

## Systematization of the Teaching of the Turkic Languages in Higher Education

Arailym SARBALINA<sup>1</sup>, Zharkynbike SULEIMENOVA<sup>2</sup>, Kunipa ASHINOVA<sup>3</sup>,  
Zhaidarkul BELASSAROVA<sup>4</sup>, Balkiya KASSYM<sup>5</sup>, Aiman KOBLANOVA<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Kazakh National Women's Teacher Training University, Almaty, KAZAKHSTAN  
ORCID: 0009-0000-8034-6156

<sup>2</sup> Kazakh National Women's Teacher Training University, Almaty, KAZAKHSTAN  
ORCID: 0000-0002-1891-2134

<sup>3</sup> Kazakh National Women's Teacher Training University, Almaty, KAZAKHSTAN  
ORCID: 0000-0001-6938-2092

<sup>4</sup> Corresponding author, Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, Almaty, KAZAKHSTAN  
zhaidar77@mail.ru  
ORCID: 0000-0001-9858-5083

<sup>5</sup> Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, Almaty, KAZAKHSTAN  
ORCID: 0000-0002-5375-387X

<sup>6</sup> Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, Almaty, KAZAKHSTAN  
ORCID: 0000-0002-1246-7690

### Article information

Submission	10/01/2024	Revision received	15/03/2024
Acceptance	30/03/2024	Publication date	28/04/2024

### Keywords:

Turkish,  
Turkic languages,  
systematization,  
higher education,  
linguistics

**Abstract:** This study aims to analyze the factors influencing the typology of Turkic words to examine the specifics of the way students learn Turkic languages in higher education institutions. A hypothetic-deductive, survey, and comparative method was used for the study. Results showed that the learners have trouble constructing oral discourse and do not achieve coherence and cohesion in the field of communication they produce, as they do not integrate the parts into the whole under a structured system. Results also suggest that the systematization of Turkic words and expressions forms the trunk of the numerous Eastern Mediterranean and Asia languages, where most of them are very similar. It is concluded that categorizing words and expressions systematically by teachers through linguistic and pedagogical activities can contribute to one's learning and teaching of Turkic languages.

### Anahtar Sözcükler:

Türkçe,  
Türk dilleri,  
sistemleştirme,  
yüksek öğrenim,  
dilbilim

### Yüksek Öğretimde Türk Dillerinin Sistemleştirme Yoluyla Öğretimi

**Özet:** Bu çalışma, yükseköğretim kurumlarında öğrenim gören öğrencilerin Türk dillerini öğrenme biçimlerinin özelliklerini incelemek için Türkçe sözcük tipolojisini etkileyen faktörleri incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Araştırmada varsayımsal-tümdengelimli, taramalı ve karşılaştırmalı bir yöntem kullanılmıştır. Sonuçlar, öğrencilerin sözlü söylemi yapılandırma zorlandıklarını ve parçaları yapılandırılmış bir sistem çerçevesinde bütünleştiremediklerini göstermekte ve bu yüzden iletişimde tutarlı bir akıcılık sağlayamadıklarını göstermiştir. Sonuçlar aynı zamanda Türkçe kelime ve ifadelerin sistemleştirilmesinin, benzerlik Doğu Akdeniz ve Asya'daki sayısız dilin öğretiminde de etkili olabileceğini göstermektedir. Sonuç olarak çalışmanın bulguları öğretmenlerin dilsel ve pedagojik etkinliklerle kelime ve ifadeleri sistematik bir şekilde sınıflandırarak Türk dillerini öğrenme ve öğretmeye katkıda bulunabileceğini ortaya koymaktadır.

**To Cite This Article:** Sarbalina, A., Suleimenova, Z., Ashinova, K., Belassarova, Z., Kassym, B., & Koblanova, A. (2024). Systematization of the teaching of the Turkic languages in higher education. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 18(1), 37–47. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10986647>

## 1. Introduction

The term “Turkic” is not a specific ethnic group but refers to a community of tribes mainly speaking the same language, as they all belong to the same language family. That means that the Turkic ethnic group and the Turkic-speaking group are two different categories because not all Turkic linguistic types in modern times are their descendants or share a common history and culture; their geographical range extends from western China to the Balkans. It is part of the Altaic branch of the Ural-Altaic languages. Turkic languages form a family of closely related languages spoken from Turkey and Eastern Europe to Central Asia, where the dialects of the Turkic branch are very similar to each other, as in Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan and Tajikistan. Owing to internal and external factors in the history and modern views of Turkic studies, the discipline of Turkic linguistics has achieved remarkable results, but there is still a wide field for development because the aspects of learning how to classify terms of current languages are poorly understood.

The systematic research and affirmation of the language in Turkic studies form a solid basis and broad perspective for teaching. The development of linguistics has been the subject of review by various researchers (Chugayeva *et al.*, 2019; Zhanzhigitov *et al.*, 2022), who emphasize the special features of teaching languages as a scientific endeavor. Researchers such as Khatun (2019) and Zamora-Polo and Sanchez-Martin (2019) emphasize the general understanding that the formation of terminology for each language is an organic part of the history of its style. This does not cause serious arguing in teaching. However, other forms of thinking, such as scientific, artistic, and journalistic styles, are mostly universal, and this generates a certain contradiction and discomfort between the versatility of terminology systematization and the folklore nature of the scientific style. The development and change in society require a constant adjustment of the teacher’s vocabulary to meet the needs of students and fulfill the social function of language effectively. The development and evolution of Turkic languages in history closely mirror the social changes of the era. Social development, national integration, production, and changing lifestyles of Turkic peoples in the Middle Ages are internal factors in the development and evolution of their vocabulary. Because Turkic is an agglutinative language based on a system of suffixes and infixes added to the root of words, it lets to express many meanings in several words, and its grammar usually has no exceptions and no grammatical gender. However, the current topic has attracted little attention from contemporary researchers.

The different forms of this language family share very similar characteristics in the systemization of phonetics, grammar, and vocabulary terms so that most speakers can communicate without translation. Shazia and Kiazai (2022) and Davari *et al.* (2019) emphasize that the Turkic language family is widespread in the vast territory of the Caucasus in the West, Eastern Siberia in the east, the Arabian Peninsula in the south, and the Novosibirsk region in the north. Therefore, Turkic studies have identified Turks as one of the main components of the Central Asian nation. One of the essential characteristics of the languages in these areas is the presence of terminological units characterized by a high level of text specialization and terminological density and their intense use in the teaching or learning of Turkic studies. As the degree of specialization decreases, the discourse acquires the features of a non-specialized context, where semantically, there are conceptual variations, redundancy, ambiguity, and lack of strict precision. The terminological units within the language’s grammar are phonology, morphology, vocabulary, sentence, and textual syntax. However, in the teaching process, this system should include formal rules and conditions and some cognitive and pragmatic elements to keep the specificity of the classification of

terminological units because the Turkic language has a long history and contains many dialects that demand further research by scholars. Hence, the study aims to analyze the factors influencing the typology of Turkic words and to explore the specifics of the way students learn Turkic languages in higher education establishments.

## 2. Methods

The methodological basis of the study followed a hypothetic-deductive, survey, and comparative method. At the analysis stage of the research results, the hypothetic-deductive method involved highlighting basic information regarding the systematization of Turkic language terms in teaching to test hypotheses, compared with the facts of Turkic-speaking peoples' classification. Its characteristic traits were formulation of hypotheses, verification of assertions, and validation of information regarding the ways of teaching Turkic languages in an educational environment by higher education institutions. At the stage of formulating initial judgments, the current method relied on a survey to rule out most hypotheses and confirm some of them. The authors used the hypothetic-deductive method to investigate the classification data of Turkic language terms and prioritize the outcome. The current research method helped record and discover the behavior of a small group of teachers. It examined their situation and methods of teaching Turkic languages based on real-life events, as well as the specific features of the systematization of terms used in Turkic studies.

The survey method took place in two phases throughout September 2022, involving 24 teachers from the Department of Turkic Studies of the various higher education institutions in the Republic of Kazakhstan, such as Al-Farabi Kazakh National University (Almaty), L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University (Astana), and Kazakh National Women's Teacher Training University (Almaty). This method helped to enrich the information obtained from the structured data collection with the teacher, conducted with a high level of approach in two sessions, during three hours in a reserved room and in a relaxed and reflexive environment. Subsequently, the information on teaching Turkic languages to students and the special features of the systematization of terms was reorganized and managed in the following steps: narrative preparation, labeling of information, and data reduction through the classification of linguistic units. The authors identified the main categories of the educational analysis in the first phase of the survey and the sub-categories of structuring the Turkic terms in the context of Turkic studies. They were later emphasized in the second phase of data collection, and both the information collected and the research objectives were separated through the deductive process and naturalistic concepts. This procedure helped to classify the raw information by presenting it with appropriate labelling and coding. Following these mechanisms, the survey method helped to systematize information about teaching by its categorizing.

The comparative method helped compare the educational aspects of Turkic language studies in higher education at the step of discussion. Similarly, the authors conducted the data analysis based on the researchers' submissions supported by substantial textual evidence to ensure consistent results. Moreover, the authors presented, commented on, and discussed the study's results at the final stage of data comparison on teaching Turkic languages to students. This exchange provided greater validity to the conclusions reached. Using the comparative methodology, and the authors carried out multiple triangulations of results based on data collection and processing. In addition, the authors discussed the issue to demonstrate contrastive findings. The resulting category system created with data collected on the classification of Turkic-speaking terms has presented a direct connection to the study

objectives. Each of the sub-headings of the discussion extracted by sub-categories has deepened the data on the structure of educational institutions based on the analytical comparison.

### 3. Results

According to the principles of historical geography, the modern Turkic languages can be systematized as follows: the south-eastern linguistic branch, including Uzbek, Uighur, and West Uighur. The southwestern linguistic branch includes Turkmen, Gagauz, Salar, Crimean Tatar, Azeri, and similar dialects in Iran. The north-western languages include Kyrgyz, Kazakh, Karakalpak, Nogai, Kalmyk, Bashkir, Tatar, Karaim, Karachi and Balkar. The north-eastern branch includes Tuva, Khakasia, Altai, Yakutsk, and Harai used in Iran. Harai spoken in Iran differs significantly from other Turkic languages; Chuvash is considerably distanced from other Turkic languages by many ancient features. The Turkic-speaking ethnic groups mainly use the Arabic alphabet (McEnroe-Petitte & Farris, 2020). Before the early 1920s, various Turkic-speaking ethnic groups in the Soviet Union began to introduce the Latin alphabet. After 1939, the Latin alphabet was entirely replaced by the Cyrillic alphabet. Only Turkic-speaking peoples in China, Afghanistan, Iran, and other Arab countries still use the Arabic alphabet. The distinctive feature of the Turkic language classification is the vowel sounds. The vowels are of two types: front-row ([e], [i], [ü]) and back-row vowels ([a], [o], [u]). Turkic terms contain either only front-row vowels or only back-row vowels. All suffixes and additional components should be compatible with the vowel of the preceding syllable in the word. The morphological changes are mainly based on the adhesive method, i.e. suffixes are used to express grammatical concepts while independent words are rarely used. There are no relative pronouns but many verbs, participles, and gerunds (Burroughs et al., 2020).

Turkic linguistic terminology is characterized by a combination of systematic and hybrid methods, which in turn create challenges and opportunities for research and terminology-making practices and make the integration of interdisciplinary theory inevitable in teaching activity. The widespread distribution of Islam after the 10<sup>th</sup> century and the influence of foreign cultures are external conditions to the evolution of Turkic vocabulary. Old Turkic words inherited from the Middle Ages have undergone some changes in form and meaning. From Central Asia, Turkic words and expressions have appeared in the Mediterranean area since the Middle Ages. Today, they are spoken in Anatolia, the Caucasus, parts of Iran, and across Central Asia, up to China. There are also Turkic-speaking groups in all countries bordering the Black Sea, from Bulgaria to Moldova and Ukraine. Sometimes, Turkic languages come together with Mongolian in the category of Altaic languages, but today, the similarities between the two groups rely on loanwords rather than common vocabulary. Almost all Turkic languages of Europe, Anatolia, and West Asia, reaching as far as China, are so similar that communication between them is possible, although different spellings are standardized, and grammatical variants exist (Nahardani et al., 2022). Only Kazakhs and Kyrgyz seem to have distanced themselves a little more.

The main difference between the Turkic languages' philological subgroups is their pronunciation. The most common is the grouping of Turkish, Azeri, Gagauz, Turkmen, and Kashkai as Oguz languages, in contrast to Kipchak languages, which cover variants spoken in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and the North Caucasus, while Uzbek belongs to the third branch of the Karluk branch. The most common Turkic language is certainly Turkish. The other is Azerbaijani, also widespread in north-western Iran (Nahardani et al., 2022). The variants of Turkish spoken in Syria and Iraq, known as Turkmen, bear a strong resemblance

to Anatolian Turkish, although the Iraqi variant is also sometimes classified as a dialect of Azeri (Arikan *et al.*, 2017). Very similar to Azerbaijani is Kashkai, spoken in central and southern Iran, and Gagauz, preserved in Romania, as well as Crimean Tatar, which is very similar to Turkish. Kipchak variants include Kazakh and Kyrgyz in Central Asia and several more minor languages in the North Caucasus: Kumyk or Kumuko in the Russian Autonomous Republic of Dagestan, Nogai in the same area, and Karachai-Balkar situated further to the West. Urum, spoken in some villages in the Donetsk Basin in Ukraine, is sometimes added to these languages, but it seems to be just a variant of Crimean Tatar. It is also used by Turkic speakers in Georgia, although their language corresponds to Anatolian Turkish (Salimova & Sabitova, 2019).

Turkic languages are agglutinating, i.e. certain morphemes for place, time, pronouns, and related persons are added one after another at the end of a word, sometimes lengthening it considerably. In some cases, when negation is used, they are inserted between two syllables of the word itself. This feature, unknown to Indo-European or Afro-Asiatic languages, means that Turkic is often considered difficult to learn and teach in higher education. Among the most characteristic features of Turkic languages is the presence of eight vowels, divided into two blocks: [a], [i], [o], [u] and their equivalents: [e], [ï], [ö], [ü]. The vowel harmony requires that only vowels from the same block are used in a word, which requires adaptation of suffixes. For example, the plural of “kuş” (bird) would be “kuş-lar” and from “göl” (lake) “göl-ler”. As Turkic languages do not have spelling, they have used many alphabets throughout history. The Arabic alphabet was used in Anatolia until 1928, followed by the Latin alphabet; in Azerbaijan, the Arabic alphabet was used until 1929, the Latin alphabet until 1939, and the Cyrillic alphabet until 1991; later, the Latin alphabet was reintroduced with characteristics like the Turkish version (Onishchuk *et al.*, 2020). The Turkic languages of the North Caucasus still use the Cyrillic alphabet, as does the Urum variant of Tatar.

Regarding grammar teaching, Turkic terms have the morphological characteristics of agglutinative language, where creation and word formation come by adding a suffix to express a particular meaning after the root or base. The basic word order of a sentence is subject-object-verb. Although vowel harmony is a general law in Turkic languages, it is not precisely homogenous, and many inconsistencies exist. The relative vowel system mostly remained, but in Uighur, the ancient opposition between [i] has disappeared, merged into one phoneme [i] and produced the associated sound [A] and [e], assimilated or weakened under certain conditions (Nghiem-Phu & Nguyen, 2022). A vowel-compatible system supports only three sets: [a], [o], [y], while both [i] and [e] have a middle line in vowel harmony. In Kazakh, a new phoneme [e] is added; in Kyrgyz and Tuvan, the vowels are long; in Salar, the vowels are stricter. For example, “emek” (donkey) “moermek”, where the back-row vowels are in harmony, but in “apple”, “alma”, “green”, “yaşıl” (green), there is a loss in vowel harmony. The characteristics of the ancient root sounds [g], [k], and [ɣ] combined with front and back row vowels, respectively, have disappeared in many languages, as each of them has absorbed many loanwords (Hirsh *et al.*, 2022). Therefore, [r] and [l] appeared at the beginning of the word, and the other voiced sounds began to appear at the end of the word. From a grammatical perspective, Turkic languages retain agglutinative language characteristics. However, the noun domain suffix in Salaric no longer distinguishes between singular and plural. For example, “atɑ”, “anɑ”. Regarding vocabulary, the ancient elements of Turkic languages in the West constitute a large adoption percentage of loanwords from Chinese, Mongolian, Tibetan, Arabic, Persian, and Russian (Krulatz, 2019).

In sum, 21 out of 24 teachers turned to this culture and language for their motivation. By addressing the difficulties students encounter in learning a language, it is important to highlight two of the most common problems in acquiring Turkic language skills. Firstly, the syntax is subject + object + verb (SOV). As can be seen, word order is complex. This means that the mother tongue creates structures that resist various changes. Secondly, comprehension of written texts and vocabulary is initially difficult for the student who has to structure the sentence after reading in different ways and add suffixes that change the meaning of the sentences. In turn, 19 out of 24 respondents who teach Turkic believe that the most challenging words for students to understand are long words formed with several suffixes. Besides, some sentences have independent postpositions in addition to words with several suffixes. During the systematization of terms, authors observe the same problem with sentence structuring and difficulties in pronunciation, accent, and intonation because there are no specific phonemes in the Turkic language.

As the Turkic population has lived with neighboring ethnic groups for a long time, it is difficult to separate their languages. On the one hand, the Turkic language family has been dramatically influenced by languages such as Chinese, Persian, Arabic, and Russian; on the other hand, the Turkic language family also influences the language of surrounding ethnic groups reaching as far as Southeast Asia, Xinjiang, Russia, and even North America (Li et al., 2019). For instance, the Turkic languages used in present-day China have features from different periods of its development specific to the various regions of China. A respondent survey at the second stage revealed that all 24 teachers consider dictionaries as a tool for reflecting the culture of society, distinctive national features, and details of peoples' lives and activities, which somehow helps to systematize Turkic terms in the educational process of higher education institutions. A total of 21 out of 24 teachers interviewed paid particular attention during their studies to the emergence of bilingual dictionaries of Turkic peoples, their structure, and socio-cultural functions. In the respondents' words, observation and comparison are the main ways of classifying Turkic units. Thus, the sources of contrasting information were bilingual dictionaries of Turkic people, which represent the first experience of perceiving the mental qualities of Turkic peoples, including Tatars, documented in the form of lexical units that objectively assess the user's degree of socio-cultural competence. Bilingual dictionaries serve as a practical tool for teachers to learn another language, obtain verified information, and establish a communicative teaching method.

The comparison of disciplinary terms and knowledge units widely deepens appropriate learning of the organization models, optimizes the association of professional fundamentals, and builds a model system of organization and compilation of terminology by developing terminological splines (Lee-Smith, 2021). By combining theoretical perspectives on the organization of knowledge and contrasting terminology, authors have determined that the systematization of units in the context of teaching focuses on the terms of classic Turkic semantics, describes the features of linguistic terminology in the respective dictionaries, and analyses their limitations. After teachers compared different Turkic teaching texts, they found that, firstly, terminology classification methods have specifics due to different organizational goals, and secondly, the structured learning method helps to improve the accuracy of the description of knowledge units. The related knowledge models spread by comparing subject terms and units from different fields of Turkic linguistics. In addition, terms of special meaning adopt the educational context in the field of teaching by being effectively used within an educational institution, which brings the meaning of the units and their conditions of use.

#### 4. Discussion

According to Djumabaeva and Avazmatova (2022), the general patterns of the Turkic language system constitute the discipline's learning subject without prioritizing any of its regional variants, irrespective of the origins or preferences of the authors of the textbooks and teachers. Thus, in Turkic studies, language is an essential instrument for professional activity, scientific self-development, and an essential tool of contact with other cultures. However, it does not fully consider the systematization and classification of terms when teaching students. Also, among the learning habits and strategies to develop, it is crucial to consider working in pairs and groups and introduce an "outside the classroom" format of contact with Turkic languages to foster closer relationships and reduce tensions in environments where it is not commonly used. The authors imply the natural precedence of oral language use over its written forms by using a communicative method to develop knowledge, skills, and habits. This would engage effective and appropriate communication by accepting and negotiating messages contained in acts of communication through verbal and non-verbal language. Translation into the mother tongue is a natural resource in any conscious attempt to appropriate another language, applied whenever possible to indicate its structural or semantic differences and equivalence. However, it should be said that it limits fluency in message processing and serves as a more complex and self-targeted additional skill, emphasizing the structuring problems of language units when comparing research results.

According to Sun (2022), the teaching of foreign languages, particularly Turkic languages, as a social phenomenon was not set apart from various transformations that have taken place around the world in recent years. The educational systems have, therefore, undergone changes, innovations, transformations, and improvements, especially in higher education institutions, which have directly involved study projects, their content, and the discipline's teaching and learning process. It is not enough to understand and pronounce sentences in a specific context; developing basic Turkic language skills is mandatory. The critical features are listening and reading comprehension, together with oral and written expression, followed by the necessary professional skills in the discipline. There are reasons related to the globalization of the world that respond to the linguistic markets for effective language teaching behind this growing interest in improving the methods of communication skills. These reasons are sociolinguistic, closely linked to migratory movements and international relations, as well as reasons of a technical nature, such as the ability to systematize, store, and process the language use, driven by the logical need to know more about this area of social behavior and human knowledge. After all, revealing the history of teaching Turkic linguistics indirectly influences the formation of external and internal social and cultural factors that create the current conditions for the advancement of the people of the Republic of Kazakhstan in the field of philology and Turkic studies. The comparison of the results of the work and the author's data confirms the fact that the teaching and classification of Turkic languages are stipulated, on the one hand, by different historical periods and, on the other hand, by the uneven development of different nations within the context of different times.

Marull and Kumar (2020) believe that one of the current challenges of teaching Turkic languages is to save and preserve the cultural identity of the people who use the language as their mother tongue. Knowledge and protection of the specific features and customs of Turkic studies constitute the urgent need to systematize the terms, using productive and modern methodologies to create and reinforce differences and similarities in Turkic languages to develop a rational educational environment in higher education institutions. The authors emphasize the importance of teaching a foreign language by considering the nations'

traditions and cultural, geographical, and political features, which influence its structure from within in one way or another. This kind of teaching process in higher education establishments focuses on making students perceive the language as a tool for communication, to learn how to use Turkic languages outside the classroom, in different scenarios, reinforcing the psychological factors influencing the study of Turkic studies and offering opportunities for reflection and social interaction. The interactive didactics and systematization of Turkic languages, when comparing the researchers' data and the results of current work, confirm that the teaching-learning process acts as an interactive development of a reflective and social nature, requiring both attention to content and classification of Turkic speakers and the formation of the aspects of socialization and cooperation. The structuring process engages students to expand their skills in classifying terms and language units, adopting and using communication skills in their future professional lives.

According to Wang (2019), the pedagogical core of the systematization of Turkic terms in the learning process constitutes uninterrupted improvement and development of the methodology of teaching Turkic studies at all stages of its educational evolution. This process is characterized by some linguistic and social tools while creating the basis for cultural and linguistic competence, stating that the use of languages has a clear expression in its pragmatic scope. In general, when learning a foreign language, the main obstacles for the students arise from the teaching style and didactic method of teaching, which makes it difficult to perceive all the linguistic aspects of Turkic nations. Despite the great variety and innovative methodologies that appeal to students, their use and implementation in higher education is not frequent. As a result, when comparing research data, the author observes that the pedagogical strategies used in Turkic language teaching ascend to traditional methodologies based on the development of routine didactic activities supported by the official language and the inclusion of a scarce variety of resources and capacities classifying terms by geographical features. The author emphasizes supporting tasks that develop linguistic, sociolinguistic, and discursive competencies. It is essential to pay particular attention to pedagogical strategies that improve the communicative approach through timely planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation so that learners can adequately express themselves by structuring basic language units according to the geographical features of Turkic-speaking peoples.

Ensuring that higher education institutions align their curriculum with the professional demands of the workforce is paramount (Zorba et al., 2021). Consequently, synchronizing objectives through joint participation facilitates students' readiness, predisposition and success and also helps them perform well in their jobs (Freiermuth & Huang, 2021). In addition, it requires reliable and appropriate sources of information, defined as effective as possible in the process of systematizing the terms. The Turkic Department classes should focus on the grammatical aspects of languages, emphasizing memorizing verbs and acquiring vocabulary. The authors report that these classroom practices mainly used the manuscript format through numerous and repetitive exercises. Teaching Turkic languages continues to be one of the "unresolved subjects" of didactics. The recent decades have offered methodological options to prioritize communicative objectives over information on language functioning, but even this has not significantly led to improved results. The number and timeliness of digital resources alone do not increase the effectiveness of language learning (Ivanova & Dimova-Severinova, 2021; Johnson & Sdunzik, 2023; Maja, 2023; Makeleni et al., 2023). Their contribution will be valuable only based on careful didactic planning and the time spent by individuals and learning types and styles (Ece et al., 2023; Mdodana-Zide & Mafugu, 2023; Wu et al., 2023). It should genuinely consider the cognitive nature of Turkic



studies and its representatives. Alongside this reality, a teacher of Turkic languages should come as an informed, critical, and highly qualified professional.

## 5. Conclusion

The study established that the described characteristics, contributions, and connections to the study and systematization of Turkic languages serve as an approach traditionally used in linguistic work, where the terms and resources of Turkic studies integrate information about Turkic-speaking nations through cooperation and application of interdisciplinary knowledge. The abovementioned limitations and problems of classifying language units contribute to reflecting on changes in the criteria pre-determined by traditional teaching methods. However, despite the development of Turkic studies, few research papers explore the reality and state of this educational field. There is a need for valid and reliable knowledge that explains trends and clearly defines the teaching profile in the country. The perceptions of the effectiveness and usability of different higher education practices vary according to the needs and goals of students (Zorba, 2023). These variations also depend on language, culture and experience. The set of methods for teaching Turkic languages can be seen as a radical reaction to the traditional methods of grammar, translation, and audio-lingual modes. However, these extreme methodologies also have flaws due to the complete exclusion of the traditional study of Turkic-speaking term structure.

Authors have established that even under immersion, the learners whose second language experiences do not include negative feedback or formal grammar instruction demonstrate outstanding comprehension abilities after learning Turkic studies. However, they are pretty prone to errors in the reproduction of language units. The meaningful contexts of communicative activities with material that learners understand are still necessary for mastering Turkic languages, but this requires periodic and timely inclusion of distinctive information about language structures. The classroom activities should be communicative, allowing students to use language to their advantage. Nevertheless, these actions should adopt the correct use of grammar, the specific application of certain forms and units, and be classified in terms of meaning and socio-communicative use. There is a continuous process of improvement and development in the lexical-terminological layer of the language. After analysing teachers' active participation in the process of systematizing Turkic terms to teach students, the goals achieved can be observed. Tracing their mastering and origin is one of the keen issues of linguistics. Determining the degree of mastery of Turkic terms requires teachers to do further severe research in linguistic and pedagogical activities.

## References

- Arikan, A., Varli, O., & Kürüm., E. Y. (2017). A study of Assyrians' language use in Istanbul. *Sustainable Multilingualism*, 10(1), 56–74. <https://doi.org/10.1515/sm-2017-0003>
- Burroughs, N., Jacqueline, G., Youngjun, L., Siwen, G., Israel, T., Kimberly, J., & William, S. (2020). *Teaching for excellence and equity, Analyzing teacher characteristics, Behaviors and Student outcomes with TIMSS*. Amsterdam: IEA.
- Chugayeva, T., Fattakhova, A., & Yuzmukhametov, R. (2019). East is East, West is West: The experience of linguistic culturological description and teaching of multi-structural languages. *ARPHA Proceedings*, 1, 893–905.
- Davari, M., Noursalehi, P., & Keramati, A. (2019). Data mining approach to professional education market segmentation: A case study. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 29(1), 45–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08841241.2018.1545724>

- Djumabaeva, J. S., & Avazmatova, M. M. (2022). Categorization of foreign language teaching approaches and methods. *International Journal of Social Science Research and Review*, 5(5), 341–346.
- Dominguez, A., Truyol, M. E., & Zavala, G. (2019). Professional development program to promote active learning in an engineering classroom. *IJEE*, 35, 424–433.
- Ece, C., Balkan, O. & Dincer, N. (2023). Immersive virtual reality in tertiary level EFL education: A systematic review of recent applications. *Innovational Research in ELT*, 4(2), 59–69. <https://doi.org/10.29329/irelt.2023.623.6>
- Freiermuth, M. R., & Huang, H. (2021). Zooming across cultures: Can a telecollaborative video exchange between language learning partners further the development of intercultural competences? *Foreign Language Annals*, 54, 185–206.
- Hirsh, A., Nilholm, C., Roman, H., Forsberg, E., & Sundberg, D. (2022). Reviews of teaching methods- which fundamental issues are identified? *Education Inquiry*, 13(1), 1–20.
- Ivanova G., & Dimova-Severinova D. M. (2021). The role of happiness in applying suggestopedia and fostering the language learning process. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 12(4), 365–383.
- Johnson, C., & Sdunzik, J. (2023). Introduction to special issue: Re-imagining teaching and learning in the context of current crises. *Research in Educational Policy and Management*, 5(1), i–iii. <https://doi.org/10.46303/repam.2023.1>
- Khatun, M. M. (2019). A critical review of Sibel Tatar's article "Why keep silent? The classroom participation experiences of non-native English-speaking students." *International Journal of Linguistics*, 7(2), 35–39. <https://doi.org/10.15640/ijlc.v7n2a1>
- Krulatz, A. (2019). Content-based instruction in teacher education: Re-shaping pre-service teachers' beliefs about language teaching. *ELTED Journal*, 22, 9–16.
- Lee-Smith, A. (2021). Making interdisciplinary connections in the advanced-level Korean language curriculum: Designing content-based project modules. *The Journal of the National Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages*, 30, 1–47.
- Li, S., Hiver, P., & Papi, M. (2019). Research initiatives in the foreign and second language education program in Florida State University: Multiple perspectives, multiples approaches. *Language Teaching*, 52(4), 537–541. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444819000259>
- Maja, M. (2023). Teachers' perceptions of integrating technology in rural primary schools to enhance the teaching of English first additional language. *Journal of Curriculum Studies Research*, 5(1), 95–112. <https://doi.org/10.46303/jcsr.2023.8>
- Makeleni, S., Mutongoza, B., & Linake, M. (2023). Language education and artificial intelligence: An exploration of challenges confronting academics in global south universities. *Journal of Culture and Values in Education*, 6(2), 158–171. <https://doi.org/10.46303/jcve.2023.14>
- Marull, C., & Kumar, S. (2020). Authentic language learning through telecollaboration in online courses. *TechTrends*, 64(4), 628–635. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-020-00488-2>
- McEnroe-Petitte, D., & Farris, C. (2020). Using gaming as an active teaching strategy in nursing education. *Teaching and Learning in Nursing*, 15(1), 61–65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.teln.2019.09.002>
- Mdodana-Zide, L., & Mafugu, T. (2023). An interventive collaborative scaffolded approach with a writing center on ESL students' academic writing. *Journal of Culture and Values in Education*, 6(2), 34–50. <https://doi.org/10.46303/jcve.2023.7>
- Nahardani, S. Z., Rastgou, S. M., Mirmoghtadaie, Z., & Keshavarzi, M. H. (2022). The hidden curriculum in online education based on systematized review. *Shiraz E-Medicine Journal*, 23(4), 96–103. <https://doi.org/10.5812/semj.105445>

- Nghiem-Phu, B., & Nguyen, T. H. (2022). University lecturers' use of active teaching methods: a segmentation study concerning trust, empowerment, thinking styles and emotional intelligence. *Journal of Asian Business and Economic Studies*, 29(3), 189–204. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JABES-05-2020-0057>
- Onishchuk, I., Ikonnikova, M., Antonenko, T., Kharchenko, I., Shesstakova, S., Kuzmenko, N., & Maksymchuk, B. (2020). Characteristics of foreign language education in foreign countries and ways of applying foreign experience in pedagogical universities of Ukraine. *Romanian Magazine for Multidimensional Education*, 12(3), 44–65. <https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/12.3/308>
- Salimova, D., & Sabitova, A. (2019). Problems of choosing the main language in a bilingual society of national regions. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 10(2), 74–90.
- Shazia, A., & Kiazai, A. N. (2022). A study to find out the teaching methods in secondary schools of Zarghoon town, Quetta. *Journal of Quranic and Social Studies*, 2(1), 68–86.
- Sun, H. (2022). Status quo of foreign language teaching based on multimedia equipment-assisted teaching. *Academic Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 5(2), 112–121.
- Wang, L. (2019). The enlightenment of management teaching method of Queensland University of Technology. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(4), 63–69.
- Wu, W.-C., Yang, C.-H., & Turner, M. (2023). Exploring the interdisciplinary relationship between music and language for enhanced bilingual curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies Research*, 5(3), 96–112. <https://doi.org/10.46303/jcsr.2023.33>
- Zamora-Polo, F., & Sanchez-Martin, J. (2019). Teaching for a better world, sustainability, and sustainable development goals in the construction of a change-maker university. *Sustainability*, 11(15), 4224. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11154224>
- Zhanzhigitov, S., Abdualiuly, B., Doszhan, R., Serikbayeva, Z., Aigul, M., & Balzhan, Y. (2022). The problem of systematization of terms in Turkic languages and technologies of teaching at universities. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, 17(4), 1077–1089.
- Zorba, M. G. (2023). A text-based approach to developing EFL learners' intercultural awareness in higher education. *Turkish Journal of Education*, 12(2), 106–121. <https://doi.org/10.19128/turje.1186875>
- Zorba, M. G., Zamisheva, G., & Rakhimbekova, V. A. (2021). A comparison of the curricula of English philology departments in Kazakhstan and Turkey. *Bulletin of the Dulaty University*, 4, 63–71. Retrieved from <http://journals.dulaty.kz/images/vipusk/dulaty/63-71-rahimbekova.pdf>