered English proficiency and subject matter knowledge, but devoted little share to contextual knowledge, pedagogical reasoning, and decision making.

Kic-Drgas and Çomoglu (2017) compared the ELTEPs in Poland and Turkey. The study revealed that the first year in the ELTEP in Turkey is almost completely devoted to developing the English proficiency of prospective teachers. However, the ELTEP in

Poland puts more emphasis on developing pedagogical content knowledge and skills through courses offered at the very beginning of the program than on developing content knowledge and skills. This early focus on pedagogical content knowledge and skills in the program results from the fact that the education system in Poland, on the whole, already develops proficiency and literacy in English before prospective teachers start their university education. Finally, Karakaş and Yavuz (2018) conducted a study to compare and contrast the ELTEPs in Turkey and Malaysia, and their results indicate that the program in Malaysia offers more compulsory courses, but fewer language-related courses than the one in Turkey. The amount of elective courses in the Malaysian ELTEP is higher, but there are fewer field experience activities. Furthermore, the results of the study showed that the program in Malaysia has religion-related courses while the Turkish program does not. The different program coverage in both countries may result from the fact that they have their own social, political, and educational peculiarities.

After analyzing the previous studies that compare and contrast country pairs in terms of the ELTEP curricula, we will present the ELTE curricula in Kazakhstan and Turkey in the following subsections.

1.1. ELTE in Kazakhstan

In Kazakhstan, there are a number of language teacher education departments in universities and colleges. The first pedagogical university of Kazakhstan was founded in 1928 before Kazakhstan was declared as an independent country. However, the number of ELTE departments started to increase after the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, when Kazakhstan achieved its independence. The education system underwent a sudden and quick change and innovation process by actively getting integrated into the rapidly globalized, and socially, culturally, and economically developed world. Language education departments in Kazakhstan provide a 4-year curriculum. Graduates of these departments are awarded the bachelor's degree in education. The courses in the program generally include pedagogic and linguistic courses. There are seminar and practice courses, as well. The functions of a bachelor's degree in education include: teaching foreign languages in educational institutions in accordance with the objectives of the profession; conducting extracurricular work in foreign languages; and implementing educational work utilizing foreign languages. The ELTEP is coded as 5B011900, Foreign Language (two foreign languages, English as the first foreign language), which is dedicated to training teachers of foreign languages. The main objective of the ELTEP is to train ELTEP students with proficiency in foreign languages at a level recognized by the international community and in accordance with the needs of the modern society of the Republic of Kazakhstan. A graduate of the ELTEP with a bachelor's degree in education is entitled to work as: a foreign language teacher at a primary school, a

secondary school, a lyceum, a gymnasium, and a foreign language teacher at secondary technical and vocational schools (Education Program, 2018).

1.2. ELTE in Turkey

Darulmuallimin (Teacher Training School), founded in the middle of the nineteenth century (Bilir, 2011), can be regarded as the foundation of teacher education in Turkey. Foreign language in the Ottoman era was primarily taught for religious purposes. Arabic and Persian, particularly morphology and syntax, were taught for learners to be able to read and understand religious texts (Soruc and Cepik, 2013). When the Republic of Turkey was founded, not only were the teacher education institutions inherited from the Ottoman Empire reformed according to the basic values of the Republic but also new teacher training schools were opened. Teacher education, which was administered by the Ministry of National Education according to an employment-based policy all along, was left to universities in 1982. The Higher Education Council (HEC) of Turkey re-structured the faculties of education in the 1998-1999 academic year (Bilir, 2011). In 1938, just as the number of students increased, so did a great need for English, French, and German teachers. To meet this need, foreign language teacher training started in the 1938-1939 academic year, when the School of Foreign Languages was opened, comprising two academic years to train teachers for high school language courses. After John Dewey came to Turkey in 1924 and wrote up a report on the education system of Turkey (Ata, 2000), a two-year School of Secondary School Teachers admitted its first 16 students in Konya. The School of Secondary School Teachers was renamed as Gazi Education Institute upon moving to Ankara, and an English department was launched at Gazi Education Institute in the 1944-1945 academic year. After 1982, education faculties replaced education institutes, leading to fundamental changes in teacher education (Demircan, 1988 as cited in Ulum, 2015). The 2547 numbered High Education Law was put into effect in 1981. As a result, the high schools, the institutes, and the academies that had previously trained teachers under the administration of the Ministry of National Education and universities were put under the administration of the universities, which started to be supervised by the HEC on the 20th of July, 1982. At this point, the four-year teachers' colleges became faculties of education while the two-year education institutes were transformed into first cycle vocational schools of education (Hismanoglu, 2012).

In terms of teacher education, all teachers in Turkey need to obtain a university degree. Primary and secondary school teachers take a 4-year course of study at language education programs. Graduation from an ELT program awards a BA degree that gives graduates the opportunity to teach at any public or private secondary or high school, or preparatory schools of the universities. All ELTEPs follow a highly centralized curriculum structure set by the HEC. Centrally making decisions in a unified higher

education system in Turkish, the HEC has executed several reforms in education, each of which was initiated on the claim that “the existing system is deficient in its goals, accomplishments and responsiveness to global changes” (Kırkgöz, 2017, p. 241).

Not only do prospective teachers take subject-related courses, but also take pedagogical, major-specific, and general cultural courses. Practice teaching at a primary or a secondary school is a nationally required course conducted collaboratively by faculty mentors and supervisors in partner schools. Currently, despite the fact that some people from other professions can get a teaching certificate, teacher education programs are primarily tasked with training qualified teachers (Haznedar, 2012).

2. Method

2.1. Significance of the Study

We observed that no study that attempts to compare the Kazakhstani ELTEP with the ELTEPs in other contexts is present. Thus, we set out to carry out the current comparative study to find out the similarities and differences between the curriculum of a Kazakhstani ELTEP (KELTEP) and that of a Turkish ELTEP (TELTEP). The significance of our study is that Turkey and Kazakhstan have socio-cultural and linguistic features in common. Also, Kazakhstan is worth investigating in terms of both its location and area, and its social, political, educational peculiarities. The countries neighboring Kazakhstan can be further studied on the basis of our study. We analyzed and compared the courses offered by the curricula in both countries in terms of the distributions and the weights of linguistic competence-related courses, pedagogic competence-related courses, and managerial competence-related courses (Peacock 2009). Linguistic competence means language proficiency, pedagogic competence covers teaching theory and teaching practices (the theory is about teaching skills along with the basic knowledge about language and language acquisition; practices is concerned with teaching, planning for teaching, and after-teaching reflection), and managerial competence refers to classroom management skills. Wedell (1992) (as cited in Peacock, 2009) proposes that adequate training of a foreign language teacher requires linguistic, pedagogic, and managerial competencies. Peacock (2009) further emphasizes the balance of the competencies mentioned above for adequate training of a foreign language teacher.

2.2. Research Questions

Considering the value of any comparative study on general education and on FLTEP/ELTEP curricula and the opportunity of learning from each other, especially in such countries as Turkey and Kazakhstan, we sought answers to the following questions:

- 1) What are similarities and differences between the TELTEP and the KELTEP in terms of courses for developing linguistic competence?
- 2) What are similarities and differences between the TELTEP and the KELTEP in terms of courses for developing pedagogic competence?
- 3) What are similarities and differences between the TELTEP and the KELTEP in terms of courses for developing managerial competence?
- 4) What are the possible implications to be drawn for the improvement both ELTE curricula?

2.3. Data Collection Method and Data Analysis

The current study adopts a content analysis, analyzing the two sample curricula, one from each country, and comparing them in terms of distribution of courses among linguistic, pedagogic, and managerial competencies. For document analysis, the data have been downloaded from the relevant webpages of the institutions: one in Turkey and one in Kazakhstan. First, each curriculum was analyzed separately for its general outlook in terms of the type of English language teacher aimed to graduate, the length of education, the total number of credits required for the BA degree, the length of practicum, the school types graduates can work at, and the steps that the graduates are to take to start their official teaching. Then, the content of each course was analyzed and grouped under the categories of linguistic competence, pedagogic competence, and managerial competence to find out the distribution of courses in the program in terms of balance among the above-mentioned competencies. A checklist comprising the explanations of linguistic, pedagogic and managerial competencies and the titles of the offered courses were given to two experts. The experts marked ‘L’ for linguistic, ‘P’ for pedagogic, and ‘M’ for managerial competence at the beginning of each course. The checklist also included the details of each course.

3. Findings

The comparison of the curricula of the ELTEPs in Turkey and Kazakhstan revealed similarities and differences given under related headings. The TELTEP contains 52 compulsory and 32 elective courses. The elective courses in this program are coded as GK (general culture), MB (professional knowledge), and A (field courses). Among the elective codes given above, the pre-service teacher of the TELTEP is required to take 4 general culture courses, 6 professional knowledge courses, and 6 field courses for graduation from the four-year program. The case in the KELTEP shows that pre-service teachers are offered 33 compulsory and 53 elective courses. The KELTEP electives are categorized under the modules of the general education, pedagogics and methods of teaching foreign languages, English theory and practice, second foreign language, social and ethical

competencies, economic, organizational, and management competencies, final qualifying examination, and training and production practices. Graduation from the KELTEP requires one to complete 33 compulsory courses, 17 elective courses, 4 school training, and production practices, one additional course, namely Physical Training, in the first four semesters, to pass the state specialization examination at the end of the program, and to write and defend a graduation work. In Turkey, after teacher candidates graduate from the ELTEPs, they take a national high-stake exam called Kamu Personeli Seçme Sınavı (KPSS), Public Personnel Selection Exam (PPSE). PPSE is composed of multiple-choice questions on social sciences, general education, specific teaching area, and language proficiency. The teacher candidates with certain levels of ranking in the exam results are interviewed by the officials of the Ministry of National Education (MONE) (This practice has been in effect since 2017). Depending on the teacher candidates' interview scores, the MONE employs them as teachers and appoints them to the state primary and secondary schools based in all parts of Turkey (Öztürk and Aydın, 2018).

In Kazakhstan, after graduation from four-year undergraduate programs, a graduate who is looking for suitable work, when applying for assistance in finding employment, is registered as unemployed to the center of employment at the place of residence or through the web portal of public services or state corporation. The employment center, within ten working days from the date of registration of a job seeker, at no cost, assists him or her in finding a job by selecting suitable work (The Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan, 2016 – with amendments and additions as of 01 January 2020). The second way is special events: job fairs. These events are organized specially for specialists where job seekers fill the questionnaire and take part in various activities. Soon after graduation, all graduates do not have employment opportunities, but the state-run programs like 'The Youth Practical Training Program' and 'With Diploma to the Village' help the graduates. The former program is geared towards providing graduates of educational institutions with an initial work experience in their teaching area. To take part in the program, a graduate must apply to the employment center of the municipality and register as an unemployed person (not older than 29 years). Within the latter program, the government offers the graduates work in a rural area, providing the graduates with substantial social support. To be eligible for the program, the graduates must find a job in person in the preferred school location. At the time of employment, a graduate submits an application for participation in the program to the district commission. If the graduate cannot find a job on his/her own, he/she can apply to the Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan or the authorities in the regions. Regional municipalities announce on their websites the information about the vacancies in their regions.

3.1. Courses for developing linguistic competence

The analysis of the two curricula shows striking differences in terms of the place and the titles of compulsory courses addressing linguistic competence. Even more striking differences concerning the two ELTEPs are between the elective courses addressing the linguistic competence of pre-service teachers.

It can be seen from the data in Table 1 that there is a slight difference in terms of the weight of compulsory courses addressing linguistic competence. The Turkish curriculum contains 14 linguistic competence compulsory courses and the Kazakhstani curriculum contains 13. As for the linguistic competence elective courses (Table 2), almost three-fifths of the linguistic competence courses in the Kazakhstani curriculum are elective. As can be seen in Table 2, 22 of the linguistic competence courses are elective, a number which dramatically contrasts with that of the elective linguistic competence courses in the Turkish curriculum – being only one. However, Kazakhstani prospective teachers can choose 9 of the suggested linguistic competence courses, but in that case, they have to take 6 pedagogic competence courses. A Kazakhstani prospective teacher has an option to make a choice in the benefits of linguistic competence or pedagogic competence courses, meaning that if he/she takes 6 linguistic competence courses, the remaining 9 courses will be pedagogic competence ones. Thus, the total number of linguistic competence courses in the Kazakhstani curriculum makes 22 or 19. This result suggests that both curricula contain a good number of courses to enhance pre-service teachers’ linguistic competence. However, according to the total number of linguistic courses that pre-service teachers can take during their education period, Kazakhstani prospective teachers of English are more likely to be exposed to linguistic competence courses in English slightly more than their Turkish counterparts are. Kazakhstani pre-service teachers may be advantageous in terms of elective courses for developing linguistic competence. As can be seen from Table 2, the KELTEP offers a variety of elective courses particularly devoted to the teaching of English for specific purposes. On the other hand, the TELTEP contains a translation course whereas the KELTEP does not offer translation courses to its pre-service teachers (Table 1).

Table 1. Turkish and Kazakhstani curricula compulsory courses addressing linguistic competence

<i>Turkish ELTEP</i>	<i>Kazakhstani ELTEP</i>
----------------------	--------------------------

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reading Skills I 2. Reading Skills II 3. Writing Skills I 4. Writing Skills II 5. Listening and Pronunciation I 6. Listening and Pronunciation II 7. Oral Communication Skills I 8. Oral Communication Skills II 9. Foreign Language I (German, French) 10. Foreign Language II (German, French) 11. English Syntax 12. English Literature I 13. English Literature II 14. Translation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Basic Foreign Language (English, A2 level) 2. Basic Foreign Language in Terms of Intercultural Communication (English, B1 level) 3. Basic Foreign Language (English, B1 threshold level) 4. Professionally oriented foreign language (English, B1 advanced level) 5. Specialized Professional Foreign Language (English, B2 threshold level) 6. English Language for Specific Purposes (B2 level) 7. Foreign Language (second, A1-1 level) (Chinese, Spanish, Italian, French, German) 8. Foreign Language (second, A1-2 level) (Chinese, Spanish, Italian, French, German) 9. Foreign Language (second, A 2 -1 level) (Chinese, Spanish, Italian, French, German) 10. Foreign Language (second, A 2 -2 level) (Chinese, Spanish, Italian, French, German) 11. Foreign Language (second, B1 threshold level) (Chinese, Spanish, Italian, French, German) 12. Foreign Language (second, B1 continuing level) (Chinese, Spanish, Italian, French, German) 13. Foreign Language (second, B2 level) (Chinese, Spanish, Italian, French, German)
--	---

Interestingly, the course contents and the titles offered in the ELTEPs of Turkey and Kazakhstan that address linguistic competence are quite different from each other. For example, ‘Reading Skills I’ and ‘Reading Skills II’ in the TELTEP are present in the KELTEP as ‘Development of English Reading Skills’; ‘Writing Skills I’ and ‘Writing Skills II’ in the TELTEP are titled ‘Development of Writing Forms of Communication’ in the KELTEP; ‘Listening and Pronunciation I’ and ‘Listening and Pronunciation II’ in TELTEP are given as ‘Development of English Listening Skills’ in the KELTEP; and ‘Oral Communication Skills I’ and ‘Oral Communication Skills II’ in the TELTEP are offered as ‘Development of Oral Forms of Communication’ in the KELTEP. The most surprising aspect of the data is in the place of the afore-mentioned linguistic skills courses: they are offered as compulsory courses in the Turkish curriculum, and as elective in the Kazakhstani curriculum. While Turkish prospective teachers can take each linguistic skill course in the first two semesters, Kazakhstani ones can take skills development courses in the first, third and fourth semesters, but each skill development course is taught only for one academic semester. Furthermore, ‘Development of Oral Forms of Communication’ and ‘Development of Written Forms of Communication’ are given under separate modules in the third semester, whereas Kazakhstani prospective teachers can choose only one module consisting of two courses. However, the KELTEP offers compulsory courses titled as: Basic Foreign Language (English, A2 level), Basic Foreign Language in Terms of Intercultural Communication (English, B1 level), Basic Foreign Language (English, B1 threshold level), Professionally Oriented Foreign

Language (English, B1 advanced level), Specialized Professional Foreign Language (English, B2 threshold level), and English Language for Specific Purposes (B2 level). The afore-mentioned courses are aimed at providing students with a holistic view of the phonetic and grammatical structure of the language; improving students’ communicative abilities in four main types of speech activity; giving students the opportunity to acquire new language means according to the selected subjects and communication spheres; providing students with the knowledge to recognize the terminology related to the particular profession, and applying the lexical and grammatical units in a specific professional field, as stated in curriculum documents. In a nutshell, the majority of linguistic courses of the KELTEP are allocated to the development of the students’ linguistic competence for specific purposes.

Table 2. Turkish and Kazakhstani curricula elective courses addressing linguistic competence

<i>Turkish ELTEP</i>	<i>Kazakhstani ELTEP</i>
1. English in Mass Communication	1. English Practical Phonetics 2. English Practical Grammar 3. Development of English Reading Skills 4. Development of Oral Forms of Communication 5. Development of Written Forms of Communication 6. Dialogic and Monologic Speech Development 7. Development of English Listening Skills 8. Discussions and Debates 9. Development of Presentation Skills 10. Business English 11. English Practical Grammar (Intermediate Level) 12. Workshop on Culture of Verbal Communication 13. International Exam Preparation Course (IELTS, TOEFL) 14. Economic English 15. Analytical Reading of Media Texts 16. Business Letters 17. Diplomatic English 18. World Classical Literature in English 19. Public Speaking 20. Literature of the Country of the Target Language 21. Socio-political English 22. Text Interpretation

3.2. Courses for developing pedagogic competence

The differences between the ELTE curricula in Turkey and Kazakhstan in terms of the courses addressing pedagogic competence are presented in Table 3 and Table 4. It is apparent from Table 3 that very few pedagogic courses are offered as compulsory in the Kazakhstani curriculum compared to the Turkish one. It shows that the Turkish

curriculum contains 33 compulsory courses for pedagogic competence, Kazakhstani one offers only 14. This distribution presents so dramatic a contrast between the two curricula as the one observed above in the breakdown of the linguistic competence elective courses, this time the Turkish ELTEP offering far more than the Kazakhstani ELTEP. The results, as shown in Table 4, indicate that 31 pedagogic competence elective courses are offered in the Turkish ELTEP and 24 in the Kazakhstani ELTEP.

Table 3. Turkish and Kazakhstani curricula compulsory courses addressing pedagogic competence

<i>Turkish ELTEP</i>	<i>Kazakhstani ELTEP</i>
1. Information Technologies	1. Human Psychology and Development
2. Introduction to Education	2. Pedagogy
3. Educational Sociology	3. English Language History
4. Educational Psychology	4. Theory and Methods of Educational Work
5. Educational Philosophy	5. Methodology of Foreign Language Education
6. Instruction Principles and Methods	6. English Theoretical Course
7. Instruction Technologies	7. Lexicology
8. Approaches to English Learning and Teaching	8. Fundamentals of Research Works
9. Linguistics I	9. Stylistics
10. Linguistics II	10. Educational Placement
11. Critical Reading Writing	11. Pedagogical (psychological, pedagogical) placement
12. Research Methods in Education	12. Pedagogical placement
13. English Language Teaching Curricular	13. Industrial (pedagogical) placement
14. Language Acquisition	14. Pre-graduation placement
15. Ethics in Education	
16. Classroom Management	
17. Teaching English to Young Learners I	
18. Teaching English to Young Learners II	
19. Teaching English Language Skills I	
20. Teaching English Language Skills II	
21. Literature and Language Teaching I	
22. Literature and Language Teaching II	
23. Turkish Educational System and School Management	
24. Testing and Evaluation in Education	
25. Special Education and Inclusion	
26. Syllabus Design in ELT	
27. Community Service	
28. Preparing Exams in ELT	
29. Teaching Integrated Language Skills	
30. Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching	
31. Guidance at Schools	
32. Teaching Practice I	
33. Teaching Practice II	

Table 4. Turkish and Kazakhstani curricula elective courses addressing pedagogic competence

<i>Turkish ELTEP</i>	<i>Kazakhstani ELTEP</i>
1. Open and Distance Learning	1. Introduction to Linguistics
2. Child Psychology	2. General Linguistics
3. Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder	3. History of Linguistic Studies
4. Educational Law	4. Self-knowledge
5. Educational Anthropology	5. Management Psychology
6. History of Education	6. Introduction to Specialization
7. Drama in Education	7. Language Policy in Kazakhstan
8. Extracurricular Activities in Education	8. Bilingualism and Multilingualism
9. Curriculum Development in Education	9. Country Studies
10. Project Preparation in Education	10. English Etymology
11. Critical and Analytical Thinking	11. Interactive Technologies of Teaching
12. Education of Hospitalized Children	12. English Phraseology
13. Inclusive Education	13. Cognitive Semantics
14. Character and Values Education	14. Critical Thinking
15. Comparative Education	15. Intercultural Communication
16. Micro Learning	16. Web Technologies in Teaching Foreign Languages
17. Museum Education	17. Linguistic Country Studies
18. Learning Environments Outside Schools	18. Digital Technologies in Teaching Foreign Languages
19. Learning Disabilities	19. Gender Aspect in Literary Criticism
20. Individualization and Adaptation of Teaching	20. Specially Oriented Methods in Teaching Foreign Languages
21. Sustainable Education	21. Discourse Analysis
22. Adult Education and Lifelong Learning	22. Speech culture and business rhetoric
23. Teaching English Lexicon	23. Cultural Studies
24. New Approaches in English Language Teaching	24. Sociology
25. Testing and Assessment of Learning	
26. Drama in ELT	
27. Pragmatics and Language Teaching	
28. English Course Book Evaluation	
29. Materials Development in ELT	
30. World Englishes and Culture	
31. Discourse Analysis and Language Teaching	

Table 3 and Table 4 show a significant difference in the number of pedagogic courses: while the ELTEP in Turkey includes 64 courses (33 compulsory, 31 elective) for pedagogic competence, the Kazakhstani one offers almost half. The most obvious finding to emerge from Table 3 and Table 4 is the evidence that the Turkish ELTEP contains a notable number of courses that can enable student teachers to achieve pedagogic competence.

Considering the courses addressing the student teachers' managerial competence in both contexts, no differences were found in the number of courses. There is only one course addressing the managerial competence of the students in the revised ELTEP in Turkey, whose title is Classroom Management. Classroom Management corresponds to Management Psychology in the Kazakhstani ELTEP. These two managerial courses can

be put under the category of pedagogical courses, as Thomas (1987) (cited in Erozan, 2005) includes four components under pedagogic competence: 1. Management: classroom management skills. 2. Teaching: skills pertaining to teachers’ communication with learners. 3. Preparation: teachers’ skills essential in preparing for teaching. 4. Assessment: teachers’ self-assessment the various skills enumerated in the first three components of pedagogic competence.

3.3. Courses for developing general competence

Apart from linguistic and pedagogic courses, there are some other courses in the two ELTEPs for developing students’ general competence, which have been placed under the category of courses for general competence in this study. These courses are: Principles of Atatürk and History of Revolution I & II, Turkish Language I & II, Information Technologies in the Turkish ELTEP; Kazakh (Russian) Language I, II & II, Modern History of Kazakhstan, and Information and Communication Technologies, which are offered as compulsory courses in the Kazakhstani ELTEP. The number of courses in the Turkish program for developing students’ general competence is somewhat similar to the ones in the Kazakhstani program. Thus, both ELTEPs require students to take three general competence courses to equip prospective teachers with general knowledge.

4. Discussion and Conclusions

Our study neither detailed the course contents nor the contextual elements that had some possible impact on the two ELTEP curricula focused on. It is based on examining two sample curricula documents, one in Turkey and another in Kazakhstan to find out the differences and similarities in the distribution of the courses among pedagogic, linguistic and managerial competencies in the ELTEPs of Turkey and Kazakhstan. Comparison of the curricula revealed an interesting example of two different attitudes not only towards teaching courses, but also the education length, the school types where graduates can teach, the total number of credits required to have the BA degree, career prospects, practicum length, and employment conditions, which are provided in Table 5.

Table 5. *Non-course-related similarities and differences between the ELTEPs in Turkey and Kazakhstan*

Country	Turkey	Kazakhstan
Length	4-year program	4-year program
Rights to teaching after graduation	Graduates of the program can work as teachers in primary, secondary, and high schools.	Graduates of the program can work at secondary schools, lyceums, gymnasiums, specialized schools, and secondary technical and professional educational

		organizations.
Required credit for graduation	240 ECTS	240 ECTS
End of the program	They can work as English teachers in public schools if they receive a sufficient score in the Civil Servant Selection Exam followed by an oral exam.	Personal application for public or private jobs. Graduates register as unemployed to the Employment Center. They can attend job fair special events or get help from the government, implementing the programs of ‘Youth Practice’ and ‘With Diploma to the Village’.
Length of compulsory practice at school	2 terms <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teaching Practice-1 (7th semester) 2. Guidance at schools (8th semester) 3. Teaching Practice-2 (8th semester) 	3 terms <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Educational Placement (2nd semester) 2. Pedagogical (psychological pedagogical) placement (4th semester) 3. Pedagogical placement (6th semester) 4. Industrial (pedagogical) placement (8th semester)

There are some common and contrasting points between Turkey and Kazakhstan in terms of program length and graduate employment. The length of the program study is four years in both contexts. Vocational practice courses include two-semester Teaching Practice I & II and one-semester ‘Guidance at Schools’ in the Turkish ELTEP, which allow prospective teachers to acquire knowledge on the routines and applications of the real classroom and school settings, apply what they have acquired during their training in real classroom settings, actively reflect on their teaching experiences, and understand the organization of psychological counseling and guidance services and the duties, authorities and responsibilities of staff. The Kazakhstani ELTEP offers four-semester school experiences. In the second and fourth semesters, prospective teachers are allowed to observe expert teachers and the school setting, the following sixth and eighth semesters they plan educational activities and practice teaching as well. The graduates in both countries should complete 240 ECTS by the end of the program. In Turkey, graduates of the program can work as English teachers in public schools if they receive a sufficient score in the Public Personnel Selection Exam followed by an oral exam. In the Kazakhstani context, graduates should apply for vacant positions in person without having to take a centralized exam, or they can register as unemployed to the Employment Center. Also, they can attend job fair special events or get assistance from

the state, implementing the programs of 'Youth Practice' and 'With Diploma to the Village'.

The comparison of the curricula in terms of the weight of compulsory courses addressing linguistic competence shows that the TELTEP offers slightly more than the KELTEP, but the Kazakhstani curriculum offers a variety of electives addressing linguistic competence. Thus, Kazakhstani pre-service teachers are more likely to develop their English for specific purposes that can be explained by the changes in the language policy of Kazakhstan. In Kazakhstan, Nursultan. A. Nazarbayev, the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, initiated 'The Trinity of Languages' project, which organizes the tasks to develop trilingualism at the national level. The goal of the project is to enable competitive professionals to be fluent in three languages: Kazakh as the state language, Russian as the medium of communication between different ethnic groups, and English as the language of successful integration in the world economy. The project has ambitious future plans for high schools and it is expected that from 2019-2020, chemistry, biology, physics, and information technologies will be taught in English (Abdygapparova and Smirnova 2018). Thus, the modern society of Kazakhstan needs qualified specialists, who will fulfill professional tasks in a foreign language society at various intercultural levels (Kunanbayeva and Zhylytyrova 2016). It is obvious that it can be accomplished by training competent pre-service teachers in ELTEPs. Therefore, the weighting of ESP courses for developing linguistic competence in the KELTEP was influenced by contextual factors on the national level, considering that those courses can contribute to the professionalism of the prospective EFL teachers. Although in the current study, the Linguistics I & II courses were classified under the category of courses for developing pedagogic competence, we cannot deny its importance in improving pre-service teachers' linguistic competence. According to Freeman and Freeman (2004), linguistics can help train proficient ELT teachers. Moreover, they claim that the more we know about language and the more we will be able to understand how language works, the more effective we will become in discovering and decoding how language elements are arranged and work. Thus, together with the knowledge of teaching methods and approaches, effective language teachers need to know the foreign language that they are going to teach. The course Linguistics can help pre-service teachers gain a more in-depth and thorough understanding of the foreign language that they will teach after graduation. When Girard (cited in Hatipoğlu, 2017), in his early study, asked students to describe the effective language teachers, they stated that s/he was the one who spoke English well, taught pronunciation effectively, and was patient. Kaş (1990), Hornsby (2003), and Hudson (2003) suggest offering Linguistics to pre-service teachers to enhance their foreign language knowledge experience. However, it is interesting to note that the course Linguistics is offered two semesters in the Turkish ELTEP as Linguistics I & II while in the Kazakhstani ELTEP, it is offered only in the first semester but as elective courses, namely Introduction to Linguistics and General Linguistics. Prospective teachers can

choose only one of them. In terms of courses addressing managerial competence, both programs offer only one course and only for one semester. In Turkey, the managerial course is taught as compulsory and in Kazakhstan it is offered as an elective. If we take into account the possibility that a prospective teacher in the Kazakhstani program might not choose a managerial course and prefer instead another course which is not related to a managerial competence of the student-teacher, he or she will not be taught about ways to develop his or her managerial competence in a detailed way through a separate course. However, the management skill of the teacher is very vital in the process of teaching because one of the serious obstacles that novice teachers face is considered classroom management. Thus, the results of the current study indicate that the number of courses addressing student teachers' managerial competence in both ELTEPs does not suffice.

From the table above, we can see that courses offered in the ELTEPs of Turkey and Kazakhstan are relatively different from each other. In terms of a second foreign language, it is limited to two languages, which are French and German languages, that are taught for one semester each in the Turkish program, the Kazakhstani program offers 5 foreign languages but requires pre-service teachers to choose one of the offered foreign languages, which are Chinese, Spanish, Italian, French, and German, that is taught for 7 semesters. Curriculum load allocated for the second foreign language in Kazakhstani context can be explained with that a graduate of this educational program is awarded a degree – 'Bachelor of education', specialty 5B011900 – 'Foreign language: two foreign languages', which means that graduate will master two foreign languages, English as a primary, and one of the suggested five languages as the secondary. To mention the difference between the two ELTEPs, the Turkish ELTEP offers more courses addressing the pedagogical competence of prospective teachers than the Kazakhstani ELTEP, especially in terms of English language teaching methodology courses. Similarly, Diaz and Arikan (2016) in their study on comparison of the Argentinean and the Turkish ELTEPs also revealed a high numerical difference between courses addressing the pedagogic competence of prospective teachers. Diaz and Arikan (2016) reported that prospective teachers in Turkey take 11 courses related to language teaching methods or pedagogy, while their Argentinean counterparts take only two. In the same vein, Seferoglu (2006) in her early study proposed that the redesigned TELTEP stressed teaching methodology and teaching practice. The most striking result to be discussed in the current study is the absence of courses such as Teaching English to Young Learners, Testing and Evaluation in Education, Curriculum Development in Education, Syllabus Design in ELT, English Course Book Evaluation, Measurement and Evaluation in Education, English Course Book Evaluation, Testing and Assessment of Learning, and Special Education and Inclusion in the Kazakhstani ELTEP, which exist in the Turkish program. The afore-mentioned courses are vital in developing student teacher's skills that can contribute to the mastery of teaching and prepare prospective teachers to be able to make better choices for their students in different situations of the teaching

process. According to Larsen-Freeman (1983), teaching material design should be emphasized in educating student teachers. Besides, we have to emphasize the importance of the course Teaching English to Young Learners. English instruction at an early age is a fundamental investment a country can make in this increasingly globalized world. We should admit that young learners need a different way of instruction and teaching than adult learners because they have stronger emotional dependence than older learners. Teacher's psychological knowledge of young learners is a clue to create an enjoyable atmosphere in classrooms, to manage young learners, and to select appropriate activities and materials. Thus, without the skills mentioned above and through a pre-service program which is aimed at teaching English with an unidentified target group of learners, it will be challenging for teacher candidates to create effective teaching and learning environments. Teacher's understanding of the learner's dimension, creating lesson plans and adapting materials that are suitable for adult learners, and young learners with different developmental stages are vital in the teaching process. These courses can teach how to select, adapt, and design teaching materials, which are considered as strong domains of pedagogic knowledge and skills. Gersonskaya (2017) maintains that effective implementation of the Trilingual Program in Kazakhstan can only be possible on the condition that Kazakh, Russian and English languages are adequately taught, and that teaching materials for Kazakh, Russian and English courses are developed. She notes that in the developmental process of new language textbooks, Kazakhstani educators tend to follow the layout and the coverage of some favorite course books and appear to miss the fact that most of the favorite course books have little or no concern about the native tongue of the learners. Gersonskaya (2017) suggests that primary, secondary, and tertiary level educators, who are expected to effectively teach integrated courses, should be trained both about language in general and about foreign language teaching methodology in particular. Therefore, the current study highlights the need for the courses mentioned above to be taught in a detailed way separately from Methodology of Foreign Language Education and Specially Oriented Methods in Teaching Foreign Languages. The latter is given as an elective course in the Kazakhstani program and the former is offered as a compulsory course only for one semester.

All in all, a noticeable point to be made in terms of the Kazakhstani curriculum is that although there is a balance between the courses addressing the linguistic and pedagogic competencies, it does not include a sufficient number of foreign language teaching methodology courses. On the contrary, Turkish pre-service teachers have more opportunities to develop their teaching skills as they are exposed to foreign language teaching methodology courses more than their Kazakhstani counterparts. The number of foreign language teaching methodology courses offered in the Kazakhstani curriculum is too small to meet the needs of the prospective teachers in many aspects, compared to the program employed in Turkey. Even though the program is coded as Foreign Language: Two Foreign Languages (English as the First Foreign Language) in the Kazakhstani

context, it was designed to prepare candidates for the teaching of the English language in a wide range of contexts as stated in the education program document. The curriculum should train effective foreign language teachers, who are able to assess learners, utilize technological capacity, manage classrooms, and carry out classroom research so that they will not lag behind their colleagues. Therefore, the findings point to the need of increasing the number of foreign language teaching methodology courses addressing the pre-service teacher's pedagogic competence in the Kazakhstani ELTEP. In sum, the value of any comparative study on general education and on FLTEP/ELTEP curricula lies in the opportunity of learning from each other, especially in such compared pairs as Turkey and Kazakhstan, which have socio-cultural and linguistic similarities.

References

- Abdygapparova, S. & Smirnova, L. (2018). Teacher and Teaching Challenges in EFL Higher Education in Kazakhstan. 1st Global Conference on Multidisciplinary Academic Research GCMAR Bangkok, Thailand ISBN: 978-0-6482404-0-2 Asia Pacific Institute of Advanced Research (APIAR), 19-25.
- Ata, B. (2000). The influence of an American educator John Dewey on the Turkish educational system. *The Turkish Yearbook of International Relations*, (31), 119-130. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/tyir/issue/50036/641468>.
- Bilir, A. (2011). The historical evolution of teacher training and employment policies in Turkey. Ankara University, *Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences*. 44(2), 223-246.
- Diaz, A.P. & Arikan A. (2016). A Comparison of Argentinean and Turkish English Language Teacher Education Curricula. *Sustainable Multilingualism* 9. ISSN 2335-2019 (Print), ISSN 2335-2027 (Online). Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.7220/2335-2027.9.7>.
- Education Program of L.N Gumilyov Eurasian National University, ФМП ЕНУ 02-01-18. Retrieved from <https://www.enu.kz/en/>
- Erozan, F. (2005). Evaluating the language improvement courses in the Undergraduate ELT Curriculum at Eastern Mediterranean University: A Case Study. A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate School of Social Sciences of Middle East Technical University (p.3).
- Freeman, D. E. & Freeman, Y. S. (2004). *Essential linguistics: what you need to know to teach reading, ESL, spelling, phonetics and grammar*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann 03801–3912.
- Gazi University Information Package (2019). *English Language Teacher Training*, Gazi Faculty of Education. Retrieved from <http://gbp.gazi.edu.tr/>
- Gersonskaya, V. (2017). Trilingualism in Kazakhstani Higher Education: Prospects and Challenges. [Online] Retrieved from <http://www.kafu.kz/en/three-language-education>.
- Hatipoğlu, Ç. (2017). Linguistics courses in pre-service foreign language teacher training programs and knowledge about language. *International Association of Research in Foreign Language Education and Applied Linguistics ELT Research Journal* 2017, 6(1), 45-68.
- Haznedar, B. (2012). Perspectives on preservice education of English language teachers in Turkish primary schools. In Y. Bayyurt & Y. Bektaş-Çetinkaya (Eds.), *Research Perspectives on Teaching and Learning English in Turkey* (pp.39-57). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH.
- Hismanoglu, S. (2012). İngilizce öğretmeni adaylarının İngilizce öğretmeni yetiştirme programı ile ilgili görüşleri. *Journal of Research in Education and Teaching*. 1(2), 330-341.
- Hornsby, D. (2003). Starting from scratch: French linguistics courses at Kent. *LLAS Occasional Papers*, October 2003, 11-12.
- Hudson, R. (2003). How can key skills "sell" Linguistics to students and employers? *LLAS Occasional Papers*, October 2003, 3-8.
- Kaş, A. (1990). Yabancı dil öğretiminde programlar [Foreign language teaching programs]. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 5, 323-330. Retrieved from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/pub/hunefd/issue/7832/103081>
- Kazakhstan: Закон Республики Казахстан о занятости населения (The Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan on employment). Retrieved from https://online.zakon.kz/document/?doc_id=38847468#pos=377;-36

- Kazakhstan: Government services and information online. Graduates Employment. Retrieved from <https://egov.kz/cms/en/articles/vipusknik>
- Kandemir, A. & Akar, H. (2018). English language teacher education program in Turkey: a qualitative meta-synthesis study. *Bildiri Özetleri Kitabı / EJER CONGRESS Conference Proceedings*.
- Karakaş, A. & Yavuz, E. (2018). A Comparative Analysis of English Language Teacher Education Programs in Turkey and Malaysia. *Cumhuriyet International Journal of Education – Cumhuriyet Uluslararası Eğitim Dergisi e-ISSN: 2147-1606 Volume / Cilt 7 | Issue / Sayı 3, 287-306*.
- Kic-Drgas, J., & Comoglu, I. (2017). A comparison of English Language Teacher Education Programs in Poland and Turkey, *Batı Anadolu Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 8(2), 112-121.
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2017). English education policy in Turkey. In R. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *English Language Education Policy in the Middle East and North Africa (235-256)*, *Language Policy* 13. Springer International Publishing.
- Kolaç, E. (2007). Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının okuyucu profilleri (The reader profiles of preservice primary school teachers). *Proceedings of the 6th National Primary Education Symposium*, 209-214.
- Kunanbayeva S. & Zhylytyrova Zh. (2016). The Development of Professional Foreign Language Competence for ESP Students: Case of Kazakh National Agrarian University Students. *International Journal of Environmental & Science Education* Vol. 11, No.14, 7262-7270.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1983). Training teachers or educating a teacher. In: James, E., Stern, H. H.; Strevens, P. (Eds.) *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press: 264-274.
- Nguyen, M. (2013). The curriculum for English language teacher education in Australian and Vietnamese universities. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(11), 32-53.
- Öztürk, G. & Aydın, B. (2018). English language teacher education in Turkey: why do we fail and what policy reforms are needed? *AJESI - Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International*, 2019; 9(1): 181-213.
- Peacock, M. (2009). The evaluation of foreign-language-teacher education programmes. *Language Teaching Research*, 13(3), 259-78.
- Seferoğlu, G. (2006). Teacher candidates' reflections on some components of a pre-service English teacher education programme in Turkey. *Journal of Education for Teaching* Vol. 32, No. 4, November, pp. 369–378.
- Soruc, A. & Cepik, S. (2013). A critical analysis of foreign language pre-service teacher education in Turkey. *Kamla-Raj*. 16(1-2), 319-324.
- Ulum, Ö. G. (2015). History of EFL Teacher Education Programs in Turkey. *Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Science* Volume 3, Issue 7: 42-45.
- Wieczorek, C. C. (2008). Comparative analysis of educational systems of American and Japanese schools: views and visions. *Educational Horizons*, 86(2): 99- 111.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the Journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (CC BY-NC-ND) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).