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Foreword

Kazakhstan is an important Central Asian country whose cultural, political, military, and economic potential is enhanced by its historical background. Being the ninth largest country in the world by area and quite rich in underground resources, Kazakhstan has come to the fore regionally and internationally due to its increasing international influence. In addition, the Kazakh language and culture have drawn considerable interest, particularly in the last 25 years.

Despite its ethnic, religious and linguistic diversity, Kazakhstan has succeeded in preserving peace and political stability within its borders. Peace, harmony, and dialogue among the cultures and languages of Kazakhstan is a noteworthy example for the rest of the world. Being intrigued by Kazakh language and culture, academics from around the world have studied it from various aspects. The Institute of Oriental Studies at Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, is an institution where Kazakh is taught at undergraduate and graduate levels within the curriculum of Turkology. In addition to the teaching of Kazakh, various dimensions of Kazakh culture and the cultures of Central Asian peoples are taught at our institute.

In 2019, we celebrated the 10th anniversary of the Section of Kazakh Studies. It was originally part of the Department of Asian Studies, but in 2020 it was merged with the Department of Oriental Studies, which is now known as the Institute of Oriental Studies. Since its inception, a number of studies on the Kazakh language and culture have been published and twenty-five undergraduate and master’s theses on numerous subjects related to Kazakh language, culture, and society have been defended. We have also hosted many scholarly and social events. The ongoing collaboration between our department and Kazakh universities and research institutions plays a key role in supporting our educational and therefore cultural partnership. Unfortunately, due to the new Polish education law coming into force this year and the subsequent new university regulations, the Kazakh Section has been incorporated into the Department of Turkic Studies, though teaching and research continue.
This book consists of articles that approach Kazakh language and culture from different aspects, such as linguistics, culture, education, and law. One article is devoted to political issues. We hope that the studies in this book offer valuable insights and contribute to future research.

We would like to sincerely thank our fellows İşıl Atlı, Dana Suleimen and Henryk Jankowski for their contributions to this book. Last but not least, we thank the director of our institute, Estera Żeromska, and the dean of our faculty, Aldona Sopata, for financing the publication costs.

*The editors*
Henryk Jankowski reads a paper at the conference “10 Years of the Section of Kazakh Studies”, 2018 (photo: Gulayhan Aqtay)

Turkology students perform a play at a Nawryz feast, 2015 (photo: Jakub Jakusik)
A group of Bolashaq scholarship holders hosted by staff members of the Section of Kazakh Studies, 2011 (photo: Gulayhan Aqtay)

Qarajorga dance performed during a folk festival in North Kazakhstan at the foothills of the Altai mountains, 2009 (photo: Gulayhan Aqtay)
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Ten Years of the Section of Kazakh Studies in Poznań

Abstract: The aim of this article is to outline the history of the Section of Kazakh Studies at Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań. The teaching of Kazakh as a foreign language began in 2002, when Kazakh and Turkish became the bedrock of the 5-year-long MA programme at the Section of Turkology. Even after the university’s integration in the Bologna process (three years of BA studies and two years of MA studies), its role remained unchanged. The purpose of this article is to familiarise the reader with the Section of Kazakh Studies by describing its history, curriculum, teaching staff, research, publications, activities, and collaborations with other institutions.
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1. Background

When the Section of Turkic Studies (formerly the Section of Turkic, Mongolian and Korean Studies) was established, its initiator envisioned that Central Asia, Kazakhstan, and the Kazakh language in particular would become the main distinguishing features of Turkology in Poznań. The teaching of Kazakh as a foreign language started when the programme was launched in 2002. Since then, the Kazakh language has played a very important role in the curriculum, enabling students to acquaint themselves with another Turkic language besides Turkish.

In the collections of our university library, there are a multitude of publications on the culture, history, language, and literature of Kazakhstan and other Central Asian countries. In addition to publications in Polish, it is also possible to find books and journals in Kazakh, English, Russian, German, and other languages.

After several years of work, the efforts of Gulayhan Aqtay (the first teacher of Kazakh) and Henryk Jankowski yielded results, and on 21 April 2009, the Section of Kazakh Studies was founded at the Faculty of Modern Languages and Literatures.
and Literatures. Gulayhan Aqtay served as the head of the section until 2018, after which Cem Erdem was appointed to this position. The section focused on research projects related to the Kazakh language, literature, culture, and the promotion thereof. We also take an interest in the history, society, and politics of modern Kazakhstan.

2. Lectures and courses

As mentioned above, Kazakh has been taught as a second Turkic language since the Section of Turkic, Mongolian and Korean Studies was established. Initially, it was taught as a part of Practical Central Asian Turkic Language, which was one of the courses in the curriculum of long-cycle studies. It was offered four times a week during the first four years of the programme, which added up to 240 hours per year. In the fifth and final year, 30 hours were allocated to this course. Descriptive grammar of the Kazakh language was taught separately as part of Grammar of a Central Asian Turkic Language, which helped our students understand the issues related to the structure of Turkic languages. The first groups of students enrolled in the programme were fortunate enough to participate in classes conducted by native speakers only, which brought very good results.

After our university joined the Bologna process, the 5-year-long MA programme was transformed into two independent undergraduate and graduate programmes. The teaching of Kazakh continued, but the number of class hours was reduced to 450 hours (over six semesters) at undergraduate level and 90 hours (over three semesters) at graduate level. In the 2012/2013 academic year, the names of the courses were changed to Practical Kazakh and Kazakh Grammar (three semesters). Also, Kazakh for Specific Purposes (3 semesters, 90 hours) was introduced at graduate level to familiarise students with the language used in professional domains, such as the language of banking, business or administration. In the 2014/2015 academic year, Practical Kazakh was introduced in the second semester of the undergraduate level and was taught for the remaining five semesters, but it is now only a 390-hour course due to the addition of Society in Central Asia to the programme. This course is also partially taught in the Kazakh language.

In addition to the aforementioned language classes, the programme includes other courses related to Kazakh culture and history. For example, Central Asian Culture is taught in the first year of the undergraduate level. The History and Culture of Central Asia was also offered in the programme until the 2012/2013 academic year. The History of Central Asia was added to the programme as an elective course in the 2014/2015 academic year and is still a part of the curriculum, but in practice students prefer History of Turkey, which is the alternative course.
3. Staff members

The founding head of the Section of Kazakh Studies, Gulayhan Aqtay (since 2002), played a significant role in opening the section and has been a faculty member since its foundation. We have also had other staff members from Kazakhstan: Damira Beysenova (2004–2005), Gulzhan Bakayeva (2005–2006), and Bibigul Khalykova (2006–2009).

Between 2009–2010, Zuzanna Grzywacz, one of our graduate students, worked as a member of the teaching staff. She was followed by Karol Wojciechowicz (2010–2012), Luiza Banach (2012–2013), and Katarzyna Stefaniak-Rak (2011–2019). Since October 2013, the Practical Kazakh and Kazakh Grammar courses have been delivered by Jakub Jakusik, another graduate student of Turkology. At present, the head of the Section of Kazakh Studies is Cem Erdem. At present, we are assisted by Dana Suleimen, a doctoral student at the Section of Turkic Studies, who also teaches practical Kazakh.

4. Cooperation with Polish and International Institutions and Scholars

Since the very beginning of the Section of Turkic Studies and the Section of Kazakh Studies, we have been active in many fields. On 25 October 2008, the First Subjective Review of Kazakh Cinema took place as part of the Offelidada Festival in the city of Gniezno thanks to the efforts of our students Luiza Banach, Zuzanna Grzywacz, and the Turkology staff. Two film directors from Kazakhstan were invited to this event. On 28 and 29 October 2008, the Greater Poland-Kazakhstan Economic Forum was held in Poznań. During this event, two academic staff members from the Section of Turkic Studies, Henryk Jankowski and Gulayhan Aqtay, delivered lectures on The Transformation of Kazakh Society and Kazakh savoir vivre, respectively. Besides, our students Radosław Andrzejewski and Zuzanna Grzywacz gave a joint presentation entitled Tourist Attractions in Kazakhstan.

We have been cooperating with academic centres in Kazakhstan for many years. Under both intergovernmental agreements and inter-university bilateral agreements, we welcome students and lecturers almost every year. In April 2010, Guliya Piraliyeva, the Dean of the Faculty of Philology at Kazakh National Women’s Pedagogical University in Almaty, visited us and delivered a speech on The Situation of Contemporary Kazakh Literature. In December 2010, a discussion about Islam in independent Kazakhstan (Kazakh Folk Islam, Contemporary Religious Views) was held with the participation of lecturers from Aqtöbe State University: Zhanna Tektigul, Aqmonshaq Tilew, Bagiyla Muratbek, Gulshat Qondybay, and Aray Omarova, a researcher at Ahmet Baytursynuly Institute of Linguistics of the
Kazakh Academy of Sciences. In March 2011, we hosted a meeting with Amanqos Mekteptegi (*Contemporary Kazakh Media*), a senior lecturer at the Faculty of Journalism at Al-Farabi Kazakh National University in Almaty. In April 2011, a meeting took place with Aydin Sahamanov, film director and lecturer at the Kazakh Academy of Arts in Almaty (*Kazakh Modern Arts. The Main Problems of Theatre and Cinema in Kazakhstan*). In June 2012, we hosted Alibi Shapauov, a professor from Sh. Ualikhanov Kokshetau State University. He also attended lectures with our students and delivered a lecture entitled *The Outline of Contemporary Drama Theatre in Kazakhstan*. In February 2018, we welcomed Yerden Kazhybek, the head of the Ahmet Baytursynuly Institute of Linguistics, with whom we discussed bilateral cooperation. Apart from lecturers and researchers from Kazakhstan, we have had the opportunity to host MA and PhD students from Kazakhstan several times. In October 2013, twenty-nine graduate students and one PhD student from Abay (Abai) Kazakh National Pedagogical University in Almaty visited our school. During their stay, with the participation of Dosan Baymolda we organised a debate on Kazakhstan’s transition from the Cyrillic to the Latin alphabet. In spring 2016, seventeen graduate students visited us, and in the fall of the same year another five came (both groups from Abay (Abai) University in Almaty). During their stay, our guests participated in special lectures by Gulayhan Aqtay and Henryk Jankowski. In addition, some of the participants also had the opportunity to teach a class to Polish students as part of practical Kazakh. For example, in 2002, Asqar Abdrahmanov, a student of history at Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, currently at UNESCO, visited us and delivered a talk entitled *A Nation to be Discovered*.

Over the years, our employees also visited universities in Kazakhstan under bilateral agreements. In spring 2015, at the invitation of Sh. Ualikhanov Kokshetau State University, Gulayhan Aqtay conducted classes with MA students and attended seminars and conferences. In the winter of 2016, Gulayhan Aqtay visited Abay (Abai) Kazakh National Pedagogical University in Almaty and gave lectures. In the summer of 2018, another staff member, Jakub Jakusik, together with three Turkology students (Aleksandra Giercuszkiewicz, Zuzanna Krzyżanowska and Mikołaj Gajewski) went to Kazakhstan to attend a Kazakh language and culture summer course at Kazakh Abylay (Ablai) Khan University of International Relations and World Languages, Almaty. The course was organised by the National Agency for Academic Exchange (in Polish, NAWA, Narodowa Agencja Wymiany Akademickiej) as part of a bilateral intergovernmental agreement. During his stay, Mr Jakusik participated in an academic seminar on the alphabet change in Kazakhstan, invited by the Ahmet Baytursynuly Institute of Linguistics of the Kazakh Academy of Sciences. In autumn 2018, Gulayhan Aqtay once again visited Abay (Abai) Kazakh National Pedagogical University, Almaty, where she taught several classes. In the summer of 2019, Mr Jakusik went to Kazakhstan for a summer course of Kazakh language and culture at Kazakh Abylay (Ablai) Khan University, Almaty.
Apart from bilateral cooperation agreements, we were also able to establish cooperation with Abay Kazakh National Pedagogical University in Almaty under the European Erasmus+ Programme. Within this framework, Mr Jakusik conducted classes with Kazakh students in May 2018. In June and November of the same year, we hosted Guldana Seidaliyeva and Gulbanu Kossymova, respectively. We very much hope that the cooperation in this field will continue to develop.

Between 2018 and 2020, an Erasmus+ international education project called EISCAS (Eurasian Insights: Strengthening Central Asian Studies in Europe) was offered at Adam Mickiewicz University as a coordinating institution by Jeroen Bosch. This project aims to improve the quality of teaching Central Asian Studies in cooperation with a number of universities such as Charles University in Prague (Czech Republic), Dublin City University (Republic of Ireland), University of Eastern Finland (Finland), the French Institute for Central Asian Studies (Kyrgyzstan/France), George Washington University (USA), School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London (Great Britain), Universiteit Gent (Belgium), University of Coimbra (Portugal), University of Glasgow (Great Britain) and University of Paris-Sud (France).

Our cooperation is not limited to academic units. For years, we have also paid visits to high schools in Poznań and Swarzędz. Both Gulayhan Aqtay and Jakub Jakusik have taken part in meetings with students, introducing themes related to the language and culture of Kazakhstan.

Our employees also actively participate in conferences in Poland and abroad. The first Polish Turkological Conference in 2007, which took place in Poznań, initiated a series of meetings for the academic community associated with Turkic Studies in Poland. The eighth conference of this series was held in 2017 in Krakow. Our department was also represented at this conference. In November 2018, we organised our own international conference entitled *Language, Literature and Society in Kazakhstan – The Kazakh Context*. The participants included Uli Schamiloglu (University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA/Nazarbayev University, Kazakhstan), Danuta Penkala-Gawęcka (Adam Mickiewicz University, Poland), Gulbanu Kossymova (Abay (Abai) University, Kazakhstan), Saule Tazhibayeva (Gumilov Eurasian National University, Kazakhstan), Henryk Jankowski (Adam Mickiewicz University, Poland), Bakyt Akbuzauova and Meruyert Ibrayeva (Nazarbayev University, Kazakhstan), Raushangul Mukusheva (Szeged University, Hungary), Zhadyra Shaimerdenova (Süleyman Demirel University, Kazakhstan), Gulayhan Aqtay (Adam Mickiewicz University, Poland), Zhainagul Duisebekova (Süleyman Demirel University, Kazakhstan), and Dana Suleimen (Adam Mickiewicz University, Poland).

The activities of Turkology students are also worth mentioning. For years, as part of the Turkology Research Group, with the help of employees of the Section of Turkic Studies and the Section of Kazakh Studies, our students have been
organising the celebration of Nauryz, the Central Asian spring festival. During these celebrations, you can see traditional games, folk dances, listen to Kazakh and Turkish music, as well as try Central Asian dishes prepared by our students. Another interesting initiative that took place thanks to the cooperation between students from the Research Group of Eastern Studies and students from our section was the academic and cultural event Poznań Days of Kazakhstan. This event took place in January 2017 and included lectures, a photo exhibition, film screenings, presentations about Kazakhstan, language workshops, and an introduction to Kazakh dances, music, and cuisine. Among the speakers were Gulayhan Aqtay with Competition of Poets-Singers in Kazakhstan (aytis), and Jakub Jakusik with My trip to Kazakhstan.

5. Research and publications

As is mentioned above, the Section of Kazakh Studies focuses its activities on research projects related to the Kazakh language, literature, culture, and the promotion thereof. Our research also includes history, society, and politics in contemporary Kazakhstan.

In the Section of Turkic Studies and the Section of Kazakh Studies, several books have been written by our employees. The first publication that appeared thanks to the collaboration between Gulayhan Aqtay and our students was a collection of Polish legends and folktales translated into Kazakh (Akhtay 2005, 2nd edition 2007). In 2011, the first Kazakh-Polish dictionary was published (Aqtay and Jankowski 2011). In 2013, a collective work was published on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of Turkology in Poznań, which besides articles on other aspects of Turkic studies also included articles on Kazakh language and literature (Jankowski 2013). In April 2015, two Kazakh textbooks were published. The first one, Kazakh for Beginners, was prepared in English by Gulayhan Aqtay, Zuzanna Grzywacz and Henryk Jankowski (Aqtay, Grzywacz and Jankowski 2015). The second textbook, Kazachski na co dzień (Everyday Kazakh), was written by Gulayhan Aqtay, Katarzyna Stefaniak-Rak and Jakub Jakusik for native speakers of Polish with an intermediate level of Kazakh (Aqtay, Stefaniak-Rak and Jakusik 2015).


Our students’ publications are also noteworthy. One of them was authored by former student and present employee Radosław Andrezewski (Andrzejewski and Pankalla 2008). Another of our students’ important publications is Zuzanna Grzywacz’s MA thesis, written under the supervision of Danuta Penkala-Gawęcka.
This work concerns traditional medicine in Kazakhstan and was published as part of the Turkic Studies series (Grzywacz 2010). Since 2002, our students have defended eight bachelor’s theses and seventeen master’s theses on Kazakhstan and Central Asia, a list of which is attached below with the names of the supervisors. In addition to books and articles, our employees have also authored book reviews on Kazakh studies: Andrzejewski (2011), Aqtay (2014a, 2014b) and Jankowski (2007, 2018). In 2013, two translations were published by Henryk Jankowski: the first is a translation into Polish of Words, which is Abay Qunanbayuly’s most popular work; the second is a Polish translation of a volume that includes poetry by the Kazakh poet Toqtarali Tańzharyq, who was the finalist of the third edition of the Gdańsk European Poet of Freedom Award.

However, not only the Section of Turkic Studies and Section of Kazakh Studies at Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań deal with topics related to Kazakhstan and, in a broader sense, Central Asia. The beginning of Central Asian research dates back to the 1970s and is related to the activities of Zbigniew Jasiewicz, Professor in ethnology (for his bibliography, see Jasiewicz 2004: 25–45). Professor Jasiewicz was the supervisor of a few PhD theses on Central Asia: Marek Gawęcki on social changes in rural areas of Afghanistan (1980), Danuta Penkala-Gawęcka on traditional Afghan medicine (1986), Maria Kośko on Yakut and Kazakh world views in change (1994), and Paweł Jessa on the cult of saints in Uzbekistan and South Kazakhstan (2006). Three of these dissertations were later published in more or less reworked forms, i.e. Gawęcki (1983), Penkala-Gawęcka (1988), and Jessa (2009); for more details see Gawęcki (2007). However, Jasiewicz is mostly interested in Uzbekistan and Afghanistan, although he has published a few articles related to Kazakhstan since 1992. Many articles and a few books on Kazakhstan were published by Gawęcki, Penkala-Gawęcka, and some by Jessa; for more details, see Gawęcki’s bibliography (2007).

In 2004, the Centre for Central Asian Studies was established by the ethnologist Marek Gawęcki at the university; it is currently headed by Ivan Peshkov.
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The New Kazakh Alphabet Based on Latin Script

Abstract: This paper discusses some important issues related to the new Latin alphabet that was adopted for Kazakh in 2017 and modified in 2018. It presents the historical background and outlines the events which led to this script change in independent Kazakhstan. The article describes some typical opinions in the debate on the new alphabet. It also examines the utility and practicality of the alphabet from the viewpoint of the phonetic and phonological structure of Kazakh. The 2017 and 2018 versions as well as the first version of the Latin alphabet from 1928 are shown in the tables.

Keywords: New, Kazakh alphabet, Latin, recent history, discussion

1. Political decisions and their implementation

On 26 October 2017, the President of the Kazakh Republic issued decree № 569, which established a new alphabet for the Kazakh language based on Latin script.1

The new alphabet contained 32 letters:

Table 1. The alphabet of 26 October 2017, the decree of the President of the Kazakh Republic № 569

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Written</th>
<th>Pronounced</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Written</th>
<th>Pronounced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A a</td>
<td>[a]</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>N’ n’</td>
<td>[ŋ], [ŋɡ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A’ a’</td>
<td>[ә]</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>O o</td>
<td>[о]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B b</td>
<td>[б]</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>O’ o’</td>
<td>[ө]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>D d</td>
<td>[д]</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>P p</td>
<td>[р]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>E e</td>
<td>[е]</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Q q</td>
<td>[к]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>F f</td>
<td>[ф]</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>R r</td>
<td>[р]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>G g</td>
<td>[г]</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>S s</td>
<td>[ц]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>G’ g’</td>
<td>[ғ]</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>S’ s’</td>
<td>[ш]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>H h</td>
<td>[х], [h]</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>C’ c’</td>
<td>[ч]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was very simple, being composed of the basic 23 letters of the Roman alphabet and 9 additional letters modified by an apostrophe after both lower – and upper-case characters. As in the original publication, these letters are marked in red in the table. After many preparatory actions, the final shift to this alphabet was scheduled for 2025; however, some online newspapers which were published in a few alphabetical versions (including the official newspaper, *Egemen Qazaqstan*) immediately shifted from the preceding Romanisation to this version as an alternative to the main Cyrillic version. Moreover, in the same year, the first book set in this new type was published and distributed (Govory‘hi’na 2017).

The idea of the apostrophe for Turkic languages is not a new one. A modifying sign similar to the apostrophe was devised by Baitursynuly, who called it dáıekshe (the term dáıekshe is also used). At present, in the Uzbek alphabet it is used with two letters, o’ and g’, as well as in Karakalpak, which is a language very similar to Kazakh.

Despite its apparent simplicity, the new alphabet received a lot of criticism from both philologists and ordinary people. Some people expected letters more similar to Turkish, Azerbaijani, and Turkmen alphabets; some disliked the digraphs, while some found the letter ı inconvenient for marking a few sounds. The specialists demonstrated more serious problems with its impact on the phonetics of Kazakh and probably also pronunciation. One of these problems was the marking of a few vowels with a single letter. In fact, as is seen from the approved alphabet, the letter ı, which is shown as pronounced [ɯ ü], follows Jübanulys’s (1935/2013c) fatal idea of lumping a few sounds together and representing them with a single letter, e.g. jıı ‘often’ for jııı or jıyn ‘assembly, or ‘meeting’ for jıyn. This was contradictory to what the basic idea stipulated, i.e. referring not to the old equivalent letter but to the pronunciation of the new letters, in the original dybystalýy. The original idea was that the new alphabet would not be a mere transliteration of one script to another but a completely new attempt to reform the writing system. There is also the problem of the appearance of the apostrophe, which looks different depending

---

2 In this paper, Kazakh words are written according to the new alphabet.
3 Kazakh words and references to Kazakh names are also written in the new standard.
on the settings in word processors. Moreover, the use of the apostrophe proved to be quite problematic. For instance, on a single page in Govory’hi’na (2017: 13), five typos out of seven are related to the apostrophe.

Therefore, a few months later, on 19 February 2018, the president issued a new decree, № 637, which modified the former alphabet, but in fact it established a new alphabet. It is still valid today and looks as follows:

Table 2. The alphabet of 19 October 2018 by the decree of the President of the Kazakh Republic, № 637

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Written</th>
<th>Pronounced</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Written</th>
<th>Pronounced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A a</td>
<td>[а]</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>N n</td>
<td>[ң]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Á á</td>
<td>[ә]</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>O o</td>
<td>[ө]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B b</td>
<td>[ң]</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ó ó</td>
<td>[о]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>D d</td>
<td>[д]</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>P p</td>
<td>[р]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>E e</td>
<td>[е]</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Q q</td>
<td>[к]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>F f</td>
<td>[ф]</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>R r</td>
<td>[р]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>G g</td>
<td>[г]</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>S s</td>
<td>[с]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>G ġ</td>
<td>[ғ]</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>T t</td>
<td>[т]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>H h</td>
<td>[х], [h]</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>U u</td>
<td>[ұ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I i</td>
<td>[и], [й]</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ú ú</td>
<td>[ү]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I i</td>
<td>[и]</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>V v</td>
<td>[в]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>J j</td>
<td>[ж]</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Y y</td>
<td>[ы]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>K k</td>
<td>[қ]</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Y ý</td>
<td>[у]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>L l</td>
<td>[л]</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Z z</td>
<td>[з]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>M m</td>
<td>[м]</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Sh sh</td>
<td>[ш]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>N n</td>
<td>[н]</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Ch ch</td>
<td>[ч]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This alphabet has also many critics, but one change should be evaluated positively: the digraphs are replaced with 6 diacritical letters. Another positive feature is the lack of a letter for /ʦ/ in Russian loanwords. In the practical use of this alphabet, this letter is rendered as s, as it is really pronounced by most Kazakhs, e.g. investisiua ‘investment’. Unfortunately, instead of s’ and e’, the new alphabet sets forth two new digraphs that are written according to the English standard, sh and ch. These letters are marked green in the decree and are positioned at the end of the alphabet. The remaining problems were not solved.

When we look at the online edition of the official governmental newspaper Egemen Qazaqstan that is published in the new alphabet, we see that there are no problems in the majority of cases of Kazakh and borrowed words in which there are no approximants j and w, e.g. Soňgy jaňalyqtar ‘last news’ Kóp oqýgan ‘most read; most popular’, Elimizdiń jáne shet eldiń blogerleri – elordada (fotoreportaj) ‘the bloggers from our country and abroad in the capital city (a report with photo-
graphs). However, words with these approximants which create pseudo-diphthongs with vowels in writing are not written phonologically; they were transliterated from Cyrillic and copied the existing deficiencies, e.g. жүүн ‘assembly; meeting’ for жүүн; кейин ‘later; after’ for кейин; жазылы ‘subscription’ for жазылы. Loanwords and foreign proper nouns and names look very odd in the new alphabet, e.g. музыка ‘music’, поэзия ‘poetry’, рыйнанат ‘spirituality’, университет ‘university’, Азия ‘Asia’, Расея ‘Russia’ and Сирия ‘Syria’.

The spelling of the Russian forms of Kazakh surnames, e.g. Көшербаев for Көшербаев, is a direct copy of the Russian standard. The influence of Russian is seen in many words, e.g. the name of Iran’s capital city is transliterated from Russian as Тегеран.

The deadline for the final shift to the alphabet is still 2025. It should be noted that the state institution responsible for this is not the Байтурсынұлы Institute of Linguistics at the Kazakh Academy of Sciences; it is the Тил-Қазына Centre, which was established by the president on 26 April 2018. However, the centre has not set any rules for the application of the alphabet. The inactivity of this centre worries specialists, many of whom have advocated for a public debate on the new spelling rules, punctuation signs, rules of transcription, transliteration of loanwords, and foreign proper nouns and names, especially of important contact languages such as Russian, English, Uzbek, Kyrgyz, Turkish and Chinese. These specialists say that the state should prepare and publish guidelines, instructions, teaching aids, and textbooks. This is a very important and huge piece of work which must be carried out by linguists and teachers.

2. The background

The history of these alphabet changes and modifications of various systems has been well examined: for the period 1850–1937, see Baldauf (1993: 252–287); for the establishing of Arabic script in 1924, see Qazaq Bilimpazdary (1925); for the adoption of the first Latin script in 1929–1940 and its modifications and various problems, see Ámirjanova (2012); for the catalogue of books printed in Kazakhstan in Latin script between 1928 and 1941, see Asqarbekova and Zamzaıeva (2007, 2011); for more recent discussion, see Jusupov (2013) and Júnisbek (2018).

It is beyond the scope of this article to present in detail the complicated history of the various alphabet changes and modifications since 1924; however, in order to understand the problems with the current transition, we have to call attention to a few facts. Firstly, after the Baku conference of 1926, when Kazakhstan started
the transition from Arabic to Latin, the notation of some sounds was not settled; this was partly due to Baitursynuly, the most eminent Kazakh linguist and practitioner of those times. Baitursynuly opposed the transition and opted for the Arabic alphabet that he prepared for Kazakh and modified twice. The first edition of his primer was published in two parts in 1912 and 1913; the second edition was published in 1926, and the third and the last was published in 1928 (Jankowski 2013: 76–79). All three editions are slightly different. These primers were quite progressive in relation to the primers written in Arabic for other Turkic languages at that time. Some inaccuracies in the first edition were corrected in subsequent ones. For example, in the first edition the approximant [w] was written identically to u, as in the title oqu quraly ‘primer; reader’ (Baitursynuly 1912, the title page); however, in the second it was written as ж (with the graphic variant ж) and distinguished from ى (u) and ئ (o). Note that the respective front vowels were marked by дәиеш, as in сүт ‘milk’.

When the transition to Latin was approved in 1928, the new alphabet, which was based on the common Turkic alphabet established in Baku in 1926, comprised 29 letters (Asqarbekova and Zamzaeva 2007: 16, Bazarbaeva 2012: 61).

### Table 3. The first Latin alphabet of 1928 with the Arabic equivalents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Ç</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>Ğ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أ</td>
<td>ب</td>
<td>ق</td>
<td>ج</td>
<td>د</td>
<td>ت</td>
<td>چ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference between this alphabet and Baitursynuly’s was that it included the consonant ж. Unfortunately, when trying to render all the types of phonetic differences, the Kazakhs started to write Russian /i u/ vowels differently, e.g. комитет for комитет ‘committee’ and студент for студент ‘student’ (Bazarbaeva 2012: 204, 298), though in an inconsistent way. These words are absent from Begaliev and Gavrilov’s dictionary (1936), but see the spelling of a similar word, комиисиа, on the title page.

There were many problems with the practical use of this alphabet, such as the writing of proper nouns and names with lower or upper-case characters, Russian loanwords, and Kazakh words. The debates continued in 1928–1938, but especially in 1933–1935. However, the established standard remained until 1938, and despite the debates the problematic spelling of the combination of vowels with approximants has not changed, e.g. оқь – ‘to read’ → оқьдым ‘I (have) read’
and өръjmөн ‘I read; I am reading’; teli – ‘to allot; to attach’ → telidim ‘I (have) attached’ and telijmin ‘I attach; I am attaching’ (Bagaliev and Gavrilov 1936: 5). These spellings are correct and should be kept since they retain morpheme boundaries and do not influence the pronunciation of pupils who learn the language from textbooks. Unfortunately, in 1938 the alphabet was modified, new spelling rules were established, and it was decided that Russian loanwords should be written in a non-adapted way, exactly as in Russian. In my opinion, the worst change was caused by the Jubanuly’s proposal, which lumped together өw, ыw and w into one letter, u, as well as ыj and ij into i (Jubanuly 1935, see also Bazarbaıeva 2012: 144). At the same time, Kazakh /ɪ/ was written as j and Kazakh /ʊ/ as ӯ (Begaliıev and Saýranbaıev 1944: 3). To show these new changes, we will cite a few examples from Amanjolov and Saýranbaıev’s grammar (1939):

(1) çinau for jyınaý ‘gathering, collecting’, later transliterated to Cyrillic as жинау, now transliterated to the new alphabet as jınaý (http://lat.egemen.kz/article/207398-qaraghandy-oblysynda-astyq-dginau-nauqany-bastaldy);

(2) siaqtь for syıaqty ‘like; as’, later transliterated to Cyrillic as сияқты, now transliterated to the new alphabet as sıagty (https://tilqazyna.kz/suraqjayap);

(3) qazaq tjlj for qazaq tili ‘the Kazakh language’; in the first Cyrillic alphabet, the letter j was replaced with i;

(4) sūrau ‘question; asking’, later transliterated to Cyrillic as сӯрау; in 1957, the letter ӯ was replaced with у; this inconvenience was solved by the new alphabet, in which it is now u.

Jubanuly’s unfortunate modifications were subsequently copied in all alphabet changes and are reflected in the official, present-day alphabet of 2018. Turning back to 1938, the Latin period did not last long. In 1940, the Kazakhs were forced to shift to Cyrillic. The Cyrillic alphabet is based on the preceding Latin alphabet, and the transition was implemented as a mere transliteration of the letters of one alphabet into the other with the same spelling rules. The Russian words were written as in Russian. In 1957, the alphabet was slightly modified, and it is still used in this form in Kazakhstan today. Only the names of the letters were Kazakhized in the early 1990s (Ámirjanova 2012: 9).

The idea of returning to the Latin alphabet arose after the disintegration of the Soviet Union and was part of the utopian political idea of the integration of Turkic states: Turkey, Azerbaijan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, and Kyrgyzstan. In 1991, the representatives of the new independent republics met in Istanbul, where they decided to take steps to shift to a common Turkic alphabet consisting of 34 letters (Ercilasun 2005: xiv). This meeting was followed by a few subsequent meetings in 1992 and 1993, but only Azerbaijan approved an alphabet close to the one proposed. This alphabet is composed of 31 letters and is still used in Azerbaijan. However, the question of the alphabet change disappeared from
politics in Kazakhstan after 1995 and the president did not initiate any steps. The idea of the shift to Latin script was pronounced again by state organs in 2002, but it was only in 2007 that the president raised the question of Latin script. He ordered an in-depth examination of the financial, economic, social, political, and linguistic impact of the possible change. This task was carried out by the respective institutes of the Kazakh Academy of Sciences. The Institute of Linguistics published a volume on the new alphabet (Nurgeldi, Küderinova and Jubaıeva 2007). It contained chapters on the history of script changes in Kazakhstan (pp. 24–80) with copies of historical documents such as decrees and legal acts (pp. 391–404), the experience of some Oriental countries, especially Turkey and other Turkic-speaking countries (pp. 81–146), and the rationale (pp. 147–162); it also presented five proposals for a new alphabet (pp. 233–237, 309–318). Some say that the publication of five different proposals was a mistake and the institute should have published one draft and tried to convince the authorities and public to accept it. Others think that it was good to start a public debate on the new alphabet.

The common feature of all five proposals was basic Roman letters. All proposals considered the possibilities and limitations of word processors and keyboards. The proposals differed in terms of the letters suggested for Kazakh sounds which could not be rendered by basic letters.

The first proposal comprised 31 letters; the diacritical letters were ā, ģ, i, ĕ, ō, š and ū (p. 233). From the basic letters, c and x were omitted, as was the letter for the consonant /ʧ/. If we take the Turkish alphabet as a reference, this alphabet is mixed since it features one typical Turkish letter, ı, but š is used instead of ş. In the sample text (p. 310), the full /i/ and /u/ in Russian loanwords were rendered iy and uw, respectively, e.g. iynstiyтуwt ‘institute’, in the same way as Kazakh [uw], e.g. qatysuw ‘taking part’.

The second proposal (p. 234) was similar to the first one, but it consisted of 32 letters. One diacritical letter was different than in the preceding proposal: ķ instead of ę. Also, the letter c for Turkish ç was added. The sample text looks similar to that of the first proposal, but it contains hanım ‘lady’ (not qanım), but qalq ‘people’ (p. 312).

The third proposal (p. 235) also consisted of 31 letters. In contrast to the preceding proposals, it envisaged 9 letters for the vowels at the beginning of the alphabet, one of which was ĭ for /i/ (the present-day Kaz. ɨ), and the other was ū for /u/ (the current Kaz. ɨ). The remaining letters for consonants appeared in a similar order to Cyrillic alphabets, among which there were three diacritical letters: ģ, ĕ and ş. This proposal is quite strange. It has ĭ for /j/ and the letters are a mixture of Turkish

---

8 For a visit by a group of Kazakh linguists to Ankara in June 2007, see Öner (2008: 142–143). The enthusiastic title of Öner’s paper has proved to be over-optimistic as another decade has passed and nothing has been done.

9 The upper-case equivalent to this letter is a typo.
and non-Turkish standards. This alphabet does not contain c and x. The sample text looks odd, e.g. *institut* ‘institute’.

The fourth proposal (p. 236) is composed of 32 letters, including the following diacritics: ã, ã, ˘ for /ɨ/ (current u), Ç (present-day қ), ñ, ō, ş but ş, ü (for /ʊ/) and ü. It does not include the letters for /ʧ/ and /ʦ/. The diacritics are also mixed since some are like Turkish ones (ã t ˘ s ü) and some follow other systems, i.e. ˘ ü ˘ n. In the sample text, words with the present-day Cyrillic ť are rendered with h, i.e. *haným* and *halk*.

The fifth proposal (p. 237) differs from all the others in that it only has 24 basic Latin letters and an apostrophe as a modifying sign called *dáıekshe*. To these 24 letters, one has to add the four digraphs gh, zh, nh, and sh. As can be seen, the digraph nh that is proposed for /ŋ/ is odd. Another strange point in this proposal is the letter j for the vowel /ɨ/, i.e. Turkish t. To the vowels ã, ō, and ü the author assigned the combinations a’, o’, and u’ (i’ is a mistake), though not placed before a respective letter but at the beginning of a word, e.g. *ushin*, in addition, with the apostrophe set in a different style (p. 318). This proposal also does not include the letters for /ʧ/ and /ʦ/.

In proposals 1–2 and 5, the consonant /χ/, which in the present-day Cyrillic alphabet is ť, was rendered with q, according to real pronunciation of many Kazakhs.

However, in the same year the president changed his mind and removed the issue from the agenda. Meanwhile, various people and organizations launched around a hundred of their own proposals for the new alphabet.

In 2013, the president returned to the planned alphabet change, which was still scheduled for 2025. This time, it was the Language Committee at the Ministry of Science and Education and the Baitursynuly Institute of Linguistics that were commissioned to prepare a new alphabet proposal by the end of 2013. The public debates continued. Some people found the transition date too late and preferred 2017 as this was the year of Expo 2017 in Astana. The final proposal approved by the president was completely different from the five proposals presented in 2007.

In recent years, the idea of a new alphabet based on Roman letters has been gaining more and more supporters, especially among young people. Naturally, it is not welcomed by the Russians, who are still a great and influential minority in Kazakhstan, as well as by all Russian-speaking citizens of Kazakhstan, including Russian-speaking Kazakhs. They are worried that implementation of the new non-Cyrillic alphabet will promote Kazakh and restrict the influence of the Russian language. They want to keep the current alphabet and are called *kırılshilder*. However, there are also Kazakh-speaking Kazakhs who are against the new alphabet. Some of them say that it will separate the people from their Cyrillic-based literary heritage and that the adoption of the new alphabet will make Turkish more
influential than Russian. There is also a small group of nationalist Kazakhs (called rýnashyldar) who prefer the Runic alphabet as a genuine Turkic writing system. This idea sounds exotic to many progressive Kazakhs. The supporters of the Runic alphabet seem to be unaware of the fact that Runic alphabets were used by various peoples and languages, e.g. in Scandinavia and Italia, therefore the Runic alphabet does not only belong to Kazakhs.

3. How many letters should an alphabet have?

To answer this question, we have to determine the number of Kazakh phonemes. According to Baitursynuly (1928: 76), there are 28 sounds in Kazakh (17 consonants – b p t j d r z s š ş q k ń l m n; 5 vowels – a o e y, 4 of which have front pairs á ó ú i; and 2 approximants – ý i); according to Jubanuly, there are 26 (2013b: 70); according to Myrzabekov, there are 34 (1999: 40, 57) (9 genuine vowels plus 2 foreign vowels and 25 consonants); according to Júnisbek (2018: 35, 83) and Bazarbaıeva (2012: 40), there are 26 (9 vowels and 17 consonants). For a discussion, see also Jankowski (2014: 141–142). However, an alphabet established on phonological principles is not satisfactory. If a phoneme has variants which are relatively distant from one another and are perceived as distinct sounds, they should be rendered by different letters, but there are also opposite opinions. In Kazakh, this is the case for [q] and [k], [ɾ] and [ɣ], and [G] and [g]. The first two pairs were conventionally always distinguished in writing in the new alphabet as /q/ and /k/, and /ɾ/ and /ɣ/, respectively. The pair [G] and [g] is rare and may be written as [ɾ] and [ɣ]. It is also important to include phonemes which occur in loanwords. This is what we see in Myrzabekov’s (1999: 57) phonemic inventory. In addition to the 27 phonemes of Júnisbek and Bazarbaıeva, he also adds both variants of /k/ and /g/ and 6 phonemes found in loanwords, i.e. /v f χ h ts ŋ/. At this point, we should note that [χ] is not only a phoneme encountered in loanwords but also a frequent variant of Kazakh /q/ in some positions. The problem of /h ts/ is special, as many speakers do not pronounce /h/ and replace /ts/ with /s/. Putting the problem of these two letters aside, in our opinion the Kazakh alphabet should have letters for the following phonemes and their variants: /a ø e ø o y i t/ (vowels) and /b p d t g y q ŋ f χ m n l v f χ r s z w j/ (consonants, including semivowels or approximants), i.e. 32 letters, 9 of which are for vowels and 23 are for consonants. /h/ should also be added as it occurs in loanwords in many languages. We will represent these phonemes and phonemic variants with more applicable letters.

---

11 First published in 1936.

12 And vice versa: /χ/ of loanwords is often pronounced as [q], e.g. a word of Arabic origin /qalq/ ‘people’, spelled халық, is often pronounced [qalquire] → [qalqì], in proposals 1–3 and 5 represented as qalqyy–; for the writing qalqy in the first Latin standard, see Begaliev and Gavrilov (1936: 176).
that are used in Turkic languages, in accordance with the alphabet comprised of 34 letters that was recommended (but not approved) by the Turkic Academy and the Language Committee in Astana, putting them in the proposed alphabetical order: Aa Ėә Bb Cc Çç Dd Ee Ff Gg Ğğ Hh İı İj Kk Qq Ll Mm Nn Ïŋ Oo Òò Pp Rr Ss Şş Tt Uu Üü Vv Ww Xx Yy Zz.

4. Discussion on the last proposal

The last proposal was presented in 2018; it was decreed and promulgated by the president and is still being discussed by specialists, writers (especially those in the political opposition), and many ordinary people. There is such a broad range of opinions that it is impossible to describe the debate in detail; instead, some crucial points will be discussed.

The most fatal failing of this proposal is the fact that it does not represent Kazakh vowels properly. As Junsisbek has demonstrated, the proposal copies the defects of the present-day Cyrillic alphabet. The biggest weakness is caused by the use of the letters u, y, and e, which were just transliterated, but the authors of the proposal did not solve the phonological problems. Moreover, the new letter i is also designed to render /j/, and the form of the letter ý for /u/ is unusual.

In the current alphabet, u stands for [i] in loanwords and for [ij] in Kazakh words. However, under the influence of Russian, the Kazakhs started pronouncing [ij] as [ij], as in mi, the correct pronunciation being [mɨj] ‘brain’. Sometimes this writing destroys minimal phonological pairs, e.g. [tiyn] ‘Kazakh monetary unit, 1/100 of tenge’, written тиын, and [tiyin] ‘squirrel’, written тиін. In the new alphabet the former is written тиын, which suggests a monosyllabic word with a diphthong, thus it would be better to write тіїн. The latter should be pronounced [tiyin], but in the new alphabet it is written тин. In fact, it should be written тіін.

Below I will discuss other cases of writing the letter u in various positions in a word.

(1) in the initial of Kazakh words with front vowels, the letter u should be represented with iy, but iy should be used in words with back vowels. Some cases of the rendering of the letter u in the new alphabet are strange, e.g. Cyrillic iye is transliterated iie ‘owner’, which looks as if there were three vowels one after another. A word written in the Cyrillic alphabet, үйк ‘shoulder’, now written tyq, should be written tyqq, which also looks strange;

(2) in the medial, this letter is rendered as in the initial, e.g. киим should be rendered kiiim ‘dress; clothes’, and not kiiim; жиыдык should be rendered jiidek

---

13 Which also includes /h/ and /ʦ/.
‘berry’, and not *jıdek*; *қина* – should be rendered *qıyna* – ‘to harm, to cause trouble’, and not *qına*–;

(3) in the final, –*u* should be rendered –*iy*, e.g. *әдеби* → *әdebiy* ‘literary’, and not *әdebi*; *мәңү* should be rendered *тәңгирі* ‘godly, divine’, and not *тәңгирі*;

(4) in Russian loanwords and words borrowed via Russian, in order not to make the foreign words bizarre, *u* should be transcribed as *i*, e.g. *институт* or less preferably *инстиyt* ‘institute’; the same should be applied to Arabo-Persian loanwords expect for the final, e.g. *иман* → *iman* ‘faith’, but *діни* → *diniy* ‘religious’;

(5) before *о* in front of vocalic words, *u* should be rendered *i*, e.g. *іо* should be rendered *iiұý* ‘bending’, in back vocalic words *ı*, e.g. *жіо* → *jııу* ‘gathering, collecting’.

The letter *у* in the Cyrillic alphabet and its odd equivalent * ý* in the new Latin alphabet stands for even more sounds and sound combinations. These are the five most important cases:

(1) in the initial before *а* или *ә* in Arabo-Persian loanwords and in some Kazakh words, it sounds like */ɰ*/ and */ʋ*, which we can simplify as *w* and which the pronouncing dictionary renders as *ұу* and *үу* (Júnisbek 2004: 696), e.g. *уағда* → *ýaǵda* ‘agreement, pact’, *уәде* → *ýáde* ‘promise’, *уақ* → *ýaq* ‘small’;

(2) in the initial before */ɪ*/ it is pronounced as *[y]*, which should be represented as *іу*, np. *ійде* → *іуілде* – ‘howl (wind)’;

(3) in the initial before */ɨ* it is pronounced *[u]*, which should be represented as *іу*, np. *уыс* → *уýys* ‘hollow of the hand; handful’;

(4) in the final of front vocalic words after a consonant it is pronounced *[yw]* and should be represented as *іу*, e.g. *келу* → *kelúý* ‘coming’; in back vocalic words in the same position it is pronounced *[uw]* and should be rendered *іу*, e.g. *аю* → *аюу* ‘bear’;

(5) in the final after a vowel, it is always [*w*], i.e. *ý*, e.g. *ійдөу* → *ійілдөу* ‘howling (wind)’;

(6) in the initial between vowels and before a consonant, it is also [*w*], which we should render *ý*, e.g. *қауам* → *саýат* ‘literacy’, *ғұує* → *ғұййие* ‘holy person’;

(7) in the medial after a consonant in back vocalic words it is pronounced *[yw]* and should be rendered as *іу*, np. *бауам* → *бапуам* ‘wrestler’, *аштыуу* → *асштыуу* ‘its leavening’; in front vocalic words it is pronounced *[yw]* and should be rendered as *іу*, e.g. *келуі* → *келуу* ‘coming’.

The vowel */е*/ in the absolute initial is pronounced [/*е*/]. Under the influence of Russian in the speech of many, especially young Kazakhs, it palatalises the preceding consonant. The practice of transliteration of the new Kazakh alphabet ignores these phonological phenomena, which is good since the prepalatalisation disappears if the preceding word ends in a consonant, e.g. [/*едим*/] ‘(I) was’, but [/*мән едим*/] ‘I was’.
However, in the Cyrillic alphabet, the letter е in Kazakh surnames transformed to the Russian forms was not transcribed but transliterated. For example, when it was transformed to a surname, the Kazakh name Сарыбай (in the new alphabet Sarybai) was written Сарыбаев. Unfortunately, the practice of the new alphabet copies this transliteration and the actual spelling is Sarybaev, the correct form being Sarybaiev. Naturally this problem will disappear with the Kazakhization of surnames, which is now an ongoing process, but the problem remains with the writing of the names of many Russian citizens of Kazakhstan as well as with others who once came or were settled from Russia or the Soviet Union.

**Conclusion**

Some criticize Kazakhstan for taking so long to transition from the Cyrillic to the Latin alphabet. However, when we evaluate the Turkmen and Uzbek cases, we can understand why Kazakhstan is being cautious. In Uzbekistan, the decision to shift to Latin script by 2000 was made in 1993, but in 1995 the alphabet was modified, and the deadline was extended to 2005. However, this new date also proved to be unrealistic, and in 2004 a new deadline was scheduled for 2010 (Abdumajidov 2004: 20–24, 26, 38). A few generations of Uzbek pupils completed their whole basic education in Latin script, but many of them are obliged to use Cyrillic as the change has not yet finished. Turkmenistan was more successful, but the country was unprepared for the transition and little progress was made at first. The decision to transition to the new Latin alphabet was made in 1993 (Șimşir 1995: 133). State symbols, the Turkmen currency, and the titles and headings of some newspapers initially appeared in Latin script. In 1994, the first newspapers shifted to Latin script, so progress was faster than in Uzbekistan. Both the first Uzbek and Turkmen alphabets were strange and contained some unusual letters. The Turkmen alphabet was modified in 1999 (No Author 2000: 286–287); however, in contrast to Uzbekistan, the Turkmen transition is now complete.

In conclusion, I would like to say that across the decades there has never been any agreement on the alphabet in Kazakhstan. Therefore, rather than start a public debate, it seems it would be better to authorize a commission of Kazakh linguists and phoneticians to work out one proposal of an alphabet and spelling rules. The problem with this shift is that it comes very late, 34 years after the proclamation of the independence of Kazakhstan, and many people want to express their opinion in the spirit of democracy. The experience of Turkey and Azerbaijan demonstrates that a successful change of the alphabet can be achieved if it is worked out by the most prominent specialists and implemented in a short period of time at the beginning of the language reform process.
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An Assessment of Kazakh as a Foreign Language Curriculum in Terms of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages

Abstract: Learning Kazakh as a foreign language is becoming more popular all over the world. Kazakh is taught as a second language and a foreign language as part of national and international courses at institutes and universities. One of the teaching centres where Kazakh is taught outside of Kazakhstan is Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznan, Poland. Kazakh, which began to be taught in 2002, continues to be taught at both undergraduate and graduate levels. Designing a programme to teach Kazakh to foreigners in a way that is compatible with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages is important for the formation of an academic, versatile, and standardized teaching activity. This study assesses the Kazakh language courses (Kazakh Grammar, Practical Kazakh) in the undergraduate programme of Turkology within the scope of the Section of Kazakh Studies, which was previously a part of the Department of Asian Studies at Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznan but has recently joined the Institute of Oriental Studies. The research data was obtained through document review using a qualitative research approach. The findings revealed that the Kazakh programme was designed to be skill-oriented, simple and holistic. It was observed that the programme has components that emphasise communicative language skills, including linguistic and pragmatic skills as well as sociolinguistic skills. In the implicit dimension of the programme, sociolinguistic skills are highlighted.

Keywords: CEFR, Poland, Kazakh as a foreign language, Programme assessment

1. Introduction

Programmes that provide information on how to carry out a broad framework of teaching activities are of great importance if successful results are to be achieved. Therefore, the process of developing programmes is significant in terms of determining the quality of teaching activities. Many variables, such as general and specific goals, content, learning experiences and assessment methods are taken
into consideration in the development of curricula. For this reason, programme development is defined as “the dynamic relations between the target, content, learning, and the teaching process and assessment elements of the education program” (Demirel 2004: 5). No matter how carefully the goals, content, and learning experiences are selected and planned, various disruptions may occur. Determining the reasons for these failures and making the necessary changes is only possible through assessment (Yılmaz 1996: 36).

The assessment process is one of the main components of the programming process. Assessment is defined as a sequence of information and thoughts (Carry and Kemmis 1986: 34); a decision-making process on the evaluation of something (Johnson and Johnson 1989: 19); the systematic and principled collection of information for decision-makers (Rea-Dickens and Germaine 1992: 36); the studying of quality, importance, quantity, degrees and conditions (Stufflebeam 1976: 5). Assessment studies, the thematic coding of which is defined as an ‘analytical process’ (Charmaz 2005: 509), can be defined in many ways because of their structural feature (Guba and Stufflebeam 1970: 10).

Experts state that a programme must undergo a strict assessment process. The aim of assessment studies is to introduce an approach that finds solutions to problems (Stufflebeam 1976: 9). Many successful programme assessment studies indicate that it is the question ‘how’ that must be focused on (Fryel and Hemmer 2012). Programme assessment plays a key role in introducing standard values and virtues as systematic research (Stufflebeam 1986: 5); it plays a remedial role in improving training programmes (Fryel and Hemmer 2012). Nevertheless, the assessment process provides information and alternative methods related to how to use a programme, the stages of production, the process steps, or different potential tools (Johnson and Johnson 1989: 19). Norris (1998: 208) states that programme assessment constitutes an important aspect of innovation in education as it forms a whole of organized and reshaped experiences. In this context, the assessment process should be considered as a process that should cover all programme activities and should be repeated.

Assessment processes serve as a guide when placing students into a particular programme and identifying the skills and knowledge required for the programme. In this vein, it is of great importance to assess the adequacy of learning outcomes at the end of the teaching process. It is stated that the effectiveness of the assessment is generally related to its extent (Hussein 1991: 145), and the necessity of structural decisions is emphasised in design assessment studies (Guba and Stufflebeam 1970: 2).

In programme assessment studies, it can be said that learning needs are directly related to the assessment criteria. Programme assessment studies typically focus on 5 main subjects:
Needs of the programme
- Design of the programme
- Application and service delivery
- Outputs
- Programme effectiveness (Woodruff 2014: 9).

Studies in the literature suggest that other perspectives and methods are recommended for programmes (Kathleen King 2005, Merriam and Brockett 2007, Brookfield 1987, Burke-Sinclair 2012).

A framework plan is needed for programme development (Burke-Sinclair 2012: 34). Hammond (2007: 577) states that the concept of being human is at the heart of professional development and assessment. Pellegrino, Chudowsky and Glaser (2010), on the other hand, state that effective programme assessment studies in educational practices are still developing. In this context, programme development constitutes an important step in the education process, and it should be carried out with assessment studies.

Programme contents, programme decisions and teaching strategies should be planned for students (Burke-Sinclair 2012: 32). Especially in the assessment studies carried out in education, it is important to display a student-centred approach in order to identify the problems encountered in achieving the goals defined in educational designs, to make improvements based on the identified problems, and to describe them effectively and accurately through detailed evaluation of the system.

2. The Common European Framework of Reference

Since 1971, various studies have been carried out due to the need for language teaching to be carried out in accordance with certain standards. As a result of these studies, the Common Framework for the Teaching of European Languages was developed. The text prepared by the Council has three main objectives. In the context of language learning and meeting communication needs, these are as follows:
- Provide language skills to facilitate everyday communication in other countries or with foreigners in Kazakhstan;
- Ensure the sharing and communication of opinions and thoughts, emotions and communication between young people and adults;
- Provide a wider and more detailed understanding of the thinking structures and cultural heritage and lifestyles of individuals in other countries (CEFR 2001: 3).

In accordance with these objectives, Martyniuk and Noijons (2007) identified what CEFR is used for at national and regional levels:
- the preparation of national foreign language teaching programmes at primary and secondary education levels;
– the preparation of language programmes for higher education;
– the preparation of programmes for bilingual teaching and the teaching of minority languages;
– the preparation of exams, measurement, certification principles, and requirements;
– the preparation of education programmes of language teachers,
– the preparation of in-service training programmes;
– making recommendations for the use of the European Language Portfolio;
– developing the principles of preparing textbooks;
– determining the language competencies of immigrants who want residence permits;
– determining the language competencies of government employees;
– the preparation of action plans and strategic documents related to language teaching.

The Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) aims to provide a common framework that guides language teaching programmes, programme guidelines, examinations and textbooks, and other studies in European countries. CEFR consists of nine chapters. Chapter 1 outlines the functions of the framework, the general language policy of the Council of Europe, and the importance of reflecting the linguistic and cultural diversity of Europe by disseminating multilingualism; it also enumerates the necessary criteria for all of them. Chapter 2 explains the details of the ‘action-oriented’ language learning approach. Chapter 3 is devoted to the definition of language use levels and the degree of competence in language use. In chapter 4, language learning situations, fields, institutions, contexts, and the psychological motivations of an individual are explained. The ability of the framework user or language learner to possess or develop within the language learning process is described in chapter 5. Chapters 6, 7 and 8 describe the relationship between ‘acquiring’ and ‘learning’, both of which are directly concerned with language learning and teaching processes in the framework; also, suggestions are offered for the development of an individual’s multilingualism. Chapter 9 explains the assessment concepts in detail, especially validity and reliability issues. At the same time, the framework covers both the cultural context in which languages are established and the language proficiency levels that enable the progress of foreign language learners to be measured at every stage of learning and on the basis of lifelong learning. (CEFR 2001: 1). CEFR is a guideline text based on the languages of Europe. Unlike these languages, Kazakh is an agglutinating language; therefore, it may be necessary to make some changes or additions in the programme for the learning of Kazakh. These issues need to be determined and appropriate actions need to be taken.

One of the main problems is the lack of a common programme for teaching Kazakh as a foreign language. When teaching a language, teachers rely on their
individual experiences and different practices. In this context, theoretical and practical methods should be established in order to promote effective teaching of Kazakh and other commonly learned languages. There are several factors that prevent Kazakh from being taught more effectively, such as the lack of a common and functional teaching programme to teach it as a foreign language and the scarcity of textbooks and equipment in line with the target language. The member states of the Council of Europe recommend the use of CEFR when teaching European languages, and they use this work as a guideline in language teaching. The review of relevant literature has shown that there is no standard in teaching Kazakh to foreigners, and it would be beneficial to use CEFR to teach Kazakh as a foreign language to regulate the process of language teaching according to certain criteria and to establish a standard. CEFR envisages that language teaching is performed in a practical way and that the teaching of theoretical knowledge and grammar rules is secondary. Therefore, it should be ensured that the adaptation is functional and easy to adapt to daily life. However, CEFR emphasises the importance of focusing on the everyday needs of students in their social environment rather than the distinctive features of the target language (such as grammatical and phonological features). Therefore, the adaptation of the Common European Framework to teaching Kazakh as a foreign language should not be discussed, but the most effective way to achieve this adaptation should be. In this study, the aims and objectives highlighted in CEFR have been considered as the main criteria in the assessment of the data collected in this study. These criteria have been discussed in terms of the needs encountered during the teaching of Kazakh, the expectations of the learners, the objectives’ priorities, and the adequacy of the programme. In this context, this study is important in terms of the effectiveness of the Kazakh programme and the extent to which CEFR is reflected in other Kazakh programmes.

3. Method

In this section, the purpose of the study, research model, study group, analysis of data and limitations are presented.

4. Research Model

Document review, which is a qualitative data collection method, makes it possible to analyse a research problem through the analysis of documents produced within a certain time frame or relevant documents produced by multiple sources at different times (Yıldırım and Şimşek 2002: 140–143). Studying texts in qualitative
research makes it possible to provide detailed interpretations and observations using the advantages of access to multiple types of meaningful information (Denzin and Lincoln 2008, Guba and Lincoln 2000). Patton (2008: 421) states that without any hypothesis and prejudice in such studies, a situation can be more clearly revealed.

5. Study Group

The data were obtained through the descriptive and classificatory analysis of 8 course syllabuses designed for Kazakh Grammar and Practical Kazakh classes offered in the academic year 2018–2019. Thus, it was possible to comment on the common aspects of the contents of the texts, and to structure and classify them qualitatively and quantitatively.

In this context, the data obtained through the curricula were classified according to subjects, and the aspects that overlap with or differ from the Common European Framework of Reference were determined. In each table, course objectives, learning outcomes and course contents are presented. The quantitative values of these categories are made visible by presenting them in tables. In this study, the expressions used in CEFR and the findings obtained form the basis of the assessment.

6. Limitations

The research is limited to the data obtained from the 8 (eight) syllabuses designed for Kazakh Grammar and Practical Kazakh taught within the curriculum of Turkology in the 2018–2019 academic year at the Department of Asian Studies at Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznan.

7. Findings

In this section, the findings regarding the undergraduate level Practical Kazakh and Kazakh Grammar courses are given.

Kazakh Grammar Course First Year Spring Semester was designed as a compulsory 30-hour course with 3 ECTS points; classes are held once a week. The language of instruction is Polish in the fall semester and Polish-Kazakh in the spring semester. At the Department of Asian Studies, students of Turkology start taking Kazakh Grammar in the spring semester of the first year. The main objectives, learning outcomes, and the contents of the course are as follows:
Table 1. Kazakh Grammar Course, First Year Spring Semester Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Objectives</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Course Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of Kazakh phonology, morphology and syntax</td>
<td>Students show the most important features of Kazakh.</td>
<td>Structure of Kazakh. Suffixes and their types, interrogative enclitics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about the structure and functions of the basic affixes of Kazakh</td>
<td>Students learn about and correctly name the individual parts of speech and sentences.</td>
<td>Phonetics and phonology of Kazakh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about the structure and functions of basic grammatical structures of Kazakh</td>
<td>Students apply basic grammatical structures.</td>
<td>Vowel harmony, vowels and consonants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop the ability to produce correct expressions in a foreign language</td>
<td>Students analyse expressions according to grammar and syntactic structures.</td>
<td>Basic information about syntax, Sentence types, Basic pronouns in Turkic languages, nominal existential predicate (bar: joq), predicate expressed by the negation particle (-: emes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop analytical thinking skills about language and its scientific definitions</td>
<td>Students use literary sources, including those in a foreign language.</td>
<td>possession; to express possession, expression of possession (-Niki).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students are aware of cultural differences and emerging linguistic differences.</td>
<td>Adjective Clauses and Possessive Constructions (Relational Structures).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Present tense (Future) (-AdI).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Definite past tense (-DI).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wish mode (-GI-sI kel-).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conditional mode (-sA), Probable condition (-sA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suffixes, by, before, after.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Postpositions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Present tense (-Ipo tue, tur, jat, jü).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is seen that the different types of suffixes, sentence types, pronouns, approval and refusal statements, and some basic tenses and modes are presented in Kazakh Grammar. Grammatical regulations in the Common European Framework of Reference are handled with specific regulations. Accordingly, some criteria and categories are frequently used in grammatical descriptions. For example, the category of elements is defined as morphemes, root words and affixes. It is observed that these relational structures are taken into consideration in the Kazakh programme. Knowledge of grammar at the basic level is defined within certain categories.
Table 2. Kazakh Grammar Course Second Year Winter Semester Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Objectives</th>
<th>Course Acquisitions</th>
<th>Course Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of Kazakh phonology, morphology and syntax</td>
<td>Students show and correctly name the parts of speech and sentences.</td>
<td>Voice of the verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information transfer about the structure and functions of basic affixes of Kazakh.</td>
<td>Students apply basic grammatical structures.</td>
<td>Adjectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information transfer about the structure and functions of basic grammatical structures of Kazakh.</td>
<td>Students analyse expressions in terms of grammatical and syntactic structures.</td>
<td>Imperative mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop the ability to produce correct expressions in a foreign language</td>
<td>Students use literary sources, including those in a foreign language</td>
<td>Expressions of willingness (-AyIn dep edim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop analytical thinking skills about language and its scientific definitions</td>
<td>Students are aware of cultural differences and emerging linguistic differences.</td>
<td>Using verbal adjectives as genitival (- génér, – Atlh, – Ar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participles used as predicates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjective participates in an attribute function (- génér, – Atlh, – Ar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Past tense (shows repeated actions) (-AtIh),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indefinite future tense (-Ar),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purpose, intention (-MAQ-šI) expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Second case of conditional mood (-sA – Ar),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Third case of conditional mood (-sA – Ar – edi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal adverb (-I, – A, – ĞALI, – ĞAnşA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reported Past (-IptI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modality: opportunity, possibility (-UwI mümkin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modality: Consent, Ability, Opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modality: necessity (-Uw-I kerek / qajet / tiyis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>obligation (also a kind of necessity) (-Uw-ĞA tiyis bol)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modality: hypothesis (-sA kerek)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modality: irrationality (eken bol)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Word and noun formation with affixes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kazakh Grammar courses, which are offered for 3 semesters, discuss advanced grammar topics, especially modals (modes), past tenses and the types of words in Kazakh. In addition to morphological structures, the course also aims to develop semantic ability. Accordingly, students are taught how to make probability and purpose-intent statements, and expressions of skill, opportunity and consent. The formal structures presented in Grammar Course 1 are designed and deepened with semantic structures.

Table 3. Kazakh Grammar Course, Second Year Spring Semester Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Objectives</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Course Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Familiarize students with the semantic structures of the verbs and auxiliaries in Kazakh.</td>
<td>Students know the most important auxiliary verbs.</td>
<td>Progressive action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform students about the syntax of Kazakh.</td>
<td>Students know basic syntactic structures.</td>
<td>Final and completed action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop the ability to build complex sentences.</td>
<td>Students know the foundations of complex syntactic structures.</td>
<td>A Permanent and Repetitive Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop the ability to build typical expressions in Kazakh to define actions and situations.</td>
<td>Students can use all grammatical structures in Kazakh.</td>
<td>Initial and unexpected action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | Students know how to form simple or complex sentences correctly. | Immediate and nearly completed action |
| | Students are aware of cultural differences and emerging linguistic differences. | Participle clauses |
| | | Converbs |
| | | Complex sentences |
| | | Compound sentences |
| | | Sentences of Complaint |
| | | Participles and their role in the sentence |

This course, which is the final Kazakh Grammar course and is offered during one of the semesters in the second year, was planned as a 30-hour course. The grammatical structures presented include semantic structures such as expressions of complaint, active and passive voice, and the role of verbal nouns in sentences. According to CEFR, this is grammatical semantics, which deals with the meaning of grammatical elements, categories, structures and processes. Operative semantics is the study of logical relations such as demands, assumptions, and intuition (CEFR 2001: 110). In this section, it is seen that the processes of grammatical and operative semantics are followed. The following descriptive elements are used under the grammatical accuracy dimension.
At the A1 level, only a few simple grammatical structures have been learned, with limited control of the learned sentence patterns.

At the A2 level, some simple structures are used correctly, but the underlying errors are still systematic. For example, tenses are used incorrectly, but what is said is often clear.

At the B1 level, communication with reasonable accuracy is achieved in familiar contexts; usually a good control of language is observed, but the influence of the mother tongue is still noticeable. There are mistakes in communication, but what is meant is clear. Information about routines and predictable situations are used reasonably well. These proficiency levels can be divided into sub-levels, thus providing all the information necessary to define level boundaries and assess them in smaller units.

An assessment of the total number of hours in the Kazakh Language programme and the learning outcomes indicates that the targeted level should be B1.1.

In the assessment, the focus is the students’ ability to perform the descriptive elements given above. At this point, the learner needs to acquire both the form and the meaning of the language (CEFR 2001: 110), and a structure that is fit for the learner’s purpose is seen.

Learners are expected to discuss the meaning of grammatical elements, categories, structures and processes with regards to grammar and semantics. As for operative semantics, they are expected to deal with logical relationships such as demands, assumptions and intuitions. Morphological and semantic expressions in the current Kazakh Language syllabus are presented in a way that allows learners
of all levels to notice and understand them. There is no morphological or semantic classification in the programme, but such a classification could make it possible for learners to learn elements in a more meaningful and perceptible way.

Table 4. The Objectives, Learning Outcomes and Course Contents of the Kazakh Grammar Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Course</th>
<th>Number of Objectives</th>
<th>Number of Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Number of Course Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh Grammar 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh Grammar 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakh Grammar 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When Kazakh grammar syllabuses are examined, it is seen that both Kazakh Grammar 1 and Kazakh Grammar 2 have 5 objectives and 5 learning outcomes. However, the number of topics covered in both courses is higher than the number of topics covered in Kazakh Grammar 3.

Practical Kazakh was designed as a compulsory 90-hour course with 7 ECTS points; it is offered once a week for two semesters. The language of instruction is dominantly Polish, but Kazakh is also used. At the Department of Asian Studies, students of Turkology start taking Practical Kazakh in the spring semester of the first year. The objectives, learning outcomes, and the course content are as follows:

Table 5. Practical Kazakh Course, First Year Spring Semester Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practical Kazakh Course 1</th>
<th>Course Objectives</th>
<th>Learning Objectives</th>
<th>Course Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve the four language</td>
<td>Students can talk</td>
<td>Alphabet, pronunciation, simple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skills in Kazakh (speaking,</td>
<td>about simple ideas</td>
<td>everyday expressions (greetings),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading, writing, listening).</td>
<td>in Kazakh.</td>
<td>numbers, question creation, personal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce the basic Kazakh</td>
<td>Students can write</td>
<td>pronouns (career names - examples).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dictionary.</td>
<td>simple texts in Kazakh.</td>
<td>Personal expression, expression of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce the basic grammatical</td>
<td>Students can understand</td>
<td>existence: there is, there are; har. joq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forms in Kazakh.</td>
<td>simple statements in Kazakh.</td>
<td>Basic daily expressions (farewell);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise awareness about the</td>
<td>Students can read and understand simple texts in Kazakh.</td>
<td>imperative mood; ordinal numerals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linguistic boundaries of Kazakh (and Central Asia).</td>
<td>Students develop their basic vocabulary.</td>
<td>Other types of greetings; What is this? Who is he/she? Pointed pronouns (names of animals); self-representation, ownership, expression of ownership; affixes and possessive pronouns; plural.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Practical Kazakh Course 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Objectives</th>
<th>Learning Objectives</th>
<th>Course Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students can understand basic concepts in Kazakh and Central Asian culture.</td>
<td>About myself; basic verbs, present tense, situations.</td>
<td>Family; the converb п, – ip, ip (–n, – un, – in); basic poems, personal affixes; spatial poems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students can do simple projects in groups.</td>
<td>Family; the converb п, – ip, ip (–n, – un, – in); basic poems, personal affixes; spatial poems.</td>
<td>In the classroom. Grammar: reduplicated adjectives and adverbs; dative case; predicative progressive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family; the converb п, – ip, ip (–n, – un, – in); basic poems, personal affixes; spatial poems.</td>
<td>Home, flat, dormitory; relative pronouns; complementary condition; latent period; optative mood (–ГИ-сл kel –); plant names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family; the converb п, – ip, ip (–n, – un, – in); basic poems, personal affixes; spatial poems.</td>
<td>My day (my father’s day); Indefinite future mood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is seen that the practical Kazakh syllabus is in line with the Kazakh grammar syllabus. Topics are covered that relate to students’ immediate environment, such as the alphabet, simple daily expressions, numbers, personal pronouns, adjectives, the classroom, and introducing yourself. It is seen that topics discussed in Kazakh Grammar are revisited in Practical Kazakh, and these are thematically organised. Communicative language ability consists of several components, including linguistic, sociolinguistic and pragmatic structures (CEFR 2001: 10). The syllabus above deals with topics that especially elicit pragmatic skills. Topics such as my day, my class, or my home are concerned with the functional use of language. It is seen that the topics in this syllabus correspond to A1 level in CEFR, which is described as beginner or breakthrough level (CEFR 2001: 29).

Practical Kazakh 2 was designed as a compulsory 90-hour course with 5 ECTS points; it is offered once a week in the fall semester. The language of instruction is dominantly Polish, but Kazakh is also used. The main objectives, learning outcomes, and the contents of the course are as follows:

Table 6. Practical Kazakh Course, Second Year Winter Semester Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Objectives</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Course Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To improve four skills in Kazakh (speaking, reading, writing, listening).</td>
<td>Students can talk about simple ideas in Kazakh.</td>
<td>Memories from Holidays – Exercise of Past Tense.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Practical Kazakh Course 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Objectives</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Course Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To introduce the basic Kazakh dictionary.</td>
<td>Students can write simple texts in Kazakh.</td>
<td>My week; modal word 'kerek'; modal word 'mümkin'; conditional mood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To introduce basic grammatical forms in Kazakh</td>
<td>Students can understand simple statements in Kazakh.</td>
<td>Day, permission, past tense (recursive activities); instinctive situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To raise awareness about the linguistic grammar topics of Kazakh (and Central Asia)</td>
<td>Students can read and understand simple texts in Kazakh.</td>
<td>What did you do yesterday? Grammar: past tense.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students develop their basic vocabulary.

Students can use simple grammatical structures.

Students can understand basic concepts of Kazakh and Central Asian culture.

Students can do simple projects in groups.

**My week; modal word 'kerek'; modal word 'mümkin'; conditional mood.**

**Day, permission, past tense (recursive activities); instinctive situation.**

**What did you do yesterday? Grammar: past tense.**

In the store, in the market; hortative mood; expressing wishes, desires or intentions; comparative form of adjectives and adverbs.

Snack bar; restaurant.

Transportation: in the city, in the street; giving directions; case suffixes.

Christmas, Polish traditions.

Contrast exercises in the past tenses. (-DI: – Atln: – Ğan: Iptl)

*Meyram – Jana jıl, Nauwrız merekesi* – New Year, Nauryz; Holidays in Kazakhstan.


It is seen that the Practical Kazakh syllabus emphasises communicative skills and embodies a structure that predominantly includes thematic, real-life topics. It is seen that a total of 9 topics are discussed. At this level, simple and holistic activities are important. A1 level, also known as beginner or threshold level, is restricted to simple and holistic activities, such as

- Telling and asking the day, time and date.
- Using simple greetings.
- Saying yes, no, I’m sorry, please, excuse me.

In the implicit dimension of the programme, example sentences, dialogues, reading and listening texts, etc. were chosen from Kazakhstan and Poland to develop sociolinguistic skills. This conveys the sociological differences between the two countries and helps students to sense them.
A2 level is defined as an ‘intermediate or basic requirement’ in CEFR. When the topics discussed at A2 level are examined, it is found that they are generally thematically distributed, and concrete elements concerning daily life are used extensively. In addition, some grammar topics listed in the course syllabus, but no further information is provided regarding their content. The programme follows one of the main principles of education: moving from concrete to abstract and from close to distant. Besides, the activities used at this level are intended to develop observable skills and handle everyday issues.
### Table 8. Practical Kazakh Course, Third Year Winter Semester Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Course Objectives</strong></th>
<th><strong>Learning Outcomes</strong></th>
<th><strong>Course Contents</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve speaking skills at A2 level.</td>
<td>Students can express themselves in lesser known subjects during daily communication.</td>
<td>World and travel A delicious journey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop reading skills at A2 level.</td>
<td>Students know how to hold and develop simple conversations at higher levels of difficulty.</td>
<td>Students and university; education; problems concerning the graduation exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop comprehension skills at A2 level.</td>
<td>Students can write short articles and explain their opinion; they can understand medium-length texts that are not rich in vocabulary and simple expressions that are less carefully spoken.</td>
<td>Cinema world (<em>Jaw jürek mıň bala ...</em>) Media. Book of words – literature (<em>Abay</em>). Famous People (<em>Ahmet Bay-tursinuli</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop writing skills at A2 level.</td>
<td>Students can understand a lesson taught in Kazakh when presented in a simplified way.</td>
<td>Natural environment, natural disasters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 8 topics are included in this course syllabus. Practical Kazakh 4 is a 60-hour compulsory course with ECTS credits; it is offered once a week in the fall semester of the third year. The language of instruction is Kazakh. B1 level is defined as ‘the threshold’ level in CEFR. Learners at this level have two basic skills: maintaining an interaction and getting what they want in various situations; the ability to skilfully deal with everyday problems (CEFR 2001: 34). On that note, it is seen that the programme aims to help students reach a level at which they can cope with problems in a country where the target language is spoken as a native language. If clear and standard language is used, students will be able to understand conversations on familiar topics, such as work, school, fun, etc.; they will also be able to cope with problems encountered when visiting the areas where the target language is spoken (CEFR 2001: 22). In line with these abilities, students are expected to be able to make a request, take the initiative during a conversation or consultation (for example, changing the topic) despite being dependent on their interlocutor, and ask someone to explain what they have said.

At this level, the topics covered in the programme have a more intellectual form. Students are encouraged to discuss emotional, intellectual, and educational topics and give their personal opinions on themes such as modern life. In addition, it is seen that topics that students are familiar with and can easily generate ideas on have been chosen, such as university, sport, jobs, travel, etc.
As for B1 level of Practical Kazakh (Table 9), the course is a 60-hour compulsory course with 5 ECTS credits; it is offered twice a week in the final semester of the undergraduate programme. The language of instruction is Kazakh. The objectives of the course, learning outcomes and the course contents are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Objectives</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Course Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquire the ability to speak about a variety of topics using simple expressions at B1 level.</td>
<td>Students can express many aspects of daily and professional life in a simple way.</td>
<td>Speaking about young people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain the ability to read everyday texts and professional texts at B1 level.</td>
<td>Students can communicate and talk about many topics.</td>
<td>Friends and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain the ability to understand explanations at B1 level in normative language.</td>
<td>Students have a broad vocabulary and understand difficult texts.</td>
<td>Apartment and house. <em>(Päter jâne iyüeleri)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain the ability to write a text on an unknown topic after preparation and on a known subject without preparation.</td>
<td>Students understand expressions about various topics in normative language.</td>
<td>Health. <em>(Densawlıq) – Life.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students can write about familiar and unfamiliar topics.</td>
<td>Art – <em>(aytts).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students can understand lessons taught in Kazakh when the level of difficulty is medium.</td>
<td>Kazakhstan and Kazakhs *(Culture and music) <em>(Eltanim).</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                                                                  |                                                                                   | Money and life *(Indirect Speech; Trade; Winnings)* *(Aqşaň bolsa qaltaňda).* *

A total of 7 topics are included in this programme. Practical Kazakh 4 is a 60-hour compulsory course with ECTS; it is offered once a week in the fall semester of the third year. The language of instruction is Kazakh. In this semester, abstract topics such as culture, music, weddings, fears, and worries are handled in a more complicated way than in the fall semester, therefore students can express their opinions at threshold level. It could be said that ‘familiarity’ is the keyword that defines this semester. At this level, the learner is expected to present ideas about familiar topics using all skills (reading, writing, speaking and listening). These skills are defined in CEFR as follows: “They give a detailed account of their experiences, describing their emotions and reactions” *(CEFR 2001: 66).* It should be noted that each level subsumes all the lower levels. This means that a student at B1 level *(intermediate, basic requirement level)* is able to display all the skills described for A2 *(Waystage)*, but at a better standard than in the previous level *(CEFR 2001: 36).* On that note, after the undergraduate level, students are expected to display the skills described for the threshold level.
Table 10. Qualitative Data on Practical Kazakh Course Objectives, Learning Outcomes, Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course name</th>
<th>The number of Objectives</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Lesson content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practical Kazakh Course 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Kazakh Course 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Kazakh Course 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Kazakh Course 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Kazakh Course 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are three different working areas in the Kazakh Language programme. Accordingly, students are evaluated in terms of their performance in lessons held with the teacher, their preparation for class, and the final exam. Courses vary in the total number of hours. The assessment is based on a 5-point grading scale: grades 1 and 2 represent failure; the pass grade is 3. Descriptive information about the grades is given in the following figure and table:

![Figure 3. CEFR 2001: 41](image-url)
In Kazakh language courses, students are assessed using a 5-point assessment scale. In line with CEFR, the pass grade is 3. Grades 1 and 2 indicate that the learning outcomes required to pass the course have not been achieved. Practical Kazakh and Kazakh Grammar courses are in accordance with the assessment criteria provided in CEFR. The assessment is based on a 5-point scale. Table 11 shows the assessment criteria, the grades and the corresponding skills.

Table 11. Assessment Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>excellent knowledge, skills, and personal and social competences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>very good knowledge, skills, and personal and social competences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>good knowledge, skills, and personal and social competences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>satisfying knowledge, skills, and personal and social competences, but with important deficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>satisfying knowledge, skills, and personal and social competences, but numerous mistakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>unsatisfactory knowledge, skills and personal and social competences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The assessment scale is considered in accordance with the following assessment areas:

CEFR recommends structuring the test items or the stages of oral testing to elicit communicative, linguistic, social-linguistic, and pragmatic competences (CEFR 2001: 165). The Common European Framework of Reference provides detailed information on assessment.

Table 12. Types of assessment (CEFR 2001: 183)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement assessment</th>
<th>Proficiency assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norm-referencing (NR)</td>
<td>Criterion-referencing (CR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery learning CR</td>
<td>Continuum CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous assessment</td>
<td>Fixed assessment points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative assessment</td>
<td>Summative assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct assessment</td>
<td>Indirect assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance assessment</td>
<td>Knowledge assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective assessment</td>
<td>Objective assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checklist rating</td>
<td>Performance rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impression</td>
<td>Guided judgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic assessment</td>
<td>Analytic assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series assessment</td>
<td>Category assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment by others</td>
<td>Self-assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both types of assessment have advantages: the advantage of achievement assessment is that the content of the test is limited to what students have learned in class; the advantage of proficiency assessment is that it informs individuals about their proficiency level, and the results are transparent (CEFR 2001: 169).

Both achievement and proficiency assessment are used in the Kazakh Language programme. It is seen that the attempts to assess Kazakh Language programmes are focused on proficiency. Indirect assessment methods that demonstrate a student’s proficiency level are performed on the basis of fixed assessment points. In addition, success-oriented methods, such as performance assessment and assessment by others, are also used.

The assessment in the Practical Kazakh programme has 5 stages:
1. Preparation for class.
2. Participation in classroom activities.
3. Quizzes given during the semester.
4. Writing a text on a topic chosen from a list provided by the lecturer; preparation and delivery of a 12–15-minute multimedia presentation.
5. Oral and written exam.

Factors affecting EKTS scores are listed below:
1. Classroom performance
2. Courses done with the teacher.
3. Individual work.
4. Preparation for class.
5. Preparation for the exam.
6. Semester assignments.

When the stages of assessment are examined, it is seen that methods of assessment concerning pre – and post-learning outcomes are included, which indicates that process-oriented rather than product-oriented assessment methods are adopted. During the proficiency assessment (performance), the oral exam allows speaking proficiency to be measured in its natural environment. Participation in classroom activities makes process – and performance-oriented assessment possible. The methods and techniques used during the classes are chosen by the teacher according to the content taught.

8. Discussion and Conclusion

It has been shown that students are expected to reach the level of B (independent user, threshold or intermediate) after completing the Kazakh Language courses over 3 years and 5 semesters.

The Kazakh Language programme for A1, A2, and B1 level competence areas has been designed in accordance with the aims and learning outcomes defined by the skill areas discussed in CEFR.
The teaching activities have been developed such that they create an opportunity for the emergence of communicative social-linguistic and pragmatic competences. The syllabuses reflect CEFR’s hands-on approach to language teaching; the teaching of theoretical knowledge and grammar is secondary.

The aims, learning outcomes, topics and assessment components in the syllabuses developed for the Kazakh Grammar and Practical Kazakh courses, which form the Kazakh Language Teaching Programme, are designed in accordance with CEFR. This indicates that in the process of programme development, the requirements encountered during the teaching of Kazakh, the expectations of the learners, and priorities regarding the aims have been considered in terms of the programme’s adequacy to meet them.

In Kazakh Grammar syllabuses, form and meaning are presented together at all levels, which allows students to learn form and meaning holistically without having to choose one over the other. Besides, the programme does not include any morphological or semantic classification, which would make it possible to present the content in a more meaningful and perceptible way.

9. Suggestions

Although a general proficiency level is provided for each skill, it is recommended that more detailed information should be given regarding the transition between sub-levels.

It is important to write clear statements to specify the learning outcomes for listening, speaking, reading and speaking skills at each level.

It is necessary that the teaching methods and techniques should be adjusted to the course content (thematic subject and grammar).
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An Assessment of Kazakh as a Foreign Language Curriculum


Constitutional Reforms and the Circumstances Behind the Transition of Power in the Republic of Kazakhstan

Abstract: In recent years, there have been more and more publications on issues related to language, culture, history, or the socio-political structure of Kazakhstan and other countries in Central Asia. In the last three years, the Republic of Kazakhstan introduced several political reforms that radically changed the shape of the political system of the state. The most important of these was the Act of 10 March 2017, which instigated changes and amendments to the 1995 constitution. The main purpose of this paper is to analyse and describe these changes. The author focuses primarily on comparing the constitutional provisions which directly concerned the transition of presidential prerogatives to the parliament and the government.
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1. Introduction

On 19 March 2019, a surprising piece of news spread around the world: Nursultan Nazarbayev, who had been in office for almost 30 years, had resigned from his position as the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan. For many people it was a big surprise; however, all the events that had occurred on the political scene of the Republic of Kazakhstan in the two years before 2019 indicated that it had to happen sooner or later. After Nazarbayev’s resignation on 20 March 2019, in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan, the former speaker of the upper house of parliament (the Senate), Qasym-Jomart Toqaev, became the interim president (Akorda, 2019; Azattyq, 2019) and was elected as the second president of independent Kazakhstan in the early elections on 9 June 2019. He received almost 71% of all votes and won in the first round. After the election results were announced, residents of many cities in Kazakhstan took to the streets to express their dissatisfaction. Police and other services detained

The first indication of the upcoming changes was presidential decree No. 140 of the Republic of Kazakhstan on 11 January 2017, which created a special working group whose task was to develop a strategy and a way of dividing prerogatives among the branches of power (Kaztrk 2017). After less than three months of work on the draft amendments, at a joint session of both chambers on 6 March 2017, the Parliament of the Republic of Kazakhstan adopted the draft law (Azattyq 2017, Baribar 2017, Kazinform 2017). On 9 March, the Constitutional Council announced that the amendments were in line with the Constitution (Azattyq 2017, Baq 2017), and the next day the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan signed a law On introducing amendments and additions to the Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Akorda 2017, Azattyq 2017, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty 2018). The reformation of the political system of the Republic of Kazakhstan had become a fact. The primary aim of the reform was to weaken the position of the president while increasing the rank of the parliament and the government in the decision-making process, as well as increasing their responsibility for decisions. These reforms were the beginning of the transition from the ‘super-presidential’ system to the parliamentary-cabinet system. The steps that were taken by the presidential administration were aimed at avoiding a fight for influence and power after the possible resignation of Nazarbayev.

Another sign that heralded changes was the events of early February 2018, when an exceptional bill was passed in the Parliament of the Republic of Kazakhstan. This draft bill aimed to sanction the activities of the Security Council as a constitutional body but not as a consultative or advisory body. The new law, adopted by parliament on 31 May 2018, meant that the Security Council became one of the most important (if not the most important) centers of power in the Republic of Kazakhstan. The Security Council became an instrument for state administration that could de facto ‘compete’ with the presidential administration and the government. A very important provision of the new law was the establishment for life of the first President of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, as the chairman of the Security Council (Akorda 2018, Kazinform 2018, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty 2018). This legislative action was aimed at legitimising Nazarbayev’s increasing influence in both domestic and foreign policy after his possible resignation from office.

The third signal of change occurred on 4 February 2019, when Nazarbayev turned to the Constitutional Council with a request to explain the constitutional provisions regarding the termination of the presidential prerogatives. On 15 February, the Constitutional Council stated that the premature termination of presidential prerogatives was in line with the Constitution of Kazakhstan. Basing their view on the interpretation of the law, many experts presumed that Nazarbayev would
announce early elections as he had done before (Azattyq 2019, Ehonews 2019, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty 2019, Sputniknews 2019). However, just over a month later, he announced that he had resigned from office.

2. The Constitution

On 10 December 1991, Kazakhstan was defined as a presidential republic headed by Nursultan Nazarbayev. The current constitution was adopted on 30 August 1995. In the present constitution, legislative power is represented by a bicameral parliament: the upper house – the Senate (kaz. Сенат, Senat, 47 deputies); and the lower house of the parliament – the Mazhilis (kaz. Мәжіліс, Májilis, 107 deputies). As the overall head of the constitution, the government (kaz. Укімет, Ùkimet) supervises all activities (CRK 1995).

The first general presidential election in the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic took place on 1 December 1991, when the former first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, won an overwhelming victory. According to the official results, he received 98.7% of all votes. The Agreement on the establishment of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), which marked the end of the Soviet Union as an entity in international politics, was signed in Viskuli on 7 December of the same year. On 10 December 1991, Nazarbayev took office, and on his initiative the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic was renamed the Republic of Kazakhstan. On 16 December of the same year, the President of the Republic signed the Constitutional Act entitled On the State Independence of the Republic of Kazakhstan, which, together with the earlier Declaration on State Sovereignty (25 October 1990), became the cornerstone of the future constitution (Dave 2007: 8–9, Grochmalski 2006: 118–120, Załęski 2006: 146, 162–163).

The first Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan was elaborated by an independent group of experts and was adopted on 28 January 1993 (Grochmalski 2006: 303, Załęski 206: 171). However, it did not suit the requirements of all those who were actually interested, especially the ‘head of state’. Therefore, the presidential administration requested that a new constitution should be drawn up, which was then adopted on 30 August 1995 in a nationwide referendum (Dave 2007: 106, Grochmalski 2006: 315, Załęski 206: 171). The new constitution, commonly called ‘presidential’, was modelled on the basic laws of Western democracies, whose cornerstone is the rights and freedoms of the individual. ‘General Provisions’, the first part of the constitution, defines the basic principles of how the state functions and includes provisions stipulating that the Republic of Kazakhstan is a sovereign, secular, and democratic state (CRK 1995: §1 of Article 1) with a presidential form of government (CRK 1995: §1 of Article 2). Also included is a record dealing with
Montesquieu’s three branches of government, dividing it into legislative, executive, and judiciary (CRK 1995: §4 of Article 3). However, until the latest constitutional amendments and changes, the role of the president in the political system of Kazakhstan was immense and affected other branches of state power.

The current Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan has been subject to amendments and changes five times. The first one was on 7 October 1998, and the Nazarbayev administration made further changes on 21 May 2007. The next set of amendments to Kazakhstan’s fundamental system of laws was adopted on 2 February 2011. The most important set of amendments to the Constitution of the Republic was approved on 10 March 2017 as a result of the desire to introduce changes and reforms in the Kazakh political system. The last ‘largely cosmetic’ amendments were adopted on 23 March 2019, when the name of Kazakhstan’s capital was changed from Astana to Nur-Sultan (Adilet 2019).

3. Constitutional reforms

The introduction of amendments and additions to the constitution is regulated in Article 91 of the Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Amendments and additions may be accepted in a national referendum that takes place at the initiative of the president or on the recommendation of the parliament or government. Nevertheless, if the president submits a draft amendment or addition to the parliament, a nationwide referendum does not have to take place at all. Everything, in fact, depends on the will of the president. In this case, the parliament must accept the draft amendments by a majority of no less than four-fifths of the votes of the total number of deputies of each chamber. After the parliament’s approval, the president should sign a draft amendment or submit it for voting in a nationwide referendum. A referendum is considered valid if more than half of the citizens entitled to vote take part in it. Amendments and additions are considered valid if more than half of those entitled to vote in at least two-thirds of the districts, major cities and the capital are in favour of accepting them (CRK 1995: §1 of Article 91).

After publishing information about these state reforms, they were then submitted for public consultation. On 1 March 2017, Nursultan Nazarbayev participated in the meeting of a working group which discussed the further shape of the reforms. During this meeting, the chairman of the working group announced that over 6,000 proposals of changes concerning all articles of the constitution had been submitted to the presidential administration. These even included proposals that aimed to increase the constitutional prerogatives of the head of the state. In addition, among other things, citizens proposed single-mandate districts in the parliamentary elections, the introduction of a unicameral parliament, increasing the requirements for candidate deputies and judges, and either emphasising the role of the state
language (i.e. Kazakh) or making English a state language. During the meeting, the president stated that 35 amendments had been prepared for the constitution (Azattyq 2017). At the same time, he denied rumours about holding a nationwide referendum. Specialists commented on it in various ways: some believed that such changes had to be introduced with a nationwide referendum; others said that it was not necessary to carry out a referendum or to consult society directly about the reforms (Azattyq 2017).

Twenty-five amendments and additions were introduced to the Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan (LRK No. 51-V1 3PK, 2017). Among them are records regarding the role of the president himself and his prerogatives. Paragraph 2 of Article 91 of the Constitution was drafted and supplemented with a provision that regulated the inability to change the honorary status of the First President of the Republic of Kazakhstan – Yelbasy and the founder of independent Kazakhstan (CRK 1995: §2 of Article 91). Article 91 was also supplemented by paragraph three, which says that any amendment or addition to the Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan has to be in line with paragraph two of this Article. If the Constitutional Council confirms their legality, amendments and additions may be introduced by a nationwide referendum or submitted to parliament for consideration (CRK 1995: §3 of Article 91). This is intended to permanently protect the honorary status of President Nazarbayev. Another provision concerning the head of state is the addition introduced in paragraph two Article 41, which states that presidential candidates must have graduated from university, which previously had not been a prerequisite. The same paragraph was supplemented with a provision stating that the constitution may set additional requirements for presidential candidates (CRK 1995: §2 of Article 41). This regulation may allow political elites to change the criteria for candidates, for example, to prevent potentially unsuitable people from taking part in future elections.

Another very important change is the editing and supplementing of the provisions in paragraph three of Article 44 of the Constitution. According to the new regulations, the Kazakhstani president appoints ministers whose candidatures are proposed by the prime minister after prior consultation with the lower house of the parliament (CRK 1995: §3 of Article 44). Previously, this kind of consultation was not necessary. Such a change limits the independence of the head of state when creating the government and thus strengthens parliament’s influence in this matter. It is worth mentioning that the president’s duties still included the appointment of the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Internal Affairs, the Minister of Defense, and the Minister of Justice (CRK 1995: §3 of Article 44). Thus, filling the posts in the most important ministries in the state is still the responsibility of the president. Another important change in the provision of this paragraph is the question of the annulment or suspension of legal acts by the president in whole or in part. According to the previous regulations, the head of state could cancel or suspend
the decrees of the government and prime minister. Historically, this possibility had been limited to legal acts issued by the heads of executive bodies at various levels of local administrations (CRK 1995: §3 of Article 44). The change of this provision allows the government to be more autonomous in making political decisions; however, the president can still influence decisions made by representatives of local self-governments (CRK 1995: §1 of Article 66).

Paragraphs eight and nine were removed from Article 44. These paragraphs defined the prerogatives of the president concerning the approval of national development programmes and the approval of a uniform system of financing and remuneration for all entities financed from the state budget (CRK 1995: §8 and §9 of Article 44). These powers were transferred to the government and entered into the constitution. According to the new provisions of paragraph one Article 66, the government is responsible for the creation of national programmes (with the simultaneous approval of the president) and ensuring their implementation. The newly introduced paragraph 9–1 of Article 66 of the Constitution devolved to the government the aforementioned president’s prerogative regarding the approval of the financing system and remuneration for entities subordinated to the state budget. However, the new government’s prerogative must be implemented with the approval of the president (CRK 1995: §9–1 of Article 66).

Paragraph 10–1 was added to Article 44, thus giving the president the means to return a statute or other legal act to the Constitutional Council. This enables the president to check compliance with the Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan and to determine if there is a threat to the protection of the rights and freedoms of citizens, national security, sovereignty, and integrity of the state (CRK 1995: §10–1 of Article 44). Paragraph 18 of Article 44 was also edited. According to the new record, the president creates the State Security Service, which is responsible for the protection of the most important people in the state. In the previous versions of the constitution, the records show that the head of the state was allowed to form the ‘National Guard’ and ‘the security service of the president’ (CRK 1995: §18 of Article 44).

Another very important change to paragraph two of Article 45 resulted in the removal of the president’s power to legally issue laws and decrees. This paragraph was deleted in its entirety (CRK 1995: §2 of Article 45). At the same time, paragraph three of Article 53 was removed, which stated that the Parliament of the Republic of Kazakhstan “at the request of the President may delegate legislative power to the President for a period not exceeding one year, by a majority of two-thirds of the total number of deputies of each Chamber” (CRK 1995: §3 of Article 53). The removal of these provisions clearly indicates that there was a reduction in the possibility of interference in the activities of the legislative authority by the presidential administration.

Another change in favour of extending the prerogatives of the parliament is present in paragraph six of Article 57. Under the new provisions, each of the cham-
bers of parliament, by a majority of two-thirds of the total number of deputies, may submit a motion to the president to dismiss a member of the cabinet. In this case, the President of the Republic dismisses a member of the government. Previous provisions allowed the head of state to reject parliament’s request and gave the opportunity to reconsider the matter only after six months had passed from the date of parliament’s first application. Only then could a member of the government be dismissed. These changes clearly contribute to raising the status of parliament in the political system, as well as giving it direct controlling functions over the government and its members (CRK 1995: §6 of Article 57). Changes in paragraph two of Article 61 refer again to the direct relations between the President and Parliament. According to previous regulations, the head of state was able to decide the order of the bills in parliament as well as limit the time to one month for parliament to deal with a particular project. The new provisions show that parliament has two months to consider acts which have been prioritised by the president. At the same time, the provision concerning the possibility of issuing a decree-law which also limits the president’s influence on the legislation was removed from this paragraph (CRK 1995: §2 of Article 61). Another limitation of the prerogatives of the head of state and their impact on the legislative process is the removal of paragraph four of Article 73. This stated that the President of the Republic could question the decision of the Constitutional Council in whole or in part regarding a given act. Previously, the president’s objection could be outvoted by a majority of two thirds of the total number of members of the Constitutional Council; however, if the president’s objection was not voted down, then the Constitutional Council’s decision was considered to be unaccepted (CRK 1995: §4 of Article 73). This provision deprives the head of state of the possibility of interfering in autonomous decisions taken by the Constitutional Council.

The next change in the constitution which limits the presidential prerogatives is the editing and supplementing of paragraph five of Article 86. This provision is related to the dissolution of local representative bodies, so-called Maslikhats. According to the previous regulations, Maslikhats could be abolished by the President of the Republic or could dissolve themselves. Under the new regulations, the president may terminate Maslikhats prematurely; however, he must in advance consult the decision with the prime minister and the chairpersons of the chambers of parliament (CRK 1995: §5 of Article 86). Another change concerning local administration is the provision specifying the manner of dismissal of the chairpersons of local executive bodies. According to previous records, they were elected or appointed on the terms specified by the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan. According to the changes introduced to the constitution, the heads of local executive bodies (Akim, kaz. Əkim, Ákim) are elected, appointed, and dismissed on the basis of separate legal provisions. However, among the presidential prerogatives, it is still possible to dismiss them by an administrative decision (CRK 1995: §4 of
Article 86). Nevertheless, in the author’s opinion, attempts to change the regulations should be commended because they aim to achieve partial independence of local administrations from central authority.

As mentioned before, many of the presidential powers were delegated to the Parliament of the Republic of Kazakhstan, which aims to raise its status in the state’s political system. Its prominent role was reflected in paragraph one of Article 49 of the constitution. On the basis of the new provisions in the aforementioned paragraph, “the Parliament of the Republic of Kazakhstan is the highest representative body […] exercising legislative power”. According to previous regulations, it was the “highest authority performing legislative functions” (CRK 1995: §1 of Article 49). This shows clearly that the role of parliament has been increased. Under the previous regulations, the government was responsible to the president, and in the lower house of parliament he was responsible only in the situations provided in the constitution.

Moreover, under the new regulations the government is deprived of the prerogatives that relate to the designation and dismissal of the heads of central executive bodies that are not part of the government. These powers were included in paragraph eight of Article 66, which has been completely removed from the constitution (CRK 1995: §8 of Article 66). Under the new regulations, the government informs the president and the parliament about the main directions of its policy and all important decisions (CRK 1995: §4 of Article 67). Previously, the government was obliged to provide this information only and exclusively to the president. The new regulations also ensure that the government is obliged to resign when there is a new election of the lower chamber of parliament. Previously, the prime minister had been obliged to ask newly elected Mazhilis for a vote of confidence in his government: if there was a positive motion of confidence for the government and the president did not decide differently, the cabinet would continue to perform its duties (CRK 1995: §1 of Article 70). This record is another example of the increase in significance of the function of legislative power in the Kazakhstani political system.

In addition to the aforementioned changes and additions to the Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan, which are directly related to the transfer of presidential prerogatives to the parliament and the government, there are several records relating to other areas of the functioning of state power. Among them are provisions concerning the function of the Constitutional Council (CRK 1995: §2 of Article 72 and §2 of Article 74), common courts (CRK 1995: §3 of Article 79), the Supreme Court (CRK 1995: Article 81), and the prosecutor’s office (CRK 1995: §1 of Article 83). In addition, there are changes to the status of the capital of the country (CRK 1995: §3–1 of Article 2), the ratification of international agreements (CRK 1995: §3 of Article four), the possibility of depriving citizenship for terrorist offenses

---

1 Previously, deprivation of citizenship was impossible.
(CRK 1995: §2 of Article 10), determining inter-religious consent as a constitutional value\(^2\) (CRK 1995: §2 of Article 39), and the establishment of the Institution of the Ombudsman\(^3\) (CRK 1995: §1–1 of Article 55). Nevertheless, the above-mentioned changes in constitutional provisions are not directly the subject of this paper, therefore the author will not discuss them more extensively.

4. Conclusion

The reformation of the political system of the Republic of Kazakhstan has become reality. The changes and additions to the constitution were prepared and introduced at a rapid pace (in three months), although their introduction was preceded by public consultations. However, in the author’s opinion, as part of a nationwide referendum the public should be consulted on important reforms that directly impact the functioning of the state. This opinion has also been expressed by some Kazakhstani experts and scholars (Azattyq 2017). However, the pushing through of the changes without carrying out a referendum was in line with the regulations of the Republic of Kazakhstan. The main aim of the reform was to weaken the position of the president while increasing the role of parliament and the government in decision-making processes and increasing their responsibility for their decisions. The changes limit the independence of the head of state when creating the cabinet of the Council of Ministers. Once the reforms were implemented, parliament could participate in the formation and control of the government. In the light of the new regulations, parliament is now defined as the only body exercising legislative power. Thanks to these changes, the possibility of the president interfering in the functioning of the legislative branch has been reduced to a minimum. The government has been given prerogatives that provide an opportunity to implement an independent socio-economic policy for which it will be directly responsible to parliament. These reforms are the beginning of the transition from a ‘super-presidential’ system to a parliamentary-cabinet system. However, the position of the president in the political system of Kazakhstan remains strong. After all, the reforms initiated in 2017 may be just the beginning of further democratisation and systemic changes.

Many believe and hope that after Nazarbayev’s resignation there will be democratisation and a retreat from autocratic rule in Kazakhstan. The amendments to the constitution in March 2017 severely limited the president’s powers and strengthened the prerogatives of parliament and the cabinet. In relation to the above, all subsequent presidents of the Republic of Kazakhstan will not be able to rule as

---

\(^2\) Consensus among religions and harmony between the inhabitants of the Republic of Kazakhstan is a fundamental value. Therefore, it was decided to include it in the constitution and was defined as a constitutional value.

\(^3\) A candidate for the ombudsman is proposed by the president and elected by the Senate.
Nazarbayev has done until now. However, these hopes seem to be in vain. It must be remembered that the Act of 31 May 2018 made the Security Council one of the most important centers of power in the Republic of Kazakhstan. Pursuant to the Act, Nazarbayev was appointed as life chairman of the Security Council. The extended prerogatives of the Security Council allow it to influence other centers of power in the state, which will have to comply with its will, follow its instructions, and implement decisions taken by its chairman. In relation to the above, the status quo will be maintained regarding the functioning of the state and in decision-making processes. Nazarbayev will informally remain the head of the state but now will perform a different function. Nevertheless, having direct control of the armed forces and law enforcement agencies will enable him to continue to rule in an autocratic way, albeit from a more ‘back-seat’ perspective.
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A Model of Formal Analysis of the Kazakh Translation of German Poetry in the 1940s

Abstract: The goal of this paper is to present an attempt to devise a formal model of establishing the degree of equivalence, amplification, reduction and substitution of a few selected poems translated from German into Kazakh in the 1940s. These poems were published by the National Turkistan Committee in Germany and remained unknown in Kazakhstan until recently. They were selected as probably the first pieces of literature translated into Kazakh from a language other than Russian in modern times. Analysis of poetry translation is a challenge as some say that poetry is untranslatable. However, the model demonstrated in this paper may be employed for analysis of prose translation which started in Kazakhstan after 1991.

Keywords: Formal analysis, translation, poetry, from German, into Kazakh

1. Theoretical model

The central notion of translation and translation theory is equivalence. Linguists who deal with the theory of translation in Poland agree that the best definition of equivalence was formulated by Wojtasiewicz (Hejwowski 2004: 3). His definition was very simple: “Text b in language B is equivalent to text a in language A if text b evokes the same association (or associations) in the receptor as text a” (Wojtaseiwicz 1957: 20, 27). However, Wojtaseiwicz’s study was published in Polish and had no impact on international translation theory. In the international area, it was Nida and Taber (1982) who were considered to be the authors of the classical translation theory for many years, though they focused on Bible translation.

The more a translation is equivalent to the source text, the better it is. However, achieving equivalence is not an easy task, especially in poetry, since languages have various poetic tools depending on language structure, prosody, culture, and literary traditions. It is evident that equivalence between a source and a target text is easier to achieve between two languages of similar structure, between two similar cultures, and between two similar literary traditions. As a matter of fact, the
understanding and definition of equivalence is also the subject of many debates. According to Nida and Taber (1982: 24), “Dynamic equivalence is therefore to be defined in terms of the degree to which the receptors of the message in the receptor language respond to it in substantially the same manner as the receptors of the source language”. As can be seen, this is very similar to what Wojtasiewicz said a few decades earlier.

My model makes use of concepts that are well known in classical translation theory and practice. Translation procedures consist in using amplification, reduction, and substitution to adapt the target text to the source text if lexical, grammatical and prosodic equivalence is impossible to achieve. Modification may be taken as a kind of substitution. In other words, adaptation of a target text based on adding, reducing or replacing lexical, grammatical, and prosodic elements is necessary in order to acquire equivalence, which can be composed of various components such as meaning, words and sounds.

The adaptation procedures will be symbolized as in Jankowski (2016) where Turkic religious texts translated into Polish by Polish-Lithuanian Tatars in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were analysed: 1. Equivalence =; 2. Partial equivalence ≃; 3. Amplification +; 4. Reduction –; and 5. Substitution →. When any of these procedures applied by the translator was identified in a text, a digit from 1 to 10 was placed at the corresponding symbol. In the case of amplification and reduction, a digit precedes the symbol, e.g. 1+ or 2–. In case of substitution, digits are put on both sides, e.g. 1→1 or 2→1.

For example, 10: 1+ means that one element out of ten has been added. 10: 1– means that one element out of ten has been subtracted. After the symbol, added or reduced elements are shown in brackets. 10: 1→1 means that one element out of ten has been replaced. In the case of substitution, both the substituting and substituted for elements are shown in brackets. In addition to Jankowski (2016), two new symbols are used: the vertical arrow ↓ or ↑ shows that an element has been moved from the place of its equivalent in the source text to the line below or above. For example, 1 ↑c means that an element has been moved to line c above.

Once the target text has been evaluated as lexically and semantically equal to the source text, the = symbol is used. Partial equivalence is shown by ≃. I realise that partial equivalence is quite a vague term, but it is used where other formal means to denote a lack of full equivalence are difficult to employ.

To make the comparison work, a few graphical words in original German must be taken for one discontinuous grammatical word, e.g. du […] traurig bist ‘you are sad’ is one word which is identical and grammatically equivalent to Kazakh qajqilisn ‘you are sad’. Likewise, German Man sieht dir’s an den Augen an are not taken as seven units but as four, i.e. man, sieht-[…]an, dir’s, an-den-Augen. Kazakh copulas and particles like the interrogative ma are not taken as separate units.
2. Kazakh translation studies

Translations from foreign languages into Kazakh are as old as Kazakh written literature, but almost all of them are translations from or through Russian. They start with Abay’s famous translations of Russian poets such as Alexander Pushkin, Mikhail Lermontov, and Ivan Krylov. Short poems by Adam Mickiewicz and Wolfgang Goethe were also translated. However, these poems are not direct translations from the original works but from Russian adaptations. As far as Goethe is concerned, this is *Wandrers Nachtlied*, translated from a Russian adaptation by Lermontov, first published in 1909 (Abay 2005: 144, 262–264).

Translation of specialist science and technology literature or for administration and legal purposes was very important in Soviet Kazakhstan. Until nearly all Kazakhs became bilingual and it was no longer needed, Russian bellettristic literature was also translated into Kazakh in the 1920s–1950s. The situation is similar nowadays (Omarov 2011) and the problems of Russian-Kazakh translation and interpretation will be important as long as Russian is the second official language in Kazakhstan and has high prestige.

Since the 1960s, various aspects of the practical and theoretical problems of translation have been raised in studies, e.g. Taljanov (1962) and Aytbayev (1975, reprinted 2007). The former is basically devoted to the translation of Gogol, the latter to the idioms and expressions in the translation of Gorkii’s works. Although Aytbayev sometimes refers to idioms and proverbs in Azerbaijani, Uzbek, Tatar, and Kirghiz, his theoretical basis consists of Russian studies. From recent studies, we can point to both Aldaşeva’s (1998) book on linguistic and anthropological aspects and Islam’s study (2012) on simultaneous translation. However, I know of no real theoretical study in Kazakh.

3. Qobîzçî Qorqît and his translations from German poetry into Kazakh

Qobîzçî Qorqît’s translations were published in Germany during World War II in a volume addressed to Turkistani soldiers in the German army. This volume was the first publication of the National Turkistan Committee and was printed in 1943. According to the ideology of the Panturkistani movement, the names of ethnic languages do not occur in this publication. The book was prefaced by Veli Kajum-Xan (*Ünsöz*, pp. 5–6). The language of this preface is not specified, but it is Uzbek. The core of the book is forty-one poems, seven of which are translations. One poem, called *Əjelder* ‘Women’ (pp. 57–58), is shown as a Kabardinian fable (*kabarda* before this happened, Abay experimented with Arab, Persian and Turkish poets, but the few poems published (Abay 2005: 35–38) are rather inspired by the Oriental style of such masters as Firdousi, Fuzuli, Shamshi and Navai than real translations.)
ertegisi), but is not qualified as a translation. The language of the literary works is defined as taza Türkistan türkiniŋ tili ‘pure language of Turkistani Turks’ with no relation to Arabic, Persian and Russian (p. 5). The author of the preface says that Turkistan is proud of such figures in science as Ibn Sina and Ulugbek and national heroes such as Genghis Khan, Timur, and Abay. It is to be noted that according to a common belief (at least among the Turkistani aristocracy), Genghis Khan was a hero of the Turks.

As for the contents of the volume, two literary works are qualified as epic poems (dastan): Abilaj (pp. 9–32) and Kijik zarî (pp. 33–41). Four are ballads: Ulî çolda (pp. 42–43), Bürkitci (p. 44), Çolavci (p. 45) and Çetimder (pp. 46–48). The remaining are various poems (pp. 49–71). Some of these poems are called cîr (pp. 59–61, 64, and 65–66).

The part which contains translations, double titled as Avdarmalar and Tәrçime-ler, is the final part of the book (pp. 71–78). It contains two poems by Wolfgang Goethe, Legende – Anîz ‘Legend’ and Trost in Tränen – Köz çasîmen çubanuv ‘Comfort in tears’; one poem by Friedrich Schiller, Die Teilung der Welt (better known as Die Teilung der Erde) – Dünijeni bölîsiv ‘The Division of the Earth’; three poems by Joseph von Eichendorf Sehnsucht – Saqînuv ‘Yearning’, Das zerbrochene Ringlein – Sînçan baldaq ‘The Broken Ring’ and Es war, als hätt der Himmel – Kögildir kök körinedi ‘It Was as though Heaven’ (better known as Mondnacht ‘Moonlit Night’); and a popular love song Du bist mein, ich bin dein – Sen mendik, men sendik ‘I am yours, you are mine’; in total there are seven pieces of German poetry translated into Kazakh.

This publication and its contents were naturally unknown to the Kazakhs in Soviet Kazakhstan. Turkistani military men in the German army were treated as traitors and nobody in Central Asia dared to even mention them. It was only after the disintegration of the Soviet Union that people started openly speaking about their history.

Information about this publication was first published in Kazakhstan in 1991 due to Sawytbek Abdrahmanov (NA 2015). We know that the author of the poems and probably the translations is Mäjit Aytbayev (1914–1945) who used the pen name Qobïzcî Qorqît or Qobyzshy Qorqyt. As a Soviet soldier, he was sent with the Soviet army to the West where he was taken captive in 1941. Then he joined the National Turkistan Committee. He was a painter and a poet and he edited various publications of the committee. His poetry is highly evaluated in Kazakhstan.

It is to be noted that four poems in the volume were composed in German-occupied Poland: two in ‘Belopodlask’, i.e. Biała Podlaska, on 20 August 1941 – Ulî çolda (pp. 42–43) and Arman (p. 51), dated 27 September 1941; and two in ‘Logionovo’, i.e. Legionowo – Çorîq marcî (p. 63), written on 1 May 1942, and Besik çirî (pp. 65–66), written on 10 June 1942.
4. Analysis of Qobîzcî Qorqît’s translations

The following poems were selected for the analysis: Wolfgang Goethe’s *Trost in Tränen* ‘Köz çasĭmen’; Joseph von Eichendorff’s *Es war, als hätt’ der Himmel Kögildir kök körinedi’; the popular song *Du bist mein, ich bin dein* ‘Sen mendik, men sendik’; and Friedrich Schiller’s *Die Teilung der Welt* ‘Dünijeni bölisüv’. Each piece is provided in two parallel versions: the original German and the Kazakh translation. Analysis is done after each stanza.

**Wolfgang Goethe’s *Trost in Tränen* ‘Köz çasĭmen’**

This poem has eight stanzas; we take the first four for analysis.

1. Wie kommt’s, daß du so traurig bist, Qajoqilisîn, sîr bar ma çüregiñde
2. Da alles froh erscheint? Qaraçî, ajnalanaç cat, tileginde.

*a – 5: 4 (wie, kommt’s, daß, so) → 3 (sîr ‘secret’, bar-ma ‘is there’, çüregiñde ‘in your heart’); 1 (du, traurig-bist) = 1 (qajoqilisîn ‘you are sad’)*

*b – 4: 3 (da, froh, erscheint) → 3 (qaraçî ‘look’, cat ‘happy’, tileginde ‘in your desire’); 1 (alles) ≃ 1 (ajnalanaç ‘around you’)*

*c – 4: 4 (man, sieht-[…]-an, dir’s, an-den-Augen) ≃ 2 (közioniñen ‘from your eyes’, körinip-tur ‘is seen’)*


„Und hab’ ich einsam auch geweint, “Çaloqizdíq qalaj meni cîdatadî, So ist’s mein eigner Schmerz, Çanîma çara bolîp, çîlatadî. Und Tränen fließen gar so süß, Accî ças közden aqqan tatti bolîp, Erleichtern mir das Herz.“ Sol ana çüregimdi çubataðî!”

*a – 5: 1 (ich) ≃ 1 (meni ‘me’), 3 (und, einsam, auch) → 3 (çaloqizdíq ‘loneliness’, qalaj ‘how’, cîdatadî ‘makes me patient’), 1 (hab’-[…]-geweint) ≃ 1 ↓b (çîlatadî ‘makes (me) weep’)*

*b – 5: 2 (ist’s, Schmerz) = 2 (çara ‘wound’, bolîp ‘being’), 3 (so, mein, eigner) → 1 (çanîma ‘to me; lit to my soul’)*

*c – 6: 1– (und), 2 (gar, so) → 2 (accî ‘bitter’, közden ‘from the eyes’), 2 (Tränen, fließen) = 2 (ças ‘tear’, aqqan ‘flowing’, i.e. ‘dripping’), 1 (süß) = 2 (tatti ‘sweet’, bolîp ‘being’)*

*d – 3: 1 (erleichtern) = 1 (çubataðî ‘relieves’), 2 (mir, das-Herz) = 1 (çüregimdi ‘my heart’), 2+ (sol ‘that’, ana ‘that one’)*
Die frohen Freunde laden dich,
O komm an unsre Brust!
Und was du auch verloren hast,
Vertraue den Verlust.

Çañım sen ne çoqalttın çastıq künde,
Çoqı̈ndı bizge de ajtcı̈ açıq türde.
Dostarın cattıqtaqı̈ caqıradı̈,
“Va, dostım, bolcı̈ endï–dep–bizben birge!”

Und was du auch verloren hast,
Daß sie im Blütenschimmer
Von ihm nun träumen müßt.

Joseph von Eichendorf’s Es war, als hätt’ der Himmel ‘Kögildir kök körinedi’

Es war, als hätt’ der Himmel
Die Erde still geküßt,
Daß sie im Blütenschimmer
Von ihm nun träumen müßt.

Kögildir kök körinedi
Çerdi qucip süjgendej.
Qandı tüsti çer çarqırap,
Köktı köksep küjgendej.

a – 4: 2– (es, war), 1 (als-hätt’-[…]-geküßt) → 1 (körinedi ‘it looks’), 1 (der-Himmel) = 1 (kök ‘sky; heaven’), 1+ (kögildir ‘bluish’)
b – 3: 2– (die Erde, (als-hätt’-[…]-geküßt) = 2 (çerdi ‘earth’, süjgendej ‘as (if he) loved/kissed’), 1 (still) → 1 (qucip ‘hugging’)
c – 3: 1– (daß), 1 (sie) → 1 (çer ‘earth’), 1 (im Blütenschimmer) → 2 (qandı tüsti ‘blood-colour’), 1+ (çarqırap ‘gleaming’)
d – 4: 1 (von-ihm) ≈ 1 (köktı ‘sky; heaven’), 2– (nun, müßt), 1 (träumen) = 1 (köksep ‘desiring’), 1+ (küjgendej ‘as (if he) burned’)

a – 4: 3 (die-[…]-Freunde, frohen, dich) → 3 (çañım ‘my dear; lit my soul’, çastıq ‘youth’, künde ‘on the day’), 1 (laden) = 1 ↓c (caqıradı ‘call’)
b – 4: 4 (o, komm, an-[…]-Brust, unsre) → 4 (bizge ‘to us’, de ‘also’, ajtcı ‘tell’, açıq türde ‘openly’)
c – 5: 1– (und), 3 (was, du, verloren hast) = 3 ↑a (ne ‘what’, sen ‘you’, çoqalttın ‘what have you lost’), 1 (auch) → 1 (cattıqtaqı ‘lonely’), 1+ (dostarın ‘your friends’)

„Ihr lärmt und raucht und ahnet nicht,
Was mich, den Armen quält.
Ach nein, verloren hab’ ich’s nicht,
So sehr es mir auch fehlt.“

„Uv-cuvda sezbejsinder sender çajdı,
Men sorlīda barlıq[n] avır qaqıqı.
Ax, çoq, çoqaltpadım men ec närse,
Őjtkemen de çüregim emes çajlıf.”

a – 6: 2 (ihr, ahnet nicht) = 2 (sender ‘you-PL’, sezbejsinder ‘do not feel’), 2 (lärmt, raucht) ≈ 2 (uv-cuvda ‘amid noise and clamour’), 2– (und, und), 1+ (çajdı ‘situation’)
b – 4: 1– (was), 3 (mich, den-Armen, quált) ≈ 3 (men ‘I’, sorlīda ‘at the poor one’, qaqışi ‘grief’), 2+ (barlıq[n] ‘everything’, avır ‘heavy’)
d – 6: 2 (so, auch) = 2 (şijtkemen ‘so’, de ‘also’), 2 (mir, fehlt) ≈ 3 (çüregim ‘my heart’, emes ‘is not; un-, non-’, çajlı ‘quiet’), 2– (sehr, es)
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Die Luft ging durch die Felder, Dalada esip salqĭn samal,
Die Ähren wogten sacht, Egin pisip tüledi.
Es rauschten leis die Wälder, Qara ormandar cuvlaƣan çaj,
So sternklar war die Nacht. Çuldĭzdĭ çarĭq tün edi.

a – 3: 3 (die-Luft, ging, durch-die-Felder) ≈ 3 (esip ‘blowing’, samal ‘wind’,
dalada ‘in the field; outside’), 1+ (salqĭn ‘chill’)

b – 3: 1 (die-Ähren) ≈ 1 (egin ‘crops’), 1 (wogten) → 2 (pisip tüledi ‘ripened’),
1– (sacht)

c – 4: 1– (es), 3 (rauschten, leis, die-Wälder) = 3 (cuvlaƣan ‘whizzed’, çaj
‘quietly’, ormandar ‘forests’), 1+ (qara ‘black’)
d – 4: 1– (so), 3 (sternklar, war, die-Nacht) = 4 (çuldĭzdĭ çarĭq ‘starlit’, tün
‘night’, edi ‘was’)

Und meine Seele spannte
Sonda meniñana muȵlĭ çanĭm,
Weit ihre Flügel aus,
Çajĭp qurĭc qanatĭn,
Flog durch die stillen Lande,
Ucqan sĭpat tanis çolmen,
Als flöge sie nach Haus.
Öz eline baratĭn.

a – 4: 1 (und) → 1 (sonda ‘then’), 2 (meine, Seele) = 2 (meniӊ ‘my’, çanĭm
‘my soul’), 1 (spannte-aus) ≈ 1 ↓b (çajĭp ‘spreading’), 1+ (muȵlĭ ‘sad’)

b – 3: 1– (weit), 2 (ihre, Flügel) = 1 (qanatĭn ‘her wing’), 1+ (qurĭc ‘steal’)

c – 3: 1 (flog) = 1 (ucqan ‘flew’), 1 (durch-die-Lande) → 1 (çolmen ‘by the
road’), 1 (stillen) = 1 (tanis2 ‘quiet, calm’), 1+ (sĭpat ‘property’)

d – 4: 1– (als), 2 (flöge, sie) = 1 (baratĭn ‘going’), 1 (nach-Haus) ≈ 1 (eline ‘to
his homeland’), 1+ (öz ‘own’)

Popular song Du bist mein, ich bin dein ‘Sen mendik, men sendik’

Du bist mein, ich bin dein,
Sen mendik, men sendik,
dessen sollst du gewiß sein.
Sözimmer barmîn.
Du bist verschlossen
Sen enip, tĭm berik,
in meinem Herzen
Çurekte’ çandĭn.
verloren ist das Schlüssellein,
Kiłti çoq, mәȹgî bop,
du musst für immer drinnen sein.
Sen sonda qaldĭn.

sendik ‘yours’)

b – 5: 1– (dessen), 1 (gewiß) → 1 (sözimmer ‘in my word’), 3 (sollst, du, sein)
→ 1 (bar-mîn ‘I am’)

c – 2: 1 (du) = 1 (sen ‘you’), 1 (bist-verschlossen) → 2 (enip ‘going down’,
berik ‘firm’), 1+ (tĭm ‘quite’)

2 Tanis ‘known’; if we correct this word to tînîs ‘quiet’, this will perfectly render the German
stillen.
3 In the original Çurekte.
Friedrich Schiller’s Die Teilung der Welt ‘Dünijeni bölisüv’

„Nehmt hin die Welt!” rief Zeus von seinen Höhen
Den Menschen zu. „Nehmt, sie soll euer sein!
Euch schenk ich sie zum Erb und ewgen Lehen,
Doch teilt euch brüderlich darein.“

„Men endi bul çalƣandĭ ettim talaq,
Kimge ne kerek bolsa alsĭn qalap!”
Dep Zevs bulttar basqan nurlĭ aspanniñ,
Ajaj sap, ar çaqiñan turdi qarap.


b – 7: 2 (den Menschen zu) ≃ 1 (kimgie ‘to whom’), 1 (nehmht) ≃ 1 (alsĭn ‘let him take’), 4 (sie, soll, sein, euer) → 4 (ne ‘what’, kerek ‘needed’, bolsa ‘would’, qalap ‘wanting’)

c – 8: 8 (euch, schenk, ich, sie, zum-Erb, und, ewgen, Lehen) → 4 (bulttar ‘clouds’, basqan ‘treading on’, nurlĭ ‘brilliant’, aspanniñ ‘sky’s’)

d – 5: 1– (doch), 1 (teilt) → 1 (sap ‘putting’), 1 (darein) → 2 (ar çaqihan ‘from everywhere’), 2 (euch, brüderlich) → 2 (turdĭ ‘stood’, qarap ‘looking’), 1+ (ajaj ‘Oh’)

Da eilt, was Hände hat, sich einzurichten,
Es regte sich geschäftig jung und alt.
Der Ackermann griff nach des Feldes Früchten,
Der Junker pirschte durch den Wald.

Ajṭıp bәrin bolƣanca Zevs sözin,
Kütíp tuƣqan xalqtar etpej tózm.
Bajdan bastap, carliƣa cejin bәri,
Dünijege suƣanaq saldĭ közin.

a – 6: 3– (da, eilt, sich-einzurichten), 3 (was, Hände, hat) → 2 (bәrin ‘all’, bolƣanca ‘till it is’), 3+ (ajṭıp ‘telling’, Zevs ‘Zeus’s’, sözin ‘his word’)

b – 6: 2 (es, regte-sich) → 2 (etpej ‘doing not’, tózm ‘patience’), 1 (geschäftig) → 1 (kütíp-tuƣqan ‘those who are waiting’), 3 (jung und alt) → 1 (xalqtar ‘peoples’)

c – 4: 3 (der Ackermann, griff, nach-Früchten) → 3 (bajdan ‘from the rich’, bastap ‘to begin with’, carliƣa-cejin ‘to the poor’), 1 (des Feldes) → 1 (bәri ‘all’)


Der Kaufmann nimmt, was seine Speicher fassen,
Der Abt wählt sich den edeln Firnewein,
Der König sperrt die Brücken und die Straßen
Und sprach: »Der Zehente ist mein.«

Birevi eldi, birevi çerdi aldĭ,
Birevi kök quraqtĭ köldi aldĭ.
Birevi aspan çaloƣan asqardĭ alĭp,
Birevi çaz çajlavĭ beldi aldĭ.
5. Conclusion

The translations discussed above are far from ‘faithful’. Many words were replaced with words of different meanings and some were neglected in translation. There are a lot of neglected or untranslated words and substitutions. Among the neglected words there are conjunctions (daß, und), modal words (sollst, musst, müßt), adverbials (so, nun), rarely verbs (war), pronouns (es), prepositions (als) and relative pronouns (dessen, was). In Turkic languages which were deeply influenced by European languages, these words are frequently calqued from the respected contact languages. The translator only partially rendered the meaning of the poems, but he wanted the target verses to sound like true Kazakh poems. Therefore, in some cases, he employed Kazakh stylistic devices such as alliteration characteristic of Kazakh poetry, e.g. Çanıma çara bolip, çılatadı ‘it makes my soul wounded and weep’, and Kökti köksep küjgendej ‘as if it desired heaven’.
Qobızcı Qorqıt applied the same method as Abay or later as Mağjan Jumabaev did for translation strategies. It depended loosely on the source poems and the achievement of a poem written according to Kazakh poetical tradition.
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The Content of and the Public Approach to the Updated Education Programme in Teaching Kazakh Language and Literature

Abstract: The aim of this article is to analyse modern educational programmes in Kazakhstan. Education programmes in schools are not suitable for the country’s new economic strategy, but we can make progress by improving the education system. This article includes an outline of teaching concepts in the new education system. Communicative activities and skills are examined by using materials based on Nazarbayev Intellectual Schools education programmes. The result of the study presents the necessity of the Mängilik El ‘An eternal state’ concept in the new education system.
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1. Introduction

In 2009, Kazakhstan first participated in the Programme for International Assessment (PISA), which measures 15-year-old students’ reading, mathematics, and science literacy. This research is supported by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and is conducted once every three years. During PISA testing, three areas of functional literacy are assessed: literacy, mathematical literacy, and natural sciences literacy. Kazakhstan’s participation in PISA and TIMSS has shown that teachers in general education schools in the country teach subject knowledge that is ineffective in real-life situations. Thus, the requirement to develop students’ functional literacy has emerged. In the face of this strategic challenge, which is important to our country, the necessary functional qualities of an individual are activity, creative thinking, decision-making, the ability to choose a career path, and readiness for lifelong learning.

Modern education systems aim to implement a strategy focused on individuals and their values. The main idea of such a strategy is not only educating students but also developing their personal qualities and social interests. Creating a learning space that allows young people to plan and implement their own businesses is the main goal of the updated education programme.
Kazakhstan gained independence 27 years ago. The backbone of our independent state is an educated generation. It is clear that the future of the state depends on the education and upbringing of our youth. Ahmet Baitursynuly, a great teacher from Kazakhstan who had immense talent in education, said that “The improvement of the country has to begin with the improvement of children’s education” (Baitursynuly 1992: 14).

2. The main objective of the education programme for secondary schools

The basis of development is knowledge and science. Therefore, as in the developed countries of the world, improving the quality of education is one of the essential issues to be tackled in an independent country.

In this regard, it is important for the education system to provide young people with quality education to support their personal development, which requires comprehensive knowledge of pedagogical, scientific-theoretical, and methodological innovations, as well as best practices.

In countries like Kazakhstan that have an industrial economy, the modern education system is expected to shape a competent person who can keep up with scientific and technological developments and is capable of working with a world-class, knowledgeable, business-minded approach. The innovative learning outcomes embodied in the content of the updated education system should contribute to the acquisition of knowledge by the students themselves. The introduction of innovative technologies in the learning process plays a decisive role in extending student’s thinking, enhancing their worldview and cognitive activity, developing creative flexibility through research, and aspiring to qualification, i.e. the development of personality.

The content of the updated programme has a great deal to do with the teaching of Kazakh language and literature. One of the innovations in the programme is the definition of learning objectives. The principle “A lesson starts with the specification of objectives” has come to the fore in education and will be implemented in the following structure:

Specification of the objectives → Task actions, operations → Discussion of the goal achievement.

As can be seen, the following structure (specification, task actions, discussion) has never been discussed before.

The main objective of the updated education programme is to improve students’ learning outcomes. The features of the updated curriculum present a new structure consisting of 10 parts:

1. The importance of a subject.
2. The purposes of the educational programme of a subject.
3. The realisation of a trilingual policy.
4. The requirements for the organisation of educational processes.
5. Pedagogical methods used in teaching subject knowledge.
6. Respect for different cultures and attitudes.
7. Competence in the use of information and communication technologies.
8. The development of communicative skills.
9. Ways to evaluate learning outcomes.
10. Content, organisation and sequence of learning (Nazarbaev Zia’itkerlik mekteperi 2015: 2).

The updated programme implies new educational content which is intended to form, develop, and improve students’ language personality. The primary rationale behind teaching Kazakh language and literature is to create conditions for self-realisation and the development of language personality, as well as improve communicative and speaking skills. In addition, activities and exercises in textbooks should be in line with the programme and should help students understand specific situations and express their point of view, as well as analyse and evaluate information as part of a team. Thus, it is necessary to promote solutions to specific problems faced by society.

The strategic programme of Kazakhstan 2030 is characterised by the formation of a national educational model and the integration of the education system of Kazakhstan into the global educational space. Currently, the state language is Kazakh, the language of communication is Russian, and the international language is English. The content, structure and methods of teaching carried out in the three languages should not be disconnected. Disconnected teaching, which was peculiar to the previous educational process, prevented the implementation of cognitive and communicative activities in the teaching of Kazakh. In the previous programme, a given unit in a textbook would begin with a presentation of the form, such as grammatical rules and explanations, and then continue with analytical work on example sentences. Each lesson would focus on studying the form, and there was not enough time to work with texts or perform creative tasks. In accordance with the methods of teaching English, it is important to create a communicative environment for students, to encourage them to discuss real-life situations, to form an opinion, and to exchange information with each other. Thus, the learning paradigm has changed. For example, in the programme for Kazakh schools, the content of a subject consists of four types of conversational activities: listening, speaking, reading, and writing (Nazarbaev Zia’itkerlik mekteperi 2015: 4).

3. Communicative actions and communication skills in the programme

This section of the programme embodies a subject’s educational objectives. The content of subject knowledge is built on communicative actions and skills. Learning objectives regarding communicative skills are designed towards dynamic de-
velopment according to the level. The learning objectives reflect consistency and continuity, thus allowing the teacher and the student to exchange and evaluate views on future steps and plans (Chart 1, Chart 2, Chart 3 and Chart 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listening and speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L/S1. Prediction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/S2. Analysis of texts of different genres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/S3. Identifying information in a text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/S4. Identifying the main idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/S5. Response and evaluation of the material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/S6. Development of speech culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart 1.** Communicative Listening and Speaking skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1. Understanding information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2. Recognition of the style of a text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3. Distinguishing the genre features of a text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4. Comparative analysis of texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5. Students’ ability to formulate questions about a text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6. The use of reading strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7. Obtaining necessary information from various sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart 2.** Communicative Reading skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1. Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2. Writing texts in different genres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3. Presentation of written works in different formats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4. Writing an essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5. Writing compact texts on the basis of reading and listening materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart 3.** Communicative Writing skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards of literary language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLL1. Orthographic standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLL2. Orthoepic norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLL3. Lexical norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLL4. Grammatical rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLL5. Punctuation rules</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart 4.** Communicative skills of standards of literary Kazakh
In schools where the language of instruction is not Kazakh, the “Kazakh language and literature” programme is carried out simultaneously with the teaching of Kazakh.

Diagram 1. Communicative skills of Standards of literary language

Course objectives according to the four language skills are as follows (Diagram 1):

1. Listening: Listening to an authentic text, predicting the subject and the problem, understanding the content of a text, identifying basic and additional information, understanding the meaning of new words and keywords related to social and everyday topics, analysing the content of stories, short poems, finding the main idea of a text, responding to real-life situations after listening to material.

2. Speaking: Knowledge of connotations and denotations, expressing an opinion, content delivery; starting, continuing, and ending a dialogue; national speech ethics and speech etiquette; taking into account the intonational peculiarities of inquiries, messages, orders; description of stories and comparison of linguistic peculiarities; acting out a dialogue, mutual understanding and comprehension, writing a story using picture prompts.

3. Reading: Identification of important information in a text, identification of the style of a text (a diary entry, a letter of recommendation and explanation, an
autobiography, a CV) understanding the main idea, comparing types of texts, comparison of relevant information from an additional source, identifying contradictory information, linking the issue to real life.

4. Writing: A diary, a description, an explanation, an autobiography (in compliance with the stylistic features of these texts); organisation and structure of a paragraph, alignment in written works, using epithets, making posters, charts, and tables to present data; spelling words correctly; using the appropriate punctuation mark at the end of a sentence.

The Kazakh language curriculum in the updated program has evoked different views and conflicting opinions in society. Scientists, journalists, and teachers who want to teach Kazakh as a subject in Kazakh schools still continue to teach theoretical themes and the linguistic basis of Kazakh, thus introducing grammatical concepts. Many people did not welcome the lexical themes in the Kazakh language programme in Kazakh schools. The source of all knowledge, the practices of the past, and the mind and culture of humanity are transferred through the medium of Kazakh and stored in the Kazakh vocabulary. As a matter of fact, the curriculum focuses on textual vocabulary.

The implications of focusing on functional literacy in the updated programme are unclear to many people. Functional literacy refers to reading and writing as well as literacy in health issues, legal literacy, literacy in the field of family life and in natural sciences, computer literacy, as well as mathematical literacy.

These topics are discussed in the Kazakh Language, and Kazakh Language and Literature textbooks developed for the updated programme. The lexical themes in the programme are in line with the content mentioned above: they strive to prepare students for a range of topics. The aim is to help students acquire basic competencies that they can make use of in practical and effective social adaptation processes: managerial (problem-solving ability); informational (constantly improving knowledge through different sources of information); communicative (oral and written communication in Kazakh, Russian and English); social (the ability to live in society); personal (knowledge and skills needed to improve yourself as an individual); civil (the traditions, history, culture, ethics of the Kazakh people, knowledge of the language, understanding of civic duty); and technological (competent use of different technologies).

What were the problems faced in the previous programme? Today, teachers have to continually improve their teaching skills, master advanced technology, and have the ability to use it effectively. In fact, teachers have great responsibility in the education of students. An unprecedented issue is training an innovative teacher to be capable of independently and creatively solving issues related to the upbringing of each student. Kazakh society needs new, innovative, flexible, fast-changing, versatile teachers who are competent in new innovative pedagogical technologies. On that note, a three-month course was organised for the advanced training of
the pedagogical staff of the Republic of Kazakhstan, and a large amount of funds was provided by the state. The course programme set new tasks for teachers in the education system and began to improve the professional skills necessary for creative teachers. As Baıtursynuly said, “Teachers should know different teaching methods. They should resort to them for help” (Baıtursynuly 1992: 324). He also argued that modern education is in the best interests of society. Only those who are masters of their business can achieve great success. Nowadays, it is a good idea to comprehensively study a topic in order to fully understand it, to convey it to students, to design tasks for different levels, and to learn traditional and scientifically advanced methods of teaching.

Other fundamental objectives of the educational programme are to update the content of education, to introduce a system of criteria-based assessment, and to improve the effectiveness of the use of various teaching methods and tools. Learning objectives in the curriculum require learners to be able to identify and investigate real problems. The new educational programme entails critical thinking, research, and practice; it requires the use of ICT and communicative skills, engaging in individual work and teamwork, as well as creating a harmonious, favourable learning environment for students. The new curriculum teaches critical thinking, creativity, and effective teaching methods (collaborative learning, modelling, evaluation systems, and effective assessment strategies), which are necessary for the effective implementation of the curriculum (Nazarbaev Zıiatkerlik mektepterі 2012: 9). The updated curriculum is based on a spiral principle (Nazarbaev Zıiatkerlik mektepterі 2016: 11), which means tasks get more complicated as the class progresses with the repetition of topics. A student repeats a subject several times during their study; each time re-reading the subject becomes more complex; new knowledge is closely linked to previous knowledge and is viewed in the light of previous information.

The assessment system is also undergoing radical changes and adopting a criteria-based assessment in which students’ progress is measured against a set of predetermined criteria. A student’s progress in a school subject is evaluated in two ways: Formative Assessment and Summative Assessment. These types of assessment encourage children to analyse real problems. The Criteria-based Assessment System is used in countries such as the Philippines, Singapore, Japan, France, and Finland (Nazarbaev Zıiatkerlik mektepterі 2016: 4). The advantage of this assessment system is that it encourages children to think about and engage in science. Formative assessment is an integral part of everyday teaching and the teaching process in general and is conducted systematically throughout a semester. In formative assessment, students get feedback from the teacher, which allows them to adjust to a learning process without scores or grades. The final assessment is carried out by scoring and grading in order to draw information about the performance of students who have completed a part of the curriculum (general topics and a certain period
of study, such as a semester, school year, secondary education level). Formative assessment and summative assessment are used in all subjects.

There are many ways to use reflection. For example, one can ask the following questions: “Did we reach our goal? Is there any evidence? How did we manage to reach our goal (or not)? In pursuing the goals, what did we do successfully? What aspects of our knowledge should we improve? What can we do to improve it?” Reflection can be based on either verbal or written (first oral, then written) questions. This is called reverse reflection.

In short, the essence of the new programme is teaching functional literacy to children. Students should be able to use the knowledge gained at school, which is why this programme is based on the notion of ömirmen bailanys ‘Connection with Life’ (Mirseitova 2008: 79). In order to be successful in all aspects of life in the twenty-first century, teachers should acquire the skills they need. Within the framework of the updated curriculum, only those teachers who have endless love for their subject, their profession, and consider teaching as an empowering profession can work as a teacher. “If you want to see change in the future, make that change now”. As teachers, we teach students how to develop their abilities and get a good job in the future. Up-to-date knowledge is the key to the future.

4. The concepts of new education

In short, the essence of the new programme is teaching children functional literacy. Students should be able to use the knowledge gained at school, therefore this programme is based on the notion of ömirmen bailanys ‘Connection with Life’ (Mirseitova 2008: 80). Knowledge of life is inherent in all people and the whole of society. It is the complex knowledge that is applied by people in everyday life. Given its elementary and natural nature, this knowledge does not get as much attention as it deserves; as a result, the flexibility of existence decreases and misconceptions occur.

The updated content of education is aimed at loving the motherland, protecting nature, and respecting people. Each subject in the programme helps students understand the unity of man and the universe as a part of a great creation; it also helps them accept that there is no life without others. It will help us increase environmental literacy, love nature, and also appreciate what we have. I think it would be appropriate to quote “Emile, or On Education” by Jean-Jacques Rousseau. He recommends that all citizens bring up their children in a national, patriotic spirit: “I want the literate child to first learn to read about their homeland, and then in 10 years they should know all of its provinces, villages, roads and cities, and after another 15 years the entire history of the country, and after 16 years all its laws. Let there not be a single feat, a single hero that does not live in the memory or heart of a child. This is the duty of every citizen of this country” (Husserl 2000: 385).
Knowing something is one thing, but understanding it is something else. To put it differently, if knowledge comes with studying, understanding is formed by assimilation, consolidation of what is learned by heart, synthesis and analysis. In his work “Finding Your Element: How to Discover Your Talents and Passions and Transform Your Life”, the well-known scientist, speaker, and international adviser Ken Robinson suggests that the new educational paradigm prioritises divergent thinking over others (Robinson 2010: 210). What is divergent thinking? Translated from Latin, it means ‘lose, distance’. Divergent thinking is a form of thinking based on a strategy that creates many solutions to a single problem. The ability to solve a problem in a variety of ways without solving the frozen algorithm is inherent in divergent thinking. Distant thinking, or divergent thinking, depends on the creative ability of young people. The learning goals in the updated education content are based on the four language competence skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) and are aimed at increasing divergent thinking and the creative ability of students.

The main idea of the programme is to develop personal qualities, i.e., the leadership qualities of students. ‘Leadership’ refers to an independent person with great humanity who knows themselves, has managed to present themselves to others, and who knows how to work in a team. Leadership qualities are associated with the development of human values, freedom of thought, engaging in dialogue with others in a democratic society, and engaging in different activities within a team. According to Aristotle, if a person fails to integrate themselves into their society, then they will not be able to become one of the builders of the state.

5. Conclusion

The updated educational content is aimed at improving education in Kazakhstan to international standards. Despite the fact that there are different opinions about the programme, its purpose is to create citizens who can use divergent thinking and have qualities such as leadership, patriotism, and sociability. Such a person notices the advantages of the society in which he lives, appreciates the successes and achievements of the state, and is able, together with others, to take steps towards eliminating the contradictions that occur in everyday life.
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Acoustic Differences in Kazakh Male-Female WhatsApp Conversations

Abstract: This study is an acoustic analysis of WhatsApp chats in Kazakh. It aims to lay the groundwork for a more in-depth acoustic analysis of Kazakh WhatsApp conversations. Mean F0, intensity and F0 range were measured with Praat Software. The analysis was performed for ten speakers, the results of which were examined, and the average F0 was compared between male and female speakers. Based on the results acquired, it will be argued that acoustic gender differences are related to educational background, culture, and religion.

Keywords: Acoustic differences, Kazakh men and women, WhatsApp conversation

1. Introduction

Voice differences between male and female speech have been discussed and analysed in numerous studies in many languages. Researchers refer to linguistic aspects (phonetic, semantic and syntactical), but also to sociology, psychology, philosophy and anatomy. For example, a study on vowels (Peterson and Barney 1952) demonstrated that female speakers have higher F0 than men. Coleman (1976) examined female F0 and male F0 to study the differences between male and female groups. As a student of Robin Lakoff, Deborah Tannen continued and studied the differences between men and women in conversation. She argued that the cultural background of speakers is essential in conversation (Tannen 1990).

As far as different languages are concerned, Hasegawa and Hata (1995: 141–151) presented an outline of studies on differences between the male and female speech of Japanese people, and some examples were given to illustrate pitch accent. Discourse analysis of semantic notifications in Jordanian WhatsApp messages with reference to gender differences was studied by Al-Khawaldeh et al. (2016: 158–165). A sociolinguistic corpus of WhatsApp chats in Spanish between college students has also been analysed (see: Dorantes 2018). Using Python scripts and MongoDB, Dorantes’s team examined 835 conversations between 1,325 WhatsApp users (Dorantes...
et al.). Another sociolinguistic study contains a vast amount of data (Ueberwasser and et al.: 2017) which included 617 chats and 763,650 messages.

There are some phonetic (Baqıısynyly 1992, Jubanov 1999, Keńesbaev and Musabaev 1975, Myrzabekov 1993) and experimental (Júnisbek 2009) studies on Kazakh. However, no study has presented a phonetic analysis of WhatsApp chats, although WhatsApp conversations have been studied as a language teaching method for students (Gimranova, Nurmanova and Cohenmiller 2017), etc.

The present study focuses on acoustic differences between voices of Kazakh men and women recorded from WhatsApp chats.

2. Method

2.1. Linguistic material

For this study, a Kazakh corpus of WhatsApp conversations was created. The reason why WhatsApp conversations were chosen is that social networks are undisputed sources of views and information among young people. According to Sydyknazarov et al. (2018: 121–135), WhatsApp, Vkontakte and Facebook are the top social networks in Kazakhstan, accounting for 84.6%, 87.7% and 82.6% of users, respectively. Therefore, two WhatsApp conversations between classmates who studied at different universities were selected. Both conversations’ members had the same level of education (BA) and specialisation. The recordings for the experiment were made between 2016 and 2018. The first and second conversations contained 23 and 25 participants, respectively. Twenty-two participants were non-active WhatsApp users. Sixteen group participants just wrote text messages, short phrases and emojis. Among these recordings (voice recordings of 10 participants from the two conversations), male-female acoustic differences were examined in terms of some phonological aspects.

2.2. Speakers

In this study, the written and recorded messages of 48 participants were studied. For the acoustic analysis, the voices of ten speakers were chosen from two conversations. Six of them (four men, two women) speak only in Kazakh, and two of them (two women) speak in Kazakh and Russian. They are non-smokers aged 26 to 35 (smoking affects voice quality, so this is important in acoustic measurements) and live in different cities in Kazakhstan. Here is a brief summary of each speaker:

- Speaker 1: man, 31, student, Shymkent (South Kazakhstan)
- Speaker 2: man, 27, student, Almaty (South-East Kazakhstan)
- Speaker 3: man, 28, student, Taldyqorgan (South-East Kazakhstan)
- Speaker 4: man, 27, student, Qyzylorda, (South Kazakhstan)
3. Data analysis

Data analysis was conducted with *Praat* Software. The voice of each speaker was examined separately.

Speaker 1

The first speaker speaks clearly but uses only short sentences and phrases. He pronounces his own opinion about current affairs and provides additional information on domestic news. The acoustic features of his voice are the following (Diagram 1):

- **Pitch**: Minimum 75.0829859 Hz, Maximum 592.799481 Hz; Range 517.7 Hz; Average 118.357738 Hz
- **Intensity**: Minimum – 17.857888981200443 dB, Maximum 83.4267871943212 dB

![Diagram 1. Spectrogram of Speaker 1](image)

Speaker 2

The second speaker is a party (anniversary, wedding, birthday, etc.) showman. He does not use any Russian words in conversation and speaks longer than other group participants. The acoustic features of his voice are the following (Diagram 2):

- **Pitch**: Minimum 75.0829859 Hz, Maximum 592.799481 Hz; Range 517.7 Hz; Average 118.357738 Hz
- **Intensity**: Minimum – 17.857888981200443 dB, Maximum 83.4267871943212 dB
Diagram 2. Spectrogram of Speaker 2

Speaker 3

The third speaker uses some Russian words, for example, *podarok* ‘gift, present’. He also advises a group participant on how to collect money for a wedding party. The acoustic features of his voice are the following (Diagram 3):

- Pitch: Minimum 87.2184119 Hz, Maximum 463.919769 Hz;  
  Range 376.7 Hz; Average 115.882008 Hz
- Intensity: Minimum 36.08776934642554 dB,  
  Maximum 85.3087466100226 dB

Diagram 3. Spectrogram of Speaker 3
Speaker 4

Speaker 4 uses some Russian words like *davayte* ‘let us’. He suggests restarting an old conversation on another network site (*VKontakte*) to download photos and videos from events. The acoustic features of his voice are the following (Diagram 4):

- Pitch: Minimum 74.9849807 Hz, Maximum 572.70974 Hz; Range 497.7 Hz; Average 132.103614 Hz
- Intensity: Minimum 44.561368039634665 dB, Maximum 85.99790583444857 dB

![Diagram 4. Spectrogram of Speaker 4](image)

Speaker 5

The subject of the conversation of speaker 5 is a meeting arrangement. Her voice was exhausted. She said that she had been waiting for answers from group partici-

![Diagram 5. Spectrogram of Speaker 5](image)
pants for a long time. Her voice has some interesting features. For example, in the word *qyzdar* ‘girls’ the vowel [a] is pronounced long. The vowels in all words are pronounced softly. The acoustic features of her voice are the following (Diagram 5):

- **Pitch:** Minimum 76.1498162 Hz, Maximum 390.643891 Hz; Range 314.5 Hz; Average 208.660287 Hz.
- **Intensity:** Minimum 37.55232456563243 dB, Maximum 80.03119420590448 dB

**Speaker 6**

The recording of the sixth speaker is long, but this speaker speaks very fast. In some words, like *ásirese* ‘especially’, the vowel [æ] (á) is pronounced long and hard. The speaker talks about a product that she wants to buy and use. The acoustic features of her voice are the following (Diagram 6):

- **Pitch:** Minimum 77.765849 Hz, Maximum 596.006115 Hz; Range 518.2 Hz; Average 199.439026 Hz
- **Intensity:** Minimum 23.545261816389374 dB, Maximum 77.80582991607257 dB

![Diagram 6. Spectrogram of Speaker 6](image)

**Speaker 7**

The seventh speaker pronounces vowels as hard and robust. It is essential to stress her educational background as she studied in a medium-level Russian language group at school, which affects her pronunciation. The acoustic features of her voice are the following (Diagram 7):

- **Pitch:** Minimum 75.0774437 Hz, Maximum 509.393642 Hz; Range 434.3 Hz; Average 161.931941 Hz
- **Intensity:** Minimum – 6.083275719972812 dB, Maximum 76.62176017678392 dB
The recording of Speaker 8 is longer than that of Speaker 5. She uses some Russian words and phrases like yesli chto ‘in any case’. She comments on education methods. The acoustic features of her voice are the following (Diagram 8):

- Pitch: Minimum 88.4820548 Hz, Maximum 548.213846 Hz; Range 459.7 Hz; Average 209.639685 Hz
- Intensity: Minimum – 15.025229927492447 dB, Maximum 85.62020789052072 dB

In the recording of the ninth speaker, there are some missing words because this speaker is looking for the right words to explain how to get from Almaty to Turk-
Dana Suleimen estan. She uses some Russian words like koroche ‘shorter’ and luchshe ‘better’. She invites group participants to a wedding party. She repeats many words twice. The acoustic features of her voice are the following (Diagram 9):

- Pitch: Minimum 75.0159003 Hz, Maximum 551.003568 Hz; Range 476 Hz; Average 225.565533 Hz
- Intensity: Minimum 31.824345160295657 dB, Maximum 75.85742261472143 dB

Diagram 9. Spectrogram of Speaker 9

Speaker 10

The tenth speaker speaks in short sentences. She pronounces vowels very softly and quietly. She talks to the group participants about various matters. The acoustic features of her voice are the following (Diagram 10):

Diagram 10. Spectrogram of Speaker 10
– Pitch: Minimum 174.430675 Hz, Maximum 598.999947 Hz; Range 424.6 Hz; Average 250.02456 Hz
– Intensity: Minimum 25.793405331921164 dB, Maximum 83.40675720784093 dB

4. Results and discussion

In the table below (Table 1), the average of Mean F0 is given for each speaker. The mean fundamental frequency is perceived as the pitch. In this case, the average male pitch is lower than the average female pitch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mean F0 (in Hz)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>118.357738 Hz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>141.814856 Hz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>115.882008 Hz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>132.103614 Hz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>208.666353 Hz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>199.439026 Hz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>161.931941 Hz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>209.639685 Hz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>225.565533 Hz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>250.02456 Hz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean F0 is around 120 Hz for men and 200 Hz for women (Takefuta et al. 1972). The predictive frequency average for both sexes is as follows:
– The average frequency of the men (Speaker 1, Speaker 2, Speaker 3 and Speaker 4): 127.039554 Hz
– The average frequency of the women (Speaker 5, Speaker 6, Speaker 7, Speaker 8, Speaker 9 and Speaker 10): 209.211183 Hz

As shown by the data analysis, differences between men and women are apparent. Women speak more quietly but longer than men. Also, women write messages and record sound messages that are longer than men’s. Women use a lot of emojis (Diagram 11) all the time. Emotional messages are written mostly by women. Men write short, clear, understandable messages without repeating emojis. Men mostly prefer GIF animations over emojis.
Diagram 11. Differences between men and women in using WhatsApp commands

The acoustic analysis produced new and interesting results. For example, F0 range (in Hz) was more significant in the voices of the male speakers. Consonants are pronounced more clearly and loudly by the men than by the women. F1 values are higher for the male speakers, but F2 values are higher for the female speakers.

Education is an essential factor, especially educational background. Culture also affects speech. For example, the female speakers started speaking with a lower voice tone than the male speakers. The speakers choose the right words in conversations to respect customs and observe etiquette in writing and speaking. Reactions to serious news are more remarkable in the women’s messages: they use religious expressions to react, e.g. *Alla saqtasyn* ‘May Allah save us’ and *Inshalla* ‘If Allah wills’. This shows that the religion of a speaker is also an essential factor.

5. Conclusion

WhatsApp conversations have been analysed in different ways in many studies. This study aimed to lay the groundwork for an acoustic analysis of Kazakh WhatsApp conversations. The research roughly covered as much material as the previous studies as the number of speakers must be adapted to the possibilities of an experimental study.

Word order in Standard Kazakh is generally SOV, but in WhatsApp conversations this rule is not observed by speakers, e.g.
(1) *Baramyz ba kafege?*

_gofut-1pl interrog-part cafe-dat_

“Shall we go to a café?”

As can be seen from this example, the sentence starts with the verb. Another peculiarity of informal WhatsApp chats is that some suffixes are dropped. The women did not pronounce sounds and suffixes more often than the men. As a rule, Russian loanwords in Kazakh do not obey vowel harmony. However, in the pronunciation of the speakers from South Kazakhstan, vowels are adapted to Kazakh phonetic rules; for example, the constant [tʃ] is pronounced [ʃ]. This is also true of their spelling.

As was indicated in the introduction to this article, the next research issue should be the examination of a sociolinguistic corpus of social media websites in Kazakh; see also Al-Khawaldeh et al. (2016), Alejandro Dorantes et al. (2018) and Ueberwasser et al. (2017).
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