

**TURKISH INVOLVEMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN KAZAKHSTAN:  
THE CASE OF INTERNATIONAL HOCA AHMET YESEVI  
TURK-KAZAKH UNIVERSITY**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO  
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
OF  
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY**

**BY**

**ÖZCAN TÜRKOĞLU**

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR  
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE  
IN  
THE GRADUATE PROGRAM OF  
EURASIAN STUDIES**

**JULY 2005**

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

---

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata  
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

---

Assoc. Prof. Ceylan Tokluođlu  
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

---

Dr. Mustafa Ően  
Supervisor

**Examining Committee Members**

Prof. Dr. Bahattin AkŐit (METU, SOC) \_\_\_\_\_

Dr. Mustafa Ően (METU, SOC) \_\_\_\_\_

Assist. Prof. Cennet Engin Demir (METU, EDS) \_\_\_\_\_

**I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.**

Name, Last name: Özcan Türkoğlu

Signature :

## **ABSTRACT**

### **TURKISH INVOLVEMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN KAZAKHSTAN: THE CASE OF INTERNATIONAL HOCA AHMET YESEVI TURK-KAZAKH UNIVERSITY**

Özcan Türkoğlu

M.Sc., Eurasian Studies

Supervisor: Dr. Mustafa Şen

July 2005, 182 pages

After the disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1991, Turkey involved in many projects in all spheres with the Central Asian republics. In contrast, less of them have been realized. Turkey was more successful in educational projects. It has initiated more permanent projects with the republics. In this regard, International Hoca Ahmet Yesevi Turk-Kazakh University, established in 1993 in Turkestan city of Kazakhstan, is one of the first and outstanding project of Turkey not only in education sphere but also in terms of all spheres. Concurrently, for the first time Turkey involved in an international higher education activity abroad. The existence of the university both facilitated the establishment of the subsequent Turkish universities in Central Asia and contributed to the sustainable enhancement of Turkish relations with the region.

On the other hand, for the last two decades higher education is more highlighted as a cross-border issue mainly accelerated by the internationalization of higher education. Although the university is not directly prompted by the internationalization process, it both performs activities matching with internationalization and contributes to the development of this process in Central Asia. In this context, this study brings up the motives and objectives behind the establishment and structuration of the university, and argues that by foundation university has quite similarities with the rationales of the internationalization. Therefore, it aims to find out the compatible and incompatible aspects of the university with the internationalization in addition to clarify its identity and position as an international higher education institution.

Keywords: Internationalization of Higher Education, International Higher Education, Regionalism in Higher Education, Hoca Ahmet Yesevi, Kazakhstan, Turkish Universities in Central Asia, Turkish Educational Relations with Central Asia, Social Capital.

## ÖZ

### **TÜRKİYE’NİN KAZAKİSTAN’DA YÜKSEKÖĞRETİME KATILIMI: ULUSLARARASI HOCA AHMET YESEVİ TÜRK-KAZAK ÜNİVERSİTESİ ÖRNEĞİ**

Özcan Türkoğlu

Yüksek Lisans., Avrasya Çalışmaları

Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Mustafa Şen

Temmuz 2005, 182 sayfa

Sovyetler Birliği’nin 1991 yılında dağılmasından sonra, Türkiye Orta Asya Cumhuriyetleri ile her alanda birçok projelere girdi. Fakat bunların çok azı gerçekleştirilebildi. Türkiye eğitim projelerinde daha başarılıydı. Orta Asya Cumhuriyetleri ile eğitim alanında daha kalıcı projelere imza attı. Bu bakımdan, Kazakistan’ın Türkistan şehrinde 1993 yılında kurulan Uluslararası Hoca Ahmet Yesevi Türk-Kazak Üniversitesi Türkiye’nin yalnızca eğitim alanında değil, diğer tüm alanlarda da ortaya çıkan ilk ve en çok göze çarpan projelerinden biridir. Aynı zamanda, Türkiye ilk defa uluslararası bir yükseköğretim faaliyetine de girişmiş oldu. Üniversitenin mevcudiyeti hem Orta Asya’da peşi sıra gelen Türk üniversitelerinin kurulmasını kolaylaştırmış, hem de Türkiye’nin Orta Asya ile olan ilişkilerinin sürdürülebilir gelişimine katkı sağlamıştır.

Diğer taraftan, yükseköğretim son yirmi yılda daha çok uluslararasılaşma ile hız kazanan sınır-ötesi bir mesele olarak öne çıkarılmıştır. Ahmet Yesevi Üniversitesi, uluslararasılaşma sürecinin doğrudan bir ürünü olmamasına karşın, hem uluslararasılaşma ile örtüşen faaliyetler icra etmekte hem de bu sürecin Orta Asya’da gelişmesine katkıda bulunmaktadır. Buradan hareketle, bu çalışma üniversitenin ortaya çıkışının ve yapılanmasının gerisinde yatan saikleri ve amaçları ortaya koymakta; ve bunların uluslararasılaşmanın gerekçeleri ile epey yakın benzerlikler gösterdiğini tartışmaktadır. Bu nedenle, çalışma, üniversitenin; uluslararası bir yüksek öğretim kurumu olarak konumunu ve kimliğini açıklığa kavuşturması kadar, yükseköğretimin uluslararasılaşması süreciyle örtüşen ve örtüşmeyen taraflarını bulmayı da amaçlamaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Yüksek Öğretimin Uluslararasılaşması, Uluslararası Yüksek Öğretim, Yüksek Öğretimde Bölgeselleşme, Hoca Ahmet Yesevi, Kazakistan, Orta Asya'daki Türk Üniversiteleri, Türkiye'nin Orta Asya ile Olan Eğitim İlişkileri, Beşeri Sermaye.

**To My Mother...**



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my sincere appreciation and indebtedness to my supervisor, Dr. Mustafa Şen, for his friendly attitude, valuable guidance, and supervision. I believe without his encouragement this thesis would not have been progressed. I extremely thank to Prof. Dr. Bahattin Akşit and Assist. Prof. Cennet E. Demir for their generous contributions and precious comments about my dissertation.

I owe thanks to Ahmet Yesevi University's Board of Trustees; to its chairman Namık Kemal Zeybek and to the economist member Feyzullah Budak for their keen interest and valuable time allocated for the interviews. I want to express my special thanks to Dr. Öner Kabasakal for providing me with the opportunity to carry out my interviews and his valuable comments and criticism about the study.

I wish to thank my officemate Nuri Barış Tartıcı for his tolerance and generous contributions for the time needed for research and writing. I am grateful to my friends, Gülce Tarhan and Tansu Topçu, for their detailed reading and evaluations. I also desire to send my thanks to my housemate Onur Kasap for his unique moral support and encouragement throughout our thesis studies.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge my deepest gratitude to Işık Küçükyazıcı for her precious help, moral support and understanding throughout the preparation of the thesis.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
DEDICATION.....	viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	x
LIST OF TABLES.....	xiv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xv
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1. Problem of the Study.....	3
1.2. Method of the Study.....	6
1.3. Plan of the Study .....	8
2. THE DISINTEGRATION OF THE USSR: A NEW PERIOD FOR TURKEY .....	10
2.1. Political relations.....	10
2.1.1. The First Official Visits .....	14
2.1.2. Turkish International Cooperation Agency.....	16
2.1.3. The Summits and Conventions .....	17
2.1.4. The Model Country Policy.....	19
2.1.5. Turkish Foreign Policy in the Programmes of the Turkish Governments .....	22
2.2. Economic Relations .....	24
2.3. Socio-Cultural Relations .....	28
2.3.1. Cultural Relations .....	28
2.3.2. Educational Relations.....	30
2.3.2.1. The Great Student Project .....	33
2.3.2.2. Turkish Schools Opened in Turkic Republics and Communities .....	40
2.3.2.2.1. Turkish Public Schools .....	41

2.3.2.2.2. Turkish Private Schools .....	43
<b>3. TURKISH UNIVERSITIES IN CENTRAL ASIA:</b>	
<b>THE CASE OF INTERNATIONAL HOCA AHMET YESEVI</b>	
<b>TURK-KAZAKH UNIVERSITY.....</b>	<b>49</b>
3.1. Introduction .....	49
3.2. Hoca Ahmet Yesevi International Turk-Kazakh University.....	50
3.2.1. The Establishment Story of Ahmet Yesevi University .....	51
3.2.2. Foundation and History.....	53
3.2.3. Mission.....	56
3.2.4. The Board of Trustees and Administration.....	58
3.2.5. Student Admission System .....	59
3.2.6. Students and Academics .....	61
3.2.7. Finance of the University .....	64
3.2.8. Lifelong Learning Activities .....	65
3.2.9. Campuses and Faculties .....	65
3.2.10. Language of the Instruction .....	66
3.2.11. Distance Learning Activities.....	67
3.3. Kyrgyzstan-Turkey Manas University .....	70
3.3.1. The Comparision of Ahmet Yesevi University and Manas University .....	72
<b>4. THE MAIN STRENGTHS OF THE UNIVERSITY .....</b>	<b>74</b>
4.1. Introduction .....	74
4.2. The Importance of Higher Education.....	75
4.3. The Strengths of the University: the name and location.....	78
4.3.1. Hoca Ahmet Yesevi .....	79
4.3.1.1. The Basic Principles of Ahmet Yesevi Thought.....	83
4.3.2. Why Kazakhstan?.....	83
4.3.3. Why Turkistan City?.....	90
<b>5. INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND</b>	
<b>AHMET YESEVI UNIVERSITY .....</b>	<b>93</b>

5.1. What is the Internationalization of Higher Education?.....	93
5.2. Why Internationalization?.....	94
5.3. The History of Internationalization of Higher Education .....	97
5.4. How the Internationalization is Perceived as a Process? .....	100
5.5. The Competition in Higher Education among the Developed Countries .....	104
5.6. The Role of Instruction Language in International Higher Education.....	107
5.7. The Trade of Higher Education Services in International Market.....	109
5.8. Higher Education: A Tradable Commodity or Public Service?.....	111
5.9. The Educational Services in the Scope of WTO and UNESCO Conventions.....	114
5.10. The Statistics on International Student Mobility.....	116
5.10.1. Turkish Involvement in the International Higher Education Activities.....	118
5.10.1.1. The Procedures of Higher Education in Turkey for Foreign Students.....	121
6. THE IDENTITY AND POSITION OF AHMET YESEVI UNIVERSITY AS AN INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION.....	123
6.1. The University Models: Public and Private .....	123
6.1.1. European Model .....	125
6.1.2. American Model.....	126
6.2. Internationalization of Higher Education without Student Mobility .....	128
6.2.1. Branch University .....	130
6.2.2. Virtual University.....	132
6.3. Globalization versus Internationalization in Higher Education .....	133
6.4. Nationalism, Regionalism and Internationalism in Higher Education.....	135
7. THE RATIONALES OF THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND AHMET YESEVI UNIVERSITY .....	140
7.1. Introduction .....	140
7.2. Political Rationale .....	143
7.2.1. The Analysis of the Political Rationale for AYU .....	144
7.3. Economic Rationale .....	145
7.3.1. The Analysis of the Economic Rationale for AYU .....	146

7.4. Academic Rationale .....	148
7.4.1. The Analysis of the Academic Rationale for AYU .....	148
7.5. Socio-Cultural Rationale.....	149
7.5.1. The Analysis of the Socio-Cultural Rationale for AYU .....	150
8. CONCLUSION.....	152
REFERENCES.....	155
APPENDICES .....	164
A. THE ALLOCATED QUOTAS TO TURKIC STUDENTS .....	164
B. THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD IN 2005.....	165
C. AHMET YESEVI UNIVERSITY AND MANAS UNIVERSITY COMPARED ...	166
D. AMERICAN UNIVERSITY-CENTRAL ASIA .....	168
E. AMERICAN UNIVERSITY IN THE WORLD .....	169
F. ABOUT KAZAKH HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM.....	170
G. THE POLICIES ON TURKIC GEOGRAPHY IN THE TURKISH GOVERNMENT PROGRAMMES .....	175
H. THE SURVEY RESULTS OF THE TURKIC STUDENTS IN TURKEY .....	178
I. THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE AND THE QUESTIONS.....	179

## LIST OF TABLES

### TABLES

Table 1: Turkic Students Educated in Turkey in 2004 .....	36
Table 2: The Statistics About Beneficiary Turkic Students in Turkey by Levels of Education (by 2004).....	38
Table 3: The Statistics About Beneficiary Turkic Students in Turkey Since 1992-1993 (by 2004).....	39
Table 4: The Rates of Graduation by the Education Levels .....	39
Table 5: The Statistics On Turkish Schools Established By MEB (2003-2004) .....	42
Table 6: The Students in Ahmet Yesevi University in 2005 .....	62
Table 7: The Number of Academics in Ahmet Yesevi University .....	63
Table 8: The National Compositions of Kazakh Country Since 1926.....	87
Table 9: Foreign Higher Education Students in the US by Countries .....	117
Table 10: The Comparision of the University Models .....	124
Table 11: Some Primary Values of Globalization and Internationalization .....	135
Table 12: The Stages in Higher Education and Economic Cooperation.....	138
Table 13: The Axes of the Rationales .....	142

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

APEC	: Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation
ASEAN	: The Association of Southeast Asian Nations
AYU	: Hoca Ahmet Yesevi International Turkish-Kazakh University
BSEC	: Black Sea Economic Cooperation Organization
CERI	: Centre for Educational Research and Innovation
CIS	: Common Wealth Independent States
DPT	: Turkish Undersecretariat of State Planning and Organization
EIU	: Economic Intelligent Unit
EU	: European Union
FSU	: Former Soviet Union
GATS	: General Agreement on Trade in Services
HE	: Higher Education
HEIs	: Higher Education Institutions
IHE	: Internationalization of Higher Education
IMHE	: Institutional Management in Higher Education
MEB	: Turkish Ministry of National Education
MFA	: Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs
NAFTA	: North America Free Trade Agreement
OECD	: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
ÖSS	: Student Selection Exam (Turkey)
ÖSYM	: The Student Selection and Placement Center (Turkey)
SIS	: Turkish State Institute of Statistics
TCS	: The Exam of Turkic Republics and Relative Communities
TICA	: Turkish International Cooperation Agency
TÜBA	: Turkish Sciences Academy
TURKSOY	: Joint Administration of Turkic Culture and Art General Directorate
UN	: United Nations
UNDP	: United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	: United Nations Education Science and Culture Organization
USSR	: United Soviet Socialist Republics
YÖK	: Turkish Higher Education Council
YÖS	: The Examination for Foreign Students (Turkey)

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1991 allowed Turkey to embrace with the Central Asian republics with them it has common historical, ethno-linguistic and cultural heritage. Relative to the other countries of the world, these similarities have further motivated Turkey in regard to political, economic, technical, and cultural activities, projects or cooperations. The Summit of Turkic-Speaking Countries (hereafter Turkic Summits), the Turkish Eximbank credits and the “Great Student Project” (*Büyük Öğrenci Projesi in Turkish*) are some of the crucial events realized with the republics. In addition to them, Turkey has also institutionalized its projects and activities through such public agencies like TICA, TÜRKSOY, the Eurasian Channel, and the State Ministry (in charge of Turkic republic and relative communities).

The accelerated Turkish relations with Central Asia have resulted in two common public universities. They have contributed much to the development of further relations with the republics relative to the other Turkish institutions. These are International Hoca Ahmet Yesevi Turk-Kazakh University and Kyrgyzstan-Turkish Manas University. By the former one Turkey has involved in international higher education activities and supplied technical assistance for the first time in its history. Although Manas University emphasizes more on national and international references, AYU was assigned more with the regional mission, which serving for the youths of the republics and other Turkic communities in addition to Turkish and Kazakh youths.

In the literature, the Central Asian republics are called as “Turkish”, “Turk” or as widely accepted “Turkic” republics. For English version, while some scholars (Yaman, 2002) use the “Turkish” and other (Huseyinov, 2002) prefer “Turk”, in general “Turkic” is widely recognized and used so as to differ “Turks” of Central Asia from “Turks” of Anatolia. After the collapse of the Soviet Union in Turkey the term for the republics was remarked as “Türki” and “Türkik” which coined by adding of Arabic suffix to Turkish so as to distinguish the Turks of Central Asia from the Turks of Anatolia (Şen, 2001). But, those usages were strongly criticized since they refer to the meaning of “people close or similar to Turkish nation”.



In this study as generally used in the literature the term of “Central Asian republics” will be preferred which include five republics, namely Azerbaijan in Caucasia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan in Central Asia. But, mainly in the cases of references and citations the terms of “Turkic republics” or “Turkic countries” will be used. The term “the republics” refers to the Central Asian republics and the term “Turkic communities” refers to “Turkic relative communities” living in other countries other than Central Asian republics. The term “Turkic people” in the study is an overall concept and includes both Turkic republics and Turkic relative communities. In order to achieve a consistency, “Turkish” is solely used in regard to Turkey.

In this study, unlike politically created word of “Turkic world”<sup>1</sup>, the term of “Turkic geography”<sup>2</sup> is used so as to define the overall the territory of “Turks” of Turkey, and “Turks” living outside of Turkey. The artificially created “Turkic world”<sup>3</sup> is known as the historical and ethno-cultural boundaries of Turkey, some defines it as stretching from “the Adriatic to the Chinese Great Wall” or “from Baikal to Tuna River”. Since there is no separate word to cover the both Turks of Turkey and of Central Asia, in some cases the term of “Turks” will be used to designate the whole people living in Turkic geography.

In general while the term “Turk” is being used for the “Turks” of Turkey, in some cases it may cover all “Turks” living in the world. Such as the main unit analysis of this study “Ahmet Yesevi University” in Turkey is called as “Hoca Ahmet Yesevi International Turk-Kazakh University”. The term of “Turk” in the name of university refers to Turkey. In contrast, the term of “Turk” is preferred in Turkish version instead of “Türkiye”. It designates to a conscious preference, because it covers the all Turks living in the world. It seems a very strategic preference.

---

<sup>1</sup> It is stated that the term firstly was used by Prof. Turan Yazgan’s Turkic World Research Foundation which was established in 1980. (<http://www.turan.org/bilgi.htm>, 20.05.2005).

<sup>2</sup> It includes Turkic people living in all former socialist countries of Balkans, Eastern Europe, Russian Federation, Caucasia and Central Asia.

<sup>3</sup> From the Balkans to China there are different “Turks”, some living in their independence republics, some in autonomous republics and some live as the citizens of other countries. The language is the most effective tool to determine the actual population size of the Turks. It is estimated as the fifth mostly spoken language in the world with almost 250 million people (Yaman, 2002) (Yaman, 2002). It is stated “Turkic World Concept”, other than Turkey, includes the Central Asian republics and “federal states” existed in Russian Federation, and the Turks living in other near abroad countries and all of other continents (Zeybek, 2003: 10-11). The term “Turkic world” is not existed in the regulation of AYU, officially prepared by Turkey and Kazakhstan. The term is choiced and favored more in Turkish nationalist discourse and within the remarks of Turkish politicians.

The official name of the university in English is “Ahmed Yasawi Kazakh-Turkish International University”. It is the official usage in the correspondences, but is not the prevalent usage in Turkish literature and society. The English version reveals that the university’s name was entitled with nationalities rather than with state names, like Kazakhstan or Turkey. On the contrary, in that of Manas University, the names of the states are used.

In Turkey, the most recognized name of the university is “Uluslararası Hoca Ahmet Yesevi Türk-Kazak Üniversitesi” which can be translated into English as “International Hoca Ahmet Yesevi Turk-Kazakh University”. The Turkish version is used in the “foundation treaty” and repeated in the “regulation” (*tüzük*). Therefore, throughout the study, the translated version will be preserved. But, for the sake of shortening “Ahmet Yesevi University” or AYU will be used in the texts.

On the other hand, the name is being confused with the other versions like, “Hodja Ahmed Yasevi International Turk-Kazakh University”<sup>1</sup> or “Yasavi International Kazakh-Turkish University”<sup>2</sup>. Despite its Kazakh usage in which the term of “Turk” is replaced with “Turkish”, the university shortens the name and prefers the usage of “Ahmet Yesevi University” in its both websites<sup>3</sup>.

In this study one of the main core terms is “internationalization” (*Uluslararasılaşma*). It can be used as a separate concept and can be adapted to diverse sectors other than education or higher education. For this reason, in this study internationalization is solely concerned on the topic of higher education. It is widely used as “internationalization process” or “the internationalization”.

### **1.1. Problem of the Study**

The international conjuncture emerged by “perestroika” and “glasnost” policies of Gorbachev era have allowed Turkey to accelerate his relations with Central Asian republics even during the time of the USSR. Turkey’s relations with the Central Asian republics were mainly facilitated by its common historical, ethnic, cultural, religious ties. Those similarities have also justified

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://byegm.gov.tr/YAYINLARIMIZ/newspot/18/N26.htm>, 22.04.2005.

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.president.kz/articles/Science/Science\\_container.asp?lng=en&art=college](http://www.president.kz/articles/Science/Science_container.asp?lng=en&art=college), 29.04.2005.

<sup>3</sup> The Kazakh version is <http://www.turkistan.kz>, but the Turkish version is <http://www.yesevi.edu.tr>.

Turkey to be presented as the best country having the most suitable economic and political model to be followed by the republics in their process of secularisation, advancement on democracy and market economy. Turkey's condensed relations in the first half of 1990s with the republics in spheres of political, economic and socio-cultural resulted in many contracts and treaties, but some of them have produced concrete activities or projects. The well-known projects and institutions related with Turkic republics and communities are the results of this period.

Unlike political and economic relations of Turkey, the beginning of socio-cultural relations have traced back to the pre-independence time when the republics were sovereign but not independent. Turkey's most smooth and productive relations have realized in this sphere which did not need great financial resources and were easily shaped upon ethno-linguistic, historical and cultural similarities. It does not need to interfere or engage in international political economy. Despite the other planned projects in the sphere of politics and economics, Turkey has easily developed its educational relations through the significant projects like "Great Student Project" and common (joint venture) public universities established in the Central Asian republics.

This study focuses on educational relations took place with Central Asian republics and highlight the establishment of International Hoca-Ahmet Yesevi Turk-Kazakh University. It is worth to analyze the university because it is known as one of the first concrete Turkish projects materialized just one year after the independence declaration of Kazakhstan, but its foundation story goes back to the December 1990 of Turkish Minister of Culture's and Turkish President Özal's visits in March 1991 to Kazakhstan in which cultural, scientific and technical cooperation treaties were signed. Then, the establishment of the university finalized in April-May 1992 by Turkish Prime Minister Demirel's visit to Turkestan city where the mausoleum of Hoca Ahmet Yesevi exists and where the predecessor university, Ahmet.Yesevi Turkestan State University, had been established in June 1991.

By the ascending of the globalization national borders have blurred in higher education services and it became a more cross-border issue. Moreover, the commoditization of higher education service and strengthening of English as prevalent lingua franca allowed more international self-paying students to be involved in international higher education. The rising of student mobility has also fostered the exchange and mobility of staff and curriculum. Owing to his political,

economic, academic and socio-cultural rationales both individual states and higher education institutions have involved more in the bilateral or multilateral regional and international higher education cooperations in order to benefit from the process and be able to survive in the age of internationalization in which competition increased and public funding decreased.

The internationalization process has diversified the types of universities and facilitated the states or the institutions to be involved more in the cross-border activities. AYU is not a conscious product designed so as to benefit from this process. On the contrary, it has been established in a political conjuncture resulted from the disintegration of the FSU, but coincidentally it has many similarities with the process which paved the way for the penetration of internationalization of higher education in Central Asia. For this reason, Ahmet Yesevi University is an exceptional international common university, which was established in 1992 and materialized in 1993. The establishment of AYU corresponds to the motives of the internationalization of higher education which has been grown since 1980s and fostered in 1990s.

There are some reasons of why the university worths to analyze? Firstly, the establishment of the university proposes a great structural transformation from its previous name of “Ahmet Yesevi Turkestan State University” to “International Hoca Ahmet Yesevi Turk-Kazakh University”. Secondly, by the establishment of the university for the first time Turkey has provided technical assistance to a foreign country in higher education. Thirdly, it is not solely an academic institution; it has an implicit mission to contribute Turkish political and economical relations with Central Asian republics. The mission of the university reveals the arguments of Turkish foreign policy on Central Asia. Fourth, it not only serves for Turkish and Kazakh youths but also by foundation it aims to educate youths of other Turkic communities. It has strong regional dimension and considerations. Fifth, unlike other common Turkish university in Central Asia, namely Kyrgyzstan-Turkey Manas University established in 1995, AYU does not include the word of “Turkey” both in Turkish and English versions. Instead of “Turkey”, the word “Turk” is officially being used. Thus the sphere of influence covers all Turks living in the world instead of emphasizing solely on Turkish youths. Sixth, it defines itself as an “international university” and uses the name of “Ahmet Yesevi” who is known as one of the first Sufi of Turkic communities who teaches them the practices of Islam with Turkic language in the past and has function both in the Turkicization and Islamization of Anatolia. Seventh, it has facilitated the establishment of the subsequent Turkish universities in Central Asia, which make important contributions for the involvement of internationalization of higher education in Central Asia.

This study argues that, by foundation, AYU has been presenting structural similarities with the internationalization process, and the mission of AYU has coherence with the rationales of the IHE. The growing involvement of the university into internationalization activities is resulted from its compatible aspects with the process. In this way the university has obtained greater convergence toward the internationalization of higher education and paved the way for the internationalization of higher education in Central Asia.

The university is examined both conceptually and practically in order to detect compatible and incompatible aspects of the university with the IHE process, and clarify its stage and identity in the age of internationalization of higher education. Therefore, this study examines the reason of existence and structuration of the university in line with the internationalization of higher education nomenclature. To do that, initially, the study claims that although the establishment of AYU is not resulted from any public or institutional decision to obtain convergence to the internationalization of higher education, its establishment naturally corresponds to the developments and peculiarities of the internationalization.

## **1.2. Method of the Study**

The study is built upon two pillars. The first one focuses on external, but the second one on internal analysis. The former one tries to explain the environment in which the university has emerged. The environment designates to the relations taking place among Turkey and Central Asian republics. The political, economic and social relations which directly or indirectly supported the establishment of the university are quite functional to understand the conditions in which the university was created. Therefore, it is focused on the brief summary of the developments throughout the period of establishment of AYU in the first half of 1990s.

The establishment, structuration and criticism are the subjects of the second pillar. It examines the establishment, mission, structure, students, services and identity of the university by the means of the internationalization of higher education nomenclature.

The first pillar solely includes the chapter two, but the second pillar includes the chapter three, four, five, six, and seven. The chapters of the study are formulated in a deductive method. The

first pillar ends with the analysis of Turkish educational relations and the second pillar starts with the establishment of AYU and ends with the core analysis of the university through the rationales of the internationalization. In the first pillar the emerged Turkish educational relations and activities, but in the second pillar the establishment of the university and the internationalization of higher education are the core issues of the study.

In order to; obtain first hand information on the Turkish relations which stimulated the establishment of the university; increase the familiarity with the recent structure and general facts of the university; and discuss the theoretical arguments of the study the three in depth interviews have been carried out with three of AYU's Turkish members in the Board of Trustees (see Appendix I). The information obtained from the interviews was closely analyzed to clarify the emergence of the university and identify the structure and stage of the university within the internationalization process. Predominantly tape recording is preferred for the interviews. The interviews were arranged on the base of the thesis chronology and were conducted in offices of the members in Ankara in the first week of January 2005. In the study, the results of the interviews are presented by the reference to their surnames within the text.

The interview with Namık Kemal Zeybek (current head of the Board) has covered the developments and relations taking place with Central Asia, which resulted in establishment of AYU and clarifies the reason of existence for the university. Zeybek is known as one of the famous former Turkish Minister of Culture. He is recognized as one of the leading nationalist politician in Turkey and identified with "Turkic world" concept. His political carrier started as the Minister of Culture in the 46<sup>th</sup> Turkish government headed by Prime Minister Özal between March and November 1989. Then, he was re-appointed for the same ministry in the 47<sup>th</sup> Turkish government headed by Prime Minister Yıldırım Akbulut between November 1989 and June 1991. Zeybek, throughout his ministry in the latter government accelerated his workings for the Turkic republics which was about to declare their independences. Finally, as a deputy of Tansu Çiller's True Path Party, he was appointed as the State Minister in the 54<sup>th</sup> Turkish government, namely Refahiyol coalition government, between June 1996 and June 1997. Namık Kemal Zeybek, other than being the biggest moral supporter of the university, is known as the tacit creator of AYU who lobbied for the establishment. He is the head of AYU's Board of Trustees since the establishment and re-appointed in 1999 for seven years<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> He was honored by Kazakhstan in 1996 with the award of "Peace and Moral Consensus" (Barış ve Manevi Uzlaşma).

The second interview was carried out with Feyzullah Budak on the issues of finance, management, services and overall structures of the university. Budak is an economist and audit employed long years as a bureaucrat of Turkish Ministry of Finance. Then he was recruited as the adviser of Turkish Minister of Culture, head advisor of the Kyrgyz President on economy, and lastly member of AYU's Board of Trustees since 1995.

The third interview was carried out with Dr. Öner Kabasakal so as to clarify the identity of the university among different university typologies, and question the structure and existence of AYU through the internationalization of higher education nomenclature. Kabasakal is an expert on education planning and higher education management. He has started to his carrier in the Department of Social Planning of Turkish State Planning and Organization (DPT). Later on, he became the adviser of Turkish Minister of Culture, Turkish Prime Minister, and appointed to the presidency of TICA in 1999. Currently, he is the advisor of the President of TOBB (The Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey), general director of TOBB's Education Foundation and vice head of TOBB-Economy and Technology University's Board of Trustees in addition to that of AYU. He has PhD on policy of economics.

The italic typescripts or the explanations within the parentheses refer to the additional information which needed by the author. The interview records, Turkish government programmes, Turkish daily and magazine sources and the five-year development plan documents were translated by the author into English.

### **1.3. Plan of the Study**

In accordance with the thesis problem and the method, the structure of the thesis is formulated in six main chapters. Chapter II aims to clarify the conditions in which the university was established. It explains the condensed political, economic and socio-cultural relations developed with Central Asian republics mainly in the first half of the 1990s which are quite functional to understand the establishment of university matured in 1990 and 1991, and realized in 1992 and 1993. The aim of the chapter is just to describe the relations briefly, and hence provide the understanding of Turkish foreign policy initiatives taking place from 1990 to 1993. Unlike educational relations, the relations took place in other spheres after the establishment of AYU is not the matter of the chapter and also the study. The chapter more emphasizes the educational

relations and activities of Turkey took place with Central Asian republics in addition to discuss the role of Turkish schools in Turkic geography.

Chapter III focuses on the establishment of the university and presents factual information about which enriches the further chapters and core analysis of the thesis. Chapter IV focuses on question the three important components of the AYU, which shape the identity of the university and allows him to secure more convergence to the internationalization process. Those are Ahmet Yesevi, Kazakhstan, and Turkestan City. Before the analysis of these components, the importance of higher education is discussed in line with market economy and social capital, in this way the significance of this higher education project is highlighted.

Chapter V, VI, and VII, inter alia, discusses the university by means of the internationalization of higher education nomenclature. Chapter V seeks to explain the definition, history and theoretical bases of the internationalization in addition to highlight international higher education activities, student mobility in the world, institutions which make research on the issue, and the commoditization of higher education as a cross-border issue. In this context, the involvement of Turkey in international higher education market is being examined. Chapter VI poses a comparative approach to determine the identity and position of the university among different typologies. Respectively, those are university models; globalization versus internationalization; and the taxonomy among nationalism, regionalism and internationalism. Chapter VII follows the findings of the previous chapters (the chapters of the second pillar) and tries to find out the compatible and incompatible aspects of the university in the light of the rationales of the internationalization. These are the academic, political, economic and socio-cultural rationales.

Chapter VIII consists of the conclusions and evaluations about the identity and position of the university relating to the internationalization of higher education. It highlights the strengths and weaknesses of the university within the context of the internationalization process.



## CHAPTER II

### THE DISINTEGRATION OF THE USSR: A NEW PERIOD FOR TURKEY

#### 2.1. Political relations

Some believe that the founder of modern Turkey, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, on 29 October 1933 for the probability of disintegration of Soviet Union's designated that "...under the administration of this friend (*the USSR*), we have brothers who have common language, belief and origin with us. We have to be ready to embrace them. Being ready is not only keeping silent and waiting, we need to prepare. How the nations prepare for? As keeping the moral bridges strengthened; language is a bridge, belief is a bridge, and history is a bridge." As Atatürk mentioned 58 years ago the USSR (the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) disintegrated in December 1991.

The disintegration has "marked the beginning of a new chapter in the history of the Central Asian republics" (Haghayeghi, 1995: 71) and designated to the end of cold war in which Turkey could not develop any relations with his ancestral land, Central Asia. The demise of the former Soviet Union (hereafter FSU) resulted in the emergence of the well-known fifteen republics which has largely influenced Turkey rather than any other country in the world.

The five of the republics are in Turkic descent and have common ethno-historical heritage with Turkey. The collapse of the socialist system has provided the republics to emancipate from the Soviet regime and blending with their elder brother. These republics are Azerbaijan in Caucasia; Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan in Central Asia. Turkey has strengthened his geo-politic environment by the independence of its brother republics of Central Asia. In terms of Turkey, it was more than a power struggle which realized between developed countries of the world. It is argued "Turkey's foreign relations have acquired new political and economic dimensions with the emergence of newly independent states of Caucasia and Central Asia" (Laumulin: 14). The motives for Turkey were that serving to and integrating with Central Asian Turkic republics, so called as "the lost world" (Bilici et al, 2001).

It is claimed that “having close historical, cultural, fraternal, and linguistic ties with Central Asian Republics that have emerged with the demise of the former Soviet Union, Turkey tried to get benefit from the opportunity provided by the post-Cold War environment to revive its relations with these countries of Turkic lineage” (Aydın, 1998). It is believed that “Turks are no longer alone in the world” and the emergence of “a gigantic Turkic world” would lead Turkey to look to the new Turkic republics as a result of having failed to receive admission to the European Union (Şen, 2001: 27).

In that sense, no governments interested with “outside Turks” in Turkey until the disintegration of the FSU. The historical fears on the expansion of communism and Turanism worried both sides and made the issue suspended (Oran, 2001). The emergence of Central Asian Turkic republics allowed “the inclusion of historical dimension” (Cem, 2001) into the Turkish foreign policy formulation toward Central Asia.

Turkey has secured to meet his historical miss either by political demonstrations by the “Turkic Summits”, economic assistance or cultural and educational exchange activities. It was a new period for Turkey in which it has strived to consolidate the independence of the republics. Turkey, in the initial years of independences of the republics has developed great projects and follows idealist policies with assertive arguments, e.g. “we are one nation but many states”. These initial years had passed with mutual visits, which resulted in significant projects for the development of Central Asian republics.

The Turkish foreign policy towards the Central Asia is classified into four main periods (Aydın, 1999: 111). The first is 1989-1991 period of Moscow-centered foreign policy; the second is 1991-1993 periods of unplanned start of efforts and rise of foreign policy leaded mostly by nationalist and Islamic arguments. The third is 1993-1995 period of foreign policy in which Turkey has noticed his limits and insufficiencies. This period is one in which Russia Federation has filled the gap of authority once again in the region and Turkey has disappointed. The fourth one is 1995 and after in which Turkey has well analyzed his situation, power, potential and facts. Turkey justified the Russian Federation as a partner country and signed energy contract which resulted in pursuing of more balanced, realistic and collaborative policies with him. The latter period is called as the period of transformation from regional competition to cooperation. Turkish foreign policy on Central Asia evolved from enthusiasm of early 1990s to realism of

mid-1990s. It can be stated that the period of 1991-1993 is the time of re-gaining cultural and historical deepness into the Turkish foreign policy formulations.

Turkey has engaged in crucial activities in the field of political, economic, cultural, military and fiscal sectors since the mid-1992 so as to become an effective country which aims the regional leadership (Oran, 2001: 387). Turkey in this period (first half of the 1990s) was relatively successful and active. The monumental and gigantic projects and policies were composed in this period. The well-known activities of Turkey, like the establishment of TICA, AYU, TURKSOY, Eurasian Channel and the implementation of the “Great Student Project” were materialized in this period.

Unlike political and economic relations with Central Asia, “the most important cooperation projects in this regard were implemented in the field of education. Numerous students were brought to Turkey from the Turkic republics and relative communities” (Yaman, 2002). Today, those formations designate to the well-known missed glorious past of 1991-1995 period. Structurally, the Turkish foreign policy objectives and expressions were more suitable to develop relations and establish common projects in the socio-cultural sphere. The republics were also favoring the further developments and common policies on socio-cultural relations. The political projects or activities could not be strengthened due to country-specific issues and economic relations could not be achieved in expected level due to some physical and fiscal insufficiencies. The projects in social sphere did not require any pressure on the political decision making for selection and did not generate great financial burden on the national budgets for the realization. In this context, educational projects which have attracted greater interest are the leading factor for the enhancement and permanency of the relations.

The most strategic and meaningful reciprocal educational projects have been composed in higher education. In that sense, it is widely accepted that the most and first magnificent formation of higher education activity is International Hoca Ahmet Yesevi Turk-Kazak University. The university clarifies also the peculiarities of Turkish foreign policy developed with Central Asian republics in the first half of 1990s.

Akiner argues (2001) “there was an expectation in Turkey at this time that the crumbling of the Soviet Union heralded the emergence of an integrated pan-Eurasian Turkic Bloc”. Turkey’s closer relations with the republics questioned that whether Turkey in intention for the revival of

pan-Ottomanism and pan-Turkism. Therefore, Russia accused Turkey of applying “racial criteria” in his activities resulted from proclaims of the Turkish leaders declared on the emergence of Turkish-speaking communities from Adriatic to China (Aydın, 2000). This region mentioned differently by (Dugin, 2003: 260) as “from Yakutstan to Sarajevo”. Turkish-Russian rivalry caused the republics to be subjected to dilemmas stemming from the efforts on pan-Turkic alliance (Şen, 2001). But, Turkey has proclaimed his intentions in favor of living and working together with Russia in a cooperative manner (Behar, 1994).

Central Asian republics also emphasize and enhance their distinctive identity rather than “be submerged within a broader cultural and political umbrella” (Aydın, 2000: 39). It is argued that the “presence of emotional ties” rather than a scientific and logical method have dominated the relations between both sides until today (Yaman, 2002: 9-11). It is argued by (Aydın, 1998: 76) that the euphoria, or the enthusiasm, of the first couple of years has given way to a more pragmatic approach recently and more state-to-state type of relationships have gained dominance in the interaction between Turkey and the NIS in the southern Caucasus and Central Asia for some time into the future. In fact, the short-term governments between 1990 and 1993 and the leader-based policies (Özal and Demirel) challenged Turkey to build state-to-state policies in their absence.

The lack of stability and consensus in internal politics perhaps due to the short-term governments and then coalition governments in the first half of 1990s, weak and unstable Turkish economy resulted in the devaluation of 1994, and lack of physical and fiscal capacity forced Turkey to mitigate his voice for the previously proclaimed targets on Turkic geography.

The death of President Özal in April 1993 also hampered the permanency of developed and matured relations. The Kazakh political scientist Seyidahmet Kuttukadam mentioned that during the period of 1991-1993 though the contribution of President Özal, Turkic republics had produced good strategies on economy, politics, and other fields (Bilici et al, 2001). The incoming governments could not enhance the relations advanced by synergy of former president Özal and Prime Minister Demirel. Hence, in the succeeding years it could not build significant projects. Özal had believed to the motto of “21th century will be the century of Turks”. Demirel was also the leading figure in the relations. The former Turkish state minister

Ayvaz Gökdemir said about him “he was like an orchestra chief of the relations during his prime ministry and presidency”<sup>1</sup>. Similarly, Zeybek argued,

It was a different period in which everybody was like a Turanist and there was much more ambitious in the relations. But, after the death of President Özal, Prime Minister Demirel was elected to the presidency and Tansu Çiller became Prime Minister who was unfamiliar to “Turkic world” concept relative to the previous politicians. The numbers of Turkish politician who had interest on Turkic republics were quite limited. Turkey could not sustain the successful relations started in the post-independence period”. Zeybek further emphasized “the institutionalized entities of then have progressed and allow the continuation of the relations. If the institutions could not available today, in addition to the absence of emotion, the relations would be damaged widely.

### **2.1.1. The First Official Visits**

Turkey’s official relations with Central Asia has launched in March 1989 via MFA delegations to the Central Asian republics and other republics of the former Soviet Union. The delegation has prepared a report submitted to the Turkish government (Oran, 2001). Furthermore, before the disintegration of the FSU, in Turkey, the most important governmental visit to Central Asia made by Namık Kemal Zeybek, the 47th Turkish Government’s Minister of Culture in 1990. Zeybek, in the first tour, visited to Moscow, Azerbaijan and Turkmenistan. In the second tour Kazakhstan was visited in December 1990 by the invitation of Kazakh minister of culture for the symposium of Ahmet Yesevi. This second tour directly made to Kazakhstan without flying to Moscow In this context, the expectations of the both side for the restoration of Ahmet Yesevi’s mausoleum was negotiated. Zeybek signed a treaty with Kazakh Prime Minister and minister of culture so as to undertake the restoration of the mausoleum.

In the second half of 1990s, all Central Asian republics declared their sovereignties. The first Presidential official visit of Turkey to the region realized in March 1991 by President Özal when the republics were sovereign but not independence which resulted from Gorbachev’s reform policies. Özal firstly toured to Moscow, then after to Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan and Ukraine with

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/tutanak/donem21/yil3/bas/b095m.htm>, 03.05.2005.

whom the establishment of Black Sea Economic Cooperation (BSEC)<sup>1</sup> was being thought (Oran, 2001). Kazakhstan and Azerbaijan were selected by the advice of Zeybek to be visited by Özal (Zeybek, 2005:183). Those first visits have showed that Turkey was sensitive against the Russian Federation. The visits were organized to Central Asian republics in the second step of the tour. Thus, economic assistance and cultural exchange opportunities were strengthened before the independence declarations (Şen, 2001).

Those accumulated diplomatic relations then have facilitated the decision of Turkey as being the first country in the world recognizing the Central Asian republics. Turkey firstly recognized Azerbaijan on 9 November 1991. After the establishment of the CIS<sup>2</sup> on 8 December 1991, Turkey recognized rest of Central Asian republics on 16 December 1991.

One of the important landmark in the official relations materialized by Turkish minister of Foreign Affairs, Hikmet Çetin. He firstly toured to Ukraine and then Central Asian republics before the Prime Minister Demirel's well-known visit to Central Asia in May 1992 which resulted in the establishment of International Hoca Ahmet Yesevi Turk-Kazakh University. Demirel's tour is a corner stone in the history of relations with the republics and stimulated cultural and economic relations. Such as, Turkey has offered 2000 quotas (*1400 of them for higher education*) for each republic for the "Great Student Project" and decided on the training of bureaucrats and army officers. In addition, Turkey has offered one billion dollars export credit, diverse humanitarian aid, and decided for TRT to launch broadcast for entire of Eurasia (Behar, 1994). Thus, Turkish foreign policy has get out of Moscow-centered formulations (Oran, 2001)

After the sovereign declarations, the Presidents of all republics have also visited Turkey to reinforce their recognition in international diplomacy. The leaders of the Turkic republics were also willing to obtain Turkey's economic and technical assistance. Kazakh President Nazarbayev had visited Turkey after the sovereign declaration of the republic on October 25 of 1990 when the USSR still on the rule. This was the first foreign tour of the leader realized as the President

---

<sup>1</sup> The BSEC was founded in June 1992 in İstanbul with the signed "Summit Declaration on Black Sea Economic Cooperation" among the head of states or governments of eleven countries. These are Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Georgia, Greece, Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Turkey and Ukraine.

<sup>2</sup> CIS agreement signed among Ukraine, Belarus and Russian Federatin on December 8 of 1991. Then, it included all the republis of the USSR apart from Baltic republics.

of a sovereign republic. It is stated the “the base of further relations developed with Turkey was constructed on this tour” (Nazarbayev, 1998).

The delagative visits have condensed in 1992. The visits of Turkish President, Prime Minister, other ministers, the opening of Turkish embassies, the establishment of TICA and the arrangements of the first Turkic summit (Ankara) were held in 1992 (DPT, 2000a). In the first year of the indepenence period, over 1200 Turkish delegations had visited Central Asia (Hussain, 1993, cited in Aydın, 1999). By February 1993, Turkey had signed more than 140 bileteral agreements on a variety of subjects with Central Asian republics (Şen, 2001: 5-6; Oran, 2001).

The political relations established between Turkey and the Central Asian republics resulted in the various agreements for cooperation in diverse sectors like trade, transportation, military, communication, energy, technical assistance, tourism, sports, education and culture; (Demir et al, 2000; Şen, 2001).

The growing relations and accelerated official visits have forced Ankara to establish an institution to coordinate all kind of activities related with Turkic geography, in addition to implement the policies of Turkish government formulated on Turkic geography.

### **2.1.2. Turkish International Cooperation Agency**

Apart from AYU, Turkish International Cooperation Agency (TICA) is still seen as one of the best concrete formation emerged as a result of condensed relations in the period of 1991-1993 called the years of “sentimentality and excitement in the relations” by Aydın (2000). TICA established in January 1992 in Ankara perhaps as the first main governmental institution in charge of Turkey's activities with Turkic geography. It was established as an agency affiliated to the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and was transferred to the authority of the State Ministry in May 1999 which is in charge of Turkic republics, Turkic and relative communities. The former state minister, Ayvaz Gökdemir, has discussed for this transfer that that “TICA has been performing activities which are not compatible with the activities of classic functions of the foreign diplomacy (hariciye in Turkish). The problems which TICA was subjected to and the functions authorized on TICA are not in the scope of the classic foreign affairs”<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/tutanak/donem21/yil3/bas/b095m.htm>, 03.05.2005.

Turkic geography is the reason of existence for the TICA, but the preliminary countries are defined as Turkic-speaking ones and neighbors of Turkey<sup>1</sup>. It was assigned with the task of assisting in the promotion of market economies and the establishment and consolidation of democratic systems of the newly emerging countries of Balkans, Black Sea, Caucasia and Central Asia which emerged by the disintegration of the USSR.

It is emphasized that by the foundation of the TICA Turkey has transformed to such a position in which supplied assistance for the developing countries rather than demanded assistance from the developed countries of the world. The assistance agreements are on the issues of development of trade, telecommunication, transportation, military cooperation, religious services, social, cultural and education fields, and the establishment of Turcology departments in the Eurasian countries<sup>2</sup>. TICA has also undertaken the restoration of Yesevi's mausoleum which is seen as the prestige project of Turkey But, the restoration was completed in 2001 years after.

### **2.1.3. The Summits and Conventions**

After 1991, "the outside Turks" has been considered more and Turkey has internalized his "elder brother" role toward the Central Asian republics. Turkish Prime Minister Süleyman Demirel pronounced, "we share a common history, a common religion and a common culture. We are cousins cut off from each other for over a hundred years, first by the Russians under the Czars, and then by the Communist regime" (Şen, 2001: 5). Turkish President Turgut Özal in the opening ceremony of Turkish Parliament on 1 September 1991 claimed that Turkey has gained a chance coming 400 years later for the leadership of his region. Thus, the singleness of Turkey within international diplomacy would be diminished and Turkey's role would be strengthened (Oran, 2001:370). The speeches that made in the summits were more meaningful challenges to the regional powers which pursuing their national interests in the Eurasia region. Apart from the US, and European Union other regional powers dealing with the region are Turkey, China, Iran, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and Russian Federation (Fuller, 1992).

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.tika.gov.tr/hakkinda.asp>, 06.05.2005.

<sup>2</sup> Avrasya Bülteni, Sayı: 27, Ekim 2004.



The first summit (*The Summit of Turkic-Speaking Countries*) was organized just one year later of the independence declarations. It was held on 30-31 October 1992, in Ankara. The participant countries, other than Turkey, were Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. Before the summit, Turkish President Turgut Özal had advocated the formation of a “Turkic Common Market” and the creation of a “Turkic Trade and Development Bank”. Those kinds of ideas were matured perhaps due to negative response of the EU to application of Turkey in December 1989. But neither market nor the bank was materialized. The republics were not sympathetic to “the formation of organizations based on purely religious and ethnic grounds”, but Ankara Declaration brought vague and general references to the necessity of developing cooperation in the domains of culture, language, education, security, economy, judicial and parliamentary affairs (Şen, 2001: 6; Oran, 2001: 389).

“Uzbekistan’s self image as the centre of ‘Greater Turkestan’ calls caused unease among other republics” (Aydın, 2000:19). In the initial years, Turkey’s foreign policies toward Central Asia have largely affected by pan-Turkic ideas in state level and disturb the republics. Because, they want to emphasize their difference, do not attach any other big brother and prefer to adjust relations with the West directly. For instance Uzbek leader Kerimov proclaimed, “Turkey wants us to become Turks but we are Uzbeks, not Turks” (Laumulin: 18).

Nazarbayev has opposed to any segregation based on Turkism and Islam. He was favoring to take parts in “neutral” international organizations (Olcott, 1997). Nazarbayev argues (2000: 201),

I have been forced to injure Özal because it was foreseen that the republics will cooperate with Turkey through unity of historical roots, language, culture and traditions. I have mentioned I am favoring to take part in economic, humanity and political relations. We do not want to break our relations with other people and states. We do not want to be part of unequal relations anymore. Uzbek leader Kerimov also had advocated my thoughts. Özal was a wise politician, and he understood well my ideas. The relations and collaborations of Turkey and Kazakhstan were advanced as equal partners. Özal had understood that friendship, equality and the beneficial economic relations which favoring the both sides were most appropriate.

Then Özal in 1993 rejected the big brother role of Turkey and emphasized the independent status of the republics in his television speech. Haghayeghi (1995: 183) argues that Özal has favored a community with the republics like the Arabs.

The second Turkic summit held in October 1994 again in Turkey, but in İstanbul and closed with 'Istanbul Declaration' reiterated the call for closer ties between the participating states. The second summit was more successful, the relations and activities were institutionalized. The third summit was held in August 1995 in Bishkek, i.e. in the FSU's territory for the first time. The participants were five Turkic republics of Central Asia. It is argued that while the summits aim to build Turkic bloc (Laumulin: 14), they have not able to produce concrete results (Bilici et al, 2001).

In March 1993 in Antalya Turkic Convention (*kurultay*) was realized by the participation of Özal, Demirel and Alpaslan Türkeş, the well-known Turkish nationalist politicians, who organized the meeting. The meeting was formed with a semi-official character and enhanced by the contributions of some nationalist groups in Turkey; the ultimate aim was to create a "Turkic commonwealth" (Oran, 2001), which was intended to prompt by the summits. Türkeş has composed Turkic States and Communities Friendship, Brotherhood and Cooperation Foundation (TÜDEV). Since 1993 the foundation has organized annual conventions with the participant of diverse delegates from Turkic republics and communities.

The successor meeting of Antalya was held on 21-23 October in 1994 in İzmir just after the second Turkic summit. The organizer of the second convention of "Friendship, Brotherhood and Cooperation of Turkic States and Communities" was again the nationalist groups and parties rather than Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs or any official institution. The meeting again has demonstrated the domination of emotions and intervention of non-governmental groups in the Turkish foreign policy toward Central Asia (Oran, 2001: 399).

#### **2.1.4. The Model Country Policy**

Turkey's common historical, ethno-linguistics and religious ties with the region have consolidated his position as a model country in the new international setting emerged by the end of cold war. The "model country" perception was implanted to Turkey by western countries and cause Turkey to justify his position as a regional power in the emerging new era by 1991. It was

shaped externally and burdened on Turkey to accept his new role of “model country”, i.e. Turkey has pursued a static foreign policy directed and corrected by international powers (Avşar and Solak, 1998). In the new era, the re-formulation of Turkish foreign policy shaped by the assistances and suggestions of his western alliances (Oran, 2001). After the Davos Forum in 1992, the world politics has justified and well approved Turkey’s position as a model country in the initial post-cold war years for these newly emerging republics of Central Asia which desire to escape from the Moscow-centered planned economy and build up their state mechanism engaged in world markets and politics (Behar, 1994: 14)

During Cold War years Turkey had performed significant commitment to the NATO’s collective defense efforts in its “Southern Flank” against the Soviet threat (Aydın, 1998: 61). Turkey’s NATO membership has provided an advantage for him (Laumulin: 14) and secured him to be stated as a model country for the newly independent Turkic republics of Central Asia. Turkish model that is based on secularism, liberal democracy and a free market economy consolidated its position for the modelling (Hüseynov, 2001; Behar, 1994). In fact, the post-independence period was the years of “consolidation of statehood” and “transition to a market economy” for the Central Asian republics (Rumer, 2002: 3). It is also argued that if the new republics become, secular, democratic and market oriented countries, Turkey would enhance its position in the region against the Western countries (Şen, 2001: 27).

The EU’s “Turkey Representative” Michael Lake was defining Turkey’s rising strategic importance in the new era as: “Turkey is one of the key partners of EU’s foreign policy which may create influential impacts in Balkans, Central Asia, and Middle East (Karadeli, 2003: 233). The US justification of Turkey’s model country role has been reinforced by the US foreign minister James Baker’s speeches (Oran: 383). Baker emphasized democratic and secular model of Turkey relative to the repressive and theocratic Iranian model for the republics of Central Asia (Efeğil and Akçalı, 2003: 13). Furthermore, Turkish foreign minister Hikmet Çetin in his visit to the Central Asian republics in June 1992, the secretary-general of the Council of Europe, Mme Cathrine Lalumiere declared that Turkey provided a valid model of development for newly-independent countries of Central Asia (Şen, 2001).

Turkey was also being modeled or praised by the republics. The model was being perceived as “the legend of Özal’s Turkey” (*Özal Türkiyesi Efsanesi*). This legend still persists in Central Asia (Zeybek, 2003: 325-326). Nazarbayev (2000: 199-200) emphasized Özal was a great

reformist in political and economic spheres. He was coming to Central Asia in order to actualize the Turkic world reality from Baykal to Tuna, which had been also anticipated by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk”. Similarly, the former Turkish state minister Ayvaz Gökdemir, who was in charge of Turkic republics, Turkic and relative communities, stated that “by the disintegration of the former Soviet Union in the territories stretching from Balkans to China, a Turkic world belt and Turkic culture belt was appeared by everyone. In fact, this reality was in existence, but was suppressed by the communist system”<sup>1</sup>.

Turkish model was more beneficial for the expectations of the republics and their transition. “Central Asian republics emphasized their secular nature and separation of state and religion in principle. While the leaders met the popular demand on Islamic institutions and service, they challenged against the “political manifestations of radical Islam” (Aydın, 2000: 23). Turkey was especially supported by the west “whose fear that radical Islam might fill the power vacuum that emerged in the region led to strong encouragement to these states to adopt a “Turkish model” of secular democracy combined with a liberal economy” (Aydın, 2000: 37).

Due to the large presence of ethnic Russians within the republics, Russia has favored secular Turkey for the sake of welfare of ethnic Russians rather than Iranian penetrations, which propagate his Islamist ideology on the Muslim societies in the FSU territories (Behar, 1994: 15). Gorbachev administration has also showed positive reactions against the growing Turkish interests on Central Asian republics realized by cultural relations in early of 1990s (Zeybek, 2005:180).

In conclusion, Iran was disfavored due to his Shiite population while the majority of Moslems in the FSU territories are Sunni. Theocratic character of Iran was a fear also for the secular leaders of the republics apart from Tajikistan by which Iran has “ethnic, linguistic and cultural closeness” (Aydın, 2000: 41). Turkey’s model country role was mitigated by the embark of Russia’s “near abroad” policy which created by Russian nationalist and conservative politicians for the sake of Russian interests in the FSU territories. The Russian involvement with this policy has altered the conditions, priorities and modified interests for non-regional powers. Aydın (1999: 116) argues the rich energy resources of the region allowed the western companies to contact directly with region’s countries, and removed the need for Turkey’s mediator position.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/tutanak/donem21/yil3/bas/b095m.htm>, 03.05.2005.

### **2.1.5. Turkish Foreign Policy in the Programmes of the Turkish Governments**

It is the fact that four different governments came to power in Turkey in the first half of the 1990s. The political instability has hindered Turkey to pursue stable foreign policy resulted in concrete projects. The formulation or scope of Turkish foreign policy on newly emerging Central Asian republics or generally Turkic geography is clarified in Turkish government programs.

47<sup>th</sup> Turkish government programme suggested that “the aim is; enhancing our relations with the USSR and eastern European countries on the framework of the principles of, sovereignty, independence, equal rights, respect for land unity and neutral to internal affairs; evaluating the existed wide cooperation potential in a maximum level with special emphasis on economy and trade”<sup>1</sup>.

48<sup>th</sup> Turkish government programme stated that “we have satisfied with the recent positive developments took place in our relations with the northern neighbor, the USSR”<sup>2</sup>.

While the USSR was already sovereign, in Turkey the election resulted in a new coalition government among True Path Party and Social Democrat People’s Party, which finalized President Özal’s Motherland Party’s long governance. In fact, when the new government came to power in October 1991, the USSR was still in power. The new coalition government, 49<sup>th</sup> government, stated in its programme “our government highly appreciates the friendship relations and cooperation with the Soviet Union which is already in a historical re-formation. We hope that this process will end up with democracy and peace. The relations with the republics with them we have closeness on language and culture will be in harmony with this main approach”<sup>3</sup>.

The 50<sup>th</sup> Turkish government programme has generated explicit policies. It emphasized that “Turkey will be the attraction center in 2000s for the FSU territories. Turkey has significant tasks and responsibilities for the Turkic origin republics’ integration and openness to the world. By this consciousness, we will notice to develop economic, social and cultural relations. We will

---

<sup>1</sup> 47<sup>th</sup> Turkish government headed by Yıldırım Akbulut between November 1989 and June 1991.

<sup>2</sup> 48<sup>th</sup> Turkish government headed by Mesut Yılmaz between June 1991 and November 1991.

<sup>3</sup> 49<sup>th</sup> Turkish government headed by Süleyman Demirel between October 1991 and May 1993.

also encourage the Turkish entrepreneurs to invest in Caucasias and Central Asia republics by tax improvement. The success of the Russian efforts in transition to market economy and democraticization process has a historical magnitude. For the realization of this issue, we believe in the importance of the political and economic solidarity and cooperation both with Russia and other neighbour and peripheral countries. In this context, we will give a special and permanent importance to reinforce the cooperation and assistance relations with Azerbaijan and Central Asian republics with whom we have common linguistic, religious and cultural ties. We will also maintain our initiatives decisively on the base of peace and respect to human rights to save the land integrity of friend and brother Azerbaijan which is in war with Armenia<sup>1</sup>.

Zeybek claimed that the governments came to power after 1994 were not in capable to interest with Turkic world; the relations took place then after could not achieve the level achieved before 1994. Similarly, it is argued that the “relations between Turkey and the republics suffered when a coalition government led by the Islamist Welfare Party held office Ankara from mid-1996 to summer 1997” (Laumulin: 18).

In fact, Turkish official foreign policy on Turkic geography was not a highlighted issue between 1994 and 1999 relative to the past. Until the coalition government which came to power by May 1999 and included Nationalist Movement Party (MHP) the issue had been largely suspended within Turkish internal politics. The traditional interest of MHP on the region allowed to the re-structuration of Turkish policies and institutions. As it is mentioned in the previous parts, TICA was reformed and its budget has increased to \$12 million from \$4,5 million of 1998<sup>2</sup>. The recent governments which came to power after November 2002 have been favoring Turkic geography in the framework of a larger strategy which focuses on regional cooperations. Hence, the governments of Justice and Development Party (AKP) pursue more neutral policies relative to the fluctuations of the past (see Appendix G).

---

<sup>1</sup> 50<sup>th</sup> Turkish government headed by Tansu Çiller between May 1993 and December 1995.

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/tutanak/donem21/yil3/bas/b095m.htm>, 03.05.2005. (The figures explained by the State Minister Abdulhaluk Çay).

## 2.2. Economic Relations

Turkic republics have launched a reform process in the early of 1990s in order to accelerate their convergence to conditions of free market economy. Turkey was very decisive to make contribution to the efforts of republics. It has aimed to become an economic model for the transition of those economies and signed many treaties fixing the legal framework of the economic and trade relations. Such kind of treaties are land transportation, civil aviation, communication, economic and technical collaboration, banking, preserving and promoting of foreign capital, removing of visa (Oran, 2001: 429).

Şen argues that (2001) Turkey was eager to be a principal supplier of aid and credits. It initially announced it could offer \$3 billion to support the Central Asian republics (Oran, 2001: 425). However, it soon became clear that Turkey's promises and proposals concerning aid and credits to the region were not realistic. By the end of 1998, the total amount of Turkish Eximbank credits extended to \$903 million but more than half of the credits allocated to Central Asia were used to finance construction and telecommunication projects undertaken by the Turkish companies in order to secure the republics to make their imports from Turkey (Şen, 2001; Avşar and Solak, 1998). The Eximbank credits have created great business and trade volume among the republics and Turkey (Aksiyon, 1997).

Central Asian republics have been subjected to economic difficulties and instability right after the independence. Turkey's economic relations with the region could not be strengthened due to economic insufficiency and instability of Turkish economy which suffered from high inflation rates, foreign debt burdens and enduring crisis (Şen, 2001), e.g. the devaluation of 1994 hampered the economic relations which ever been enhanced. But, all the republics have succeeded to overcome about their economic stagnation of 1991-1996, and then they achieved a stable economic growth (Bilici et al, 2001).

Nonetheless, Turkey has fostered his economic relations relative to the pre-independence period. It has realized many treaties with the five of Turkic republics on "trade and economic cooperation", "mutual promotion and preserving of investments", and "the prevention of dual taxing" from 1991 to 1995 (Avşar and Solak, 1998: 56). While Turkey has exported consumption goods and machines, it has imported raw materials mainly oil, gas and cotton. But, international foreign trade routes were closed and in terms of export logistic they were highly

attached to the former Soviet routes. Avşar and Solak (1994) mentioned the geographic distance of the region from Turkey and the Iranian drawbacks on transit roads have distorted Turkey to enhance trade relations. It is emphasized there were no alternative transport way of Turkey to Central Asia other than airlines.

On the other hand, Turkey's export to the region has increased almost fivefold from 1992 to 1995; respectively the figures were \$83 to \$390 million. Unlike the fluctuations with Uzbekistan, Kazakstan was the pioneer country of the Turkish export. The exports to the republics include just 1,8 % of the overall Turkish export volume. Furthermore, Turkey's import from Central Asian republics has increased almost sixfold from \$54 to \$272 million. Apart from Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan was the pioneer of the imports. The total volume of imports made from Central Asia composed the 0,8 % of the overall Turkish imports (Şen, 2001: 16-18). In other word, it has increased from \$160 million of 1992 to \$969 million of 1998 (Oran, 2001: 430).

Turkish private sector has involved more in the Central Asian economies. Turkish construction firms have performed billion dollars projects (Aksiyon, 1997). They have constructed great industrial plants and infrastructure investments more with the Eximbank credits. The investments in construction sector have exceeded billion dollars within a few years of the independence (Oran, 2001). Furthermore, Turkey invested to contribute the infrastructure of the region which secures them to contact easily with the external countries. Turkish Airlines established scheduled flight with Almaty, Baku and Tashkent in May 1992 and supplied telecommunication service for the republics (Şen, 2001; Behar, 1994).

In the 7<sup>th</sup> Five-Year Development Plan of Turkey which lasted from 1996 to 2000 (DPT, 1996: 86), the role of economic relations had been emphasized more than the political or cultural relations. It was noted that the necessary measures would be composed in order to facilitate the circulation of labor force, capital, goods and services. Furthermore, it was emphasized that the contributions to the economic building of the republics will be accelerated, the necessary infrastructure and information support will be provided to Turkish entrepreneurs and small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) who want to make business.

In fact, Turkey's involvement to the economies of the republics mainly resulted from the activities of Turkish entrepreneurs. Şen (2001) argues "multiethnic structure of Turkey and the



host countries have played an important role in the establishment of trans-regional networks and the development of economic activities of the Turkish entrepreneurs in the host countries. It is fact that, the success of Turkish enterpreneurs is resulted from common religious, lingusitic and lineage advantage in addition to being the first one arrives to the region (Bilici et al, 2001). Turkish business community in the region has diverse social, cultural and occupational background but their strengths were non-economic motives secured by religious or nationalist sentiments and move ahead on non-economic network relations. In this context, Şen (2001) argues Turkish enterpreneurs' ideological, religious and cultural sentiments are articulated, overlapped and entangled with economic action.

Turkish companies are great in numbers and operate in Central Asia since 1991 in areas such as construction, banking, tourism, telecommunication, industry, transportation, energy and retail trade sectors (Şen, 2001; Oran, 2001). The sector penetrated into the region with 200 firms in addition to the public sector (Oran, 2001: 381-382) Turkish public banks, namely Ziraat Bankası, Emlak Bank and Halk Bankası, have opened their branches and involved in the financial markets of the region usually via joint-inventure banks. Furthermore, Demirbank is one of the pioneers private bank of Turkey established its joint venture banks in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan (Şen, 2001: 23).

Turkish companies were in small and medium-sized scales and their investments were mainly centered on food industry and trade, which did not require large capital investment and employment opportunity for the region. Turkish entrepreneurs were not in adequate professionalism, had not any economic strategy and were not in manner of foreign investor (DPT, 2000a).

According to Şen (2001: 21-26) Turkish companies have involved in Central Asian economy either in the form of joint ventures with local firms, or they are established as foreign companies. The companies are divided into three categories in terms of their scale. The first is big business undertaken by large Turkish companies, namely the well-known Turkish firms or holdings. The second one is larger in number and composed from medium-sized enterprises which are formed by two or more partners and invest in the areas which are not preferred by the previos group companies. They invest on trade or services. They usually improt goods and processed food from Turkey and organize the distribution of consumer goods or services, e.g. bakery shops and restaurants. They are crucial for the realization of free market economy in the republics. The

third group companies have causal investments and jobs which want to make money in a short time and are mainly concentrated on the export and import by trucks.

For the future, in the 8th Five-Year Development Plan of Turkey, which covers the period from 2001 to 2005, it is argued that in order to develop trade with the republics, the necessary knowledge and services will be secured for small and middle-sized entrepreneurs who have plan for business (DPT, 2000b). Therefore, it is fact that there are close relationships between the foreign policy orientation and activities of the entrepreneurs (Şen; 2001: 33).

Turkey has participated into two regional economic organizations established with Eurasian countries. These are Economic Cooperation Organization (ECO)<sup>1</sup> and Black Sea Economic Cooperation<sup>2</sup>. Unlike the ECO, Turkey is also together in the organization of Islamic Conference with the Central Asian republics. Turkey could not accomplish to compose an economic organization whose members are solely Central Asian Turkic republics and Turkey.

Turkic republics of Central Asia like other new republics of the FSU have transitioned from centrally planned economy to market economy. However, Turkic republics, in addition to Turkey's insufficiency on economic assistance, had some drawbacks relative to the Baltic republics, other eastern European countries, and the FSU republics. Central Asian republics have stayed longer under the socialist regime, remote from the European markets, not having opportunity to access for seas due to land-locked geography, the heavy industrialization economic structure of the Soviet economy and such regional conflicts hampered their economic progress. The most important advantage of Turkic republics was rich natural resources and advancing on science and technique (Yaman, 2001; Nazarbayev 2000). The dependency of economy on supply of agriculture and raw materials for the other parts of Soviet territories had lacked them to progress on service and industrial sectors. The service sector as the leading sector

---

<sup>1</sup> Economic Cooperation Organization: ECO was established in 1985 as a trilateral organization of Iran, Pakistan and Turkey to promote multi dimensional regional cooperation. Following the amendment in the Treaty of Izmir (1977) ECO was fully launched in early 1991. After the fall of the FSU, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan along with Afghanistan sought the membership of ECO and were admitted into the organization in May 1992 in Islamabad.

<sup>2</sup> Black Sea Economic Cooperation: Although it was established with the initiatives of Istanbul Summit Declaration on Black Sea Economic Cooperation in 1992 with eleven members. Its official birthday is acquired internationally on 1 May 1999 by the entry into force of the Charter of the Organization of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation (BSEC, 2002). Unlike Azerbaijan, Turkey was in favor of inclusion of other Central Asian republics but it could not be realized. Turkey has pioneered the foundation of BSEC and purposed to strengthen his economic power in the new international setting shaped by 1991. BSEC is very significant because it is the first organization blending the FSU countries and other capitalist countries of Europe around the same economic goals under the roof of a regional body.

of the capitalist economies had also been ignored. They had advanced on agriculture sector and subjected to lack of urbanization which stimulates economic development. The well-known Soviet division of labor, i.e. regional economic specialization is one of the leading factors for underdevelopment and economic problems in the initial post-independence years.

For example, in Kazakhstan while the major components of import were in mainly in capital goods the export was largely consist of raw materials. The import of Kazakhstan was including machine building equipments, light industry goods, food industry goods, chemical products, oil and natural gas. The export of Kazakh economy was agriculture, light industry goods, chemical products, metals (ferrous), oil and natural gas.

### **2.3. Socio-Cultural Relations**

Unlike political and economic relations and partnerships, the socio-cultural sphere is regularly enriched and relations are sustained without any great break. This field present great opportunity for the exchange of cultural values, traditions and folks stemmed from common ancestral heritage. In fact, the role of Turkish private sector and NGOs is outstanding in the advancement of reciprocal relations with the republics and communities. The embracement in this field was more satisfactory. During the second Turkic summit held in Istanbul, the regular meetings of culture and education ministers have appreciated (Oran, 2001: 397) rather than any other events. In this study, there are two main pillars of the socio-cultural relations which worth to examine more closely. These are cultural and educational relations.

#### **2.3.1. Cultural Relations**

It is the easiest way of the relations shaped upon common ethno-linguistic heritage. Those relations are more functional owing to securing both Central Asian and Turkish side to know each other closely. In this respect many common seminars, conferences, festivals and celebrations are being arranged since 1991. One of the first and outstanding start is “International Ahmet Yesevi Symposium” organized by Turkish Ministry of Culture which was held in Ankara from September 26 to October 1 of 1991 (Ocak, 1996: 51). Later on, 1993 was declared and celebrated as “Ahmet Yesevi Year” for all Turks.

The base of cultural relations was to enhance a common language. The Common Turkic Alphabet (Oran, 1996: 393) was expected to be formed with Turkic republics in 1993. Hence, the Alphabet and Orthography Conference was held in March 1993 in Ankara. 34 letters were foreseen to form the alphabet. TICA has committed to open Turcology centers in the countries Balkans, Caucasus, Black Sea, Central Asia, and in the Turkic communities of Russian Federation in order to teach Turkic history and Turkish language so as to expand its usage in those territories since 2001. Turkey was ambitious to make “Turkish a lingua franca of the new republics which is considered to be a vehicle to enhance political and cultural ties and simultaneously as a means to ease commercial interaction”. On the contrary, unlike Tajikistan’s switch to Arabic script, and apart from Azerbaijan and Turkmenistan no other republics have taken steps to replace the Cyrillic alphabet with a version of Latin script mainly due to their ethnic heterogeneity. However, they have declared their native languages as the official language of the country (Şen, 2001: 11-12).

Turkey right after the independence declarations has broadcasted TRT-Eurasia as a Turkic channel since April 1992 so as to re-activate the cultural relations broken by seventy years ago, and elaborate the friendship and solidarity in addition to secure the unity in thought and language. The Channel was expected to contribute for the development of Turkish Language’s familiarity and the familiarity of Turkic people with the Latin script. Furthermore, it is planned to establish a “news network” for the Turkic-speaking countries under the scope of Turkish Eurasia Channel and Anatolia News Agency.

Turkish Ministry of Culture’s TURKSOY (*Joint Administration of Turkic Culture and Art General Directorate, in Turkish means Türk Kültür ve Sanatları Ortak Yönetimi*) project is implemented so as to increase cultural cooperation and to create a unity like “Turkic Unesco” (Avşar and Solak, 1998: 55). TÜRKSOY accomplishes the mission of UNESCO in its own geographic location, i.e. Turkic geography. In June 1992, the Culture Ministers of Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Turkey and Turkmenistan met for the first time and signed a protocol of intention targeting the spiritual integration of the Turkish-speaking countries in the new era. The depositor nation for the TÜRKSOY Organization is Turkey. The official language of TÜRKSOY is Turkish and the administrative center of the organization is located in Ankara. TURKSOY meetings are still held regularly and the presidency is allocated to member countries periodically. In this context, “Turkic world youth festival and congress” is being organized since 1994.

### 2.3.2. Educational Relations

The history of educational relations goes back to President Özal's visit to Kazakhstan in March 1991 and Nazarbayev's visit to Turkey in September 1991. The nucleus or embryo of AYU has been created in a time between the both visits. It was Ahmet Yesevi Turkestan State University established in June 1991 by Kazakhstan. But it is important to be familiar with the educational relations took place Turkey and Central Asian republics in the initial years of the post-independence period.

Some institutional arrangements have been performed in Ankara after 1991 in order to manage and execute the educational activities with the republics and communities. The Head Advisory Office in Turkish Prime Ministry (headed by Zeybek), General Directorate of Abroad Education and Training of MEB, Turkish Language Learning Center (TÖMER) and Turkish International Cooperation Agency (TICA) were the related public institutions. Furthermore, "The Beneficiary Student Center" (*Burslu Öğrenci Merkezi*) was authorized in YÖK in Ankara so as to deal with the issues of Turkic students coming from all around Turkic geography to study in Turkish secondary schools and HEIs.

Right after the dissolution of the USSR, the mutual visits were launched after the January 1992, many educational contracts and protocols have been signed between Turkey and Central Asian republics (MEB, 1998: 17; DPT, 2000a: 286). In the 7<sup>th</sup> Five-Year Development Plan, it was emphasized that the exchange of students and scholarship activities will be sustained and the suitable environment will be secured in order to increase the exchange of academics and students between the universities (DPT, 1996: 86). Turkey has signified the role of education and launched educational activities with the republics so as to; raise quality and number of service provider; accelerate their switch to Latin alphabet; recover the common cultural values; and obtain collaborations in the world politics and activities of supranational organizations (DPT, 2000a: 286).

The First Conference of Turkic Republics Education Ministers and Turkic Communities Education Representatives were held on 18-23 May 1992 in Ankara. The date of the conference shows that Turkey in a short time after of the independences of the republics was able to organize such a meeting and analyzed the strategic importance of education. The participants of

the conference were; Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Northern Cyprus and Bosnia-Herzegovina (MEB, 1998).

The Second Conference was held in the same year on 29 September to 3 October in Kyrgyz capital, Bishkek. The number of participant countries increased, but the characteristic of participants had changed. Other than the republics, a great number of Turkic relative communities were included in the meeting. On the other hand, the third conference could not be arranged until 1998 (MEB, 1998: 13). In the conference it was decided to establish a commission in order to prepare a common “Turkic History” and “Turkic Literature Book” for the high school lectures. The educational relations have further progressed through student, teacher or instructor exchange programs, supplying of course books and educational materials, academic conferences, the opening of Turkish cultural centers and Turkish language courses offered by TÖMER (Şen, 2001). By 1998, 64 sister schools from Turkey matched with their fellows in Turkic republics (MEB, 1998).

Some observers maintain that through the activities in the field of education, Turkey is attempting to supersede-Russian cultural dominance in the region and create Turkish-speaking elite to replace the Russian-speaking elite (Hunter, 1996). It is argued that Turkish language is an instrument to shape the post-Soviet Central Asian elite, and in order to achieve this goal, Ankara has pursued an active policy of establishing Turkish schools in the region (Laumulin: 14). But, it is officially declared, the main objective of educational projects is peace, brotherhood and solidarity. The project does not include any political target; it is trying to secure unity in the hearts. It is a unique humanism project whose source is common history (MEB, 1998). Not only the Turkish schools in public status, but the private Turkish schools are also appreciated many times by Turkish politicians because of their roles in the expansion of Turkish culture and teaching of Turkish language. For instance, the former state minister Abdulhaluk Çay, who was in charge of Turkic republics, Turkic and relative communities in the 57<sup>th</sup> Turkish government, declared for the private Turkish schools that “those schools are not in divergent education in relevance to Turkish education system”<sup>1</sup>.

The role of education supplied by Turkish schools in Central Asian republics is outstanding in regard to their contributions to; parent-school relations, the relations of the republics with

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/tutanak/donem21/yil3/bas/b095m.htm>, 03.05.2005.

Turkey, educational system and mainly to the process of transformation, and the curriculum development of the national education systems (Demir et al, 2000). Furthermore, in regard to Turkey Şen (2001) argues “education is significant in terms of developing its long-term ties and reinforcing its cultural links with the new Central Asian republics” (Şen, 2001: 10).

Kabasakal noted that Turkey through the educational projects and institutions in each level of education, for the first time in his history has generated technical assistance to external usage. Hence, it can be said that Turkish National Education System was not anymore an entity within national borders, but also has gained a cross-border dimension after 1991. It has emerged as a service provider country on education for the Turkic geography either by opening schools or by sending academics. In the post-independence years, Turkish NGOs had also more involved in the educational activities so as to improve the educational infrastructure of Central Asian republics, enhance their competency in the market economy and introduce Turkey and Turkish education system<sup>1</sup>, for instance it is stated that from 1991 to 1999, 1500 person have been invited to Turkey to take courses and to participate informative seminars for Turkish educators who would be in charge of service supplier in Turkic republics or communities in the future. It is stated other than Turkish business sector, one of the main success of Turkey was achieved in education field which was initiated by Turkish private sector (Aksiyon, 1998; Zeybek, 2005: 201).

The Project of “Introduction of Turkish Culture and National Education System” through the coordination of TICA and MEB has been sustaining since 1995. In July-August period of each year educators, teachers and ministry staff of the Central Asian republics are invited to Turkey. In addition to be familiar with Turkish national education system, they are in charged of teaching Turkish language, culture, and history to the next generations of their republics. It is suggested that Turkey would sustain its educational services for the personnel coming from Turkic Republics (DPT, 2005: 113).

The educational relations with the republics and communities have resulted in projects and institutions. The main composition for the former one is “The Great Student Project” started in 1992 by the initiatives of Prime Minister Demirel; and for the latter one is Turkish elementary schools, high schools and universities opened in the republics either in public or private status.

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.turan.org/etkinlik/ilkler.htm](http://www.turan.org/etkinlik/ilkler.htm), 20.05.2005.

In higher education, it is stated that Turkish universities have signed 148 cooperation protocols with the universities of Turkic republics from 1989 to 1999<sup>1</sup>. Similarly, in order to prepare common projects in the scope of research and development, 84 collaboration protocols signed between Turkish and Turkic universities since 1998 (YÖK, 2003:145).

Unlike the Turkish public universities established in Central Asian republics, the “Great Student Project” is still recognized as one of the greatest substantial project of Turkey with Turkic people in regard to the whole sectors. It has shaped a framework for the latter educational activities of Turkey and realized with the great political will of the Turkish government in 1992 and 1993. It still has a core position within educational activities and educational relations. In the 8th Five-Year Development Plan (2000-2005), it is suggested the implementation of “the Great Student Project” will be sustained.

### **2.3.2.1. The Great Student Project**

In order to meet the need of qualified human resource and to give a moral support for the republics and communities, by the directives of Prime Minister Süleyman Demirel, in 1992 beneficiary students were invited to Turkey with the state scholarship. In the scope of the project, almost 10.000 students have been invited to Turkey from 6 Turkic Republics (Tajikistan was accepted as Turkic republic then) and 46 Turkic and relative communities. The capacity of quotas for each republics were 2000, that of 1400 were allocated for higher education students. Turkey has been allocating state scholarship for the student selected from the republics and communities in the field of secondary and higher education since 1992-1993. However, the project is currently sustained just for higher education. It is noted the project is currently sustained with four Turkic republics (apart from Uzbekistan) and 57 different Turkic communities<sup>2</sup>. MEB has claimed for the project “with this educational cooperation, 200 million people have embraced with each other” (MEB, 1998). Zeybek argued “the US’s officials have confused with the overmuch student numbers of the project which were determined by Demirel so as to give a powerful message to external world about Turkish policies and its cares on Turkic world”.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.yok.gov.tr/egitim/raporlar/mart99/bolum10.html>, 18.03.2005.

<sup>2</sup> <http://yeogm.meb.gov.tr/webim/hizmetler/proje.htm>, 15.04.2005.



The objectives of the project are stated as follows<sup>1</sup>:

- Assisting to the raising of qualified human resources in the republics and communities
- Achieving permanent friendship and brotherhood bridge with Turkic world through raising youth as Turkish friend
- Teaching Turkish language and introducing of Turkish culture

It is education projects realized between Turkey and the republics, but prompted by political goals and enhance the relations between both sides in societal level. The core target of the project was to educate the students by means of Turkic consciousness so as to train them as the experts within their professional fields. Turkey holds great hopes for these students to return to their home countries to compose the future bureaucrats and elites of their countries. Unlike the establishment of AYU, the project corresponds to the greatest case of embracement of Turkey with Turkic people.

Süleyman Demirel for the incoming students from Turkic republics and communities said that “those students are our native (*öz*) sisters, brothers and sons. They were entrusted to safekeeping of our state’s intimacy, nation’s kindness and benevolence. These youth students are the assurance of ‘great Turkic world’ and humanity in the future” (MEB, 1998). However, Hikmet Uluğbay, the Minister of National Education (*from Democratic Left Party*) in his speech said “the persons in all sections of societies need to learn new information emerged by changed conditions in which the biggest role certainly belongs to education” (MEB, 1998). There were not any other nationalist arguments or desire for those incoming students and realized educational relations with Turkic people.

The other related activities in the scope of the project are “sister schools project” and “sister family project”. Today there are 205 schools in Turkic republics and other countries like Mongolia and Moldova involved in the former project. The latter one aims to introduce Turkish family structure and values in addition to providing an opportunity of Turkish language practice. It is stated that the numbers of the Turkish families involved in the project was 545 in 2004<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://yeogm.meb.gov.tr/webim/hizmetler/proje.htm>, 15.04.2005.

<sup>2</sup> <http://yeogm.meb.gov.tr/webim/hizmetler/proje.htm>, 15.04.2005.

In 1998, the statistics of the project were summarized as; the allocated quotas were 26.368. But, in total 16.692 students came to Turkey. 2192 of which were came for secondary education, the rest of the number were came for higher education. In total, 2133 students have graduated but 5,889 students have returned to their homes without complete their education. The total amount of expenditures made by Turkish state until 1997 was nearly \$16,5 million. In 1998 budget, Turkish state allocated \$13,5 million. Turkey has spent \$55 million between 1992 and 1997 (MEB, 1998).

It is noted that due to lack of plan, program and preparation, in a short time the project was subjected with problems, but then after the problems were eliminated largely (MEB, 1998). The project has been labelled as “unsuccessful” due to the return of large volume of the students to their countries without completing their education because of lack of the scholarships and perhaps the coming of “reluctant students”. It is argued the Turkish politicians’ assertive goals to reach thousands students led the project in failure (Oran, 2001: 386; Avşar and Solak, 1998). Turkish Ministry of Education has declared its disfavor in terms of coordination problem of “Great Student Project”. Coordination problem was the crucial obstacle in the supplying of services. In order to solve the problem a coordination entity was recommended by the ministry which would be in charge of wide orders (MEB, 1998).

In 1994, MEB’s “General Directorate of Abroad Education and Training” conducted a survey for the Turkic students (Azeri, Kazakh, Kyrgyzs, Turkmen, Uzbek and Turkic communities) who were in education in scope of the project. Furthermore, in 1996-1997, General Directorate of Higher Education Credit and Hostels Institution (*in Turkish Yüksek Öğrenim Kredi ve Yurtlar Kurumu Genel Müdürlüğü*) conducted a second survey for 1272 last-year students in higher education. In line of the survey results (see Appendix H), MEB have generated recommendations for the further realization of the determined goals of “The Great Student Project”. Some of them (MEB, 1998: 20-22) were as follows:

- The quotas allocated to the republics or communities should be diminished
- The project should be reinforced by turkish foreign policy
- Students should be allocated to the programmes which needed more by the republics or communities
- Students should be placed to the universities of ten provinces

- Students' proficiency in Turkish language should be assessed just by one exam like the TOEFL
- Maximum three-person rooms for the master and doctorate students should be provided
- Mechanisms for project in order to teach the Turkish culture should be enlarged
- Accepting of the secondary school students should be abandoned
- Pre-undergraduate scholarships should be removed and transferred into the master or doctorate studies
- After the recourse for vacancy in their countries, students should have opportunity to employ in turkey like Turkish citizens
- The project should be introduced to the Turkish businessmen who have activities in the Turkic republics and communities

In order to solve the students' problems and secure advancement on the coordination between Turkey and the Turkic authorities, "education representatives" currently are being employed in MEB.

The Great Student Project progressed by MEB has been continuing with the coordination of State Ministry in charge of Turkic republics and communities, and TICA. In the scope of the project, 5462 students are being educated in Turkey in 2004.

**Table 1: Turkic Students Educated in Turkey in 2004**

Countries	TÖMER (1)	Vocational School (2)	Undergraduate (3)	Graduate (4)	Doctorate (5)	Total (6)
Azerbaijan	76	9	247	160	118	610
Kazakhstan	105	17	322	109	35	588
Kyrgyz Rep.	92	46	387	146	73	744
Uzbekistan	130	20	246	113	67	576
Turkmenistan	46	0	508	66	6	626
Asian Countries	135	64	575	147	9	930
Balkan Countries	206	91	927	130	34	1388
Total	790	247	3212	871	342	5462

(Source: MEB, 2005; 210).

As indicated in the table, the allocated quotas are highest for Turkmenistan. The main reason of this perhaps is the proximity of its language to Turkish. Azerbaijan and Turkmenistan emphasize their co-nation character with Turkey as referring to "we are one nation but two states".

The number of total opening or quotas of higher education allocated to Turkic republics diminished to 150 for each republics (see Appendix A), which was 1400 for per republics in the initial years of the “Great Student Project”. Since 1999, the quotas allocated to Turkic republics are 150 students which is distributed among the departments demanded most by the republics or communities<sup>1</sup>. However, the allocation for Uzbekistan suspended due to its prolonged crisis with Turkey. Unlike Tajikistan’s 40 quotas and the situation of Uzbekistan, other Central Asian republics have 150 quotas. The higher education quotas offered to the other Eurasian countries were almost 800. These countries are Balkan countries, Turkic communities in Asian countries, Russian Federation, China, Mongolia and other Turkic communities of the FSU republics.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.yok.gov.tr/egitim/raporlar/mart99/bolum10.html>, 18.03.2005.

**Table 2: The Statistics About Beneficiary Turkic Students in Turkey By Levels of Education (By 2004)**

Countries	The scholarships from 1992 to 2004		Cancelled scholarship					
			TÖMER (1)	Voc. (2)	B.S. (3)	M.S. (4)	Ph. D. (5)	Total (6)
Azerbaijan	secondary	higher	14	341	1702	324	50	2431
	311	3042						
	3353							
Kazakhstan	secondary	higher	58	325	1465	207	79	2134
	179	2723						
	2902							
Kyrgyzstan	secondary	higher	77	367	753	224	84	1505
	140	2249						
	2389							
Uzbekistan	secondary	higher	278	510	1879	352	76	3095
	338	3671						
	4009							
Turkmenistan	secondary	higher	30	764	1930	120	24	2868
	876	3495						
	4371							
Asian Countries	secondary	higher	230	375	1510	172	6	2293
	113	3223						
	3336							
Balkan Countries	secondary	higher	157	329	1658	125	11	2280
	236	3669						
	3905							
Total	secondary	higher	844	3011	10897	1524	330	16606
	2193	22072						
	24265							

(Source: MEB, 2005: 211).

2193 quotas in secondary education and 22072 quotas in higher education were used. However, the allocated quotas in the both level are quite higher than the used quotas and graduate numbers. The allocated quotas respectively are 5037 and 36597 as indicated in Table 3.

**Table 3: The Statistics About Beneficiary Turkic Students in Turkey Since 1992-1993**

Countries	Secondary education			Higher education			
	Allocated quotas	Used quotas	Graduate	Allocated quotas	Used quotas	Graduate	Current enrollment
Azerbaijan	604	311	198	4783	3042	1043	610
Kazakhstan	620	179	55	4707	2723	681	588
Kyrgyzstan	672	140	77	5007	2249	390	744
Uzbekistan	682	338	23	5950	3671	606	576
Turkmenistan	1035	876	537	5403	3495	1268	626
Asian Countries	113	113	21	4834	3223	553	930
Balkan Countries	1311	236	93	5913	3669	907	1388
Total	5037	2193	1004	36597	22072	5448	5462

(Source: MEB, 2005: 211-212).

The Turkic republics and relative communities have just used almost the 43,5 % of secondary education quotas offered by Turkey; and that of 60,3 % of higher education.

**Table 4: The Rates of Graduation by the Education Levels**

Countries	Graduate Rate (%)	
	Secondary education	Higher education
Azerbaijan	32,78	21,81
Kazakhstan	8,87	14,47
Kyrgyzstan	11,46	7,79
Uzbekistan	3,37	10,18
Turkmenistan	51,88	23,47
Asian Countries	18,58	11,44
Balkan Countries	7,09	15,34
Total	19,93	14,89

(Source: MEB, 2005: 211-212).

As the total data indicated, the graduation rate of secondary education students was quite higher than that of higher education. The higher rates of graduation both in secondary and higher education belong to Turkmenistan and Azerbaijan in which the titular nationalities are in great majority; and in which Cyrillic alphabet was replaced with Latin alphabet. The students of those two republics are more eligible in Turkish language. They need less for language courses and stay shorter in TÖMER's language courses relative to the students of other republics. The course books are being sent mainly to the both countries from Turkey (MEB, 1998). For this reason, they have obtained greater successes relative to the other republics.

The graduate rates showed that the implementation and management of Great Student Project is not satisfactory and not compatible with the initially declared political goals of the project. The

outputs of the educational relations in Turkey In fact stem from the lack of institutional coordination among the state agencies.

The allocated quotas have decreased year by year. As it is seen in the first year of the project by the initiatives of Süleyman Demirel, the number of students was significantly higher than of the forthcoming years. This trend designates to the downward character of relations took place among Turkey and the republics even in educational relations. In other word, when the figures are examined just one of eight students of total allocated quotas has achieved graduation. This can be resulted from the lack of professionalism in the project.

The project is still implemented by the acceptance of the students. For this purpose an exam, TCS (*Türk Cumhuriyetleri ve Akraba Toplulukları Sınavı*, in English means *The Exam of Turkic Republics and Relative Communities*) is held by the cooperation of Turkish agencies. Those are the Student Selection and Placement Center (ÖSYM), MEB and YÖK. The applications to the departments are fixed by the demand of the republics and communities. The students are placed to the departments according to their scores of the exam and their preferences. The students who have not competency in Turkish language are involved in one-year Turkish language preparation school<sup>1</sup> in TÖMER.

These students have some positive rationales in their preference for Turkey. Firstly, the opened high schools by Turkish private sector have graduated many students who are capable in Turkish language. Secondly, the Turkish entrepreneurs who have investment in Turkic geography mostly prefer the students completed their higher education in Turkey. Thirdly, in Turkey the institutions are providing education overlapping with the curricula of western universities.

### **2.3.2.2. Turkish Schools Opened in Turkic Republics and Communities**

Unlike the establishment of AYU, both Turkish public and private sectors have involved in educational activities in the Central Asian republics and other Turkic relative communities. The schools were established in all levels of formal education. They have been favored more owing to their supply of secular and modern education services. Turkish HEIs and secondary schools

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://yeogm.meb.gov.tr/webim/rehber/TCS.htm>, 15.04.2005.

have contributed both to social transformation and to the development of educational system of the republics (Demir et al, 2000).

MEB for the first time, in 1995, held a meeting in order to solve the problems of the public and private Turkish schools. In addition to contribute to their productivity and coordinate their activities, the main aim of that meeting was to secure the schools to provide service in line with the objectives and principles of Turkish National Education System (MEB, 1998). It is emphasized Turkey is in favor of supervising those schools, monitoring their curriculum and teachers for the sake of national interests, and it is further suggested those schools should be supported and the assistance to solve their problems should be considered (DPT, 2000a).

MEB has recommended those schools opened by the ministry should be transferred to the home countries and just for the necessary fields Turkish teachers should be sent. It was argued due to lack of teacher salary, the ministry was in difficulties to appoint teachers. It is further stated that apart from the support for teachers of Turkish history course, the public schools should be transferred to home countries due to their rising costs on Turkish budget. Turkish Language Learning Center as the sole institutions should be reserved and expanded to each city of the region (MEB, 1998: 18).

#### **2.3.2.2.1. Turkish Public Schools**

The numbers of schools opened by MEB in Central Asian republics were 21 by 1999; that of 2 in Azerbaijan, 2 in Kazakhstan, 4 in Kyrgyzstan, 1 in Tajikistan, 4 in Turkmenistan, and 8 in Uzbekistan (7 of them were closed by Uzbek authorities in 1999). Due to the prolonged crisis existed among both countries the Uzbek-Turkish high school contract was not revised in 2000 which had been signed in 1992. Uzbek state has also withdrawn its students from Turkey. It is noted that by 2001, just 2 of 26 schools are in operation due to the crisis (Bilici et al, 2001).

By 2004, Turkey has 16 public primary and secondary schools in the diverse countries of Eurasian geography. The nine of them are formal institutions, and the rest of them are non-formal education centers.



**Table 5: The Statistics On Turkish Schools Established By MEB (2003-2004)**

Countries	School Number	Student Number		Course Center	Coursier Number	Teacher Number	
		TR <sup>1</sup>	Other			TR	Other
Azerbaijan	2	164	288	1	117	30	14
Kazakhstan	-	-	-	2	700	23	7
Kyrgyzstan	3	161	292	1	316	54	15
Uzbekistan	1	120		-	-	11	1
Turkmenistan	2	253	605	2	644	52	13
Tajikistan	-	-	-	1	152	4	-
Moldavia	1	-	59	-	-	11	7
Total	9	698	1244	7	1929	185	57

(Source: MEB, 2005: 207).

The names of those institutions by countries are as follows:

(a) Azerbaijan

1. Baku Turkish Primary School
2. Baku Turkish Language Learning Center
3. Baku Turkish Anatolian High School

(b) Kazakhstan

4. Turkestan Non-formal Vocational Training Center
5. Almaty Turkish Language Learning Center

(c) Kyrgyzstan

6. Bishkek Turkish Primary School
7. Republic Genuine (*Yetenekli*) Children Kyrgyz-Turkish Anatolian High School
8. Kyrgyz-Turkish Anatolian Female Vocational High School
9. Bishkek Turkish Language Learning Center

(d) Uzbekistan

10. Tashkent Turkish Primary School

---

<sup>1</sup> Republic of Turkey

(e) Tajikistan

11. Dushanbe Turkish Language Learning Center

(f) Turkmenistan

12. Ashgabat Turkish Primary School

13. Ashgabat Turkish Anatolian High School

14. Ashgabat Turkish Language Learning Center

15. Ashgabat Non-formal Vocational Training Center

(g) Moldova

16. Kongaz Süleyman Demirel Moldova Turkish High School

Unlike the primary and secondary schools, Turkey firstly has involved in higher education activities. It currently has two joint venture (common) universities in Central Asia. International Hoca Ahmet Yesevi Turk-Kazakh University established in 1993 with Kazakhstan and Kyrgyz-Turkish Manas University established in 1995. The establishments of the universities were finalized by the decisions of Demirel. During the establishment of AYU, he was Prime Minister, but in time of Manas University he was President for two years. While Turkish presidency has not large executive functions, Demirel has engaged also in the establishment of the second university. In fact, as it is mentioned in the next parts, those two universities were previously designed and matured by the efforts and guidance of Demirel's head advisor, namely Namık Kemal Zeybek, and his working friends.

Apart from the universities, Turkish Foundation of Directorate of Religious Affairs (Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı) as an agency of public sector has opened theology faculties in the republics and communities in order to meet the need of religious men emerged by the disintegration of the USSR. TICA is also active for the establishment of Turcology centers in the Eurasian countries since 2000.

#### **2.3.2.2.2. Turkish Private Schools**

In addition to the activities of Turkish public sector in the education sphere, it is known that “one of the most important initiatives in the domain of education has been taken by Turkish

companies and foundations active in Central Asia” (Şen, 2001: 11). In 2000, the numbers of Turkish private schools ranging from language center to university were 123 including Russian Federation, Ukraine and Mongolia apart from Central Asian republics (DPT, 2000a: 294). This figure was 117 in 1997 (Oran: 385). Unlike the Turkish public universities established in public status, Turkish private sector has also more involved in the establishment of private HEIs in Turkic republics and relative communities. In a short period of the post-independence years, four private universities were established by the sector.

The well-known Turkish private higher education institutions are:

- International Turkmen-Turkish University in Ashgabat (1994)
- Suleyman Demirel University<sup>1</sup> (Almaty) in Kazakhstan (1996)
- Qafqaz University in Azerbaijan (1996)
- International Atatürk Alatau University in Kyrgyzstan (1996)

The universities established after AYU, including Manas University, have been largely modeling AYU in regard to many aspects, e.g. similar missions, Turkish word in the name of the universities, multi-language instruction, the Board of Trustees, presence of international student and academics. In addition, the universities introduce themselves through three or four languages in their web pages on the Internet. Those languages mainly are the national language of the home country, Turkish, Russian, and English.

Currently, there are such western universities in Central Asia which challenges the Turkish universities more than the national universities of the republics. The main western universities can be mentioned as; American University of Baku (1995), American University-Central Asia (1997), Kazakh-American University (1998) and Kazakh-British Technical University. In fact, Kazakhstan is the leading republic in terms of its involvement in international higher education activities (see Appendix F).

Furthermore, Research Foundation of Turkic World (*Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Vakfı*) is a leading Turkish foundation which also established their schools in Central Asia and Caucasia. The foundation has been operating in educational activities in the Turkic republics and

---

<sup>1</sup> Suleyman Demirel University (SDU) is a non-profit international university whose instruction language is English, and has 3 faculties on Philology, Economics, and Engineering.

communities since 1991 through establishing faculties, departments and high schools<sup>1</sup>. It has also opened various higher education faculties and departments affiliated to the home countries' universities<sup>2</sup>. The faculties are in linguistic, management and political sciences. The departments are largely on linguistic and affiliated to pedagogy faculties of the home universities. It is stated the institutions of the foundation are recognized by Turkish authorities and the curriculum alignment is secured as done by Turkish and Turkic education institutions.

The foundation has two faculties in Jelalabad of Kyrgyzstan, and one in Baku of Azerbaijan. It gives opportunities for the students to engage in further academic degrees in Turkey in master or doctorate levels. The other higher education activity of the foundation is Turkish language departments established mainly under the pedagogy faculties of Turkic universities so as to expand the usage of Turkish language in Turkic geography. The departments are equipped by the foundation and its instructors are sent from Turkey. The graduates have opportunity to become Turkish language teachers in their countries. Foundation is operating six to eight departments, five in Kazakhstan, and one in Daghestan, Tatarstan and Chuvashistan. The next and last kind of institution is high schools. Foundation has six schools, one in Azerbaijan, two in Kazakhstan, two in Tatarstan and one in Chuvashistan.

It is emphasized by the foundation that unlike other Turkish high schools established in Turkic republics or communities, the instruction language of the foundation's high schools is solely Turkish, and education is non-paid. It is mentioned the schools target the unity in language, thought and work. The most significant high school of the foundation is Ahmet Yesevi High School opened in Kentau of Kazakhstan in which AYU also has a university campus. It is stated the successful students from each level of the institutions visit Turkey in summer and learn more about Turkish culture and Turkey. These visits have function in mitigating of the previous prejudices.

Currently, the numbers of Turkish private high schools are higher than that of private HEIs. Those high schools supply education in the level of "Anatolian High School" of Turkey, and the education is controlled by the supervision of Turkish and home country authorities. In those

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.turan.org/etkinlik/yd\\_egitim.htm](http://www.turan.org/etkinlik/yd_egitim.htm), 20.05.2005.

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.yok.gov.tr/egitim/raporlar/mart99/bolum10.html>, 18.03.2005.

schools, the social lectures offered by home teachers, but language and science lectures offered by Turkish (host) teachers (Bilici et al, 2001). It is mentioned by Ayvazoğlu (1996) that<sup>1</sup>,

No country can compete with Turkey in education sector. The young teachers run here with a spirit of Alperen and they make such kind of restoration against ex-regime's social capital. The republics advocate those schools sometimes by allocating old buildings. The goal of this great project is just peace, brotherhood and solidarity, i.e. forever friendship. It has no political goals and its name is humanism stemmed from common history and culture.

It is argued “according to the many independent observers, the biggest success which Turkey achieved for Turkic world, in the tenth year of the independences, is Turkish schools” (Bilici et al, 2001). It is mentioned that Bülent Ecevit, the former Turkish Prime Minister<sup>2</sup>, had appreciated the 154 Turkish schools opened in 34 countries of the world by Turkish businessmen and NGO (*namely Fethullah Gülen Community*). It is stated that for the first time the Turkish Schools were introduced in the Booklet of Turkey which was presented in Davos Economic Forum (Bilici, 2000).

There are lots of Turkish private schools opened in Central Asia and territory of the former Soviet Union. Those schools are opened by the foundations and companies of the Turkish entrepreneurs. Those schools are termed like “Turkish schools” (Demir et al, 2000), the schools affiliated to “Turkish foundation, association, corporates” (Oran: 385), or schools of “private Turkish firms” (Bilici et al, 2001). But, those schools are largely known as “Gülen schools” in Turkey, which is believed that they are opened by the supporters and followers of Gülen Community. It is known that the community has opened primary, secondary and higher education institutions throughout the world.

It is stated that apart from Turkish private sector, the American and other western corporations accelerated their educational investments in the region (Bilici et al, 2001). However, the western countries have often pointed out that Turkey is the strongest state in the region which may have an important role in promoting political and economic liberalization in presenting a more moderate form of Islam and in preventing the incursion of fundamentalist Islam. Turkish schools

---

<sup>1</sup> The translations by Özcan Türkoğlu

<sup>2</sup> The former Turkish Prime Minister, in the 56th and 57 Turkish governments came to the power in 1990s (see Appendix G).

train human resources needed to implement this policy in Central Asian countries in addition to their contribution for the future development of diplomatic and political channel among the west and Central Asia (Demir et al, 2000). Eren (1999) argues,

MEB could not open ten schools in each republics of the region. But, the republics demanded for those schools. Turkey has generated many educational contracts but could not apply them; even it could not provide the educational personnel needed by the schools opened by Turkey. But, the special educators have achieved this objective instead of the state, i.e. fill the empty of the state. Therefore, any person who are against those schools (both official-public schools and the private schools) are opposite of Turkish interests. If any kinds of problems are exist in terms of the structure of those schools the administrators of the home countries (republics) could not allow them.

In addition to the modern physical facilities and course materials, the leading strengths of Turkish schools is its teachers. “They are highly motivated because of their working conditions and their personal goals such as serving people who have same religious, linguistic and historical origins as themselves” (Demir et al, 2000: 152). The President of the executive board of Sebat Educational Services Company (the Turkish company belongs to Gülen’s supporters in Kyrgyzstan) Orhan İnandı said “we could not make any plan on the future in the past, we moved with emotions then the mind and rationalism have penetrated into the process” (Özcan, 2005).

In the foundation years of the schools, young Turkish teachers have also visited the parents of the students by horse to the rural areas. Those young teachers are mainly graduates of the best public universities of Turkey (Ayvazoğlu, 1996). Özcan (2005) argues “the young and idealist teachers running from Anatolia to the region today enlighten Eurasia”. It is known that those teachers usually engage in offering Computer, English, Turkish, Mathematics and Science courses (Demir et al, 2000:143). The teachers and administrators of Turkish schools argues these schools train the future bureaucrats, leaders and technocrats who are equipped with various skills and competencies (Demir et al, 2000).

The schools are preferred by high state officials of Kyrgyzstan and Russians (Özcan, 2005). Such as, Kyrgyz President Askar Akayev for the schools have been opened since May of 1992 and financed by Turkish schools mentioned “the biggest assistance and investment of Turkey are realized in the field of education. Those assistances are not measured by money. Our most

selected and privileged students will be raised in those schools” (Taygar, 1997). Taygar further argues those schools have opened a new path and contribute for the convergence the curriculum in line with the Turkish and European systems. Likewise, Akayev has further mentioned on the Turkish schools that “the bases of those schools were constructed by former Turkish President Özal. We did not forget him. Demirel has also great role for the continuation of the elaborated relations” (Taygar, 1997). Nazarbayev also mentioned “as a state we will continue to support those schools. They allow us to progress our friendship and brotherhood. For this reason, the existence of Kazakh students in Turkey and the opening of Kazakh-Turkish high schools and universities in Kazakhstan are very outstanding” (Bilici et al, 2001).

## CHAPTER III

### TURKISH UNIVERSITIES IN CENTRAL ASIA: THE CASE OF INTERNATIONAL HOCA AHMET YESEVI TURK-KAZAKH UNIVERSITY

#### 3.1. Introduction

Turkey was able to establish just two public universities in Central Asia, namely in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan. The rest of the republics still have intention to set up such kind of institutions. However, the political conjuncture has altered much, and the Turkish foreign policy considerations are not same that of 1991. The periods of enthusiasm and ambition in regard to the relations have passed. Kabasakal noted “if Turkey is able to offer powerful proposals to Turkmenistan and Azerbaijan which have already a strong will so as to set up joint-university with Turkish state, those universities can be established”. Zeybek noted “the proposals for establishing common university should be made by the republics. We have experienced that it was a more functional way and facilitated our further efforts and preparations”. Zeybek said “the plan of the cadre<sup>1</sup> was to open common universities with each of the republics. Zeybek argued “although there was not any model, there was an idea to establish a university with each republic. We have worked hard, cooperate with the republics and achieved”. The name of the universities which were desired to open; Fuzuli University (Azerbaijan), Ali Şir Nevai (Uzbekistan), Mahtumkulu (Turkmenistan), Manas (Kyrgyzstan) and Ahmet Yesevi (Kazakhstan).

Higher education institutions are among the initial concrete activities of Turkish state which took place in the framework of the educational relations with Central Asia. Unlike International Hoca Ahmet Yesevi Turkish-Kazakh University in Kazakhstan, Turkish-Kyrgyz Manas University in Kyrgyzstan also could be seen as the fruit of the initial intensive educational relations realized in the first half of 1990s. Those universities are termed in Turkey as “public university in private status”. The first one was formulated in 1992 and established in 1993, the latter one established

---

<sup>1</sup> The official working group in charge of coordinating the activities and projects held for Central Asian republics and other Turkic communities in the period of Demirel’s Prime Ministry in the 49<sup>th</sup> Turkish government. It is an autocratic entity, headed by Namık Kemal Zeybek and located in Koza Sokak in Ankara.



in 1995. The manifested objectives of the universities are raise higher education standards in the republics and overcome the shortage of qualified human resources needed by the new republics in all disciplines. But the latent objectives of the universities are more supreme. Those are enhancing the social, economic and political relations and dialogue among the both sides and thus raise the qualified generations of the future who are anticipated to make the Turkic world among the most developed region of the world.

Unlike the modern educational standards and curriculum, the crucial method for the achievement those objectives are the assets of local Turkic culture which benefited and inspired by both universities and their students. In the first university “Ahmet Yesevi” and in the second university the legend of “Manas” is the motivator factors both in the establishment, instruction and identity building of the universities.

### **3.2. Hoca Ahmet Yesevi International Turk-Kazakh University**

International Hoca Ahmet Yesevi Turkish-Kazakh University’s establishment designates to the realization of Mustafa Kemal’s foresight proclaimed in 1933 which emphasized the common language, history (origin) and belief. AYU perhaps is the first and concrete step realized in line with Atatürk’s historical intuition. It was officially established on 1 January 1993 as a joint venture institution of Kazakh and Turkish states, just one year after the disintegration of the Soviet Union. Turkey concurrently has provided technical assistance and exported his accumulated higher education experience obtained by the home (Turkish) universities.

AYU is the first common university of Turkic geography established among two states. The name and location of the university is significantly meaningful. It can be labelled as an excellent case of “glocal” activity. It tries to achieve universal education in academic sense, but shapes its institutional identity on the basis local heritage, like Hoca Ahmet Yesevi’s doctrine and Turkestan city. Furthermore, it is global since it accommodates humanistic and universal values, traditions and beliefs through university. On the contrary, it is local since it reinforces its global character by benefiting from the advantages of Ahmet Yesevi or Turkestan city’s historical heritage, accumulation and reputation.

AYU contributes to the sustainability of interstate relations with Kazakhstan and other Turkic republics and communities. Those relations are enhanced and sustained through the youths coming from diverse regions of Turkic geography. They have acquired a chance to live side by side and know each other closely. AYU has been presenting a great opportunity for them to share some ideas together and move ahead on the common goals and objectives that can be defined as “serving to Turkic world” by Zeybek.

### **3.2.1. The Establishment Story of Ahmet Yesevi University**

Although the establishment of AYU was decided in an official visit of Turkish Prime Minister Demirel to Kazakhstan, the story of the establishment goes back to the Soviet time. The road map proceeding toward the establishment of AYU could be clarified in ten stages. The first stage is Turkish minister of culture Namık Kemal Zeybek’s official visits respectively held to Moscow, Azerbaijan and Turkmenistan in autumn of 1990. Zeybek noted that “the visit materialized by the invitation of Soviet Minister of Culture, and by the means of former Soviet Ambassador to Ankara, Albert Cernishev. In fact, it was result of the period of sovereignty for Turkic republics which resulted from Gorbachev’s glassnots policies”. Second stage is again Zeybek’s official visit directly held to Kazakhstan in December 1990. Kazakh minister of culture Kanat Savdabayev invited him for Ahmet Yesevi Symposium. Zeybek has travelled to Kazakhstan (Turkestan city) via Tashkent, Uzbek capital, and also meet there with his Uzbek colleague (Zeybek, 2005: 214). In Kazakhstan, he has visited the mausoleum of Yesevi and signed a cultural cooperation treaty with his Kazakh collegeaus in Almaty. It is labeled as the first treaty signed between Turkey and Kazakhstan (Zeybek, 2005: 213). In fact, Zeybek went to Kazakhstan also for the restoration of Ahmet Yesevi’s mausoleum. Zeybek noted,

Then after Azerbaijan and Turkmenistan, I was still looking for a further opportunity as a minister of culture to visit the other Turkic republics. One day a Kazakh man (*Head of Kazakhstan Union of Writers*) visited my office at the Ministry. He was touring the world so as to collect money for the restoration of Ahmet Yesevi’s mausoleum. He demanded financial assistance from Turkey. I persuaded him to finish his tour because I am undertaking the restoration of the mausoleum as the minister of culture. The Kazakh man returned his country and informed the Kazakh Minister of Culture Kanat Sevdabayev.

Third stage is Turkish President Turgut Özal's visit to Kazakhstan held in March 1991 when the USSR was still on power. Özal signed a treaty on scientific and technical collaboration and cultural exchange so as to reconstruct the Kazakh economy (Oran, 373). In fact, it can be argued that such kinds of activities were resulted from the period in which "Gorbachev' glasnost became an official vehicle for the the expression of ethnic, linguistic, cultural, environmental, and religious grievances that had not been addressed openly in recent decades" (Haghayeghi, 1995: 41). The fourth stage is the establishment of Ahmet Yesevi Turkestan State University (the predecessor of AYU) in June 1991 by the order of President of Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic Nursultan Nazarbayev. The fifth stage is Nazarbayev's visit to Ankara in September 1991. The sixth stage is the general election of Turkey held in October 1991. As a result of the election Zeybek remained out of the politics and was not re-elected. The former government (Mesut Yılmaz's Motherlan Party) has lost the election and Süleyman Demirel's True Path Party came to power through a coalition government with Erdal İnönü's Social Democrat People's Party. Zeybek noted that "Süleyman Demirel has offered coordination task to me for the relations with Turkic republics. I was equipped with the position of "head advisor"<sup>1</sup> (*baş danışman*) of the Prime Minister and empowered with ambassador authority of the five Central Asian republics, because it is the time of when Turkish official ambassadors still were not in office". The seventh stage is the independence declaration of Kazakhstan on 16 December 1991.

The eighth stage is Zeybek's pre-visit for 21-days to Central Asian republics and Kazakhstan which held before the well-known tour of Demirel in May 1992 to Kazakhstan. Zeybek noted,

The idea for the establishment of university was proclaimed by Kazakh Prime Minister Sergei Tereshchenko<sup>2</sup>. He told us that you (Turkey) are quite interested with Turkestan. We know your interest on the city. Our President (Nazarbayev) has opened a university, namely Ahmet Yesevi Turkestan State University there. Tereshchenko offered that this university can be valued as the common university of both States, and I immediately agreed upon.

---

<sup>1</sup> Zeybek said "I have composed a cadre composed of three members but then reached to 33 members. This cadre has sustained and managed the "great student project" which was financed by Eximbank credits and had formulated to cover 10000 students. We have worked from early of 1992 to that of 1994 with high motivation and satisfaction. In this process we obtained intensive support of Demirel and Özal rather than other related ministries".

<sup>2</sup> He has retained his Prime Minister position in Kazakhstan until March 1994.

The ninth stage is Demirel's tour to Kazakhstan in April and May 1992 in which Nazarbayev offered the proposal again "this university shall be the common university of Turkey and Kazakhstan". The tenth stage is the foundation treaty of AYU signed on 31 October 1992 in Ankara. Kazakh Ministry of Education and YÖK were assigned as responsible bodies. It was signed among Turkish Foreign Minister Hikmet Çetin and Kazakh Deputy Prime Minister in the first Turkic summit. Zeybek argues it was the single concrete action of the summit, and signed at the presence of other Presidents".

The significant steps for the establishment of AYU are the treaty on the restoration of Ahmet Yesevi's mausoleum signed in Zeybek's first visit to Kazakhstan, and the visit of Özal held in March of 1991 to Kazakhstan which has further motivated Kazakh country to open a university in Turkestan city just 3 months later than Özal's visit.

### **3.2.2. Foundation and History**

"Ahmet Yesevi Turkestan State University", the previous name of AYU, with the decree issued by Kazakh President Nazarbayev was founded in Turkestan city on 6 June 1991. Although every kind of decisions related to the universities are decreed by the Kazakh Council of Ministers, the foundation decree of Turkestan State University signed by Nazarbayev. This was done the first time and never continued for something other university then after (AYU, 2001). The order made by Nazarbyaev mentined "in order to develop the Kazakh economy, raise the high qualified experts in university level education and develop Turkestan city known as the scientific and cultural center of Central Asia, Turkestan State University shall be opened and the university shall be named after with the supreme poet and intellectual Ahmet Yesevi" (AYU, 2001).

During the former Turkish President Süleyman Demirel's tour of Kazakhstan on 29 April to 1 May of 1992, he visited Turkestan city and the mausoleum of Ahmet Yesevi whose restoration treaty had signed in December 1990. After the briefings made for him about Ahmet Yesevi and Turkestan city, Turkestan city again was honored as the center of science and culture. Thus, by the approvment of both Presidents the formerly established university was transformed to the common university of Turkey and Kazakhstan, but was honored to serve to all Turkic people.

Before the sign of the foundation treaty in Ankara, Turkish and Kazakh parts have meet and signed a memorandum of understanding which has designed the road map for the further legislative preparations. It was signed by Aydođan Ataünal (MEB General Directorate of Higher Education) and Uygur Tazebay (vice president of YÖK) in Turkish part; Korolkov V. Trophimovich (First Assistant Deputy Minister of Kazakh Public Education Ministry) and Murat Curinov (The rector of Ahmet Yesevi Turkestan State University) in Kazakh part.

During the first Turkic summit which was held in Ankara on 31 October 1992, “The treaty on establishment of International Hoca Ahmet Yesevi Turk-Kazakh University in Turkestan city between the governments of Republic of Turkey and Kazakh Republic” was signed as a founder treaty. In fact, the foundation treaty is the product of “The Cooperation Treaty on Education, Science, Culture and Sport” signed on 1 May 1992 in Almaty, for the development and empowerment of economic, historical, cultural and scientific ties between Kazakhstan and Turkey.

The founder treaty of AYU signed on October 31 of 1992 by Turkish Foreign Minister Hikmet Çetin and Kazakh Deputy Prime Minister Mirzatay Coldasbekov. The treaty consisted of five articles. In the treaty *it* is stated that “the contractual parts will sustain the required studies till end of 1993 in order to compose a university compatible with international standards”. In the same article it was foreseen that the name of Ahmet Yesevi Turkestan State University will be replaced with “International Hoca Ahmet Yesevi Turk-Kazakh University”. In the treaty, it was agreed on Prof. Murat Jurinov shall be the rector of AYU. It is stated that the contractual parts must be in consensus for the appointment of rector and vice rector. Furthermore, it is noted that a cooperation protocol will be signed between Hacettepe University of Turkey and Turkestan State University of Kazakhstan in order to prepare the regulation (Tüzük in Turkish) of AYU. Moreover, in the treaty, it was decided that the new buildings of AYU will be constructed by Turkish firms which would start in March-June 1994.

On 29 April 1993, the approval of the treaty amended by The Grand National Assembly of Turkey (TBMM), and finally the treaty was approved by Turkish Council of Ministers (*the cabinet*) on 11 August 1993. The regulation<sup>1</sup> of the university signed by Prof. Dr. Yüksel Bozer (rector of Hacettepe University) and Prof. Dr. Murat Jurinov (rector of Ahmet Yesevi Turkestan State University) on 6 June of 1993 in Almaty. On the same day, the regulation (21 articles in total) was affirmed by Turkish Foreign Minister Hikmet Çetin and Kazakh Deputy Prime Minister Kuanış Sultanov. Ultimately, it was agreed on the Board of Trustees to be located in Ankara, and the education services will be supplied in Kazakhstan.

Some of the main articles from the regulation are as follows:

**The Article 4:** The Board of Trustee is appointed for seven years period, the head of the Board appointed by Turkish President and the vice head appointed by Kazakh government.

**Article 6:** The internal administrative body of the university is Senate. The duration is five-years.

**Article 10:** The rector is proposed by Senate and then appointed by the Board of Trustees for five years. The acting rector (meanwhile the first vice rector) is appointed by YÖK for five years, but the rest of the vice rectors are appointed by the rector.

**Article 12:** The deans and department heads elected by Senate and appointed by the rector.

**Article 15:** The Turkish universities may send academics to the university.

**Article 16:** The annual capacity of quotas is determined by the Board. The half of the quotas allocated to Kazakhstan and the other half divided equally to Turkish students and students of other Turkic republics and relative communities. The student admission from Turkey is arranged by ÖSYM, but the admissions from Kazakhstan and other Turkic republics or communities are arranged by the university.

**Article 17:** The education and instruction language of the university is Kazakh, Turkish, Russian and English languages. The students who are not competent to follow the

---

<sup>1</sup> Zeybek mentioned that “after the draft regulation has completed in Ankara by the efforts of both sides, the Kazakh side has returned to their countries. Then after, they informed us that a problem has occurred owing to the position of head of the Board of Trustees which is decided to be performed by a Turkish official. Kazakh side was recommending the co-presidency for the position. I went immediately to Kazakhstan and negotiated the issue. I offered myself as head of the Board as a solution. They have declared their approval for this solution. Therefore, sometimes I believe that personal relations have better functions in diplomacy”.

education programme due to its instruction language should take 1-year language preparation. In the all departments, one of the languages among Kazakh, Turkish and English is studied in status of elective course; other languages to be studied are offered on need. Students must be fluent in both Kazakh and Turkish language in order to graduate.

**Article 18:** University's financial resources are grants from governments, the student fees, aids, and revenues coming from trade activities of the university.

**Article 19:** The diploma is recognized in both countries like the diplomas of the native universities, and has international equivalence like them and possesses same rights to his or her owners, but the validation of diplomas in the rest of the countries is dependent on the treaties which would be realized.

### **3.2.3. Mission**

The predecessor of AYU, namely Ahmet Yesevi Turkestan State University was established with the similar purpose which is explained by Haigh (2002: 54) as “in most instances, universities have been established as regional institutions, created and continually funded by local or national governments with the clear priority and responsibility to meet the intermediate educational requirements of its locality”. But, it is fact that the establishment of AYU is a more missionary event in many respects.

The reason of existence is defined in the Article 1 of the regulation as follow: “provide higher education service to the youth, who are currently in university age in Turkish Republic, Kazakh Republic, other Turkic republics and other Turkic communities, according to the necessities of Turkic consciousness, international education and contemporary science” (AYU, 2001). AYU is assigned itself to sustain, highlight and transmit the ideas, morals, traces and memory of Ahmet Yesevi which based on solidarity and tolerance for the benefit of next generations. Zeybek argued “AYU is an institution integrating Turkic world in line with Ahmet Yesevi's thoughts and make studies achieve information age for Turkic world”. In addition, Kabasakal emphasized “AYU is the case of friendship and humanism project”.

AYU describes its principles so as to raise constructive and creative students as who are:

- particularly bound to essentials of democratic and secular state,
- equipped with knowledge and experience as much as meeting the needs of forthcoming centuries,
- tied to national and moral values,
- possessing a free and scientific thought and wider world view,
- respectful for human rights,
- matured and developed enough in terms of physic, mind, spirit, moral and feeling,
- having feeling of responsibility against society.

Both Turkish and Kazakh politicians and high level bureaucrats have appraised the establishment of the university usually in their visits to AYU. The common base of these opinions emphasizes the function of AYU as the means of securing and strengthening unity of Turkic people all around the world. The Turkish Presidents Demirel and Sezer have visited AYU. Budak noted that the Yesevi's mausoleum also motivated them to travel Turkestan. Some crucial opinions declared about AYU in AYU's Catalogue (2001) and in AYU's Booklet (2002) are as follows:

I hope, AYU, in a short time would take a position among the world's most recognized universities. It will provide cooperation and "union thought" between Turkic states, and in future the generations who will enhance the relations between Turkic people will be trained here (Hüseyin Kıvrıkoğlu, the former President of Turkish General Staff).

To this university, who carrying the name of our holly ancestor, my belief is forever in terms of being identified among the most recognized science entity in the world in future. This university founded in Turkestan is an international institution and open to all humanity. It is a kind of science, enlightenment and peace home (Süleyman Demirel, the former Turkish President).

Hoca Ahmet Yesevi International Kazakh-Turk University which was established in Turkestan will empower the relations between the two brother people and will make Turkestan the common science (ilim) center of Turkic world (Nursultan Nazarbayev, Kazakh President).

Ahmet Yesevi University is an education and training center allows Turkic people all over the world to close each other and empower the common perception. The Turkish and Kazakh youths who study together and then graduate would set up a friendship bridge between



our countries in the future. We will continue to survive Ahmet Yesevi, the sign of our common history, by his mausoleum and the university (Ahmet Necdet Sezer, Turkish President).

Turkestan city and AYU founded there, has become the hope of Turkic world (Ömer İzgi, the former President of Turkish Parliament).

AYU is a university which has international status. It established to bring youths of Turkic geography and aims to provide them an education comply with the essentials of international education and modern sciences” (Akad Orazalı Sabden, the former rector of AYU).

### **3.2.4. The Board of Trustees and Administration**

“Board of Trustees” is recognized as the managerial product of the Anglo-Saxon university model. It was firstly adopted by AYU, and then modeled by Turkish public and private HEIs in Central Asia. It is specified in the regulation that AYU has “administrative”, “fiscal” and “academic” autonomy by foundation. University has two main administrative mechanisms. Those are university senate and Board of Trustees<sup>1</sup>. According to the regulation of the university, the Board is composed of ten high level bureaucrats. Other than four Turkish members, head of the Board is appointed by Turkish President<sup>2</sup>. Apart from Namık Kemal Zeybek and Feyzullah Budak all other members of the first Board are not in office today (see Appendix B). The senate is the internal body of the university administration appointed for five-year period. Its President is rector. Other members are first vice rector and other vice rectors, deans, directors of institutes, directors of vocational high schools and five chosen academics. But the executive board includes rector, first vice rector and other vice rectors, directors of the campuses, deans, five chosen members by the senate and directors of the institutes. The rectorate is located in Turkestan campus. The rector is appointed for five years by the proposal of the senate and the decision of the Board. Other than the the first vice rector or *acting rector* (appointed by YÖK), other vice rectors are appointed by the rector. The current rector of the university is Prof. Dr. Serik Piraliyev (Kazakhstan), and the first vice rector is Prof. Dr. Abdulkadir Yuvalı (Turkey).

---

<sup>1</sup> The founder and current head of the Board is Namık Kemal Zeybek. The members of first Board in Kazakh side were; Prof. Murat Jurinov, Prof. Kırmbek Köşerbaev, Prof. Erlan Arın, Prof. Altay Zeynelgabdin. The members of Turkish side were; Bener Cordan, Dr. Uygur Tazebay, Prof. Oktay Sinanoğlu, and Feyzullah Budak.

<sup>2</sup> Zeybek said “for the appointment of head of the board president Demirel was favoring the authority of government. But, we insisted for the authority of presidency so as to strength the position against the political instabilities”.

### 3.2.5. Student Admission System

As designated in the regulation of AYU, students are accepted from three different categories. The 50 % of the quotas offered to Kazakh students, the remaining half divided into two for Turkish and other Turkic students (republics and communities). The procedures for the admission are different relative to these categories. In the article 16 of the regulation the admission of the students are arranged different than today. It is stated that Kazakh students and Turkic students are selected by the university's own exams, but the Turkish students are placed to the university by the exams of Turkish ÖSYM.

Turkish students were selected and placed by ÖSYM from 1995 to 2000. However, the Board of Trustees in April 2000 and in line with the university's demand decided to remove the name of university's departments from Higher Education Programmes and Quotas Booklet of ÖSYM in 2000. The admission of Turkish students to AYU has been organized by the Board since 2000.

Kazakh students are accepted to AYU according to the results obtained in the central exam held by Kazakh Ministry of Education. In Kazakhstan, the applicant students are evaluated in accordance to their scores in the central exam. Then they prefer the universities in relevance to their scores and individual preferences. The students from the Turkic republics or communities are selected by three ways. First one is organized by the related state agencies of those republics and communities; second one is organized by AYU's own contact persons there; and third one is organized with the support of sister university. If the number of applications exceeds the allocated quotas, AYU arranges its own selection exam there. In 2001, AYU arranged its entrance exam in 21 different countries from Balkans to Siberia (Ayhaber, 2000). The capacity of dormitories and the long distance are the main obstacles for the non-Kazakh students<sup>1</sup>.

Budak noted "the higher demand comes from Kazakhstan rather than Turkey, and other Turkic republics or relative communities. For this reason, the annual quotas are allocated in favor of Kazakh students. AYU is the first and mostly demanded university in Kazakhstan in 2004. This indicates the position and reputation of the university". In fact, there are two medals of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Budak mentioned "sometimes, unusual applications may emerge, e.g. a student 7000 km away from Kazakhstan comes to Turkistan by his efforts for studying in AYU. He is from Siberia's Televut Turks (Tölevit descent) which is solely indicated by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk in the history of Turkey".

student admission of the university. While the Kazakh students are the top students of the country which are ranked by the central exam of Kazakhstan, there is not any overall central exam for Turkish and other Turkic students.

The selection of Turkish students starts with the publication of quotas of the departments in Turkish press and websites of the university in July. The first condition is entrance to the ÖSS (*in Turkish Student Selection Exam*) and taking sufficient score determined by the board<sup>1</sup>. First of all, students make their choices for three departments, and then take the exams in a sequence order. Two writing exams are held. The first one is on Turkish composition. The second one is on Turkic culture, a testing exam. After the verbal interview in the exam committee which has seven members, the overall total score of the student is calculated through the scores of ÖSS exam, composition, test and interview. Then the total individual scores are ranked and the successful ones are accepted. The student who could not take 50 points in the composition is eliminated. Budak emphasized “AYU has a mission and the both states have expectations on it, therefore Turkish students who will be studied in AYU have a representative role on behalf of Turkey. They should be eligible, competent, and conscious.

For the 2004-2005, 623 Turkish high school students have applied to AYU. 586 of them entered to the written exams and 187 of them have passed. Then after the interview, held in the exam committee, just 61 of the applicant students have passed and were seen eligible. But, the total number of quotas allocated for Turkish students were 160. The number of quotas offered to Turkish students is decreasing, for instance the quotas were 300 in 2000-2001. Budak mentioned “AYU was not established to meet the higher education demand of Turkey; it has a specific mission and should seek the most willing students”.

For the way of further enrollments of the foreign students apart from Turkic republics and communities, Zeybek said “the term of Turk is widely dominant in daily usage in the university. The students from outside of Turkey and Turkic people may be disturbed by the wide usage and also may face difficulties in learning Turkish and Kazakh languages. In fact, the regulation of the university does not allow admitting the students of other nationalities. But, in future, we may favor a wider approach which covers other nations who are close to Turks”. On the contrary, Budak noted “AYU have Russian students who are Kazakh citizens. Unlike Turkestan campus,

---

<sup>1</sup> For the 2004-2005 education year the required exam scores in “crude scores” were; minimum 220 for ÖSS-SAY and ÖSS-SÖZ, 200 for ÖSS-EA and 185 for ÖSS-DİL (<http://www.yesevi.edu.tr>, 11.02.2005).

Russian students are concentrated in other campuses, more in Chimkent campus. Although they are familiar with the mission of AYU, they prefer to study in AYU, perhaps owing to the closeness of their settlements the campuses and the service quality of AYU". As Budak designated, the service quality of a university may be the reason of internationalization in higher education as discussed by the academic rationales in the Chapter VII.

### **3.2.6. Students and Academics**

The university emphasizes its international dimension and accepts many students from diverse countries of Central Asia, Caucasia and Balkans. Since the university accepts students from Turkic republics and communities. Hence, it shapes the boundaries of Turkic geography. In 1991 the number of students in Ahmet Yesevi Turkestan State University was 332<sup>1</sup>. But, the number of students for AYU grew to 7730 in 1998<sup>2</sup>, 13544 in 2000-2001 (AYU, 2001) and 24168 in 2005. AYU attracts students from entire Turkic republics, communities, and from other countries in which Turkic communities live (Table 6). For instance, AYU currently has students stretching from FYR Macedonia in Balkans to Sakha Turks in Siberia.

The number of Turkish students in AYU is 380 in 2005, 490 in 2001, and 503 in 1999. Turkish students have been enrolled to the university since 1995-1996. Although the regulation of the university (*Article 16*) allocated the 25 % of its quotas to Turkey, the number of Turkish students decreases year by year. Turkish students are largely enrolled to the departments of Turkestan and Kentav campuses. The decrease may impair the international identity of the university.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.yesevi.edu.tr/?sayfa=akyap>, 11.02.2005.

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.yok.gov.tr/egitim/raporlar/mart99/bolum10.html>, 18.03.2005.

**Table 6: The Students in Ahmet Yesevi University in 2005**

<b>Republics</b>	<b>Students Number</b>
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	<b>22396</b>
<b>Turkey</b>	<b>1100</b>
<i>Formal Education</i>	380
<i>Virtual Education (TÜRTEP)</i>	720
<b>Turkic Republics</b>	<b>307</b>
Kyrgyzstan	114
Turkmenistan	73
Kyrgyzstan (Türk Ata) <sup>1</sup>	49
Karakalpakstan (Uzbekistan)	40
Uzbekistan	31
<b>Turkic Communities in Russian Federation</b>	<b>237</b>
Altai	43
Karachay-Cherkessia	38
Dagestan	34
Tuva	30
Khakassia	25
Chuvashstan	10
Sakha	10
Tatarstan	9
Omsk	8
Balkaria	7
Televut (Teleud)	6
Bashkortostan	5
Siberia	5
Crimean Tatars	4
Noghai	3
<b>Other Countries</b>	<b>128</b>
Kazakh-Uygur (China)	39
Bulgaria	20
Mongolia	16
Azerbaijan	13
Moldova	13
Northern Cyprus	9
FYR Macedonia	7
Ukraine	7
Iraq	3
Romania	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>24168</b>

(Source: Unpublished document, 2005).

If the TÜRTEP (*Online Education Programmes with Turkish Language*) students are not taken into account, the total number of students out of Kazakhstan is 1052 and constitute almost 4,5 %

<sup>1</sup> Budak stated that this community called themselves as “Türk Ata”, and perhaps comes from descent of Göktürk.

of the student population. The ratio for Turkish students is 1,6 %, but if the TÜRTEP students are added the ratio increase to 4,5 %. Turkish students are distributed to the three campuses by 82 % in Turkestan, 10 % in Chimkent and 8 % in Kentav. The gender of Turkish students is quite separate, female students just composes the 15 %. The more preferred departments by Turkish students respectively are Turkish Literature, English Literature, Medicine, Management, International Relations, History, Computer Engineering, Journalism and Tourism.

The numbers of academics were 593 in 1996 and 983 in 2000, but it increased to 1855 in 2005. The academics are mainly from Kazakhstan, Turkey, Central Asian republics and other Turkic communities. Sometimes the foreign academics from rest of the countries are employed for a short-term period, e.g. from China, Egypt and Mongolia. In contrast, the overall mobility and existence of foreign academics is too limited. For instance, the numbers of foreign academics were just two in 2005.

**Table 7: The Number of Academics in Ahmet Yesevi University**

Country	Profesor	Assoc. Prof.	Lecturer	Total
Kazakhstan	82	448	1259	1789
Turkey	11	15	38	64
Total	93	463	1297	1853

(Source: Unpublished Document, 2005).

Turkish academics from Turkish universities are also temporary employed in AYU with the contract its duration is mainly determined by academics. They occupy a functional position by transferring knowledge and experince among two countries. Budak emphasized that “the biggest problem for mobility of Turkish academics is long distance”. Recently, partnership relationships have increased with other Turkic universities which may foster the exchange activities of the academics. According to the survey report of the IAU (Knight, 2003) academics are seen the main drivers for the internationalization and they are more active than administrators and students.

### 3.2.7. Finance of the University

The finance of the university is budget oriented. Both states are responsible for co-financing (*Article 18 of the regulation*). The lack of self-financed students is the major financial drawback. Budak emphasized “step by step we are progressing toward the admission of self-financed students”. In AYU, the whole self-paying students are Kazakhs. The students coming from outside of Kazakhstan are further promoted sometimes by scholarships. Budak mentioned “the distance is too large and this may break the motivation of the incoming students”. Kazakh students in regard to payment status are separated into four groups. The first group students have grants from Kazakh state. The second group includes the students who using state credit, the third group includes self-financed students, and the fourth group includes the students who are partially financed by Turkish budget of the university. In the 2005, the percentages of the groups within the Kazakh students respectively are 7,4 %; 3,1 %; 74,8 %; and 14,7 %.

The financial support of Turkey has decreased in recent years by the completion of necessary infrastructure investments. Budak noted “the decline of public support recently forces AYU to looking for new financial opportunities. The distance learning can also be considered is a source of finance for AYU”. There are more than 700 students registered in TÜRTEP in 2005. The non-formal or non-traditional education services in AYU, e.g. distance learning activities, lifelong learning courses and extern departments are other main income generation sources in finance of the university. The regulation of the university allows diversifying the financial resources. This diversification of economic activities through online-virtual education or arrangement of life-long courses is compatible with the commoditization of higher education which stimulates the international students’ mobility which stimulates and contributes to the internationalization process. In addition to the academics, in total, there are 3047 personnel of the university. The salaries of the personnel are paid from different budgets. Those are Kazakh, Turkish and Commercial budgets.

AYU’s fund raising activities are also performed in Turkey. Zeybek mentioned “AYU is like an iceberg of a huge organization”. In fact, AYU has various institutions and media corporations in Turkey. The first group includes Ahmet Yesevi Strategic Researches Center, Aysev Tourism and Travel Corporation, Turkic World Culture Center and Assistance Foundation of AYU. The second group includes Ayhaber Magazine, Asia-Europe Magazine, Bilig (*scientific journal*) and

Aygazete (Turkish daily). In addition to their financial contributions, those entities are quite functional for the overall recognition and advertisement of AYU both in Turkish and international society. In Kazakhstan, there are some economic entities whose activities are also can be considered sources of income, like non-formal education center and Yesi Hotel.

### **3.2.8. Lifelong Learning Activities**

HEIs in the developed countries offer certificate courses or lifelong learning activities mostly demanded by labor force market to eradicate unemployment or enhance the competency level of employees. In this respect, the established Non-Formal Education Center of AYU is a compatible element of the university with the fore mentioned circumstance. AYU started to offer non-formal education courses since 2001-2002 in order to raise qualified entrepreneur generations<sup>1</sup>. The offered courses in the non-formal education center are the occupations mostly demanded by the market. The university currently offers seven vocational courses. These are computer, carpet, hairdresser, knitwear, dressing-confection, embroidery and sanitary installation courses (AYU, 2001). It allows adults and youths to obtain new occupations, to improve their job skills, and to create job opportunities for themselves.

### **3.2.9. Campuses and Faculties**

In the establishment period, AYU solely had one campus (*Kalecik*) in Turkestan, but currently it has four additional campuses. The main campus is still in Turkestan where the presidency (rectorate) is located. These campuses are Kentau, Chimkent, Taraz, and Almaty. In addition to the campuses, there are education offices in İstanbul, Ankara and Almaty.

Turkestan State University had 6 faculties and 20 departments in 1991<sup>2</sup>. By 2005, AYU has 16 faculties, 3 scientific research institutes, 2 scientific research centers, and 2 distance learning faculties. Moreover, AYU has Graduate and Post-Graduate Institute in Almaty, and Social

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.yesevi.edu.tr/?sayfa=yayegt>, 11.02.2005.

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.byegm.gov.tr/YAYINLARIMIZ/newspot/18/N26.htm>, 22.04.2005.



Sciences Institute in Ankara. The latter one is hosting the graduates of AYU for their graduate and post-graduate education held in Turkish universities.

The types of education and students are various. AYU offers education in types of formal (*örgün*), ekstern and virtual (TÜRTEP). Three kinds of students also are existed in AYU. Those are the beneficiary students (who have scholarship or grants), non-beneficiary students (self-financed students and the students studying with credit of Kazakh state) and ab extra (extern) status. The first two should attend to the classes. Formal education is sustained without student fees.

The recognition of the diploma is ensured by the regulation. AYU has not student exchange programs with Turkey in type of twinning programme. But AYU proposes graduate education opportunity for the successful students in Turkish universities. They are called as research assistants and responsible against AYU's Ankara office. They visit the office and take professional support courses. Then after, they return to Kazakhstan and can be employed in AYU. Budak noted that AYU has partnership agreements for graduate education with Gazi University and Hacettepe University in Turkey. The latter university also is the “guarantor” university of AYU in the period of establishment.

### **3.2.10. Language of the Instruction**

AYU is a multilingual university. For instance, unlike the Turkish web page, the web page in Kazakh language proposes services in the four other languages. These are Turkish, Russian, English and Arabic. Although the Article 17 of the regulation determines Kazakh, Turkish, Russian and English as education and instruction language of the university, in reality courses are offered in Kazakh and Turkish languages. The students should be competent in the both languages in order to follow the courses. In the preparatory school, the non-Kazakh students must take Kazakh, Russian, English, Turkish languages and computer courses. But, after the results of the proficiency exams held in all languages, the students who are competent in one or more languages solely take the rest of the compulsory courses. The language preparatory school is located in Turkestan campus. Budak noted that Kazakh students do not take preparatory school, but they take Turkish language as a compulsory course for four-hours in a week.

Furthermore, it is mentioned that (AYU, 2001) for the all students of the departments “Vocational Turkish” are offered.

AYU contributes to expand the scope of Turkish language in educational institutions of the Turkic republics and communities. For instance, the number of high schools affiliated to AYU has grew up from 12 in 2004 to 32 in 2005 in Kyrgyzstan. The university recently has developed agreements with the universities from Turkic republics and communities to open Turcology departments in their HEIs. The agreed universities are “Os State University”, “Kyrgyz-Uzbek University” in Kyrgyzstan (Ayhaber, 2004) and Dagestan State University.. In fact, those strategic alliances with the high schools and departments would promote students to take their undergraduate, graduate or post-graduate education in AYU, because they will be competent in Turkish language. In future, by the means of AYU’s partner institutions, the recognition of AYU in Turkic geography and student mobility in AYU can be increased.

### **3.2.11. Distance Learning Activities**

Max Weber argues (cited in Kongar, 2002: 303) the main impetus behind the social change is ideology rather than technology which is the last stage of change. Technology composes its own culture on the beneficiaries. The foundation of AYU is a significant case of ideology-organization-technology chain rather than the opposite chain. In case of AYU, initially the values and beliefs have altered, then accordingly the organization of the university was structured and finally the recent technologies were started to be used in order to supply quality service and achieve the realization of the ideology (the mission of AYU or political rationale behind the establishment), e.g, distance education technology is good case of technology. As it was argued the beliefs changed first and then accordingly technology was appropriated to improve the service quality of the university.

The accumulation of AYU on the Distance Learning is divided into two periods. Respectively, they are “video conference system” and “distance learning programmes”. The Board of Trustees decided to establish “Distance Learning Faculty” in 1996 which was designed to use modern education technologies in the services. With the satellite communication system (*uydu haberleşme sistemi*) upon Turksat 1C, interactive video-conference system was operated between Ankara and Turkestan city. The system has started to provide “support courses” from

Ankara studio to Turkestan in 1998, but it was finalized in 2001. For the video-conference system two contracts had been signed with Anatolia University and Gazi University in Turkey. Unlike the distance learning programmes, the system had a complementary function in the formal education of students in Kazakhstan. They had achieved interactive face-to-face relations with the Turkish instructors via the video conference system.

Former Turkish President Demirel was the first instructor of the first course for the video conference system, whose topic was “human rights”<sup>1</sup>. Demirel with the first video-conference embraced with his colleague Nazarbayev and this event was headlined in Turkish media as “virtual embracement” (Ayhaber, 1998a)

The long distance among the campuses in Kazakhstan and also the remotness of Kazakhstan to Turkey justified the implementation of “distance learning technologies”. The benefits of the project are defined as follows:

- It provides the academics to offer course without moving to Kazakhstan,
- The accumulated experience of Turkish academics will be transferred to Kazakhstan,
- The costs on academics will be diminished,
- The experience of Kazakh academics will be transferred for Turkish students.

On the basis of the Article 18 of the regulation, the university can diversify its income generating activities. In that sense, AYU offers online (virtual) formal education programmes (distance learning) in Turkish language since 2002. Although the economic rationales of the programmes are not notably emphasized, the economic contribution of the online programmes can not be ignored.

It is argued that (Kurmanaliyev and K ksoy, 2002) the lack of Turkish and Turkic students in AYU is resulted from economic, social, political and geographic breakdowns of the student families. In order to overcome this problem distance learning programmes were designed for this population. However, it is noted that the purpose for the establishment of distance learning programmes is also giving a further opportunity for the employees in Kazakhstan.

---

<sup>1</sup> Demirel mentioned through the distance education “we are such people, despite the long distance we embrace each other, the distances have lost their importance”. The Turkish press has highlighted the issue with their sub-headlines, such as “the virtual education lecture from Demirel” or “video conference from Demirel” (Ayhaber, 1998a).

“Turkestan Distance Learning Faculty” was reorganized to supply virtual higher education programmes for two-year vocational higher education, undergraduate and graduate degrees. Turkestan Distance Learning Faculty have three departments; TÜRTEP (instruction programmes with Turkish language), KAZTEP (instruction programmes with Kazakh language), and RUSTEP (instruction programmes with Russian language). TÜRTEP’s academic and technologic infrastructure has completed and the service is supplied through the web since 2002-2003. Whatever the nationalities and wherever the students reside, they can recourse to TÜRTEP if they have sufficient competency in Turkish.

AYU currently has two “Distance Learning Faculty” in Chimkent and Türkistan campuses. The instruction language of the former one is Kazakh and Russian language, but the latter one is Kazakh and Turkish language. In the faculty of Turkestan, KAZTEP and TÜRTEP departments were set up. Those faculties have coordination functions; the services are supplied by the academics of formal education departments. The diplomas are same which are given from the equivalence department of the programme in the formal education faculties.

Through TÜRTEP, the service was launched to be offered via Internet relative to video-conference system. It is stated that the obstacles stemmed from time and place were removed. The service is supplied throughout 24 hours of day. It is stated that the population having intention of higher education by Turkish language but impeded by problems arising from work, distance or private life, have obtained further opportunities. Moreover, the Turkish higher education students currently enrolled in a home (Turkish) university may apply to the TÜRTEP programmes for a second diploma. The duration of education in the programmes is five years relative to the four years of the formal education.

The conditions of applications for TÜRTEP are changed relative to the nationalities. The pre-undergraduate (Computer Programming) and undergraduate programmes<sup>1</sup> require that; Turkish citizens should pass respectively 160 and 185 scores in ÖSS exam; Kazakh citizens should enter the central exam of the country and pass the determined score; and the other must have a

---

<sup>1</sup> Those programmes are management, management and information system, computer engineering, and industrial engineering.

recognized high school diploma of its country. The requirements for graduate education<sup>1</sup> are; applicants have university diploma obtained by four-year education and approved by their native countries; the Turkish graduates from foreign universities, rather than AYU and Manas University, should submit official document taken from YÖK about the recognition of their universities.

### **3.3. Kyrgyzstan-Turkey Manas University**

Manas University is the second common Turkish public university established in Central Asia. The name of university both in Turkish and English version are same. Unlike AYU, it explicitly was denominated with the name of Kyrgyzstan and Turkey in its both versions. It was founded in accordance with the agreement signed on 30 September 1995 in Izmir, between the government of the Turkish Republic and Kyrgyz Republic. By 2003, the total number of student was 1722 (Kyrgyzstan 1153, Turkey 447 and other countries were 127). In the university, there are 82 academics and 37 administrative personnel from Turkey, those numbers were 93 and 148 for Kyrgyzstan (YÖK, 2003: 145).

Manas University does not widely hold regional concerns. Relative to AYU, it seems more in national character and international orientation. In fact, it is the result of the reinforcement of AYU's model. The foundation of Manas was finalized again by the decision of Turkish President Süleyman Demirel. Zeybek said,

When I was head advisor of President Demirel in 1995, I have advised Kyrgyz Minister of Education to inform the President Askar Akaev about the intention for the establishment of a common university with Kyrgyzstan. But, the Minister advised and convinced me to tell the project Akaev. I told the project to Kyrgyz President and assured him to share the project with Demirel. We had experienced in AYU that the proposal for such institutions should be done by the partner country. Akaev told Demirel the issue and he has accepted. I have recorded this official conversation and signed it to Uygur Tazebay and Kyrgyz Minister, and noted myself as the observer, because I had not any executive authority to sign such agreements.

---

<sup>1</sup> Those programmes are management, management of health enterprises, management and information systems, and computer engineering.

Although the university was established long after AYU, its mission is quite similar with that of AYU. The mission is defined “to secure an education, in community for the Kyrgyz and Turkish young people as well as for the young in other Turkic Republics and communities, along with helping them develop common approach and cooperation. It is believed that in this way the university will contribute to contemporary scientific developments and will support the renaissance of Turkic civilization. In this frame the goals of the university are<sup>1</sup>:

- serving as a model for the higher education system of Kyrgyzstan, and in this way to play a leading role in global integration by making use of contemporary education standards and methods in a modern university administrative model,
- bringing up new generations as constructive, creative, modern, who believed in the principles of a democratic and a secular state, considerate to human rights, conscious of their national identity, faithful to their moral values, stable and healthy in terms of body, mind, spirit, morality and feeling, having social responsibility,
- contributing to the processes of democratization and transition to market economy by making use of the experiments in modernization and market economy of the developed countries,
- assisting the improvements in scientific literature and experiments in the world with its investments in research and developments as well as scientific technology,
- educating the young people of the Turkic countries as individuals, who are devoted to their national values, equipped with universal qualifications and views. In this way, they will be accomplished to be distinguished members of the international communities,
- bringing up the new generations as men who are perfect in every field, self-confident, equipped with a multidimensional and critical approach, easily adaptable to the society in constant change and development, respectful to the rules of democratic way of living, participant, can undertake risk, ready for cooperation, tolerant, freemen, creative, researcher, having artistic sensitivity, always ready to learn.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.manas.kg/index?id=2>, 11.03.2005.

### 3.3.1. The Comparison of Ahmet Yesevi University and Manas University

Turkey has established Ahmet Yesevi University in 1992 with Republic of Kazakhstan and Manas University with Kyrgyz Republic in 1995. Today both universities correspond to the fact that they are the product of the magnificent period in terms of political, economic and socio-cultural relations took place between Turkey and Central Asia in the first half of the 1990s. On the contrary they were established in a quite different political conjuncture in terms of Turkish politics. As it is mentioned in Chapter II, in the period of 1991-1993 Turkish nationalistic arguments were more prevail than that of 1993-1995 in which the relations were more pragmatic and Turkey had noticed its limits as a *model country*. However, the title of Turkish politician, Süleyman Demirel, who decided to establish these universities, had also altered. During the former one he was Prime Minister, but in the latter one he was President.

Both universities are titled as common “public university in private status”. But, the similarities are fewer than the differences among the institutions. The comparison of them is not the topic of this thesis, but it is worth to detect some major differences and to highlight the advantages and disadvantages of the both in regard to the internationalization of higher education (see Appendix C).

The main difference is that AYU emphasizes its missionary existence more than Manas University. The mission and target of the university determined in the foundation year are sustained without any break. AYU aims to attract more Turkic students and want to be the leading university of Central Asia. The personal commitment and motivation of Turkish members of the Board of Trustees is the most determining factor in this process which emphasizes and consolidates “Turkic world” concept on the basis of Yesevi doctrine. Hence, AYU seems more in a character of Turkish “private” or “foundation” university, and has more regional considerations. In contrast, Manas University is closer to the Turkish public university structure, and its international expression is stronger.

The number of students, faculties and campuses are quite higher in AYU. In order to survive this huge university, AYU has forced itself to diversify its financial resources in addition to public funding. AYU is more selective for the incoming students both from Turkey and Turkic republics and communities; it arranges its own exams for those students. However, Manas admits these students through the centrally arranged Turkish exams like ÖSS and TCS. Unlike

AYU's regulation, the regulation of Manas does not limit its quotas according to nationality of the students. Therefore, the international students, out of Turkic republics and communities, have more chance for enrollment in Manas University. One of the further advantages of Manas is its location. While Manas was established in the most urbanized area of Kyrgyzstan, AYU was established in an area of rural Kazakhstan and expanded to the urbanized areas of the country through the subsequent campuses. It can be concluded that Manas University was built upon the lessons learned from AYU's structure and legislation which secured Manas to obtain more convergence to Turkish higher education system.

It can be concluded that AYU designates well to the cooperation in regional scale (Turkic geography). On the contrary, Manas University has regional considerations, but it has less regional orientation. The latter seems to more engage in the international (out of Turkic geography) activities in future. Such as, it hosted an international symposium with the collaboration of TICA, Middle East Technical University (METU – located in Ankara) on “The Integration of Eurasian Countries' Higher Education and Science Systems to the Bologna Process and Tecnopark Practices” in December 2004 (TİKA, 2005). In fact, the symposium refers to the penetration of the internationalization process into Eurasia region and the Turkish universities either located in Turkey or Central Asia will play a very decisive role in this process.



## CHAPTER IV

### THE MAIN STRENGTHS OF THE UNIVERSITY

#### 4.1. Introduction

Chronologically, Kazakhstan has declared his sovereignty in October 1990, and established Ahmet Yesevi Turkestan State University in June 1991 and lastly became an independent state in December 1991. A short time after the independence of Kazakhstan, Turkish state had undertook a great mission to establish a common HEIs with Kazakh state in May 1992 which replaced the name of Ahmet Yesevi Turkestan State University with International Hoca Ahmet Yesevi Turk-Kazakh University.

The name of the new university covers two additional terms. Those are “international” and “Turk-Kazakh”. While the former means that this university is open to other nations, the latter one designates to the fact that this university is a common entity of Turkey and Kazakhstan. The predecessor university had established with national objectives, but switched to the regional and international objectives and considerations.

AYU is seen as a great gift presented to Turkic geography and for its expected socio-economic development in the 21st century, which is called by Nazarbayev as “century of Turks” during his visit to Turkey in September 1991 (Oran, 2001:380). AYU has been established before the establishment of other similar Turkish or foreign universities in Central Asia. Because of its preliminary charecter it is worth to make a close investigation for the basis of the university. The privilege of AYU comes from the fact that it is not only the one of the first concrete project emerged in education sphere, but also it is among the initial activities of Turkey realized with the Central Asian republics. Hence, it still represents the symbol of outstanding start of Turkey in the new period emerged by 1991.

In regard to its foundation year, the university is a product of well-designed project. The project raises a few main questions in mind to be answered. These are the type, name and location of the

project. The project is a university project named with a great Turkic intellectual (Sufi) Hoca Ahmet Yesevi and established in Turkestan city of Kazakhstan where his mausoleum exists. The analysis of those dimensions or components allows to reveal the significance of the university in relevance to its followers and to detect the compatible aspects of the university with the internationalization of higher education.

#### **4.2. The Importance of Higher Education**

University is a cognitive and rational institution where knowledge is produced and transmitted; technology and skill usage are instructed (Akşit, 2002: 345). Education covers re-production of individuals and cultures in social sense through the pedagogic techniques, curriculum programmes and ideologies implanting and guiding knowledge (Marshall, 1999: 174). Education, in addition to increasing the knowledge and skills level of individuals, it is the main input of economic development and basis of life quality. Bozkurt (2004: 286) argues sociologically, education is the strongest tool to make individuals to create the expected results and changes in behaviors, because it secures social and political integration through the creating a common sense under the same institution.

The foundation of the university is strongly matched with Weber's "social action theory" (cited in Marshall, 1999: 792). Unlike traditional and emotional action types, the two other components of the theory are highly beneficial to understand the establishment of AYU. These are value-based rational action and purpose-based rational action. If the foundation of AYU is a case of rational social action, the former one designates to the values of Turkicness and principles of Ahmet Yesevi thought. The latter one also designates to train the generations for the sake of Turkic world's welfare and future by the means of higher education. AYU submits a functionality of place where the values and traditions of Turkic culture are learned to the students in addition to raising the qualified labor force.

For the socio-economic development, the significant role among the educational levels surely belongs to higher education. Higher education is the last stage before entering into labor force. It is known as the last chance to gain the students the abilities to whom they will need in the market economy. Even if the previous educational stages (secondary or post-secondary) are not

complying with the necessities of capitalist market, the higher education allows students to accumulate professional background.

The knowledge base of the republics of the former Soviet Union is not enough by itself to secure expected economic growth. The republics were in shortage of social capital which is the main motive of the economic development. The entrepreneur culture was lack, and due to the Russians immigration the qualified labour force of the Central Asian republics was decreasing. On the other hand, the collapse of the socialism has allowed to higher education institutions of the FSU republics to supply the social sciences in the field of economics, management, theology, international journalism, cartography and international relations which had been forbidden in academic sense by the socialist regime (UNDP, 1997:37).

In the new international political economy shaped after the disintegration of the Soviet Union, one of the leading strengths of the Central Asian republics is their literated labor force. The relation between population and economy or between education and development propose a chain of causation. First chain is between social capital, economic activity and income. For this chain, the influence of the amount and charecteristic of social capital is seen as a determining factor for the economic development. Reversely, the second one is also formulated between income, economic activity and social capital. In this causality the role of income is seen as determining factor for the achivement of social capital and qualifications (Kasnakoğlu, 2003: 18-19). In order to give meaning for the relation between the education and development in Kazakhstan or Central Asia, we may empahisize on the first chain, i.e population or social capital. Higher education is one of the best tools enhancing and stocking the social capital.

Until 1991, Moscow provided centrally planned curricula, and textbooks (UNDP, 1997: 31). The intellectual development of the students was under the strong control of the state. In contrast, a qualified system of higher education is a necessity both for intellectual development of human resources for the transition to market economy. Private Turkish educational institutions were also realized for the rationale of meeting the shortage of human resources of the Turkic republics and communities equipped with entrepreneur motives which were required more after the Soviet Union<sup>1</sup>, e.g. the establishment of “management institute” in Baku before the disintegration of the

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.turan.org/etkinlik/ilklere.htm](http://www.turan.org/etkinlik/ilklere.htm), 20.05.2005.

Soviet Union. Hence, professional training of young generations is essential for the achievement of global competency in the open economy encountered after 1991 by the republics.

The sufficiency of educational infrastructure or the high literacy rate of the Central Asian republics were not sufficient for the overall development. It is the fact that the literacy indicators due to the system of the Soviet regime were higher than most of the developing countries of the world, but teaching methods of the FSU republics do not compatible with the skills required by capitalist market. The training of human resources by modern and secular education systems is significantly important for the transition economies on the path toward capitalist world-system.

Yelland (2000) argues the skilled labor is the major advantage of the nations to achieve a competent society in the capitalist market economy. It is the human resources who would lead the transition from socialism to capitalism and would develop the expansion of the private sector to which the Central Asian republics need more. It is argued “countries of the former Soviet bloc hope the internationalisation of their higher education institutions will help them make the transition to a more market-oriented economy” (OECD, 1996:114).

It is emphasized that the entire post-Soviet space is exposed to the decisive impact of several powerful processes. Those are the formation of an independent state and the creation of a national economy, the transformation of a command-mobilization economy into one based on the marketplace and globalization (Zhukov, 2002: 354). In fact, the last one much facilitated the establishment of joint venture higher education institutions in Central Asia, but more in Kazakhsan and Kyrgyzstan.

It is known that in the information age the closed education systems will be challenged by the mobility of international higher education systems through the mechanisms of technical assistance, joint venture institutions, virtual campuses, and twinning arrangements so as to eradicate the differences between developed and underdeveloped countries. Turkey as a developing country has committed outstanding technical assistance to the Central Asian countries either by student exchange programmes like “The Great Student Project” or establishing joint venture universities established in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkmenistan. It is found out that HEIs have central role within the knowledge society to identify political, social, economic, environmental and cultural needs and to solve corresponding problems (OECD, 2004b:14).

It is argued that the reason behind the establishment of the university is also matched with Yesevi's principle on "science". In the "information society", the sole rational collaboration could be secured through education and science. The role of science and education is significant in terms of cultural integration, economic and political cooperation of Turkic world. In this context, in AYU's Booklet (2002) it is mentioned the university represents the will who would prepare the Turkic world for the information age. AYU does not directly contribute to the advancement of higher education system of Kazakhstan and other republics, instead it explicitly allows Turkish and Turkic youths to embrace and introduce with each other and contribute to the socio-economic development of the republics.

According to Parsons, the founder of structural functionalism theory, the education institutions function both socialize and also allocate student for the position of adults in the future. In that sense, the students of AYU implicitly are assigned to recover the relations broken by the socialist regime. Parsons's social system theory emphasize that the modern society will be achieved then after the emergence of three kinds of revolution. These revolutions take place as the action of different sub-systems of the social system. The first one is economic system's industrial revolution. The second one is political system's France revolution and the third one is the establishment and differentiation of modern university of education system. In fact, the revolutions have experienced by Kazakhstan and other Central Asian republics. The revolutions respectively could be the heavy industrialization during the Soviet rule; the independence declarations and enhancement of the democratic systems; and the rising number of private universities established in the post-independence period. In that sense, AYU being the first, international and autonomous university of Central Asia occupies the position of facilitator which allows switching to the last revolutionary stage (Parsons, 1973, cited in Akşit, 2002).

#### **4.3. The Strengths of the University: the name and location**

Both the name and location of the university is not ordinary preferences. They are very functional in the institutional identity of the AYU which is quite compatible with socio-cultural and political rationales of the internationalization.

#### 4.3.1. Hoca Ahmet Yesevi

The name of university is very meaningful and designates to the conscious preference selected by Kazakh state and welcomed by Turkey. Ahmet Yesevi (or Ahmed Yasevi) is a historical and legendary figure in the mind map of Turkic communities. He composes strong common base and eased the both states to come together with the intention of maintain a common projects. In regard to Central Asian republics, Yesevi's thought (*doctrine or way*) is very crucial, because it preserved and retained Turkic cultures despite the prolonged Soviet rule.

Hoca Ahmet Yesevi in Turkish or *Hodja Ahmed Yasevi* in English version is known as; elder of Turkic people, founder of Yesevi religious order, mystic and poet and first Turk-Islam Sufi. In fact, it is mostly recognized as a Sufi poet. His titles change according to the societies and geographies. But in historical materials (Kenjetay, 2003: 229) some titles are "Sultan-al arifin" (the sultan of saints), "Sultan-i Turk" (the sultan of Turks), "Asitane-i saadet" (the bate of Happiness), "Qutb al aqtb" (the head of moral principles), and as widely used "Pir-i Turkestan" (saint of Turkestan). Ahmet Yesevi is called as "Hazret-i Sultan" in Central Asia, and "Pir-i Turkestan" in Islamic world. He is more familiar in Central Asia rather than Turkey and agreed as the "spiritual cement" (*hamurkar*) of Turkic nationality (*Türk milliyetinin*) (Zeybek, 2005).

He was born in Chimkent's Sayram town of Kazakhstan which is 157 kilometers away from today's Turkestan (Yesi) city. Yesevi is his agnomen means that "he is from Yesi city". It is estimated that he lived in 1093-1166. His mausoleum was built in Turkestan at the end of the 14th century and became a sacred place for the visitors, i.e. Muslims from all around the world. His father is Ibrahim Seyh and mother Ayşe Hatun. He has trained by Arslan Baba who is known as the pioneer of religious intelligentsia for the expansion of Islam in Central Asia (Toker, 1984: 29-30). Then, he migrated to Buhara city and learned the basics of Islam from Sheikh Yusuf Hamedani. After the death of Hamedani, Yesevi returned to Yesi City (*Turkestan city*) and continue to his knowledge activities there (AYU, 2001; Toker, 1984; Develi, 1999; Yılmaz, 1995; Zeybek, 2005). Ahmet Yesevi has established his school (mektep) and dergah in Yesi (today's Turkestan), in order to teach the Islam and Sufism (Islamic mysticism).

Ahmet Yesevi as a well-known great Sufi teacher was trained in "Bukhara's learning institutions in twelfth century like his teacher Shaykh Yusuf Hamadani" (Togan, 1998: 54) and allowed the

expansion of Sufism in today's Central Asia. Sufism is explained as mystical expression of the Islamic faith emerged in Central Asia after the penetration of Islam in the 7<sup>th</sup> century to the region (Trimingham, 1998; Efeğil and Akçalı, 2003: 137). Trimingham defines *Yasavi Way* as the "way of holiness and a method of religious practice which displaced the ancient religion of the Turks, rather than a mystical Way" (1998: 59). Yesevi has guided Muslim Turks in Central Asia through Sufism, thus set up the bases of "Turkish Islamic tradition" (*Türk Müslümanlığı*) (Ocak, 1996: 31-32; Trimingham, 1998: 58).

Sufism was the tool of Yesevi students benefited to expand Islam (Toker, 1984). Before 1991, the religion in Central Asia practiced on traditional type of Islam and composed itself as a part of socio-cultural fabric (Efeğil and Akçalı, 2003: 130). It can be stated that the perception of religious life mostly shaped by Ahmet Yesevi's Sufism, which is far away from any political concerns, and today is highly matched with the moderate Islam. Moreover, Kenjetay argues (2003: 8) that Yesevi way is the source of moral knowledges both aims to raise free men and allow them to embrace with their internal liberty.

It is argued that although Ahmet Yesevi was competent both in Farsi and Arabic languages he preferred to write his "hikmets" (wisdoms) with Turkic language which was mainly based on social ethic in order to guide the Muslim in line with the basics of Islam. Thus, he has maintained and recovered Turkic language and taught Islamic religion<sup>1</sup>. Ahmet Yesevi had lived after the period of Karahanlı state which is known in Turkic history as the leading country in terms of their contribution to the formation of Turkic language. Such as the first product of Turkic literature "Kutadgu Bilig" and "Divan-ı Lügati't-Türk" were produced during Karahanlı administration. It has facilitated the way for Yesevi to write and read his poems with Turkic language (Develi, 1999: 16). Furthermore, his thoughts composed the basics of Turkic thought, culture and philosophy history (Kenjetay, 2003).

Contemporary Turkish literature is grateful to Ahmet Yesevi owing to his enrichments and highlight of Turkic language in his time. His thousand number students taught those poems to the people of Turkic geography. By the impact of "Hikmet" so many poets have emerged to write poems and reactivated the Turkic language as a literature language. In Turkey, they are

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.yesevi.edu.tr/?sayfa=ayk>, 11.02.2005.

disseminated in the name of “Divan-ı Hikmet” by Turkish Religious Foundation and “Selections from Divan-ı Hikmet” by Turkish Ministry of Culture.

He has simplified the Islamic nomenclature mainly for the new believers, Turkic nomad communities, who were in difficulties to understand the basics of Islamic religion. He played great role in the Islamization of Turkic tribes, in the adaptation of Islam to the nomadic life and in linguistic reconciliation through his poems and his successor dervishes (Trimingham, 1998: 58-59). Yesevi achieved to teach Islam without disturb or reject the lifestyle practices of the nomads.

The students of Ahmet Yesevi who are called as “teacher dervish” have achieved the expansion of Islam among the Turkic communities. In that sense, Turkey is also quite grateful to Ahmet Yesevi. The idea is that “Turkicization of Anatolia” and “Islamicization of Anatolia” were performed by Yesevi Alperens (follower students or disciples) and Yesevi thought in general (AYU, 2001). It is stated that in the embracement of Turkic world in general, Ahmet Yesevi’s name, ideas and services compose the basis of the integration (Zeybek, 2005).

Trimingham argues (1998: 59) the Yasavviyya was a tariqa of wanderers who spread the Yasavi tradition throughout Turkestan, region in larger sense, which includes Azerbaijan and Anatolia where the formation of popular side of the new Islamic Turkish civilization emerged by contributions of Yesevi students. It is argued Yesevi has raised many students in Yesi who are called as alperens. These students were coming from diverse region of Turkic geography, even from Balkans. They were trained in Yesi and then moved back to their lands and trained their local people in line with Yesevi’ Hikmets. They are called as “*Yesevi Erenleri*” and destined to Turkestan, Horasan and Anatolia as mentioned earlier (Ocak, 1996; Develi, 1999).

Zeybek notes (2005) that in Anatolia, Yesevi’s students are called with the names of “alperen” (who have worried for the expansion of Islam), “bacıyan” (who enlightened other women) and “ahıyan” (opinion leaders bringing ethic and discipline to trade). There are such well-known Turkish legendary intellectuals among Yesevi’s students who shape the base of Ottoman Empire, e.g. Şehy Edebali, Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli, Hacı Bayram-ı Veli, Geyikli Baba, and Yunus Emre who are known mainly as great moral teachers blending Turkic culture and Islamic knowledge and shape the cultural heritage of Anatolia. In addition to students or followers in Asia Minor (Anatolia) like Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli, the representative of Yesevi thought were also



existed and operated in cultural life of today's Central Asian republics (Kenjetay, 2003: 26-27). Sufi missionaries of the four important orders accelerated Islamization of Central Asian communities. The most prominent ones were Naqshbandi from Bukhara, Qadiri from Fergana, Yasawi from Southern Kazakhstan and Kubrawi from Khorezm. Unlike Qadiri all other order was quite prevail (Haghayeghi, 1995: 77).

It is discussed that Ahmet Yesevi stressed upon Islam's sensitivity on science, working, and production. He was also approaching to other religions with tolerance which embraces all humankind with love. It is argued "as similar to the past, he will also continue to guide Turkish and Turkic people. He is symbol of our common history; we will survive him by means of his mausoleum and university named with his name" (AYU, 2001). The reason for the selection of Ahmet Yesevi's name is reinforced as "Yesevi is the representative of a religious perception in which science is initially important" (Ayhaber, 2000). It means that Ahmet Yesevi represent a thought in which science is highlighted as much as religion.

Ahmet Yesevi has been assigned as the cement of relations among people of Turkic geography. His major contributions can be classified as; first is the expansion of Turkic language, second is the Islamization of Turks and the third is the correct interpretation of Islam among Turkic people. The contribution of Ahmet Yesevi both to the development of Turkic language and religious life of Central Asian communities in the past is still contributing to the basis of socio-cultural building of contemporary republics and that of AYU. Budak emphasized Ahmet Yesevi's thought is justified as the overall spirit of AYU to which all students are expected to feel and perceive in the campus of Turkestan.

Owing to all above mentioned informations, Ahmet Yesevi is honored many times by the ideas of officials so as to emphasize the good selection of his name for the university. Turkish President Ahmet Necdet Sezer said "Hoca Ahmet Yesevi has a significant function in the Turkicization of Anatolia. He is known as the first Turkic thinker, he will be sustained to guide Turkic world in future as did in the past" (AYU, 2001). The Kazakh President, Nursultan Nazarbayev<sup>1</sup> argued "our path is to integrate Turkic world in the line of Ahmet Yesevi and make it to achieve information age. He is our prime teacher who teach us the progress on the science

---

<sup>1</sup> The present and founder President of Kazakhstan. He was elected in 1991 and then he won a further seven years term in the 1999 election in addition to two-year presidency in Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic from 1989 to 1991.

road through preserving our language and origin” (Ayhaber, 2000). Zeybek also argues “Ahmet Yesevi was his times’s Atatürk in 12<sup>th</sup> century” (Ayhaber, 2002).

#### **4.3.1.1. The Basic Principles of Ahmet Yesevi Thought**

It is shortly called as “Ahmet Yesevi thought” (*Ahmet Yesevi Düşüncesi*) or “Ahmet Yesevi Way” which consists of three services and seven principles. The first service is his writings in Turkic language. His Islamic poems (*hikmets*) written by Turkic language then after contributed also to the emergence of Turkic literature. The second one is his students sent to diverse territories of Turkic geography who teach Islamic religion. The third one is his efforts resulted in Turkic interpretation of Islam which consist of the seven principles (Zeybek, 2005). The principles are quite universal and today more compatible with higher education to train the students on a civic identity. These are adherence to god by love, sincerity, human love, tolerance, equality of men and women, holiness of labor and work, and science.

The students coming from diverse regions of the Turkic geography are integrated upon Yesevi principles and trained by the essence of his thoughts so as to achive a common understanding, solidarity and retain a perception stemming from the heritage of common history and culture. The principles are quite functional to accomodate universal and humanistic values for the students. The ambiance formed by the essence of principles cause both students and academics to grasp a universal culture. Many of those universal principles are formed and used as the tools in order to internationalize the campus so as to create an environment of international and intercultural understanding. In that sense, AYU is one step further relative to its rivals because of possessing these principles in his reason of existence. It can be concluded that these principles can easily realize and foster the multi-cultural ambiance and intercultural understanding in the campus which paved the way for the international identity of the university and paved the way for the consolidation of socio-cultural rationale of the internationalization in the campuses.

#### **4.3.2. Why Kazakhstan?**

The reason behind Turkey’s decision to establish a common university with Kazakhstan is stemming from the presence of Ahmet Yesevi mausoleum in this country to which all Turkic people engaged with great respect and love. Unlike this visible reality, there are many tacit reasons for this preference which force Kazakhstan to sustain the cooperation with Turkey; and

guide Turkey for the enhancement of this common project with Kazakhstan. Turkey is the first country in the world recognizing the independence of Kazakhstan. This may have facilitated the process or decision, but it is not sufficient rationale today for answering the reason.

It is true also that Kazakh country was in privilege status owing to his national comparative advantages relative to the other FSU republics. The first is ownership of nuclear power remained from the USSR which motivated the US foreign minister James Baker to make his first visit to Kazakhstan among the Central Asian republics (Bilici, 2001); second is having largest hydro-carbon reserves of the region; third is having space station of Baykonur; and fourth is having the most diversified and developed economy of the Central Asia. The substantial foreign investment allowed Kazakhstan to be second largest oil producer and exporter after Russian Federation in the former Soviet Union (EIU, 2003: 23). It is claimed “Kazakhstan’s economic potential is enormous because it combines natural and human resources” (Olcott, 2002: 10).

Under the Soviet rule there was a system of economic division in which Central Asian republics were signed to the role of providing agricultural goods, raw materials and of minerals to the rest of the Soviet republics (Birgerson, 2002: 139). On the other hand, Kazakhstan had the most developed diversified and specialized economy in addition to its advanced technology relative to other Turkic republics. In terms of Durkheim’s terminology (Harris, 1968, cited in Kongar, 2002: 103-104), Kazakh society is the leading one in regards to the division of labor which pushing societies from mechanic solidarity to organic solidarity in which individualism fostered, local ties weakened and universal values enhanced. Durkheim argues that social change is based on technology and division of labor. In fact, these were higher in Kazakhstan. Therefore, it may be argued that Kazakh society is more open to international higher education activities.

Under the Soviet rule the education levels rose dramatically for Central Asian republics (Schatz, 2004: 51-52), but the average was below that of Russian population. In 1989, the numbers of university graduates were 99 for per 1000 population in Kazakhstan, but it was 108 for the USSR. On the contrary the ratio for secondary schools was better in Kazakhstan; respectively the ratios were 541 and 504 per 1000 population (DIE, 1993). Moreover, the education level of the employees were lower in Kazakhstan in terms of having university diploma. In 1989, the rate of employees with university diploma was 41,7 in Kazakhstan; 46,5 in Turkmenistan; 47,0 in Kyrgyzstan; 47,2 in Uzbekistan; and 52,7 in Azerbaijan (DIE, 2003: 102). In Kazakh country, this relative shortage of higher education graduates perhaps further motivated new Kazakh

republic to expand and improve its higher education system. Such as, higher education students increased from 281.000 to 515.000 among 1996 and 2001 owing to increase in private HEIs. They accounted 35,7 % of the national student population, but, in this process the educational expenditures diminished reversely (EIU, 2003: 22).

Despite the rationales mentioned above, the composition of Kazakh population and socio-cultural background, i.e. the multicultural heritage of Kazakhstan is more explanatory. The university concerned to supply international higher education service is structurally compatible and in consensus with the existence level of multi-cultural and multi-ethnic societal circumstances. In that sense, the social structure of Kazakhstan made him the most appropriate republic to allow the expansion of the international higher education. Kyrgyzstan due to his similarities with Kazakhstan perhaps became the second republics with whom Turkey established its second public university.

In Kazakhstan, an important parts of the Kazakh population speak Russian language perhaps resulted from the large existence of Russian population during the Soviet time. In 1990, Russian was the second language of the 60,5 % of Kazakh population (DİE, 1993). Therefore, the Russian language is honored as the language of inter-ethnic communication. But, as seen in the foundation years of AYU in 1992 and 1993, the percentage of Russians fluent in the Kazakh language was insignificant with 0,9 %. The rate was 4.5 in Uzbekistan, 38 % and 34 % respectively in Lithuania and Armenia. However, according to a sociological survey conducted in December 1994 both Kazakhs and Russians want to learn the language and culture of other. The majority of Russians asked 63.5 % agree to see Kazakh language as a compulsory subject in all schools; on the contrary 80.6 % of the Kazakhs have the same attitude toward the Russian language (Tishkov, 1997).

The language adoption in Kazakhstan is showed as the most liberal ones perhaps in Eurasia, while Kazakh language is state language, Russian is official language of the country (Boranbayeva, 2004). In the Article 8 of 1993 constitution, it was noted that “both Russian language and other spoken languages’ field of usage will be kept and the efforts for the improvement will be sustained by the state” (Behar, 1994: 49). During the Soviet period, Kazakhstan in demographic sense was one of the cases of true Soviet multinationalism. National composition in the country was in favor of Russians right after 1939. The situation of why Kazakhstan present a heterogene ethnic mixture historically defined by four reasons. These are

the heaviest Slavic influx even to countryside by virgin land project of Khrushchev, proximity of the country to non-Islamic regions, greater fluency of Kazakhs in Russian language, and the higher degree of urbanization for Russians (Ramet, 1978).

In 1991 the population of country was 16,6 million (TİKA, 1998) 57 % of which was in urban, relative to 43 % of rural population. Kazakhstan was the fourth biggest country in terms of population in the USSR. His population constitutes the 5,8 % of the Soviet population, but the republic was in the last in terms of population density with 6,1 person.

The demographic dynamics and structures of Kazakhstan were country-specific. Due to the country's internal ethnic heterogeneity, both the sovereignty and independence (except Uzbekistan) declarations were made later than other republics of Central Asia. Kazakh country was not included into original Central Asian Turkic republics during the Soviet period. Unlike Armenia which is the sole mono-ethnic republic among the CIS republics (Dugin, 2003: 25), Kazakhstan was the leading ones in terms of multi-ethnic structure.

The nation and state-building process was subject of hot political debate in 1990s due to sub-ethnic divisions in Central Asian republics (Schatz, 2004). Due to the higher ethnic heterogeneity of both Kazakh and Kyrgyzs republics, they have showed open society and open economy characteristics more than other Central Asian republics. The rate of Slav population was higher in Kazakhstan. It is quite meaningful that Turkey has established joint venture (common) universities with these two republics. They have further similarities that the nomadic communities were prevail in those countries (Birgerson, 2002) and the rate of urbanization was less relative to the large Russian populations. They are also showed as the top republics completed their transition to democracy and have "respectable degree of political tolerance" relative to the other republics (Haghayeghi, 1995).

Despite the diminished in the percentages of non-titular nationalities, in the post-Soviet era Kazakh country is still keep the position of multi-ethnic republic of the FSU. Due to the presence of exiled nationalities under the Soviet leader Khrushchev's Virgin Lands program (Fuller, 1992: 51). Kazakhstan became the true case of multi-ethnic republic of the former Soviet Union. According to the last Soviet census held in 1989 Kazakhstan was the leading republic by accomodating almost 38 % Russian population relative to the other thirteenth republics, and in addition to Latvia and Estonia, Kazakhstan was also subjected to greater degree of acculturation

towards Russian culture (Tishkov, 1997: 41-42). Therefore, there are many non-titular nationalities in the republic. The main ones are; Russians, Ukrainians, Uzbeks, Germans, Tatars, Uygurs, Tajiks, Belorussians, Koreans, Azerbaijanis, Bahskirs, Chechens, Dungens, Ingushs, Jews, Kurds, Kyrgyzs and Meskhetian Turks. The last Soviet census designated that Kazakhs constituted 39.7 % of the population, while Russians were 37.8 %.

**Table 8: The National Compositions of Kazakh Country Since 1926**

Nationalities	1926	1959	1979	1989	2002
Kazakhs	57.6	30.0	36.0	39.7	55.7
Russians	19.7	42.7	40.8	37.8	28.3
Ukrainians	13.7	8.2	6.1	5.4	3.3
Germans	1.5	7.1	6.1	5.8	1.8
Uzbeks	1.9	1.5	1.8	2.0	2.6
Tatars	1.3	2.1	2.1	2.0	1.6
Belarussians	0.4	1.2	1.2	1.1	0.6
Uygurs	0.6	0.6	1.0	1.1	1.4
Koreans	1.6	0.8	0.5	0.6	0.6
Azeris	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.5	0.5
Dungens	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2

(Source: Kesici, 2003: 87).

Due to high volume of the mentioned non-titular nationalities, Tishkov argues (1997) social and professional differentiation along ethnic lines was and has remained greater in Central Asia and Kazakhstan than elsewhere in the former USSR. It is noted that Kazakhstan's parliament voted for independence eight days after Russia, Belarus, and Ukraine announced its withdrawal on 16 December 1991, and became the last republic to leave the Soviet Union (Olcott, 2002).

By the independence of Kazakh republics mainly the Russians, Germans and other minority groups launched to leave the country. Due to the lost of skilled workers by emigration, most were ethnic Russians, the nationalist policies have been disfavored (EIU, 2003: 9). By independence they started to emigrate from Kazakhstan which resulted in depletion of Kazakh skill base, despite the literacy remained high in 1999 census by 97,5 % (EIU, 2003: 21). Because, the Russians of Kazakhstan were highly qualified and nominated to political cadres and administrative positions of the country apart from possessing of technical and professional positions (Tishkov, 1997; Behar, 1994). Fuller argues (1992: 41) "the industrial, economic, commercial, and agricultural resources of the republic are mainly in the hands of non-Kazakhs; as a former nomadic people, the Kazakhs like the Kyrgyz lack an industrial, agricultural, or mercantile tradition".

In addition to the Germans, it is estimated that the number of both Russians and Russian-speakers migrating to Russia between 1990 and 1994 were more than 300.000 annually (Olcott, 1997). According to Haghayeghi (1995: 176) from 1990 to 1993 almost one million of Russians have returned their home. The population of the republic was 16,5 million in 1989 (Uludağ and Serin, 1990: 253). In the 1999 (EIU, 2003: 21) after the tenth year the population had decreased by 1 % and counted as 14,9 million in 1999. Kazakh population continues to decrease due to emigration of non-titular populations.

The immigration caused to the leaving of qualified labor force of Kazakhstan and in this context hampering human resources needed by Kazakh economy in the new era. Kazakh government favors the expansion of higher education sector, especially the private HEIs, so as to meet national qualified labor force. Together with the adoption of law on education and higher education in 1993 and 1996 the establishment of private HEIs were facilitated<sup>1</sup> and promoted. In that sense, the establishment of AYU could be seen as the first goal-oriented action of Kazakh state.

It is argued “Kazakhs and Russians have been living near one another for more than three hundred years. For virtually, all their shared history they have been able to accommodate themselves to one another peacefully” (Olcott, 2002: 58). Therefore, unlike other socialist countries, Kazakhstan pursues a policy of preserving the memorials of the Soviet period as the sign of the old culture (Behar, 1994). Today, this kind of prolonged Kazakh multi-culturalism enriches the socio-cultural ambiance of the campuses of international HEIs in Kazakhstan to whom the internationalization process need more.

Kazakh state pursued the more moderate state-building policies among Central Asian republics. Such as, Russian language was honored as the language of inter-ethnic communication among the people of Kazakhstan (Behar, 1994), and Russians obtained “dual citizenship” status (Olcott, 1997). In that sense, Kazakh state placed notion of citizenship and nationality on the base of residency and pursued a more deliberate nationalism owing to existence of large non-Kazakh population and for the sake of political and economic stability (Behar, 1994). In addition,

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.euroeducation.net/prof/kazancko.htm](http://www.euroeducation.net/prof/kazancko.htm), 15.04.2005.

Nazarbayev has instituted a stringent legal framework to severely punish both Kazakh and Russians who stir up interethnic enmities (Haghyeghi, 1995: 176).

The historical ethnic heterogeneity in the country empowered the ideology of living together by other non-Kazakh populations. Kazakhstan's Ambassador to Ankara Gayret Sarıbay also noted<sup>1</sup>,

Socialism has dissolved due to planned economy and political totalitarianism, but it was successful in terms of education. In the past we have named it as internationalization, that is, respect to other's culture and language. When we achieved our independence, we did not interfere to others with Kazakhization, such as we did not close the Russian schools.

Those kinds of socio-cultural heritages of Kazakh country contributed the rise of Kazakh country in the international higher education market in terms of attracting international HEIs to the country. The joint ventures universities with Turkey, United Kingdom and Russian Federation in addition large number of private HEIs empower the position of the country for internationalization of higher education in Central Asia.

Nazarbayev argues (2000: 36) "I believe it could not be unity and peace in a place where no respect to other's national culture. Kazakhs has tolerated Russian culture in deepness. Therefore, the Kazakh culture should not be a thing which is known as *ceti kat cer astındaki (means thing under seven strata under the earth)*". Furthermore, the government has emphasized the need to guarantee the development not only of Kazakh, but of the other languages as well, in accordance with the law in the name of consolidation of society, friendship, and mutual understanding of all nationalities living on the territory of Kazakhstan (Fuller, 1992: 49).

Kazakhstan's ever-present demographic realities forced President Nazarbayev to stress "repeatedly that Kazakhstan will be neither eastern nor western; neither Islamic nor Christian; rather the state should be a bridge between both" (Olcott, 1997:557). Similarly, when Nazarbayev came to power in 1989, he mainly pursued to keep disparate ethnic groups in balance, allowed measure of economic reforms and foreign investment (EIU, 2003: 16).

---

<sup>1</sup> Turkish daily Milliyet, 04.07.2003.



Before the independence, in 1985 the numbers of HEIs (including universities) in Kazakhstan were 55 (Uludağ and Serin, 1990: 255). The numbers of public HEIs have not altered much when it comes to 2000s. The number of state-owned HEIs in Kazakhstan are distributed as; 9 Academies, 1 Conservatoire, 15 Institutes and 25 universities (including “Yasavi International Kazakh-Turkish University”). In Kazakhstan, except for AYU there are some universities named after with famous historical personalities, e.g. “Lev Gumilev Eurasian University, Al-Farabi Kazakh State National University, and A.S. Pushkin West Kazakhstan Humanities University. It designates to the diverse character and function of university structure of Kazakhstan which keep together the historical and cultural richness of country and transmit it to the next generations through HEIs. In that sense, the internationalization process could be progressed more easily with the existence of this diverse universities represent different missions and traditions (see Appendix F).

It is noted by Olcott (2002:67) that Eurasian University opened in 1996 and named after with Lev Gumilev was a great gesture of Kazakh government to non-Kazakh population. It also represents a symbol for Kazakhstan as being the bridge between east and west repeated many times by President Nazarbayev. In fact, the Kazakh and Russian versions of Gumilev’s pamphlet “I am a Eurasian” were both bestsellers in Kazakhstan.

#### **4.3.3. Why Turkestan City?**

Turkestan city is located in the southern Kazakhstan which is the region known as one of the place of strongest domination of Islamic customs and traditions in Central Asia history. Turkestan city and Chimkent where AYU campuses exist both corresponds to the southern section of the Kazakh steppe where the “Islam found its way into Chimkent with relative ease. Haghayeghi argues (1995: 76) as for the western, central and northern steppe, it was not until the early fourteenth century that that Islam gained acceptance.

The city is called as the “forever center of science and enlightenment (*kadim ilim ve bilim merkezi*)” (Zeybek, 2005: 229). The establishment of AYU in Turkestan city is not a haphazard event. Geographically, it is noted “Yesi city is imagined as the center of Central Asian Turkic republic” (AYU, 2001). The city has designed as the scientific and cultural center of Turkic world by the starting of campus construction of the university on 14 June 1995. It is foreseen

that Ahmet Yesevi University is an outstanding tool to allow surviving of the preserved historical and cultural heritage of the city and region.

The importance of the city mainly comes from being the city or home of Ahmet Yesevi. Yesi city firstly named after Ahmet Yesevi then took the title of him. Previously the name of the city was “Turkestan Hazret’s city”, then after shortened to Turkestan<sup>1</sup>. Turkestan term is also a general term used in the past by Soviet Empire and Czar to describe the regions in which Turks were living instead of single names, e.g. Uzbekistan or Tatarstan (Zeybek, 2005:185).

The historical and cultural heritage of of the city is the biggest reason of Turkish interest on the city. It is justified that since the city hosting Ahmet Yesevi’s mausoleum to which all around Central Asia and Turkic geography great crowds come to visit. In addition to the mausoleum, Yesevi’s Dergah also exists there. After the latest restoration of the mausoleum made in 1972, in 1991 after the visit of Zeybek and of Turkish President Özal the restoration agreement was signed between Turkish Ministry of Culture and that of Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic’s. The restoration activities then after undertook and managed by TICA, but it was able to complete in 2001.

In AYU’s Booklet (2002) it is defined the city has gained auspicious with Ahmet Yesevi. Turkestan city not only with Ahmet Yesevi’s Dergah but also with Ahmet Yesevi University has been moving toward the future on the road of being the center of moral and science as fitting into its past. In fact, the importance of the city comes from the center of moral system created by Ahmet Yesevi.

Turkestan city (previously Yesi, Yassı or Yassı-kale) was the capital of Kazakh khanates and the as of Oghuz Khan, the legendary person of Turkic history. Furthermore, the city was the political center during Samani and Harzemsah administration, with the beginning of 16th century the city has reached to supremacy of being the spiritual capital of all Turkestan regions. Throughout the 1500-year history, it was the vigorous center of trade, culture and civilization. Turkestan city was the capital of khanates during the Kazakh Khanates. It was the throne city of Kazakh Khanates between 16th and 19th century. Yesevism which blending Turkic cultural traditions and basics of Islam expanded to the out of Central Asia and penetrated into Anatolia in

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.yesevi.edu.tr/?sayfa=ayk>, 11.02.2005.

13th century. In AYU's Booklet (2002) it is defined that those khanates have organized their important meetings at the Aksaraylar (white houses) which located in the Ahmet Yesevi *Dergah*. The Turkestan city is also being honored by the remarks of Kazakh and Turkish politicians. Some of these remarks can be summarized as follows (AYU, 2001; AYU, 2002; Ayhaber, 2004),

Turkestan city has special importance in many respects. As it was known, the city is identified with the name of great Turkic thinker Hoca Ahmet Yesevi (Turkish President, Ahmet Necdet Sezer).

Ancient Turkestan city previously was the capital city of Kazakh Khanate. But, today it is recognized as a moral center of Central Asian Muslims (Kazakh President, Nursultan Nazarbayev)

To this university, possessing our great ancestral thinker Ahmet Yesevi's name, my belief is definite that it will be among the one of the best university in the world recognized as science and knowledge center (The former Turkish president, Süleyman Demirel).

We will try to make auspicious Turkestan for Turkic nation moral capital through making the center of science and culture (The former rector of AYU, Akad Orazalı Sabden).

It is very correct decision by which AYU was established in Turkestan. It is not solely the name of a city; it is also a name of geography (Turkish Minister of National Education, Hüseyin Çelik).

Ultimately, AYU can be seen as an outstanding case of "Glocal University". Glocal means both global and local, i.e. blending of the both. Such kinds of universities aim to achieve global contemporary education while strengthening on its local roots<sup>1</sup>. Both the location and name of AYU designate to the local and regional assets of the university on which it was designed so as to achieve international contemporary higher education. For this reason, AYU can be best fit into the concept of "glocal university" which fosters global citizens, but possess a global perspective and local soul<sup>2</sup>. It is also visioned by such kinds of Japanese universities and described that "local means to grasp region, specification and concrete phenomenon as something substantial; and global means to discern globe, world, whole and universality"<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.globalpolicy.org/globaliz/cultural/2003](http://www.globalpolicy.org/globaliz/cultural/2003), 06.05.2005.

<sup>2</sup> [www.waseda.jp/eng/news04](http://www.waseda.jp/eng/news04), 06.05.2005.

<sup>3</sup> [www.ryukoku.ac.jp/english/university/project](http://www.ryukoku.ac.jp/english/university/project), 06.05.2005.

## CHAPTER V

### INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND AHMET YESEVI UNIVERSITY

#### 5.1. What is the Internationalization of Higher Education?

The fact is that there is no specific and unique definition of the concept. The conceptualization of internationalization has transformed from “the mobility of international students” to a more complex definition. It is widely agreed in the literature that it means “the process of integrating an international dimension into the teaching, research, and service functions of higher education institutions” (De Wit and Knight, 1997).

The concept of “internationalization” in the higher education designates to the eradication of national borders and allows free movements of students and the increasing of oversea enrollments. The European Association of International Education defines the term as the processes by which higher education became less national and more internationally focused. The meaning either is termed with “internationalization of learning” (Kerr, 1990: 10) or is usually used synonymously with “cross-border higher education” (Bartell, 2003) and transnational higher education (Altbach, 2004). The term widely used with “study abroad”, “oversea students” or “foreign students’ mobility”. But it is important to note that the concepts of “international higher education”, “offshore higher education”, “borderless higher education”, “cross-border higher education”, “trans-border higher education”, “transnational higher education” or “global higher education” are widely confused with the internationalization of higher education (IHE). Unlike the latter one, the former concepts refer to the mobility of students, academics or educational programmes between different countries.

It is argued internationalization of the higher education resulted from ad *hoc* mobility of staff and students (Huisman et al, 1998). Ultimately, the internationalization usually refers to the cross-border student flows in higher education service in addition to “staff mobility” and “curriculum mobility”. AYU owing to his quota rule in his regulation is closed to wider flows of

international student in terms of formal education, but allows to the enrollment of virtual students through distance learning faculties.

The elements of the internationalization are:

- foreign language curriculum,
- international elements in the curriculum,
- work and study abroad opportunities,
- the presence of international students,
- faculty/staff exchange or mobility programmes,
- institutional cooperation agreements,
- joint research projects with transnational partners,
- area studies,
- cross-cultural training,
- extra-curricular activities and institutional services (OECD; 1996; 113).

AYU in terms of the fore mentioned elements submits a case of weak internationalization. The insufficiencies in study abroad opportunities, the lack of existence of international students out of Turkic geography, and the lack of faculty exchange and mobility with other countries are the current drawbacks. But the area studies in research centers and cooperation agreements with other Turkic universities, and high schools on Turcology departments and Turkish lectures respectively may be counted as the strength points of AYU.

## **5.2. Why Internationalization?**

There are several reasons of why HEIs desire to internationalize their service. The rationales are (De Wit and Knight 1997; Knight, 1997) clustered into four groups to propose a useful framework of the issue. Those are political, economic, academic and socio-cultural rationales. Knight argues that (2002: 3) the use of internationalization has been more closely linked to the academic value of international activities rather than to the economic motive.

The each of the rationales briefly designates that academic means including the enhancement of the international professionals of institutions and reputation, economic or financial means

including the recruitment of fee-paying international students as a source of institutional revenue, cultural and social means create an environment that allows an international understanding, and political means educating the next generation of global leaders (Callan, 2000).

The four different approaches are mainly being used to describe the concept of internationalization. Those are activity approach, competency approach, ethos approach and process approach. *The first one* promotes activities such as curriculum, student/faculty exchange, technical assistance and international students. *The second one* emphasizes the development of skills, knowledge, attitudes and values in students, faculty and staff in order to develop internationally knowledgeable and intercultural skilled human resource. *The third one* emphasizes the creation of a culture or climate that values and supports international and intercultural perspectives and initiatives. *The fourth one* stresses integration or infusion of an international and intercultural dimension into teaching, research and service through a combination of a wide range of activities, policies and procedures (Qing, 2003;251). In this taxonomy the leading approach which has closer coherence with the definition of the internationalization is the fourth one. In AYU, the presence of various Turkic students from different countries enables the last three approaches, but the lack of student and faculty exchange with other external universities and lack of student mobility impair the first approach.

In addition, there are three different models presented in attempt to capture the diverse approaches to the internationalization of a university. The first one is *competitive model* which introducing international content into curricula and other elements of campus life is chiefly a means to make students, the institutions and the country more competitive in the global economic market place. The second one is *liberal model* identifying the primary goal of the internationalization as self-development in a changing world and/or global education for human relations and citizenship. The third model is social *transformation model* which suggest that the most important goal of internationalization is to give students a deeper awareness of international and intercultural issues related to equity and justice, and to give them the tools to work actively and critically towards social transformation (Wagner, 1991). The post-Soviet era necessitated the development of individual skills and qualifications in order to obtain competency in the transition economies. Therefore, AYU more fits into the social transformation model and less into the competitive model.

Similarly, it is argued by (OECD, 2004a: 295) that there are four mutually exclusive approaches to cross-border higher education. Those are mutual understanding, skilled migration, revenue-generating and capacity building approaches. It is discussed that unlike the first approach which is more prevalent in the most countries than other approaches, some countries use cross-border education as a means to attract a skilled workforce into their knowledge economy (skilled migration approach) and sometimes, additionally, to generate export revenue to the education sector (revenue-generating approach). On the other hand, emerging economies also use imports of cross-border education services as a means of building their capacity in higher education, (capacity building approach). In that sense, AYU more fits into the last approach. Budak argued that the contribution of AYU is higher to Kazakh higher education system rather than to the Turkish one. In fact, the expansion of international HEIs in all Central Asian republics designates more to the capacity-building approach.

It is argued by Wende (2001: 433) that in the period after the Second World War and in the de-colonization period in particular, political and cultural rationales were basic arguments for internationalization, but in the 1980s, the academic rationale of internationalization as a means to improve the quality of education and research become more prevalent. Recently, international labor competence and economic competitiveness, i.e. economic rationale has obtained greater importance.

The developed countries involved more in the process of the internationalization. They compete for academic staff, research funding and oversea students. English-speaking countries are widely active in seeking to attract those students as a way of earning exports and income for their HEIs, such as in Ireland “internationalization” became an issue of strategy document for the national interests (OECD, 2004b). Such as, in order to increase the quality level of tertiary education, the Dutch Government owned internationalization as an educational policy (OECD, 1996: 8).

Unlike economic and academic rationale, political rationales refers to the mission of AYU in regards to serving for overall Turkic people, and socio-cultural rationale attracts diverse students and allows them to internalize Yesevi principles. Thus more understand and to familiar each other, more respect to others’ culture and language.

### 5.3. The History of Internationalization of Higher Education

It is argued the term goes back to ancient history but has come to stand under the labels of modern era, i.e. the modernization, the liberalization or the westernization (Yang, 2002: 83). In fact, the field of the internationalization of higher education represents an important tradition of analysis and conference. The issue firstly emerged with the problem of the rising “mobility of foreign students” from the developing countries to the industrialized countries or from the south to the north. The internationalization currently is in great transformation from an issue of the student mobility to wide range of the internationalization activities like research, instruction, culture, facilities and management of HEIs. But, the student mobility still dominates the literature of the internationalization of higher education.

The individual countries of Japan, Netherlands, Australia, New Zealand and Hong Kong are the leading countries on research and development of the “internationalization”. The issue was emphasized more by supranational bodies or national research institutes. The pioneer and most dominant one is the OECD’s CERI (Centre for Educational Research and Innovation). CERI dominates a crucial role for the issue’s further methodological and policy development. From 1985 to 1990, OECD/CERI arranged three important conferences namely on the issue.

Internationalization started with 1980s was an integral part of tertiary education<sup>1</sup>. It has achieved a significant social reality in the world-wide by 1980s (Umakoshi, 1997). OECD/CERI organized a conference in 1985, at the Zoetermeer (Netherland) on “Higher Education and the Flow of Foreign Students”. The second follow-up conference was held in 1988, at Hiroshima (Japan). The topics in general debated were the statistical data on the student mobility and the case studies of some institutional practices and approaches on accommodating foreign students. For the first time it was seen that the foreign students are an opportunity for change and reform in the higher education. The third conference was held in 1990, at Hannover (Germany). The

---

<sup>1</sup> Tertiary education also prefers to higher education which connotes university whereas much of the development taking place as alternatives to universities. Tertiary also has value in sequential logic of primary then secondary education. It refers to the next stage in the process. It includes both university and non-university type of institutions. It is more than even before the gateway into employment and citizenship roles for great numbers of young people. For adults also it presents a point of re-entry to formal education to reorienting their careers. The knowledge-based economy makes the prolonged education a social norm. The full-time and part-time duration of study are proposed (OECD, 1998).



theme of the conference was the institutional change and the quality improvement in higher education by the means of the internationalization which had been initially perceived solely as the foreign student flows.

On the research of international higher education, the leading entities have been established by UNESCO and OECD. In the scope of former one, UNESCO-CEPES and UNESCO Global Forum on Quality Assurance, Accreditation and the Recognition of Qualifications are two main bodies on higher education; and in the scope of latter one CERI and IMHE are the most recognized bodies on the issue. One of the leading higher education research institute in Europe is CHEPS (The Center for Higher Education Policy Studies) established in 1984 in the Universiteit Twente of the Netherlands.

UNESCO-CEPES (the European Centre for Higher Education) is a decentralized specialized office of the UNESCO Secretariat. It was established in Bucharest in September 1972. Its main goal is defined to promote cooperation in the field of higher education among member states of the Europe Region including North America, and Israel, but it gives special attention to Central and Eastern European countries<sup>1</sup>. It is argued that the Global Forum on International Quality Assurance, Accreditation and the Recognition of Qualifications responds to the growing demands of the international community to have UNESCO proactive in the debates borderless higher education and trade in higher education in frameworks such as the GATS (the General Agreement on Trade in Services) as well and the related key issues of quality and recognition. The Forum reflects UNESCO's mission to respond to the ethical challenges of globalization<sup>2</sup>.

OECD agencies are also more active in international higher education and have advanced more on the internationalization of higher education. The OECD Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (CERI) was established in 1968. It is emphasized that CERI was established as an international reputation for pioneering educational research, opening up new fields for exploration and combining rigorous analysis with conceptual innovation<sup>3</sup>. However, the Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education (IMHE) was established within

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.un.ro/unesco\\_cepes.html](http://www.un.ro/unesco_cepes.html), 13.05.2005.

<sup>2</sup> [http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=21666&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/ev.php-URL_ID=21666&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html), 13.05.2005.

<sup>3</sup> [http://www.oecd.org/document/0,2340,en\\_2649\\_33723\\_2516571\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/0,2340,en_2649_33723_2516571_1_1_1_1,00.html), 13.05.2005.

the framework of the height of the period of expansion of higher education. As the issues of quality assurance, human resources, funding and internationalization move even more into the forefront of debate because of the massification and heterogeneisation of the student population, IMHE assists institutions, ministries and governments, through the sharing of information, experiences and expertise, in addressing these new challenges. IMHE membership includes institutions, government agencies and nonprofit organizations which are dealing with issues in higher education management<sup>1</sup>. It was noted that “there has been very close co-operation and co-ordination between IMHE’s and CERI’s work on the institutional effects of the internationalization. It is argued that the IMHE studies have a management focus designed to complement the CERI’s studies on financing and curriculum development (OECD, 1996; 18).

In 1995 at Hague a seminar was held by NUFFIC<sup>2</sup>, in the seminar especially some negative developments were foreseen for the internationalization in future. The three of them can be states as follows; firstly the trade and exchange of the services may raise questions about the acceptability of standards and qualifications across national boundaries; secondly the new developments in information technologies and software may substitute for student mobility; and thirdly fiscal problems in any countries may cause the traditional sources of support for the internationalization to decline (OECD, 1996; 10). The second development has emerged in AYU, namely distance learning opportunities through TÜRTEP. The process of virtual internationalization has realized in AYU.

The internationalization simply has started with cross-border student mobility and oversea enrollments, but recently it is more highlighted in respect to its financial contributions to the budget of HEIs and states. The counter arguments have increased against the commoditization process of international higher education. But, nobody ignores the economic contribution of the internationalization process. HEIs have been more involving in the process and planning to diversify their service quality in order to attract more international self-paid and successful students.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.oecdwash.org/PUBS/PERIOD/per-hem.htm>, 23.05.2005.

<sup>2</sup> Netherlands Organization for International Co-operation in Higher Education.

#### **5.4. How the Internationalization is Perceived as a Process?**

It is argued that “the perception of foreign students as agents for change introduced the awareness of the qualitative dimensions of the internationalization” (OECD, 1996: 32). By 1990s, it was known or perceived by the western tertiary education institutions that the internationalization, conceptually do not designate only to student mobility among the industrialized world and the other. It was much more than the student mobility. The major importance of IHE is its role as a means to improve the quality of higher education, i.e. the presence of international students is more beneficial than their amount of fee payments. However, it is emphasized that the internationalization of higher education is seen as a great opportunity especially for the less developed countries so as to improve the cost efficiency of their higher education systems (OECD, 2004a).

Knowledge intensive and service-based economy of future forced universities and states to operate with the international considerations in their higher education service. OECD document (OECD, 2004a) discusses that some national governments have made international student mobility an explicit part of their socio-economic development strategies. Likewise, the amendment to the Law of the Russian Federation on Education adopted by the Council of the Federation in January 1996 has overestimated the openness to the international arena by Article 57 “educational authorities of all levels shall be entitled to make direct contacts with foreign enterprises, companies and organisations” (OECD, 1999:15). It is argued by Yelland (2000: 298) that the biggest challenge is to achieve this integration while maintaining the traditional universal goals of higher education.

The internationalization secures a rational base both for professional and personal development of students and institutional growth and improvement. It provides international contributions on curricula, literature in foreign languages, and both teacher and students’ exchanges (Yang, 2002: 82). It is also seen as the tool providing less ethnocentric and more humanitarian or universal expectations from the education.

Similarly, it is claimed there are three major universal reasons for the internationalization of higher education; the interest in international security, the maintenance of international competitiveness, and the promotion of human understanding across nations (Aigner et al, 1992).

The presence of various international students at campuses enable students to learn living together and compose a peace ambiance. In that sense, AYU presents solid opportunities for the incoming students rather than Kazakh and Russian students who live together in a civic life for a long time.

The internationalization contributes to the curriculum development, decreases locality and provides inter-cultural awareness, sets and promotes standards as internationally recognized, innovate viable programmes of study and may solve local and regional problems (Shepherd et al, 2000). The student mobility as the core of internationalization provides some social and educational (academic) benefits, such as acquiring cross-cultural knowledge and competencies, improving foreign language proficiency, establishing international both personal and professional networks and getting familiarity with other cultures (Van Damme, 2001).

The OECD working groups of the Hague Conference have evaluated the circumstances emerged by the internationalization process (OECD, 1996; 20-22). These circumstances can be summarized as follows:

- Knowledge of languages, including the cultures and societies within which they originated, should be central to the internationalization
- Internationalization is a necessity for higher education and has research, teaching, language, and mobility dimension
- Internationalization is a right, equitable access to internationalization activities should be basic principle for higher education
- Internationalization is a criterion of quality, in a time of financial constraints, it is important to demonstrate how the internationalization increases the quality of higher education programmes
- Internationalization is a responsibility of higher education which requires the university and other higher education institutions to mobilize their resources to provide assistance to less-advantaged nations and their students
- Internationalization can be tool for changing educational methods
- Internationalization can benefit students; a major benefit is the knowledge and the appreciation of other languages, cultures and societies
- Governments must be involved in internationalization, because of the importance of higher education for the internal and international economic success of a nation

- Internationalization can be means to improve higher education. It affects the content, the structure, and the participants in higher education. It forces the government, the institution, and the participants to recognize that higher education inherently is a supranational activity
- Internationalization is a process of specific exchanges. People, ideas, and experiences are exchanged through the process of international programmes
- Internationalism can redefine the nature of the university. Universities have a major responsibility for cultural and humanistic education. It may be that the universities' role is better described by the phrase universalization than by that of internationalization

Apart from the quality assurance of IHE, its costs and benefits are defined variously. The costs are as follows:

- Brain drain effects. Particularly for smaller nations which may lose trained manpower to developed nations where much of the training may take place
- Requirements for more resources. The expanding internationalization will increase budget demands but little is known about the scale of these effects
- The loss of cultural identity. This is especially a risk when students are forced into a language environment (such as the need to use English in a course of study) which fails to accommodate for the broader needs of students
- Employment effects. If domestic unemployment already is high the importance of large number of foreign students can create conditions which aggravate the situation for domestic workers
- Constraining local educational development. The availability of education abroad may curtail the appropriate development of domestic higher educational opportunities among the sending countries

On the other hand, for the *benefit sides* the following effects are emphasized as follows:

- Development of a civil society. In addition to the economic benefits that normally are stressed, is essential to consider the effects of internationalization on the behavior, the attitudes, and the values of the citizenry

- Improvement in the broader cultural, political, and economic contexts, extending well beyond the immediate effects on students, faculty, and higher education institutions themselves
- Character-building among individuals, especially related to intercultural issues
- Network relations among individuals, groups and institutions; these can be the bases for the future economic and political as well as socio-cultural alliances
- Preparation for work abroad for students in the economies where employment opportunities are poor

On the other hand, according to the results of a recent survey report<sup>1</sup> of IAU (International Association of Universities) brain drain and the loss of cultural identity are the greatest risks of internationalization (Knight, 2003). However, student, staff and teacher development; academic standards and quality assurance; and international research collaboration are noted three most important benefits of the internationalization.

The benefits are quite compatible with AYU which is a case of internationalization achieved in Kazakhstan and allow the Kazakh students to internalize this process in their country without moving to the western countries. It can be stated that AYU has also function of preventing brain drain of Kazakh population. Kabasakal discussed “AYU today holds almost 25 thousand students. Most of those students may prefer study abroad if AYU was not available. The current students may have looking for opportunities to leave Kazakhstan to study abroad. In this respect, AYU has also highlighted Turkey as the country of transition for further destinations”.

On the contrary, it is usual that Kazakh graduates should share the employment opportunities created by multi-national corporations in Kazakhstan. However, they have also achieved further opportunities in terms of vacancies in the other economies through learning a few foreign languages and obtaining a diploma recognized in Turkey and other countries. AYU students have more advantage than the students of other Kazakh universities, because, they achieve intercultural relations, learn more languages, and make friends in other countries.

The rate of internationalization is strongly regulated by university’s internal culture. Internationalization needs to “fit between cultural values, structural arrangements, and strategic

---

<sup>1</sup> “Internationalization of Higher Education Practices and Priorities: 2003 IAU Survey Report”

plans within the whole university” (Bartell, 2003: 55). Bartell shows Sporn’s “typology of university culture” which is divided into four dimensions so as to explain whether internationalization is possible or not. First one is “weak and internally oriented cultures”; the second one is “weak and externally oriented cultures”; third one is “strong and internally oriented cultures”; and the fourth one is “strong and externally oriented cultures”. The last one owing to having best of both the university’s culture (strong) and cultural orientation (outward) dimensions is seen as the strongest case adaptable for the internationalization. (Bartel, 2003: 56-57). The mission of AYU which is consolidated by Yesevi’s thoughts and Turkestan’s spiritual climate allows the university to be categorized under the fourth dimension of the typology.

### **5.5. The Competition in Higher Education among the Developed Countries**

It is emphasized that increasing number of families have wanted their children to reach more advanced education and training levels than they were able to reach themselves, in part because they have seen the value of education or competence in cultural and social terms, but also education is perceived as the way to social mobility or to secure higher ranked positions in employment (OECD, 1998: 19).

The rising demands for higher education, in the world-wide, challenges all governments to provide sufficient opportunities for growing demand especially coming from middle and low class members of societies. The lack of public universities resulted in the expansion of private universities at home which justified the oversea enrollments even for undergraduate education. Hence, the students having of sufficient financial power prefer to study abroad. On the other hand, the growth of information technologies, liberalization of trade in educational services and some developments in higher education services like “branch campuses”, “virtual universities” or “twinning programmes” have imposed more challenges and opened great opportunities for governments, universities, academics and students. Knight argues (2002) the demand for higher education has increased much owing to the growth of knowledge economy, movement to lifelong learning and changing demographics. But, paradoxically the capacity of public sector is not sufficient to satisfy the demand due to the budget limitations, the changing role of government, privatization and the increased emphasis on market economy.

The fore mentioned reasons are quite explanatory for the motives behind the movement of students to study abroad. These are; inability to obtain entry into local universities due to entry

exams or lack of space; easier entry mechanisms abroad; the opportunities provided by the host countries to the brightest students; weak specialization of home countries in some scientific areas; diverse job opportunities; and wealth of host economies (Altbach, 2004). However, the international student mobility patterns can be influenced by various “push-pull factors”, e.g. language barriers, the academic reputation of the institutions, the flexibility of programmes with respect to counting the time spent abroad for degree requirements, restrictive university admission policies at home, tuition costs, geographic and historical links between countries, future job opportunities, cultural aspirations, government policies to facilitate credit transfer between home and host institutions, and degree requirements (OECD, 2004b).

The Turkish students prefer higher education abroad perhaps due to the lack of quotas of the home universities and advanced competitive exams. This is a valid fact also for AYU, but ultimately those students decided to move Kazakhstan by their own conscious preference which more or less matched with the mission of AYU, i.e. Turkish students by preferring study in AYU, both obtain the opportunity for higher education and assigned with the task of representing Turkey. Turkic and Kazakh students prefer AYU perhaps owing to its service quality and standards which is not available in the most of their home universities.

The consumption activities of foreign students are also seen as essential for the competition among the higher education institutions of the developed countries in order to attract more self-financed students. No country ignores the economic function of international student mobility. In the last decades several OECD countries are planning to promote international student mobility in higher education because it is argued “one way for students to expand their knowledge of other societies and languages and hence to leverage their labor market prospects is to study in tertiary educational institutions in countries other than their own” (OECD, 2004a: 294).

While some countries have made international student mobility as a strongest source of socio-economic development, like as Australia, Japan and New Zealand. In the former and latter countries respectively 13.1 % and 8.1 % of total service exports resulted from international higher education activities. However, it is emphasized that (OECD, 2004a: 298) the promotion of regional economic integrations by organizations and treaties such as the EU, NAFTA, ASEAN and APEC may provide incentives for students to develop their understanding of partner countries’ cultures and languages, and to build bilateral or multilateral networks. Forest argues (1995) that the total amount of expenditures made by foreign students justifies the



economic dimension of the internationalization and negotiated the issue under such supranational economic organizations. The European Union, NAFTA and ASEAN are some examples of supranational bodies which created common regional area of higher education.

It can be said that since Turkey and Central Asian republics have not composed an exceptional economic integration among themselves, the further cooperation for cross-border or international higher education activities is not visible in near future. However, among the FSU republics also an education area is composed with the name of “NIS Education, Culture and Exchange Organization”. The participant countries by the number of institutions (either cultural or educational center or formal institution) are; Armenia 1, Azerbaijan 5, Belarus 10, Georgia 5, Kazakhstan 25, Kyrgyzstan 11, Moldova 2, Russian Federation 68, Tajikistan 9, Turkmenistan 1, Ukraine 40 and Uzbekistan 5<sup>1</sup>. Such main integrations of this process in the European continent are ERASMUS project and Campus Europae which aim to strengthen European dimension in higher education and compose a “unity in diversity”. The other main regional integrations in higher education can be stated as Central European Exchange Program for University Studies (CEEPUS), Regional Student Mobility Program among the Nordic Countries (NORDPLUS) and University Mobility in Asia and the Pacific (UMAP).

The European experience also shows that educational integration and cooperation as a "soft" dimension would enhance the expected commercial and political arrangements in future, like the establishment of Bologna Declaration<sup>2</sup> which is the mechanism accelerating Europeanization of higher education in the continent. The declaration has created EHEA which is expected to secure convergence among European higher education systems at national contexts.

The basic rationales behind the Bologna process are; to increase employability of the citizens, ensure international competitiveness of the European higher education system and compose an attractive higher education area in order to compete with the American and Australian

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.civilsoc.org/usnisorg/usnisedu.htm>, 29.04.2005.

<sup>2</sup> Bologna Declaration is the Joint Declaration of the European Ministers of Education signed in Bologna of Italy in June 1999 by the Education Ministers of twenty-nine European nations. The Declaration aims to make the Europe having the most dynamic knowledge-based economy of the world. The notion stated by “European Higher Education Area” is “the creation of an environment of European education in which transparency of the quality assurance systems across structures is combined with plurality and maximum openness of national systems to access and mobility. Common academic space will be held until 2010 by adjusted and tied policies. It has been a dominant motive for the recognition and integration of the international dimension in the national higher education policy of the member states. International competitiveness of the member states has increased. The reform process started with Bologna in 1999, Prague in 2001, Berlin in 2003 and Bergen in 2005.

universities which were embraced with globalization more than one decade ago (Thoben, 2002). It is argued the main aim is to facilitate the mobility and bring competition for European higher education (Nokkala, 2002). However, Bologna process has increased the opportunity for the majority of the students who could not study abroad (Rudder, 2000). Therefore, European universities have been accredited since the introduction of European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) which enhanced the quality of supplied education in order to secure alignment with other European universities and to be involved in the projects initiated by Bologna process.

The EHEA encompasses the following principles so as to achieve his objectives. These are:

- public responsibility for higher education,
- institutional autonomy,
- participation of students in higher education governance,
- cooperation and trust between the participating countries and organizations.

“Campus Europae” is a cooperation network formulated to strengthen the development of EHEA initiated by Bologna process (Thobe, 2002). The core of Campus Europae project is noted to “experience the unique quality of Europe whose major achievements include the declaration of human rights and scientific universalism. Additionally, the project hopes to foster the notion of “unity in diversity” and make students aware of a European identity”<sup>1</sup>.

### **5.6. The Role of Instruction Language in International Higher Education**

In the tertiary education sector some receiving countries are mentioned as “net receiver countries” like the US, France, Germany, the United Kingdom, Canada and Australia. These countries are attracting both “free movers” students who finance their education, and students sponsored by state scholarship. By 2001, the 32 % of international students are in the US, 16 % in the UK, 13 % in Germany, 11 % in France and 8 % in Australia (Haigh, 2002). In other word, the 80 % of international students is pulled by five developed countries. The pioneer countries of the OECD in terms of sending tertiary students to abroad are France, Germany, Greece, Japan, Korea and Turkey. The similar countries from partner countries are China, India and other Southeast Asian countries (OECD, 2004a).

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.bologna-berlin2003.de/pdf/Campus.pdf](http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/pdf/Campus.pdf), 13.05.2005.

The most competitive receiver countries against the US monopoly are the United Kingdom, Germany and France (Altbach, 2004; Haigh, 2002; Hansen, 2002). But, the strongest competitive countries against the US are the well-known English-speaking countries; Canada, the United Kingdom again, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa which struggling to attract more international students by the advantage of English which is the dominant language of instruction in the world. The English-speaking countries are also meeting their needs of professions in which they are in shortage. They regulate their higher education systems in line with the internationalization process and allow the professional education to be a transnational matter (Iredale, 2001).

The language of instruction is a determinant reason in selecting the host country for abroad study. The dominance of English-speaking countries over French, German or other world languages force other countries to offer instruction in English in order to attract more foreign students (OECD, 2004a). AYU is submitting a special case in regard to its instruction language. Not only Turkish but also Russian and English languages expand the sphere of activity for AYU graduates, and allow AYU to attract students all around the world. In contrast, as it is discussed in Chapter III, the student admission procedures are not responsive to attract students out of the Turkic geography.

It is argued that despite the hegemony of English-speaking countries, “Germany, France and Spain have their certain market areas for selling higher education service” (Nokkala, 2002). In this context, Turkey can be built itself as the pioneer receiving country for the mobility of the higher education students of Turkic geography. AYU may undertake an important role of facilitator agents in this process. For this reason, AYU submits special case with its instruction language of Turkish which belongs to Oghuz group of Turkic dialect and Kazakh language (which belongs to Kipchak group of Turkic language family) apart from English. Since the independence of the republics, Turkey seeks to empower the Turkish language as “lingua franca”. For instance, Şen (2001: 12) argued “Turkey has been trying to persuade the republics to adapt to the Turkish form of the Latin alphabet instead of the currently used Cyrillic Alphabet”.

## 5.7. The Trade of Higher Education Services in International Market

For last two decades the demand for international higher education has been increasing. The students desire more than ever before to empower his or her career in abroad. It is stated that internationalization, the growing demand for post-secondary education and the rising dominance of private institutions perhaps in tertiary education are affecting national higher education policies and systems in world-wide to discuss the cross-border higher education within the scope of GATS negotiations (OECD, 2004b). Wende argues (2001: 439) this process will certainly lead to a further enhancement of the economic rationale for the internationalization.

GATS is the first set of multilateral rules covering international trade in services. It considers education as a tradable service in addition to covering 12 other<sup>1</sup> service sectors. It is the affiliate agreements of the WTO<sup>2</sup> established in 1994 and came into force in 1995. It is stemmed from the GATT (The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) of 1948. GATS aims to achieve the liberalization of cross-border trade even in traditional public services like health and education.

Hans de Wit<sup>3</sup> argues that GATS highlights the liberalization of the global trade, importance of the knowledge economy, new information and communication technologies, and changing role of governments. In that sense, he further discusses that internationalization of higher education is one of the ways a country/institution responds to the impact of globalization and the internationalization is an agent of globalization.

The major stakeholders of education, academics and students, consider that education is not a tradable commodity and should remain as a public good and in public responsibility. However, GATS is perceived as a threat to national sovereignty and culture as a serious attack on the core values of the university and the quality of teaching. Perhaps, it damages the nature of classic “European model” universities rather than American model universities.

---

<sup>1</sup>Business, Communication, Construction and Engineering, Distribution, Education, Environment, Financial, Health, Tourism and Travel, Recreation, Cultural and Sporting and Transport.

<sup>2</sup> Unlike Kyrgyzstan, the rest of Central Asian republics are not member of WTO. Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan and Uzbekistan have observer status in the organization by 2005. Turkmenistan declared his neutral position in 1993 which was approved in 1995. Thus, it achieved to become the “peace home” of Central Asian countries (Zeybek, 2005:167).

<sup>3</sup> [http://www.autc.gov.au/visiting\\_scholar/documents/de\\_wit1.pdf](http://www.autc.gov.au/visiting_scholar/documents/de_wit1.pdf), 06.05.2005.

The further commoditization of higher education in the future will more damage to the “mission” universities which are equipped with public concerns. The cross-border education under GATS provisions not only questioning the public funding but also “raise traditional educational policy issues on access, equity, cost, quality and contribution of education to growth” (OECD, 2004a: 296).

The classic public university of industrial society also contributes to the internationalization of higher education which initiated by economic motives of universities. It is known that the economic rationales of the internationalization motivate the institutions to compete in the global market of the educational services. Public universities could not meet the rising higher education demand and which resulted in the commoditization and the privatization of educational. Furthermore, while the non-payment and equal access characters of higher education are favored, on the other hand the efforts of public universities to adjust with the developments stemming from needs of information society and tolerate those to compose initiatives similar to private universities has accelerated so as to survive and progress in the neo-liberal capitalist economy in which university-market relations have condensed (Akşit, 2002).

While higher education is a public good and financed largely by public budget, recently it is being privatized and funded mainly by the internal direct beneficiaries, i.e. students, private sector and NGOs. It is stated that the intentions on trade liberalization of educational services in higher education are emphasized more due to its probable growing economic implications over countries’ balance of payments. Therefore some countries (*receiving countries*) are in tendency to specialize on educational exports (OECD, 2004a).

GATS defines 4 ways that all services can be traded based on four modes of supply. Those are as follows (Nokkala, 2002; Knight, 2002):

- Cross-border supply (distance learning, e-learning): The first one is the consumption abroad of service by consumers traveling to supplier country, e.g. students studying abroad
- Consumption abroad (traveling abroad to study): The second one is the cross-border supply of a service to consumer country without the supplier, e.g. open and distance education

- Commercial presence (branch campuses or twinning and franchising agreements): The third one is the commercial presence of a supplier in consumer country, e.g. offshore foreign universities
- Presence of natural persons (teachers, professors, researchers): The fourth and the last one is the presence of natural persons from supplying country in consuming country, e.g. professors, researcher working outside their home country

The last two issues are limited in AYU. On the other hand, the university has been submitting a more compatible case for the first two components. The first one is the leading component on which AYU has advanced more.

### **5.8. Higher Education: A Tradable Commodity or Public Service?**

Bartell argues (2003) university's primary functions are teaching, research and subsequently have function of service to its near community or "surrounding community. The spheres of influence for HEIs have expanded to cross-border territories. The growth of new information technologies, the liberalization of trade of educational services and the emergence of various forms of borderless education brought about new challenges to governments, institutions, policy-makers, educators and students also. Nation-states are seen no longer the sole providers of higher education<sup>1</sup>. International higher education resulted from the impact of such external developments, i.e. neo-liberal policies, the shrinking of distances, the rise of demand for higher education, the global trade of higher education services, the decreasing of public budget allocated to higher education, the accountability concerns of societies, the rising competition of both public and private universities in order to attract more and the best students. Hence, the number and types of private universities increased and they started to structure themselves more outward oriented. In this context, they have forced national higher education systems to involve more in international higher education services which subjected to commoditization more than national higher education services.

The expansion of markets and international trade on the knowledge-intensive and service-based sectors of the economy made higher educational institutions so as to become more oriented to

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=21773&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/ev.php-URL_ID=21773&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html), 13.05.2005.

the demands of trade and markets in terms of their educational content, approach, and outlook (OECD, 1996). Knowledge society highlights the importance of higher education, because of the strategic importance of knowledge. Since the knowledge admitted as the leading production factor, higher education switched from its “public good” character to the “tradable service” within international markets which also fostered the expansion of “entrepreneur” or “corporate” universities. Higher education has lost its public service character in the last decades and labeled as a trade issue or circulated in the global markets as a commodity because of its cross-border character. Therefore, in many times UNESCO argues to protect higher education against the ethical challenges of the commoditization of the service.

Iredale argues on the trade of higher education (2001: 9) developed countries recognize ‘knowledge’ as a highly valued asset which can be used to sell or trade in educational services as a means of earning valuable export revenue. Similarly, it is argued that the emerging post-industrial economy is one where the distinctions between goods and services will be increasingly blurred, because knowledge is the key factor for the individual or the national success in an information-based economy (OECD, 1996: 28).

Douglas M. Windham (University of Albany, State University of New York) argues “internationalization is both educational and economic issue” (OECD, 1996). Deetman (OECD, 1996), the President of the Executive Board of the NUFFIC mentions the internationalization in particular has two axes of quantity versus quality, and trade versus aid.

It is stated that “unless the quality dimension is fully integrated in internationalization policies, the further growth of mobility and transnational delivery will risk being at the expense of its quality” (Van Damme, 2001: 436-437). Similarly, Yang argues (2002: 88) the erosion of the core university values of like disinterested inquiry and critical thinking distorts the complex cultural, social and process dimensions of education.

Kabasakal has also claimed that commoditization and internationalization in higher education goes hand in hand. According to Kabasakal there are three reasons of this process which started by 1980s. The first one is stemming from the virtue of social justice, i.e. students benefit more than states in higher education. Hence, states started to question the financing of HEIs. For this reason, states diminished their financial contribution to the budgets of universities, and allow them to diversify their source of income. The second reason emerged in Europe. Since the

ageing of Europe, their universities imported students from the developing countries' rich students who have financial power to study abroad. The third is stemming from globalization which accredited the occupation in the world wide. HEIs assured the students on the recognition of qualifications. Therefore, the higher education which has vocational contribution to occupation is commoditized easily. In fact, AYU has emerged out of these tendencies.

It is true that the mechanism plan to supply higher education without public finance is being re-formulated for the sake of public fair. The cost of national higher education system is not desired to be built on financial contributions of poor segments of societies. In this context, it is argued that the financial burden of higher education on state budget should be decreased owing to rising demand and availability of self-financed rich students. The higher education is about to merchandise and seen as semi-public service. The number of graduates from HEIs increased more and graduates desire to pursue their education in master and doctorate degrees. As the students move ahead on educational stages, the benefit of the accumulation is higher for the students rather than for society. In response to those developments, governments have an intention to subsidize poor students solely.

On the other hand, the private sector interests with higher education due to function of raising labor force for the market, the sector need to involve in higher education as stakeholder for the quality of the supplied service. On the other hand, the multi-national structure of employment in the MNCs justifies the mobilization of higher education students between countries. It is argued that "international labor markets require the higher education system to deliver graduates with the academic, linguistic and intercultural qualifications that are internationally competitive" (Qiang, 2003: 254).

The rise of internationalization of labor market for the white-collar workers has reinforced to approaching internationalization of higher education as a subject matter of commodity. Basically, there are two counter arguments on the role of tertiary education institutions in terms of its relations with economic actors. The first idea sees that the relations may cause them to loss universal objectives resulted in the erosion of its broader universal and humanitarian goals. The opposite idea claims that universities should proceed on economic goals in order to obtain financial sources for innovation studies to which both governments and private sector need (Akşit, 2002).



Ultimately, it seems that the dominance of state on higher education would not be diminished extensively. The strategic role of higher education forces states to manage, regulate and involve. However, the recent researches showed that (OECD, 2004: 13) the higher education still is a functional tool for national policies. In this context, it is stated that governments involve in higher education systems to deliver a number of national policy goals for the socio-economic development. These goals include:

- up-skilling the population and life-long learning,
- social inclusion, widening participation, citizenship skills,
- economic development,
- regional policy,
- cultural development and regeneration,
- knowledge-based developments,
- research and development, especially in science, technology and medicine.

### **5.9. The Educational Services in the Scope of WTO and UNESCO Conventions**

According to the OECD document (2004b) the higher education sector expanded rapidly in the 1980s and 1990s with the increasing student participation rate and research activities. For this reason, there has been a decline in the amount of state funding per student, because students numbers have grown faster than the financial contributions. The decline in the core public funding urge HEIs to diversify their financial sources, such as increasing of student fees or attracting self-paying students either from internal or external societies. Therefore, the international circulation of money for educational services has grown faster in the last decade. It is stated that trade in higher education became a million dollar business. “The demand for higher education, on the one side, is growing, while on the other side, the trans-border education (e.g. private or for-profit higher foreign university campuses, IT Academies, twinning arrangements with other universities, corporate universities, virtual universities, open universities, e-universities etc.) is increasing<sup>1</sup>.”

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://portal.unesco.org/education/en>, 13.05.2005.

The countries opening their higher education sectors for trade are increasing. It is stated that, currently, 44 of the 144 WTO Members have made commitments in education, but only 21 of these have included commitments to higher education. Turkey, in addition to Australia, Norway, European Community, Japan, Mexico, Mexico, and New Zealand is among the 21 countries. Similar to the GATS, UNESCO<sup>1</sup> Conventions aim to promote international cooperation in higher education and to reduce obstacles to the mobility of teachers and students by a mutual recognition of degrees and qualifications between the countries.

The UNESCO Conventions on the recognition of the qualifications represent the only existing regulatory frameworks for the international mutual recognition of the qualifications. Since the question of “how can internationalization and trade activities complement each other” (Knight, 2002) is an unresolved question, Jane Knight’s “non-profit internationalization” would be challenged more by the GATS which aims to promote trade in higher education services for the purposes of market liberalization. The encounter arguments emphasize that the commoditization of higher education should be a well managed process. It could not be allowed to hamper the public good character and quality dimension of the education which has greater social and cultural contributions for less developed countries. In this context, GATS is perceived as a threat to national sovereignty and culture and as a serious attack on the core values of university and the quality of service.

While the trade or commerce departments of states and HEIs favour the GATS provisions non-governmental organizations opposed to the GATS which would impede academic autonomy and would highlight commoditization of the service (Altbach, 2004). For this reason, the international higher education has obtained a dual character. In the one side, the “trade”, i.e. WTO, and in the other side the “public service”, i.e. UNESCO tries to shape and manage the internationalization process of the higher education.

Jane Knight argues (2002: 18) by the rising of student mobility national and international recognition of qualifications and the transfer of credits has already been the subject of substantial amount of work. Knight claims that “The Lisbon Convention on the Recognition Qualifications of Higher Education” in the Europe Region, the European Credit Transfer System, and

---

<sup>1</sup> UNESCO is the specialized agency of the United Nations system for education, science, culture and communication with 188 Member States. The WTO is the more recently established world trade organization with 144 Member States.

University Mobility in Asia Pacific are good examples of regional initiatives that could lead to more international approach.

In addition, UNESCO's Global Forum on the International Quality Assurance, Accreditation and the Recognition of Qualifications was established as part of UNESCO's mission in 2001 "to respond to emerging ethical challenges and dilemmas as a result of globalization". The Forum's activities aim to overcome the obstacles in cross-border mobility as well as promoting non-profit internationalization and 'fair trade' in the interest of the learners. The Global Forum reflects UNESCO's mission to respond to the ethical challenges of the globalization, which stimulated the tradable nature of higher education activities, and accelerated by cross-border higher education. Against the challenges UNESCO offers an international policy framework to deal with the globalization and international higher education, reconciling the interests of national governments, the traditional public higher education sector, for the profit providers, the needs of students and the general public interests<sup>1</sup>.

#### **5.10. The Statistics on International Student Mobility**

It is currently estimated that 2 million students in the worldwide study outside of their home countries, and the number may extend to 8 million by 2025. In 2002, 1.9 million students<sup>2</sup> were enrolled outside their home country (94 % of them studied in the OECD member countries). It designates to the 15 % growth relative to the previous year. Since 1998, there is a 7.6 % annual increase just in the OECD countries (OECD, 2004a). It is difficult to clarify the nature of foreign students since they may be residents in the country coming from by immigration of his/her parents or not. For this reason, it is claimed that it is too difficult to calculate the right numbers of foreign students. The fluctuation year by year is high because of "many students study abroad for less than a full academic year" or "participate in exchange programmes which do not require enrollment, e.g. advance research short-term mobility" (OECD, 2004a). Mainly the articulation or the twinning forms of the international higher education cause the emergence of this issue.

---

<sup>1</sup>[http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/ev.phpURL\\_ID=21754&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/ev.phpURL_ID=21754&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html), 13.05.2005.

<sup>2</sup> Foreign students from throughout the world enrolled in reported OECD and partner countries.

The articulation form is one that is not jointly recognized but students are enrolled in programs of the host institution for a part of his or her education (Van Damme, 2001).

The percentage of foreign students to total the enrollments in tertiary education ranges from 1 to 18 % among the OECD member countries. The leading five countries are Australia, Switzerland, Austria, Belgium and the United Kingdom. However, the other five countries receive almost 73 % of the foreign students incoming to the OECD countries are Australia (10 %), France (9 %), Germany (12 %), the United Kingdom (12 %) and the United States (30 %) (OECD, 2004a).

The developed countries manage the international higher education mobility and make commitments in favor of their higher education sector in order to attract greater number of foreign students, such as the sector contributes more than 12 billion dollars for the US economy each year. It is stated that two-thirds of those students study with their family funds. Higher education is the US's fifth largest service sector. The United States with 586.000 students hosting more than a quarter of the world's foreign students. The majority of the US foreign students (55 %) coming from Asian countries. However, the total numbers of the US students abroad were 161.000 and just 0.2 % of them were undergraduates, and 62 % of them went to Europe. On the contrary, it is claimed that American students favor cultural experience more rather than academic knowledge.

**Table 9: Foreign Higher Education Students in the US by Countries**

<b>Countries</b>	<b>Student Population</b>	<b>Growth Rate for 2003-2004 (%)</b>
India	79736	+7
China	61765	-5
South Korea	52484	+2
Japan	40835	-11
Canada	27017	+2
Taiwan	26178	-7
Mexico	13929	+4
Turkey	11398	-2
Thailand	8937	-15
Indonesia	8880	-11
Germany	8745	-6
England	8439	+1

(Source: Turkish daily Milliyet, 06.12.2004).

The rising demand from the developing countries forced “receiving countries” to compete for the intelligent and wealthy students. In fact, the limited capacity of home countries (sending

countries) against the rising demand for higher education caused their wealthy students to looking for tertiary education opportunities abroad. It is stated that “the rapid economic and population growth in the some countries, especially those outside OECD, is creating a demand for higher education greater than these countries can provide for themselves” (OECD; 1996; 10). The geographic composition of the foreign students in both the OECD area and partner countries are distributed as; 45 % from Asia- Pacific (the leading ones are; China 9.6 %, Hong Kong 1.6 %, India 4.7 %, Malaysia 2 %, Indonesia 1.9 %), 30 % Europe and in particular 19 % is citizens of the EU, Africans 11 % (Morocco 2.7 %), North American 6 % and lastly South Americans account less than 4 % of the total amount (OECD, 2004a: 298).

#### **5.10.1. Turkish Involvement in the International Higher Education Activities**

By 2004, there are 20950 Turkish higher education students abroad. It is almost the 1.6 % of the home students. The number increased by 5.4 % in the last year. The numbers of students in self-financed status were 20531. In other word, 459 students are being educated by the state scholarship (MEB, 2005). While the majority of beneficiary students were in doctorate education, the majority of self-paying students were in undergraduate education. Turkey’s participation to the international higher education market reflects a gender-oriented character. The ratio of female students in the beneficiary students was 26.7 %. But, the ratio for female students within self-paying students was 7.6 %.

By country of destinations, most of the Turkish students respectively prefer the United States, Germany, England and France. For instance it accounts 57.7 % for Germany and 25.5 % for the United States. Conversely, Germany is the leading country by 12.4 % which sends students to Turkey (OECD, 2004). In fact, most of those students are in Turkish origin who had obtained Dutch citizenship before. According to the data of MEB, by October 2004, there are 4.726.306 Turkish citizens living abroad. Almost 51000 higher education students of those population educated in abroad HEIs and nearly 20000 of which educated in the Dutch universities. Thus, by 2004, when the both statistics are counted together, i.e. the Turkish higher education students leaving Turkey for higher education and the Turkish higher education students who live abroad with their families, the total amount of Turkish higher education population abroad is more than 70000 students. This score also secures Turkey as being labelled as the world’s 9th country “sending country” within international higher education market. According to the OECD data,

the number of incoming students is less than outgoing students in Turkey, i.e. Turkey is a “net sending country” within international higher education market.

There were 64 different countries and 5 autonomous republics in the Russian Federation to which Turkey sends higher education students. The scopes of countries were so diverse either from Canada to New Zealand or from Norway to South Africa. The distribution of Turkish students by important host countries were; 5201 in the USA, 3998 in Germany, 2058 in Azerbaijan, 1726 in France, 1491 in England, 1228 in Kyrgyzstan, 945 in Kazakhstan, 715 in Austria, 449 in Bulgaria, 395 in Belgium, 316 in Netherland, 273 in Canada, 266 in Ukraine, 251 in Georgia, and 181 in Russian Federation. Furthermore, the countries retaining more than a thousand Turkish students are the United States, Germany, Azerbaijan, France and England. Unlike Azerbaijan, the rest of the countries are the leading “receiving countries” of the international higher education market.

The distribution of Turkish higher education students to other Turkic republics or relative communities were; 26 in Turkmenistan, 5 in Uzbekistan, and 1 in Tajikistan; 42 in Bashkortostan, 34 in Tatarstan, 10 in Kabardino-Balkaria, 9 in Dagestan, and 4 in Chuvastan (MEB, 2005). Unlike Azerbaijan, the contribution of the Turkish common public universities, namely AYU and Manas University to the number of Turkish higher education students in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan is very eminent. In the republics with which Turkey has not public or private Turkish university, the numbers of Turkish students are less.

The number of universities in Turkey is not sufficient to meet the rising demand of the Turkish youth. In Turkey, higher education is seen as the leading gateway to employment and social mobility, especially for the large population of middle and lower income groups. The competition for the entrance exam has accelerated. The individuals who have financial power prefer abroad higher education and cause to the outflow of enormous capital. Those developments have justified the state to allow private universities in Turkey.

In 1992, there were just 29 public universities in Turkey. However, by 2004, there are 53 public and 24 private universities (*foundation universities – vakıf üniversiteleri in Turkish*) in Turkey. The number of students was respectively 1216891 and 77281 in 2004 (MEB, 2004: 238-240). The rise of universities in number, in contrast diminished the total budget of the higher education institutions in Turkey. The percentage of budget of higher education within the national budget

was 3.1 % in 1981, 2.9 % in 1988, 4.3 % in 1992, 2.6 % in 1996, 2.2 % in 2000 and 2.3 % in 2003 (YÖK, 2003: 121), and 3.3 % in 2005 (MEB, 2005; 253). Despite the increasing number of home universities, the overall capacity of the Turkish universities could not meet the growing internal demand for higher education. ÖSYM has started to disseminate the name of agreed foreign universities in his Booklet prepared for ÖSS exams since 1996.

The growing interest for the cross-border higher education in Turkey forced ÖSYM to disseminate the name of universities in order to avoid diploma equity and recognition problems. “The Regulation on Diploma Equity for Higher Education at Abroad” decreed on 14 July 1996 in Turkish Official Gazette so as to clarify the problematic issues. The measure was applied in 1998-1999 especially for the universities of former socialist countries which are mostly preferred by Turkish students due to those countries’ geographic proximity and lower tuitions. In the forthcoming years, the numbers of universities have increased in favor of the near abroad countries instead of the Central Asian republics.

The agreed external universities by YÖK were existed in “2004 Student Selection and Placement Exam Booklet”. The number of HEIs by countries were; Hungary 2, Ireland 1, New Zealand 5, the US 1 (New York State University’s branch universities (4) and colleges (20), Bulgaria 9, Romania 1, Lithuania 1, Azerbaijan 14, Kyrgyzs Republic 10 (*including Kyrgyzstan-Turkey Manas University with the caution of non-payment education*), Kazakhstan 17 (*not including AYU*), Ukraine 1, Georgia 5 and Moldova 3<sup>1</sup>. The specified universities were mainly from the former socialist countries other than Central Asian republics, and do not include any university from Uzbekistan or Turkmenistan. On the contrary, the latter has intention to establish a common university with Turkey like as AYU and Manas University.

Unlike Central Asian republics and the neighbor countries, Turkish students are western-oriented for their higher education. Azerbaijan seems most successful Central Asian republics in terms of attracting Turkish students, relative to Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan, in which Turkey has common private university, namely Qafqaz University<sup>2</sup>. It is the fact that Turkey, apart from his common universities established in Central Asia, has involved more in the international higher education, especially in his near abroad.

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.yok.gov.tr/egitim/osys\\_yurtdisi\\_bilgi\\_2002.htm](http://www.yok.gov.tr/egitim/osys_yurtdisi_bilgi_2002.htm), 18.03.2005.

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.qafqaz.edu.az>, 11.03.2005.

### **5.10.1.1. The Procedures of Higher Education in Turkey for Foreign Students**

Turkey other than being the main sending country in the world, its involvement in international higher education activities -through its HEIs and students have enhanced its attractiveness as a receiving country. The net sending country status of Turkey is challenged by the incoming foreign students to Turkey. It can be said that in a near future Turkey can be more highlighted as a “receiving country” among the OECD member states. According to the figures of YÖK for 2003-2004, the number of foreign higher education students in Turkey is 14.693. One third of the figure is filled by the female students. The number of the new enrollments is 3.289 and the graduates for the previous year were 1.813. It can be said that the demands to Turkish HEIs increases. The figures find out that Turkey attracts the students more than 110 different countries (YÖK, 2004: 128-144). Unlike Northern Cyprus, the leading country is Azerbaijan in terms of the new enrollment and overall student population. The diversity of the countries is larger for the incoming students rather than that of outgoing Turkish students.

There are three alternative ways to enroll in Turkish HEIs, which are open to the foreign students, but the sphere of influence predominantly are Turkic and Islamic countries in the near abroad. The first procedure is TCS exam held by ÖSYM. The second procedure is “The Examination for Foreign Students” (YÖS) and the third one is the scholarships offered by Turkish agencies, Turkish foundations and the international organizations in the framework of cultural exchange treaties. TCS is also operated through scholarship mechanism in which students compete to obtain scholarships offered by Turkey.

TCS is arranged in the framework of “Great Student Project” which was launched in 1992-1993. The exam is being held in Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, Moldova, FYR Macedonia, Crimea, Kosova, Tatarstan, Bosna-Herzegovina, Albania and Romania<sup>1</sup>. The all expenditures of those students are financed by Turkish state. The students, who passing the exam if their proficiency in Turkish is sufficient, are directly moving into the class without taking one-year preparatory school to learn Turkish language.

The second procedure is YÖS exam held for foreign students wishing to follow a course of study in Turkish HEIs. The exam is also held in Turkic republics since 1997-1998 and requires

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://yeogm.meb.gov.tr/webim/rehber/TCS.htm>, 15.04.2005.



students to finance their own education. It is organized again by ÖSYM. There are some conditions for the exam. Firstly, applicants should hold the nationality of a country other than Turkey. Secondly, the applicants should finance their education by themselves. Thirdly, they must be in the last year of secondary education or have successfully completed secondary education in Turkey or at a school in which the education is equivalent to that of Turkish lyceum. The YÖS exam recently held in such cities; Tiran, Baku, Dakka, Almaty, Bishkek, Beirut, Uskup, Kuala Lumpur, Cairo, Ulanbatur, Tashkent, Islamabad, Kazan, Damascus and Amman. Those coming students are entering an exam in order to determine their level in Turkish language proficiency. The students who take sufficient score in the exam (in A or B level) seen eligible in participating to the courses instructed by Turkish (YÖK, 2003:133).

The third procedure is scholarships offered by such organizations, e.g. “Foundation of Turkish Authority of Religious Affairs” (*Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı*) for theology education in Turkish universities, Islamic Development Bank<sup>1</sup> which finance Turkic students in the framework of cultural treaties and cultural exchange programs, and the scholarships of Eastern Turkestan Foundation<sup>2</sup>.

Therefore while Turkey is in position of sending country in the international higher education market, its recent efforts may transform him to take the title of “receiving country” for its near abroad countries in Middle East, Balkans, Black Sea, Mediterranean, Caucasia and Central Asia with whom Turkey has common historical, cultural and religious linkages.

---

<sup>1</sup> The bank is affiliated agency of The Organization of Islamic Countries in which Turkic republics are member countries since the foundation in 1969.

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.yok.gov.tr/egitim/raporlar/mart99/bolum10.html>, 18.03.2005.

## CHAPTER VI

### THE IDENTITY AND POSITION OF AHMET YESEVI UNIVERSITY AS AN INTERNATIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION

#### 6.1. The University Models: Public and Private

The university level education, namely tertiary education sector is divided into two, university sector and non-university/vocational sector. The aim of the former one is to educate and raise intellectuals at master to doctorate level by less focusing on undergraduate programs; but the latter one supplies mass education both undergraduate and post-secondary levels. Those kinds of institutions perform the functions that universities could not able to undertake. After the demise of communist regime in the socialist countries a great need has emerged to occupations supplied by vocational/non-university sector (Macukow and Witkowski, 2001). Diverse age groups need to train in order to hold an occupation in the newly emerged market economy. In that sense, AYU correspondences to the fact that it supplies non-formal education courses to meet also the vocational training need of Kazakh society.

The position and task of states within higher education systems are extensively discussed. States in today's knowledge-oriented societies hesitate to interfere in higher education institutions for the sake of academic liberalization and objective knowledge production. Kazakh government had great interests with the establishment of the university in order to ensure political, economic and social needs of its society. Kazakh government was in aware of that an enlarging society and economy require higher education institutions to operate with a degree of independence. It is argued that Russian Federation has also altered his education system for the sake of decentralization and civic education in order to meet the challenges of the new global setting (OECD, 1999).

In most countries while government generally remains the dominant financial source for higher education, HEIs have started to increase their non-public funding sources, e.g. student fees, foundations, revenues for research and development projects supplied to public and private

sector. The dependency on a single financial source has lessened, and the rising entrepreneurial spirit through “entrepreneur university” (Akşit, 2002) forces all types of universities to multiply their financial sources.

By the rise of various university types fostered mainly by internationalization, the categories among public and private universities have blurred. Unlike the non-university type of higher education, the university-type higher education institutions are separated into one of the general traditions either European or American model universities. Akşit claimed (2002: 353) “the universities are separated into two different extreme on the same line from classic public university to corporate private university”. The taxonomy among public versus private university can be diversified respectively to; “elite” versus “entrepreneur”; “traditional” versus “business-like”; and “continental” versus “Anglo-Saxon”.

The main differences between the both types are the management culture and funding mechanism. The first one represents the state authority the last one is emphasized on needs of market and local community. As the American model expanded to the globe the stakeholder perspective is more highlighted. It is argued by Nokkala (2002) that “the emergence of stakeholder society is closely tied to the massification of higher education emerging in the Western societies from the 1970’s onwards”.

Nonetheless, the latter type is closer to the initiatives of internationalization of higher education, which also has more ability to compare in the age of the commoditization of higher education service prompted by the globalization and implemented through the internationalization.

**Table 10: The Comparison of the University Models**

<b>“Traditional university”</b>	<b>“Business-like HEI”</b>
Supply-led	Market-driven
Reactive, resist change	Pro-active, strategic
Depends on state funding	Portfolio financing
Consuming assets	Investing for the future
Administered	Managed
Risk averse	Manages a range of risks

(Source: OECD, 2004b: 34).

Ultimately, the identity of universities separate into one of the model mentioned above. While the second model is more responsive to the expectations of stakeholders, the first model is focusing more on the strategic importance of science, research, faculty opportunities and student

needs. Those kinds of universities are the candidate for the future's "elite" universities specialized on research, innovation and rearing academics.

The evaluations on Ahmet Yesevi University are emphasized on his different and privileged position. AYU defines itself with the adjectives of "common", "public" and "autonomous". Budak claimed "AYU is a unique model of university and there is not any kind of similar formation in the world. It was fairly theoretical in the initial years. In Kazakhstan today there are some universities also named as Kazakh-Uzbek University, but those kinds of entities are organized and managed by private individuals". The increasing numbers of the campuses particularly increased the higher education opportunity for Kazakh students. But, as the university spread to Kazakh cities the management and financial efficiency of the university is threatened. Moreover, it has diversified its joint networks and generated cooperation alliances with the universities and high schools in Central Asia and Caucasus for the teaching of Turkish language. By 2002, AYU has contracts with more than 30 foreign universities, such as the US, China, Pakistan, Spain, CIS and Turkey (Ayhaber, 2002). Despite its semi-public identity, AYU builds its structure more similar with private universities. Therefore, it is meaningful to clarify AYU's position among different university models and stages progressing toward the internationalization.

### **6.1.1. European Model**

This model traced back to medieval universities of Europe, i.e. 13th century's Bologna, Paris and Oxford. It is called as political model since it approaches to higher education as public good. The model is based on public organization in which the maneuver of the rector is too limited due to limited funding and rigid legislative mechanism, and relations with the industry is less. It is indicated that while both Germany and the US have federal higher education systems, the share of public funding in the university budget is 95 % in Germany relative to 35-50 % of the US (OECD, 2004b: 71).

It is discussed by Akşit (2002: 350-351) that the monopoly of classic public university has removed on knowledge production. The numbers of actor or institutions which produce knowledge have increased in addition to the current availability of wide access to the knowledge. Therefore, the classic public university and its hegemony is challenged more. Public universities should accommodate themselves against the faced challenges resulted from the

commoditization of knowledge. One way of the adaptation is “entrepreneur university” which is internalized by American public universities or non-profit based private universities which intends to take the opportunity of knowledge commoditization experienced in the world recently.

In this model, HEIs determine their President by election mechanism, but the academic freedoms and intra-institutional democracy is not in the level of the second model due to financial attachment to state budget. It is stated that (OECD, 2004b: 25) the relationship between HEIs and state vary widely across countries. It is noted states may occupy the position or positions of:

- Owner (Own assets, employs staff, and is wholly responsible for investment and bearing the risks)
- Core Founder (provides major part of funding and takes a significant responsibility for investments and risks)
- Planner (approves mission and strategic plans and so shares in responsibility for investment needs and risk)
- Partner (works jointly with HEI so shares responsibilities and consults on plans and policies)
- Customer (purchases services, and if a strategic purchaser may share some responsibility for investment and risk)
- Regulator (regulates quality and performance)

In this taxonomy the first two roles are the best circumstances comply with the position of Turkey and Kazakhstan for AYU.

### **6.1.2. American Model**

It is widely called as “Anglo-Saxon” or “entrepreneur” university model. It gains more liberal relations with market and largely based on internal private financial mechanisms rather than public financing. In this model, university is governed by managerial procedures like done in private firms. Its upper administration mechanism is Board of Trustees rather than state. This model is more compatible with global economic and technologic developments, market, and competitiveness. The declining public fund and increasing pressures for efficiency,

accountability, and transparency highlights the stakeholders' opinions. The model manages those kinds of challenges by the mechanism of Board of Trustees.

In this model, rector is not need to be an academic member of the university, he or she can be externally appointed and must have competency in business and finance. The rector spends much of their time with looking for or creating new financial sources. For instance, the rector of Kyrgyzs-Turkish Atatürk Alatoo University, which opened in 1997, mentions “a rector should act like an ambassador here, should contact with the society, and the rector should be differing from his colleagues in Turkey” (Özcan, 2005).

The basic duties of the academics are market researchs and instruction activities. The performance of the universities is supervised by national or international accreditation agencies. Strategic management, deregulation, accountability are core concepts for the model. External performance measurement and other accountability mechanisms have required universities to publicly demonstrate their efficiency and effectiveness, which determine their public reputation. The proximity with private sector provides larger opportunities of research and development, which improve the quality of service. On the other hand, it is the fact that the comparative advantages of English-speaking countries within the internationalization of higher education facilitated the expansion of “American Model” in the world. Kabasakal discussed,

There is “American university” reality in the world. It has expanded to the world through its branch campuses. In Turkey “Robert College” is a product of this formation. It is a historical and political model presented by the US to the world. AYU does not resemble to “American model” university which historically goes back to the “American University” tradition. AYU as an autonomous international university fits into neither European nor American model. It accommodates itself between the both models. It has a more humanistic position without engage in any model.

AYU was assigned with public responsibility for all Turkic people. It can be worded as a mission university, but progress ahead on entrepreneur motives so as to improve the quality of its service and diversify its financial resources against the probable decrease of the public funding. The fiscal, academic and administrative autonomy of the university allow him to operate like as “private” and “Anglo-Saxon” model universities in order to develop itself in relevance to the stakeholder expectations. The primary stakeholders of the university are Turkey

and Kazakhstan. Because, AYU's major financial sources are flowing from the state budgets. However, its academic autonomy, namely freedom is ensured by the Regulation. It can be stated that AYU has a public base but more close to "private (Anglo-Saxon)" model university.

## **6.2. Internationalization of Higher Education without Student Mobility**

The international higher education has produced and shifted the identity of university and created "virtual university " or " branch university". These are the most prevalent outputs of the internationalization processes. It is claimed that branch campus or virtual university are the product of transnational education (Nokkala, 2002). While large student groups leave their home countries for higher education proposed in the industrialized countries, on the other hand the larger student population who choice to stay at home have achieved an opportunity by "the mobility of curriculum" which may be provided by two ways, e.g. either by branch campuses or by virtual university, i.e. education presented via distance learning technologies.

Virtual university or virtual internationalization is realized by the advancement of information and communication technologies which accelerate also the trade of higher education. It is stated that (Altbach, 2004: 7) the era of transnational higher education has increased "in which academic institutions from one country operate in other, academics program are jointly offered by universities from different countries, and higher education is delivered through distance technologies". For instance, the IAU survey report finds out that distance education and the use of ICTs are the key areas of new developments for the internationalization (Knight, 2003).

Unlike branch university, the great numbers of "virtual university" students are adults who are looking for further employment opportunities (Akşit, 2002). In contrast, the branch universities are mainly the investment of strong public or private universities which prompted by political or economic rationales. The branch campuses opened abroad in public status are largely driven by political motives.

Branch university is not single and independent institutions within higher education realm, but they are established as a part of available university in order to maximize the income abroad and export their university models to the host countries. They may be initiatives of profit-based private university, non-profit based private university or classic public university. All is stimulated by the motive of "entrepreneur university" so as to survive within competitive

international higher education market as a response to the diminishing of public funding or to increase income generating activities. Internationalization process justifies the overseas enrollments and is seen as an opportunity for financial survival of public universities especially in the new era in which private HEIs are in ascension.

The commoditization of higher education service has facilitated the emergence of branch campuses largely in developing countries which are sending more students abroad. However, the establishment of branch campuses in the developing or underdeveloped countries indicates that the universities of the developed nations are not satisfied with the growing student population flowing to them. They are mainly motivated to increase their income generating activities or contributing to the capacity building of the “sending countries”.

Today there are many countries in international higher education market with regard to “transnational education”, they are either exporter or importer country (Nokkala, 2002). These rapidly growing sub-phenomena of trade in educational services are called transnational education.

Nokkala defines the main forms of transnational education as follows:

- Franchising<sup>1</sup>, the process whereby a HEI from a certain country offers a course or programme through another institutions in a different country
- Branch campus, established by a HEI from one country in another country in order to offer its own degrees in that other country
- Program articulation or twinning, it is an inter-institutional agreements whereby two or more institutions jointly define a study programme in terms of credits and content, possibly but not necessarily offering double degrees
- Offshore institution, an institutions which in legal terms, belongs to a given country but does not necessarily have a campus in that country and is having a campus in a third country
- Corporate universities, usually large corporations setting up their own higher education institutions without belonging to any national system

---

<sup>1</sup> A stronger or better-established institution allows another to use its brand name, usually for a fee. The resulting growth in student numbers often creates progression opportunities and benefits for both institutions (OECD, 2004:42).



- International institutions which offer “international” qualifications that are not part of any specific educational system
- Virtual universities, institutions offering education mainly or solely online

In this taxonomy, AYU could be seen as a university corresponding to the international institution relative to the other forms. It is known that AYU is an autonomous university without totally engaged with the founder (partner) countries’ higher education systems.

### **6.2.1. Branch University**

It is defined as a location of an institution which is geographically apart and independent of the main campus of the institution<sup>1</sup>. The branch universities are classified as “independent-international” or “affiliate” institutions of the main university (and campus) (Umakoshi, 1997: 266). Anglo-Saxon countries “combine recruitment of foreign students with extending their educational supply to promoting markets in other countries by setting up local campuses under the full authority of the mother institution. In this tendency, the process of internationalization shifts from the demand to the supply side” (Van Damme, 2001: 425). It is seen as a result of reverse internationalization. In branch campuses the internationalization is experienced at home. But, “franchising agreements” provide local universities to use the educational programs of “offshore institutions”. It is argued that the international initiatives of the offshore institutions are to increase their income by branch campuses and transnational campuses rather than develop the home campuses (Altbach, 2004).

International higher education is not including just international student mobility, but programme and institutional mobility are growing due to their function on lowering individual costs than studying abroad. It is expected that those two kinds of mobility would likely to meet the growing demand for international higher education in future. In the Asia-Pacific region, the place of leading demand for international higher education in the world, there are such commercial arrangements through franchises and twinning for programmes or institutional mobility mechanisms (OECD, 2004).

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.calib.com/education/index.cfm?fuseaction=gloss>, 15.04.2005.

The developed nations, like the United States, today have many international HEIs namely with “American Universities” or “American Colleges” in the world-wide (see Appendix E). The economic motives of the American higher education system provides the home universities to open branch universities (and campuses) especially in the developing countries of the world, for example as done in Japan in 1970s and 1980s which was being advertised “American University in Japan” (Umakoshi, 1997). Today there are many American universities in the former socialist countries, e.g. Bulgaria, Azerbaijan and Tajikistan (Altbach, 2004). The most prominent “American University” in the scope of the purpose of this thesis is “American University-Central Asia” in Kyrgyzstan (see Appendix D).

Budak noted “the legislation of the university does not allow opening branch campus in any other country. But, I recommend that in order to live the spiritual climate of Turkestan, the students should come and live in Turkestan”. Since AYU is a common public university, it is difficult to open branch campuses abroad other than the campuses opened in other Kazakh cities. In fact, it needs the consensus of the both states, and perhaps would require the involvement of a third state for the branch campus or university abroad. Kabasakal mentioned,

During the post-independence period of the the republics, I was the advisor of Prime Minister Demirel on Eurasian issues; I have proposed the “American University” model instead of establishment of a new joint venture university in the early of 1990s. I have offered Istanbul University as the home university of branch universities which would be opened in each Turkic republic. In contrast, it is not preferred. In fact, Istanbul University is the first contemporary and one of the biggest Turkish universities in regard to its capacity on diverse disciplines and great number of academics. I believe that this was more easy way of to open university in the conjuncture of post-independence period.

AYU is not a branch university of any Turkish or Kazakh university, and has not its own branch campus abroad, but it strives to open Turculogy departments in the “agreed” universities of Kyrgyzstan and Daghestan. Currently, AYU has one main campus in Turkestan and four other national branch campuses in Kazakhstan. Unlike international scale, in local scale it adopts itself to the branch campus process. The reason behind the expansion of AYU in Kazakh cities is not economic motives as experienced in the case of entrepreneur university model. On the contrary, the basic motive behind the expansion is the result of mass demand. The expansion is compatible with the mission of AYU emphasize to reach more Turkic students.

### **6.2.2. Virtual University**

The leading universities of the industrialized world have developed a “cost-effective” method which called as also “virtual internationalization” (OECD, 1996: 25). Haigh argues (2002: 60) that internationalization of curriculum also prepares stay-at-home students to operate successfully in an increasingly international and multicultural world of work. Thus, the native students have gained a less-expensive opportunity in order to take international education without leaving their countries. It means that the student mobility is replaced with curriculum mobility. It is “virtual internationalization” resulted from by the emerging of distance learning technologies. A higher education student can obtain university degree of the host country in his home country without ever been in the host country.

Unlike the mobility of students, the mobility of curriculum and teaching activity via educational technologies created a new type of service in higher education. It is argued that the distinction between the mobility of students and the mobility of the curriculum need to be framed for the mapping of the internationalization. However, virtual higher education mainly is demanded by adult population who aims to achieve a one more university degree and find new job opportunities (Akşit, 2002: 352). Education methods via internet diminish the cost of service and remove the obstacles resulted from the time and place in addition to its contribution to the additional finance of HEIs.

AYU is known one of the leading universities in the FSU territories which offer service via distance learning technologies since 1998. AYU had firstly implemented “video-conference system” to supplement the formal education of the students in Turkestan. It was implemented almost from 1998 to 2001. Later on, it started to offer distance learning programmes in formal education status through TÜRTEP in undergraduate and graduate levels since 2002-2003.

It is emphasized that “technology may be a partial substitute for traditional pedagogy, but rarely a total replacement” (OECD, 1996: 28). This technology named as “computer-based learning” which may decrease the quality of education rather than reduce the costs. In other words, the interactive form of instruction is being favored more and the importance of teacher-student interaction is seen quite beneficial. Similarly, in this issue, Kabasakal discussed,

The distance education technologies may complement rather than replace the direct instruction; therefore the expansion and development of virtual internationalization in higher education could not be advanced in large scale in future. In this respect, I believe distance learning is not consistent with the mission of AYU.

### **6.3. Globalization versus Internationalization in Higher Education**

Those terms are not used interchangeably but mostly confused. Globalization refers to something happen to universities, but internationalization is something, which universities make for themselves, (Yelland, 2000), i.e. the internationalization realizes itself as a respond to globalization which challenge over national contexts. But, there is a cause-effect relationship between globalization and internationalization. As the level of globalization has increased together with the connection of outside markets the considerations on higher education, i.e. internationalization are also increasing (Yang, 2002). It is claimed by Zhukov (2002: 361) that in economic term “globalization refers to an unprecedented high level of mutual dependency of national economies: that dependency is based on the absolute (ideally) mobility of the main factors of production-knowledge, capital, labor, and the goods produced-throughout the entire world economy”.

There are various universities in the world which emphasize their distinctive dimensions as national, regional or international. The boundaries between them were removed by the internationalization and globalization which are originated from different motives. Internationalization is a concept internalized and recognized more humanistic than globalization and could be applied all sectors other than higher education or education. Therefore, unlike nationalization, globalization is the more influential concept encounter against internationalization. Hans de Wit<sup>1</sup> argues the impact of the globalization on higher education has resulted in such activities like; labour market, knowledge-based economy, mobility of knowledge, lifelong learning, mobility of students and scholars, privatization, standardization and regionalization.

Unlike the globalization, internationalization has been attracting more favorable interest in the world. The first motives behind the latter one are from developing countries to developed

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.autc.gov.au/visiting\\_scholar/documents/de\\_wit1.pdf](http://www.autc.gov.au/visiting_scholar/documents/de_wit1.pdf), 06.05.2005.

countries. On the other hand, globalization has imposed itself on the developing and underdeveloped countries. In that sense, internationalization may be perceived as means to improve the higher education systems of the developed countries but initiated by motives of developing countries, i.e. excessive demand for international higher education comes from developing countries. The largest consumers of international education are Asian and Latin American countries rather than western ones.

While internationalization (Nokkala, 2002) is can be both national and institutional challenge in higher education against the globalization of educational services, globalization of higher education is a challenge to nation-states in which education supplied and financed by state. The main difference between the two concepts is that globalization refers to top to bottom, while internationalization refers to bottom-up approach. Globalization enables free movements of students who have sufficient capital in world-wide, but internationalization eased and paved the way to achieve knowledge produced all around the world.

Globalization, which legitimates the trade of educational services in scope of GATS, is the basic force behind the justification of the economic rationales of the internationalization. The commoditization of higher education caused higher education institutions also to respond and adapt to the challenges and alterations coming from external environments. Furthermore, the rising multi-national characters of industrial firms due to their transnational activities at domestic markets led them to recruit internationally educated graduates (Bartell, 2003). Those firms justify the higher education to be supplied with international considerations. In fact, the main driving force for international student recruitment resulted from economic globalization rather than internationalization itself.

There are three main differences between the two concepts. Firstly, internationalization presupposes the existence of established nation-states: globalization is either agnostic about, or positively hostile to nation-states; second, internationalization is most strongly expressed through the “high” worlds of diplomacy and culture; globalization in the “low” worlds of mass consumerism and global capitalism; third, internationalization, because of its dependence on the existing (and unequal) pattern of nation-states, tends to reproduce or even legitimize hierarchy and hegemony; globalization, in contrast, because it is not tied to the past, because it is a restless, even subversive, force can address new agendas (Callan, 2000: 19).

**Table 11: Some Primary Values of Globalization and Internationalization**

Values	Globalization	Internationalization
Origin	Started in the 19th century or earlier with the rise of western imperialism and modernization, nowadays fuelled by modern technology	Dating back at least to the Sophists and Confucius, respectively in Ancient Greece and China
Impetus	Profit and belief in a single world-wide market	Advancement of human knowledge based on realization of the bond of humanity
First priority	Economic	Human interests
Primary form	Competition, combat, confrontation, exploitation, and survival of the fittest	Cooperation, collaboration, caring, sharing and altruism
Benefits	One-sided economic benefits	Mutual advantages
Mobility of educational provision	South-north for students north-south for programmes	Two-multi way
Quality regulation	Largely ungoverned	Careful quality control

(Source: Yang, 2002: 92).

The values possessed by internationalization process are quite supportive and explanatory for the establishment of AYU and its mission. It was created as the gift of Turkey and Kazakhstan to the people of Turkic geography. It includes more humanistic considerations and builds its identity upon the Yesevi thought and principles.

#### **6.4. Nationalism, Regionalism and Internationalism in Higher Education**

The OECD statements on higher education made in 1996 “regional entities as opposed to global ones have become increasingly important in the last ten years (Yelland, 2000). The globalization of capital and knowledge forced the national economies to be internationally interdependent in scope and resulted in economic regionalism. Therefore, economic regionalism is seen as the precursor stage for the realization of regionalization for international higher education. It is argued that “educational and economic regionalisms are perhaps necessary steps on the path towards true internationalization of economic and educational policies. That is, as economic policy becomes regional, so to will educational policy becomes regional” (Forest, 1995; 1). The regional economic formations bring about strategic alliance in all level of education, but especially in higher education.

In fact, regional economic cooperations have facilitated the international mobility of student and faculty exchange for the sake of national higher education's improvement. For instance, EHEA in larger sense are the cases of regionalization in international higher education. On the contrary, as seen in Europe, some countries come together within the scope of internationalization and focus on smaller regions so as to develop regional collaboration as done cooperative efforts of the Nordic countries' NORDPLUS programme (Huisman et al, 1998) or "Baltic Sea Region University Network".

It is claimed internationalization should have a global, and an inter-regional character, and should not develop primarily as an intra-regional phenomenon. Strong intra-regional programmes, such as emerged in Europe with the Erasmus project, should not preclude or restrict such inter-regionalism, but be a foundation for further international collaboration among regions and countries (OECD, 1996: 13). In that sense, AYU can be seen as an agent focused more on intra-regional activities and formations. While it has an international dimension through its name, the international dimension is very stagnant. AYU was assigned with the mission equipped with the regional concerns. It can be a true case of intra-regional (Turkic geography) cooperation in higher education prompted by the disintegration of the Soviet Union. But as it is mentioned above for the European cases, AYU as an intra-regional movement may constitute bases for further inter-regional activities and formations which will ensure the university to obtain more convergence for the true case of internationalization of higher education.

The regionalization and internationalization are not concordant terms for universities, they are seen "as the two aspects of the broader phenomenon" by setting relations with outside of campuses. Such as Hong Kong universities create a sphere of regional performing but developed connections with outside world. On the contrary, the US has showed the true case of internationalization in higher education by hosting students from all around the world. For this reason, regionalization can be explained as a part of internationalization process (Yang, 2002: 89). It is argued that regionalism may be required as the middle step between nationalism and internationalism in developing the goals and objectives of national systems and institutions of higher education (Forest, 1995: 2).

After the breaking ties of national contexts, regionalism is seen as the next period for the coming internationalization of higher education. The movement from nationalism to regionalism and to internationalism is not linear and also regionalism present multi-faceted spectrums. For example,

the Japanese higher education system shows a regional character. It is noted that the 90 % of foreign students in Japan coming from Asian countries (Kitamura, 1997: 146) mostly due to the geographical proximity. Furthermore, the number of foreign higher education students in Turkey is higher for near abroad countries of Balkans, Caucasasia, Central Asia and Middle East. Unlike geographic proximity, the cooperation among Turkey and Kazakhstan is a different case of regionalism. Despite the long distances, it aims to compose a “spiritual climate” for incoming students all around Turkic geography and strength the bases of “Turkic world” emerging by the collapse of the socialism. Kabasakal suggested,

AYU is such kind of entity, its identity is neither national nor international, it occupies a mediate position. Therefore, a Kazakh student may prefer AYU instead of abroad in the initial sense. The students after have obtained experience in such a kind of international university may have easily pass and be encouraged for the oversea education. Therefore, AYU’s model should be improved and revised.

Globalization, in realistic sense, started for Central Asian republics after 1991. It has facilitated Kazakhstan and other Central Asian republics to open up his doors to operate in global economy. The impact of globalization perhaps has urged to Kazakhstan and Turkey to establish a university which educating the students with internationally recognized curricula. In that sense, globalization accelerated after the demise of the FSU facilitated the emergence of AYU which can be identified as the product of regionalism within international higher education. In other words, AYU can be seen as a regional cooperation in higher education, but stimulated by developments resulted from globalization. That is, AYU does not totally designate to international or national concerns. It is an outcome of regionalization in higher education within the internationalization process. It performs upon internationally recognised higher education procedures, but focuses on regional goals and practices, especially for the development Turkic republics and relative communities in the FSU territories.



**Table 12: The Stages in Higher Education and Economic Cooperation**

Stages	Charecteristics
Nationalism	Limited or no cross-national student or scholar exchange, language of instruction is not well understood outside national borders, limited or no contract with literature not indigenous to nation, little if any cooperation with other nations towards common educational or economic goals; <b>nations against nation economic competition.</b>
Regionalism	Cross-national student and scholarly exchange within geographic region are encouraged, languages of instruction are same at most institutions throughout region, national governments promote sharing of resources and recognition of shared goals and objectives for all institutions in the region; <b>region against region economic competition.</b>
Internationalism	Global exchanges of students, faculty and all educational resources, support of educational programs in one region by other regions promoted as benefit to entire global community ; <b>limited economic competition between regions or nations</b>

(Source: Forest, 1995; 3)

As the regional economic integrations have increased right after the collapse of the socialist system, the emergence of regional cooperations in higher education field were also fostered. It is claimed that “internationalization activies should be built on regional strengths”. In fact, it was seen that such “multi-regional activities should receive higher priority in future” (OECD, 1996: 24).

The nationalism and regionalism are not contradictory developments for the internationalization. They may be seen as concomitant. “Internationalism stands as a counterpart to chauvinism, not to nationalism and regionalism. It is emphasized that one benefit of internationalization should be to prevent national and regional orientations from devolving into chauvinism and xenophobia” (OECD; 1996; 27). For AYU the principles and the way of Ahmet Yesevi create more humanistic ambiance and institutional identity which compose a strong base for the university. The existed instruction language of AYU designates to the different dimensions of the University. Turkish and Russian language represents the regional dimension of AYU. Kazakh language represents the national and local dimension of the university. But, English represent the international dimension of AYU.

The future of internationalization process would be enriched with the development of regional cooperations on higher education. In fact, by this way, the domination of top receiver countries of the world would be diminished. AYU, in this respect, compose a significant case for the developments foreseen.

It is argued that in the future the definite roles in the international higher education markets will be eradicated and the borders may not be so clear among the “sending” and “receiving” countries. Turkey as a country among first ten ones which sending higher education students to the United States, on the contrary attract great number of students from Middle East, Balkans and Central Asian countries. The identity of Turkey within the scope of the internationalization process may switch to “receiving country”. Budak said,

We (AYU) appreciate the composition of “Turkic world higher education area” if it is created in future. It becomes the common ideal of Turkic world which is always available in thought during the Turkic summits. But, it must be operated; In fact this development is expected from Turkey. This kind of composition should be pioneered by Turkey. Other republics favor Turkey’s such kind of initiatives if it is created. The elder politicians were more impulsive to initiate such ideals in the past, e.g. Özal and Demirel. In the realization of such ideal AYU would undertake important functions. Many things could be built upon this ideal or opinion by considering the existence of AYU.

AYU is a regional university; its sphere of influence is Turkic geography. The important thing is that it means more for Kazakhstan rather than Turkey. The latter one, as mentioned before, is an active member of international higher education market either receiving or sending country, i.e. Turkey is in stage three, internationalism. However, Kazakh higher education system has obtained a step from nationalism of Soviet period to regionalism in the early of post-Soviet years. It can be termed that regionalism is a buffer *stage (or institution by the terms of Mübeccel Kiray)* designating to the moderate transformation or change. It is more functional stage in the evolution process of Kazakh higher education system from traditional to modern, i.e. nationalism to internationalism. As it was argued by Kiray (cited Kongar, 2002: 173-175), in case of AYU also, the change was stimulated externally and regionalism efforts of Kazakh higher education is way of integrating with external countries.

## CHAPTER VII

### THE RATIONALES OF THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND AHMET YESEVI UNIVERSITY

#### 7.1. Introduction

The question of why a university desires to internationalize itself brings the four well-known rationales to light (De Wit and Knight, 1997). These rationales are quite explanatory to answer why higher education institutions or in larger sense national higher education systems desire to internationalize their education. The answer given the above question is very compatible also with the reasons of the establishment of Ahmet Yesevi University. Therefore, AYU, all over have established with the similar considerations. Unlike its reasons of existence, for the first time a university was established in Central Asia compatible with the rationales of the internationalization. For this reason, internationalization process has penetrated into Central Asia by the establishment of AYU in 1992 and then contributed to the maturation of the internationalization process which is enhanced by the forthcoming Turkish universities.

It can be argued that AYU is one step further in this road relevance to its Turkish rivals. In contrast, AYU has inconsistencies (lack of international students and academics) with the internationalization process. In future, it is easier for AYU to transform its structure in line with the internationalization process. It would not be subjected with great difficulties owing to its structuration and activities which are quite compatible with the process. The biggest advantages of the university are; being located in Kazakhstan which involving more in the international higher education activities (see Appendix F) and has historical heritage of multi-culturalism, the universal ambiance created upon Yesevi's principles in the campuses, its autonomous status, multilingual education, international students coming from out of the former Soviet territories, and Turkey which is an important actor within the international higher education.

The well-known rationales for internationalization of higher education are as follows:

- (1) Political: It assesses the internationalization as the agent of foreign policy (*in case of AYU, Kazakh Prime Ministry and Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs have undertaken active roles in the foundation years, and Turkish Minister Hikmet Çetin has signed the treaty on behalf of the state*).
- (2) Economic: It assesses the internationalization as an agent so as to improve competitiveness in the economy, raising the revenue for the institution and decreasing the financial burden on state budgets by creating an alternative funding source.
- (3) Academic: It assesses the internationalization as an agent to contribute to the quality and richness of teaching and research in general (*YÖK and Kazakh Ministry of Education are the responsible agencies in order to supply service in quality and accredit the diploma. The rector and vice rector appointed by these institutions*).
- (4) Socio-Cultural: It assesses the internationalization as an agent to foster respect for cultural and ethnic diversity and the promotion of international understanding and solidarity among different nationalities (*The foundation of the university goes back to the cooperation agreement held among Turkish Ministry of Culture and Kazakh Ministry of Culture for the restoration of Ahmet Yesevi's mausoleum in 1990. Furthermore, Ahmet Yesevi's thought and principles consolidate this rationale*).

In fact, there are two axes of rationales for the internationalization process, the first one is economic and political, and the second one is academic and socio-cultural rationales. Similarly, further typology could be composed for axes in a supplementary manner. The first axe represents the goals but the second one represents the means. The former one includes the political and socio-cultural rationales, i.e. the axe for governmental objectives and intervention, and the latter one includes economic and academic rationales, i.e. the axe for institutional objectives and intervention. The model submitted below proposed by Qiang as a well-defined formulation to understand the dual character of the internationalization. As it was argued national policies on internationalization can be analyzed on the base of mixture of such rationales (Qiang, 2003: 256).

**Table 13: The Axes of the Rationales**

	<i>State</i>	<i>University</i>
<i>Goals</i>	Political	Economic
<i>Tools</i>	Socio-Cultural	Academic

In this model, as it can be seen there is no specific relations among the cross cells. The left column usually represents the state policies, but right column represent the HEIs own policies. The cells in the bottom row have a function of “tools”, but the upper rows represent the “goals”, i.e. they are the actors for the realization of the internationalization process. Respectively, political power and money are the motivator factors. On the contrary, the academic and social rationales are in the last sense serving for internationalization of learning, but the political and economic rationales explicitly demonstrate either governmental or institutional interests. The rationales in the upper row use internationalization as a means to achieve their interests. But, both socio-cultural and academic rationales retain the internationalization as objectives.

The main stakeholders of higher education (Qiang, 2003) are; government, education sector and private sector. But, in the details the actors are so various; government, university, students and their families, academics, business and industry, public and private sector, parliament, media, community and professional associations.

Firstly, the internationalization process interests all level of governments and departments. The education authorities are directly related and responsible from the process. Secondly, the education sector includes all level of actors interested with education either on instructor and management level or as learners and researchers. Thirdly, the private sector includes more heterogeneous stakeholder group. The quality of products and services they supplied more or less depend on qualified labor force raised in universities (Qiang, 2003: 254).

The Turkish private sector benefits more from AYU’s graduates who are capable in three to four languages. The students should pay attention to local cultures and knowledge. It is crucial for the firms, which have business in diverse countries of Eurasia region. For this reason, the firms may have deal with the academic structure and education quality of AYU.

## 7.2. Political Rationale

It concerns with higher education to promote the country's position and role in the world. It sees the internationalization of higher education as a tool of foreign policy rather than to improve the education system. The fact is that international higher education in various countries was not anymore in the realm of education ministries, but in that of foreign affairs. It is argued many countries take internationalization of higher education into account as an extended form of their cultural diplomacy or as way of reducing their political and cultural isolation from the larger global community (OECD, 1996: 114).

Higher education is considered as a form of diplomatic investment for the sake of future political and socio-cultural relations. The governments approve sponsorship mechanism for the foreign students who are anticipated as the future leaders of their countries. Therefore, higher education is an outstanding case of political influence for countries both for the sake of international diplomacy and national economy. It is argued "over the years, national governments have become increasingly keen to make use of higher education in the pursuit of economic growth and national welfare" (Forest, 1995: 3).

It is foreseen that the future trade relations upon foreign graduates would enhance the justification of internationalization process by states rather than solely by HEIs. In that sense, IHE is understood as a key factor also for the national economic development. Similarly, developed countries attract master and doctorate students for the sustainable advancement of their national economies.

For example, Turkish columnist Osman Ulagay mentioned Professor Robert Nye<sup>1</sup> has declared in his writings of International Herald Tribune on November 30 of 2004 that the fall of foreign student numbers may reason a great lose. Unlike hard power (military power), soft power is essential to gain sympathy and regard in the world. Nye has mentioned also the foreign students create a market with 13 billion \$. By carrying the learned knowledge and experiences to the remote areas of the world they contributed to the US's soft power. The Bush administration has

---

<sup>1</sup> The former Defense Minister of Clinton administration in the US

forced foreign higher education students to avoid from the US who are making great contributions to the US economy and external esteem”<sup>1</sup>.

The developed countries of Europe need to recruit more talented foreign students and graduates in the fields which could not be met enough by the national students, like in science and technology sectors. Therefore, European countries need foreign students so as to sustain their capacity on research and development (Wende, 2001: 437).

It is argued by Qiang (2003) that political rationale refers to the components of:

- promoting national security and peace among nations,
- preserving and promoting national culture and identity.

### **7.2.1. The Analysis of the Political Rationale for AYU**

Ahmet Yesevi Turkestan State University of Kazakhstan was replaced in January 1993 with AYU which was builded upon such political objectives, and more compatible with the political rationale of the internationalization. AYU was shaped as a tool of Turkish foreign policy in the new era in order to facilitate and contribute Turkey’s further activities in Central Asia, embrace with the republics and sustain Yesevi’s heritage which had important functions for the cultural, historical, social and linguistic building of Turkic communities in the past. Zeybek further claimed,

AYU represents an equal success against the all other Turkish educational activities in Turkic world. It secures Turkic world perception for the students coming from remote regions of Turkic geography. AYU mission overlap with Yesevi’s thought which have universal objectives. AYU aims to integrate Turkic world in the path of Yesevi. It is a great future-oriented project. The graduates would take position as a public administrators and politicians in their countries.

AYU is presented as a mission university having bridge function between Anatolia and Central Asia, namely former Turkestan. Kabasakal claimed, “AYU has political considerations. It raises

---

<sup>1</sup> Turkish daily Milliyet, 06.12.2004.

friends of Turkey who have competent in many foreign language and contribute for the further development of reciprocal economic relations with the region and enhancement of Turkish foreign trade”. Moreover, the socio-cultural dimension of AYU is consolidated by the declarations of Turkish and Kazakh politicians. It is stated that the students of the university will compose the base of cooperation among Turkic people (Ayhaber, 2002). The former Turkish President Süleyman Demirel mentioned the cultural integrity of Turkic world will be ensured by such kind of scientific entities (Ayhaber, 1998a).

In addition, it is the fact that brain drain in higher education threatens developing and underdeveloped countries more than developed ones. Those countries, when they in need for students and benefit from them, they lost the qualified work force and their labor social capital damaged more. The selective brains of developing or underdeveloped countries migrate to the developed countries. The attractive reasons at host countries are large opportunities in field of science, technology and industry. AYU submits a case of counter-immigration of the brain drain for the developing countries.

### **7.3. Economic Rationale**

In large sense, it focuses on long-term economic benefits in addition to the role of internationalization for the enhancement of skilled human resource of nations in order to improve global competitiveness of their national economies. Among the rationales, economic rationales better explain internationalization policies and efforts both in national and institutional level (Wende, 2001). Similarly, economic growth is seen as the leading rationale for internationalization rather than advancing human knowledge and understanding (Yang, 2002).

Higher education has been commoditized and was attracting a great deal of students from the underdeveloped countries. The tertiary institutions of the developed world conceive the term as an important source of income for a long time rather than university development. The recruitment of foreign students has become a significant factor for institutional income and of national income interest (Qiang, 2003: 249). It is stated that “internationalization in the UK can be summarized as the mobilization of the skilled human resources needed to make the UK a more internationally competitive trading nation and to maximize export earnings by selling education services to paying customers” (Wende, 2001: 438).



It is argued by Qiang (2003) that economic rationales refer to the components of:

- promoting marketing and income generation from educational products and services,
- enhancing economic, scientific and technological competitiveness.

The business sector also is favoring multi-cultural literacy and diversity in the tertiary education curriculum for “internationally-oriented graduates” so that develop international business skills, language proficiency and cultural awareness in the future managers in a knowledge-based global economy. The requirements include not only academic and professional knowledge, but also multilingualism, and social and intercultural skills and attitudes (OECD, 1996: 128-129; Qiang, 2003: 248). It is argued that “industrialized countries are recognizing the need to provide their students with a global consciousness and with experience in other countries in order for them to compete in global economy” (Altbach, 2004: 1). For this reason, the curriculums are enriched by international considerations.

Private sector recently has involved more in the higher education sector. It has established their universities much operating with economic motives. The commoditization of higher education in international scale forced them to establish university with entrepreneur motives so as to maximize their incomes. Multinational corporations make HEIs to operate with entrepreneur concerns in the age of globalization. They need to provide quality education to attract more self-paying foreign students and increase their incomes, for this reason they emphasize more on stakeholder interests, e.g. MNCs. In addition to trade liberalization in educational services, HEIs force themselves to enhance their reputation and accreditation to compete in the international markets.

### **7.3.1. The Analysis of the Economic Rationale for AYU**

Kabasakal claimed that the economic rationale of the internationalization does not comply with the foundation of AYU. In fact, AYU is a public university in private status and financed by the both states. It was not designed to earn more money or for financial contribution for the national budgets.

Kabasakal mentioned,

I personally believe to the internationalization process in higher education in the world. But, AYU is not the result of internationalization of higher education and capitalist motives. It is mission-oriented entity. It was not built upon economic motives so as to attract students from diverse region of Eurasia. It is projected to create a common conscious, solidarity and brotherhood among all Turks. It is a model based on humanizm. It is the gift of Turkey for Kazakhstan and Turkic world.

Therefore, any further efforts for internationalization are not for income, but for education quality supplied for the youth of Turkic geography. In addition to the large part of the Kazakh students, the students admitted from out of Kazakhstan are not based on self-paying. The university even offers scholarships for those students coming from abroad. Since the budget contribution of both states is not sufficient to develop the university in expected level, university intends to diversify its income sources to realize its economic sustainability relative to the foundation years. In that sense, AYU's e-learning programs of distance learning faculty ensures the income generating activities. AYU's virtual department offered under the TÜRTEP are quite compatible with the arguments that the selected departments which supply education are closer to the market needs, e.g. management and computer sciences or industrial engineering.

Turkish and Kazakh economies benefit more from AYU graduates. Perhaps the economic rationale of the internationalization in terms of Turkey and Kazakhstan is greater than that of the university. The graduates are competent in Russian, Turkish, and English in addition to Kazakh language and recruited by multi-national corporations. Budak noted "some of Turkish students do not return Turkey. They prefer to stay in Kazakhstan and employed in Turkish companies in Kazakhstan and other Central Asian countries. They contribute to the development of economic relations of Turkey with Central Asia". The graduates who have competency in Russian and English are demanded more by Turkish tourism sector<sup>1</sup>. It is claimed that a tourism foundation from Antalya (Turkey) has demanded 500 students from the authorities of AYU<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Yalçın Bayer, "Turkistan'da Bir Üniversite" in Turkish daily Hürriyet, 21.09.2004.

<sup>2</sup> Güntay Şimşek, "Ahmet Yesevi Üniversitesi" in Turkish daily Sabah, 22.09.2004.

#### **7.4. Academic Rationale**

The improvement in both quality of research and teaching through the internationalized curricula is core criteria for the rationale which affects the number of recruited foreign students, and relatedly increase financial resources of HEIs. It is known that the enrichment of the curricula is strongly depends on presence of foreign faculty and students (Umakoshi, 1997). Furthermore, internationalization facilitates institutional building on the enhancement of human resources (student and faculty), technical (information and communication technology) infrastructure and management (organization) types. According to the IAU survey report the “rationales based on academic considerations for internationalization ranked higher than rationales based on political or economic considerations” (Knight, 2003).

The internationalized curriculum provides learning ambitions for all students without emphasize on national, ethnic, cultural, social and gender identities. In fact, it is stated that “academic study needs an international approach to avoid parochialism in scholarship and research and to stimulate critical thinking and enquiry” (Yang, 2002: 86). The five well-known models of curriculum internationalization are ensured upon; bringing the foreigners up to speed, education about cultural pluralism, benevolent multicultural segregation-separate development, bicultural education and multicultural education (Haigh, 2002: 57) which allow the graduates of an internationalized curriculum to easily perform within multicultural contexts and unfamiliar environments. Furthermore, Qiang argues (2003) such main components of academic rationale are:

- achieving international standards in teaching and research,
- ensuring that research addresses international and national issues,
- addressing global interdependence through scholarship and research,
- preparing graduates to be national and international citizens.

##### **7.4.1. The Analysis of the Academic Rationale for AYU**

Internationalization challenges universities to develop and modify their service quality and curricula systems to compete in the global markets. Since AYU was not an entity previously had existed, it has not altered its system to apply the necessities of “academic rationale”. Concomitantly, the structure of AYU best fits into the rationale. The mission of AYU emphasizes to “provide international education in line with the essentials of contemporary

sciences”. The “international” identity of the university; fiscal, administrative and academic autonomous of the university; the existence of foreign students (non-Kazakh) and the languages instructed allows AYU to meet the conditions of the rationale.

AYU allows its students to learn three or four foreign languages (Kazakh, Turkish, Russian, and English), which are seen as requirement for higher education and necessity in the global economy. Hence, the graduates of university may be recruited easier for the jobs supplied by Eurasian economies. Those students may recourse to the vacancies both in their countries and in foreign countries, such as the students coming from out of Turkey and Kazakhstan learn four additional languages apart from their native languages. Kabasakal argued “AYU partly has coherence with this rationale”. Apart from Kazakhstan and Turkey the students coming from other countries enhance the familiarity of the university in their countries, allow the accreditation of the diplomas internationally and contribute for the recognition of the university in international higher education area.

AYU is very sufficient in terms of supplying services in both international and national issues. The international relations faculty and Turcology faculty of Turkestan campus, Filology faculties of Chimkent and Taraz campuses provide many linguistic departments. Moreover, the research institutes of the university on archeology, ecology and Turkology are the best fields supplied perhaps for international issues. AYU has also larger opportunities to benefit from the accumulated experience of the academics of Turkey, Kazakhstan and other Turkic republics or communities. But, it is not realized in sufficient levels.

### **7.5. Socio-Cultural Rationale**

Internationalization is seen as an agent of multi-cultural ambiance and tolerance in which ethnocentrism is negated and home country introduces itself in terms of the peculiarities of its social and cultural life. The internationalization of higher education allows HEIs to compose international culture in campus to enhance the respect for other cultures and identities. The rationale favors social inclusion, cultural pluralism, world citizenship ahead of any smaller individual identity (Haigh, 2002). Hansen argues (2002: 11) international education and exchange helps to build understanding and tolerance of differences among people and cultures of the world. It is mentioned by Knight that (1997: 11) “the preservation and promotion of national

culture is a strong motivation for those countries which consider internationalization as a way to respect cultural diversity and counter balance the perceived homogenizing effect of globalization”.

Similarly, in the framework of the EHEA a project was designed, Campus Europe, which aims to benefit from cultural pluralism of Europe and achieve “unity in diversity” at the university campuses. In this respect, higher education is used as a tool oriented to shape European identity which supports Europe’s cultural diversity as a competitive advantage and to prepare European students for the global markets and multicultural environments of the future (Thoben, 2002). It is emphasized that one of the targets of “Campus Europe” is enabling the students to communicate in at least four European languages in addition to learning about other cultures. Qiang argues (2003) the components of socio-cultural rationale are:

- recognizing and support cultural and ethnic diversity,
- contributing to individual social and professional development,
- enhancing intercultural relations and understanding.

### **7.5.1. The Analysis of the Socio-Cultural Rationale for AYU**

The existence of various students from Turkic geography allows the students to be familiar with other Turkic cultures, languages and their peculiarities. In that sense, AYU allows those students to shape a high culture composed upon similarities rather than differences. AYU eliminates the ethno-centric orientations and tries to ensure a common culture which perhaps strength the unity of Turks in the world. AYU was assigned with the mission to bring Turkish and Turkich youths together on the basis of Turkic consciousness. Furthermore, the institutional culture of AYU shaped by Ahmet Yesevi thoughts enhance the ability of Turkish and Turkic students to internalize a universal and humanistic culture againts all other nations of the world. Kabasakal said “the strongest rationale comply with AYU is social rationale. Its main objective is to provide the students to know and embrace each other, familiar to the usage of other Turkic languages, and thus create a common awaransess”.

In that sense, the role of Turkish students is highlighted more by Turkish members of the Board. Turkish students are explicitly expected to represent Turkish culture and traditions. Budak emphasized

,

The selected Turkish students for AYU should be eligible in terms of representation. Because, the university to whom they anticipate to enroll was built and is supported by the contributions of the two states. Turkic students coming from out of Kazakhstan also internalize the great notion of Turkicness (Türklük) which has almost 300 million populations in the world. The students coming from remote and small Turkic communities are satisfied more with the feeling of member of such a great community relative to the emphasized micro-identities of the past.

The socio-cultural rationale of internationalization was not obtained externally, rather than AYU was designed in foundation years to achieve such a kind of socio-cultural environment which today matches with the rationale of the internationalization.

## **CHAPTER VIII**

### **CONCLUSION**

Initially it can be stated that AYU supplies international higher education service but it is not resulted from an institutional policy of AYU in regard to “the internationalization of higher education”. On the contrary, it is the result of objectives and structure of the university formulated by the regulation which was prepared in a period in which Turkish foreign policy toward Central Asian republics largely prompted by assertive nationalist arguments. By foundation, both political and socio-cultural rationales of the internationalization of higher education are quite supportive and compatible with the objectives behind the establishment of AYU. Economic rationale of the internationalization does not comply with the foundation and mission of AYU. As it is known, the rationale is focusing to increase university’s revenues; therefore HEIs aim to attain more international self-paying students. Since AYU offers non-paid education, the rationale is not compatible with the international education supplied by AYU. The university aims to attain more students in order to realize and expand the mission of AYU in diverse regions of Turkic geography. Therefore, it is stated that the endeavors to raise the number of students in AYU comes from humanistic concerns rather than economic motives. Unlike Turkestan campus, this is an important fact also behind the establishments of the other campuses in the Kazakh cities.

When it comes to the academic rationale, the fourth rationale, it is the single remaining rationale in which AYU will be challenged more by the internationalization process. The several recent activities of AYU match with academic rationale of the internationalization. AYU is forced to enhance the quality of its service in order to increase the student numbers and realize the mission. The challenge and efforts of AYU would ensure him to be able to compete with its rivals namely other Turkish universities in Central Asia. As the competition increase in time, AYU will be more involved in the internationalization process by the means of increasing student, staff and curriculum mobility. In this challenge the biggest advantage of AYU is its autonomous status and support of the both founder states. But, the biggest weakness is the competition is resulted from other Turkish universities established in Central Asian republics. Because, they have same target groups in terms of student population.

The autonomous status of AYU in terms of academic, administrative and fiscal spheres facilitates the university to manipulate and modify its system according to the requirements of the students, society, market, and other stakeholders. The flexible structure of AYU enables him to make innovations and take measurements complying with the internationalization process like as the cooperation agreements with other external universities on Turcology departments and virtual education programmes supplied through TÜRTEP.

AYU seems more involved in curriculum mobility both in regional and international scale, but still is in lack in terms of student and staff mobility. The lack of internationalization in AYU can be stated as the shortage of foreign students other than Turkish and Kazakh students. But, it is the fact that Ahmet Yesevi Turkestan State University established in 1991 and has been replaced with International Hoca Ahmet Yesevi Turk-Kazakh University by January 1993 which more fits into the the internationalization of higher education process relative to the previous ones. The higher education, which was launched in Turkestan State University, has transformed from nationalism stage to regionalism by the establishment of AYU, and by 2000s it has obtained more convergence with the internationalism.

The significance of AYU comes from being the first “transnational public university” established in “private status” in Central Asia. AYU has generated a new model in international higher education for the world. It is not only the university of Turkey and Kazakhstan. The sphere of influence of the university also includes the geography where the other Turkic republics and communities live. The major cements of the university are “being international” and named after “Hoca Ahmet Yesevi”. While the former one corresponds to the academic rationale of the internationalization, the latter one corresponds to socio-cultural rationale. Both of them have further contributions in terms of motivating and attracting students from out of Kazakhstan. It can be stated that mission of the university ensures the “axes of goals” (*political rationale*); but international education and Ahmet Yesevi’s principles fulfill the “axes of tools” (*academic and socio-cultural rationale*).

AYU, as indicated in his name, is an international university. It allows to the enrollment of students of other nations. But, by the regulation, it solely admits students from the Turkic origin countries and communities. His sphere of influence emphasizes more on the regional context, namely Turkic geography. In contrast, paradoxically, AYU accepts students from other world



countries. In fact, the system of student admission works upon the basis of citizenship. AYU has Russian students who are the citizen of Kazakhstan, and has students from other Turkic communities who are the citizens of their own resident country, e.g. Bulgaria, Ukraine or China. Therefore, the connotation of the term “international” is true. The international dimension of AYU matches also with the principles of Hoca Ahmet Yesevi which have universal emphasis, and makes difference from other rival Turkish universities of Central Asia.

On the other hand, AYU is not an ultimate or true case of internationalization in higher education that is widely experienced by the United States and other developed countries. AYU has an intermediate position between the national and international contexts. It submits a true case of regionalism in higher education. It has regional concerns and firstly was assigned with the mission for the regional students, namely Turkic students. Despite its regional dimension and identity, AYU gradually has involved in the internationalization process by 2000s. It can be worded it is regional, but closer to the internationalism stage. In future, it seems to keep its regional dimension in accordance with its regulation, but will be more forced to meet requirements of the internationalization process fostered by international higher education activities.

As similar to regional economic integrations fostered within the globalization process, there are also such regional higher education integrations in the world accelerated by the internationalization of higher education. Those integrations have eradicated national borders for international higher education. They aim to foster students and staff mobility and increase the knowledge sharing and international understanding despite the cultural diversities. By regulation, AYU has established for the higher education of all Turkish and Turkic youths and purposing to supply contemporary education and achieve the “common conscious” which are highlighted as the core issues in the challenge of Turkic people in information age. These facts may facilitate the way for the further development of Turkic dimension of higher education. In that sense, the regional intergrations in higher education among European countries or among other Asian and Pacific countries demonsrate outstanding living models for AYU. Because of its concessive and premier position among other Turkish universities in Central Asia, AYU could be the most suitable Turkish university in Central Asia correspond to the position of pioneering to the regional higher education integration of Central Asian republics or that of Turkic geography.

## REFERENCES

- Aigner, J. S., Nelson, P., and Stimpfl J.R. 1992. “*Internationalizing the University: Making It work*,” CBIS Federal: Springfield, Virginia.
- Akşit, B. 2000. “Bilgi Toplumuna Geçiş ve Üniversiteler; Şu Andaki Durum ve Yeniden Yapılanma Konusunda Bazı Söylem ve Tartışmalar,” *Bilgi Toplumuna Geçiş*, Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Yayınları, No.: 3, pp.: 343-370.
- Altbach, G. P. 2004. “Higher Education Cross Borders: Can The United States Remain The Top Destination For Foreign Students?,” *Change*, March-April, pp.:1-12.
- Avşar, B. Z., and Solak, F. 1998. *Türkiye ve Türk Cumhuriyetleri*. Vadi Yayınları.
- Aydın, M. 1998. Turkey at the Threshold of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Global Encounters and/vs Regional Alternatives. *International Relations Foundation*: Ankara.
- Aydın, M. 1999. “Global Değişim ve Genişleyen Türk Dünyası: Türkler ve Türkiler,” *Liberal Düşünce*, Vol.: 4 (13), pp.: 109-120.
- Aydın, M. 2000. *New Geopolitics of Central Asia and the Caucasia: Causes of Instability and Predicament*. SAM Papers: Ankara.
- Ayhaber, 1998a. No.: 6, Ahmet Yesevi Üniversitesi Yayınları: Ankara.
- Ayhaber, 2000. No.: 15, Ahmet Yesevi Üniversitesi Yayınları: Ankara.
- Ayhaber, 2002. No.: 16, Ahmet Yesevi Üniversitesi Yayınları: Ankara.
- Ayhaber, 2004. No.: 28, Ahmet Yesevi Üniversitesi Yayınları: Ankara.
- AYU, 2001. *10. Yıl Kataloğu*, Türkistan.
- AYU, 2002. *Booklet*.
- Bartell, M. 2003. “Internationalization of Universities: A University Culture-Based Framework,” *Higher Education*, Vol.: 45, pp.: 43-70.
- Behar, B.E. et. al. 1994. *Bağımsızlığın İlk Yılları*, T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları: Ankara.
- Birgerson, S.M. 2002. *After the Break-up of a Multi-Ethnic Empire*. Praeger: Westport.
- Boranbayeva, G. S. 2004. “SSCB Dönemi ve Bağımsızlık Sonrası Kazakistan Cumhuriyeti’nde Kazak Dilinin Genel Durumu”, *Modern Türklük Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Cilt 1, Sayı 1, pp.: 20-41.
- Bozkurt, V. 2004. *Değişen Dünya’da Sosyoloji*. Alfa Yayınları: İstanbul.

- BSEC, 2002. *Tenth Anniversary Almanac*.
- Callan, H. 2000. "Higher Education Internationalization Strategies: of Marginal Significance or All-Pervasive?," *Higher Education in Europe*, Vol.: 15, No.:1, pp.: 15-23.
- Cem, İ. 2001. *Turkey in the New Century*. Rustem Publishing: Mersin.
- Demir, C.E., Balcı, A., and Akkök, F. 2000. "The Role of Turkish Schools in the Educational System and Social Transformation of Central Asian Countries: The Case of Turkmenistan and Kyrgyzstan," *Central Asian Survey*, 19(1), pp.: 141-155.
- Develi, H. 1999. *Ahmed Yesevi*. Şule Yayınları: İstanbul.
- DİE, 1993. *Eski SSCB Cumhuriyetleri İstatistik Göstergeleri 1970-1992*. DİE Yayınları: Ankara.
- DPT, 1996. *Yedinci Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planı (1996-2000)*. Ankara.
- DPT, 2000a. *Türkiye İle Türk Cumhuriyetleri ve Bölge Ülkeleri ile İlişkiler: Özel İhtisas Komisyonu Raporu*. Ankara.
- DPT, 2000b. *Sekizinci Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planı (2001-2005)*. Ankara.
- DPT, 2005. *Yıllık Program*. Ankara.
- Dugin, A. 2003. *Rus Jeopolitiği: Avrasyacı Yaklaşım*. Küre Yayınları: İstanbul.
- Efegil, E. and Akçalı, P. 2003 (ed.). *Orta Asya'nın Sosyo-Kültürel Sorunları: Kimlik, İslam, Milliyet ve Etnisite*. Gündoğan Yayınları: İstanbul.
- EIU (Economic Intelligent Unit) 2003. *Kazakhstan Country Profile 2003*. London.
- Fuller, G. E.1992. *Central Asia: The New Geopolitics*. Rand Corporation: Santa Monica.
- Haghayeghi, M. 1995. *Islam and Politics in Central Asia*. St. Martin's Press: New York.
- Haigh, M.J. 2002. "Internationalisation of the Curriculum: designing inclusive education for a small world," *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, Vol.: 26, No.: 1, pp.: 49-66.
- Hansen, H. M. 2002. "Defining International Education," *New Directions for Higher Education*, No.: 117, pp.: 5-12.
- Huisman, J., Schrier, E., and Vossensteyn, H. 1998. "Breaking Fresh Ground: Regional Cooperation in Higher Education," *Higher Education in Europe*, Vol.: 23, No.: 2, pp.: 253-261.
- Huseyinov, F. 2002. "Relations of European Union-Turk Republics and Turkey," *TICA Eurasian Studies*, No.: 21, pp.: 61-82.
- Iredale, R. 2001. "The Migration of Professionals: Theories and Typologies," *International Migration*, Vol.: 39, No.: 5, pp.: 7-24.
- Karadeli, C. 2003. *Soğuk Savaş Sonrasında Avrupa ve Türkiye*. Ayraç Yayınevi: Ankara.

- Kasnakođlu, H. 2003. "Nüfus ve Ekonomi," *Türkiye'nin Nüfus ve Kalkınma Yazını*. TÜBA Raporları, Sayı 3, pp.:16-19, Ankara.
- Kenjetay, D. 2003. *Hoca Ahmet Yesevi'nin Düşünce Sistemi*. Hoca Ahmet Yesevi Ocađı Yayınları: Ankara.
- Kerr, C.1990. The "Internationalization of Learning and the Nationalization of the Purposes of Higher Education: Two "laws of motion" in conflict," *European Journal of Education*, Vol.: 25 (1), pp.: 5-22.
- Kesici, K. 2003. "Kazakistan'ın Nüfus Stratejisi ve Deđişen Demografik Dengeler," *TİKA Avrasya Etüüleri*, No.: 25, pp.: 75-91.
- Kitamura, K. 1997. "Policy Issue in Japanese Higher Education," *Higher Education*, Vol.: 34, pp.: 141-150.
- Knight, J. 1997. "A shared vision? Stakeholders' perspectives on the internationalization of higher education in Canada," *Journal of Studies on International Education*, Spring, pp.: 24-44.
- Knight, J. and De Wit, H. (Eds). 1997b. Internationalization of Higher Education in Asia Pacific Countries. *European Association for International Education*. Amsterdam.
- Kongar, E. 2002. *Toplumsal Deđişme Kuramları ve Türkiye Gerçeđi*. Remzi Kitabevi: İstanbul.
- Macukow, B. and Witkowski, M. 2001. "Non-university Sector of Higher Education. Closer to the labour market," *European Journal of Engineering Education*, Vol.: 26 (3), pp.: 241-246.
- Marshall, G. 1999 (ed.). *Sosyoloji Sözlüđü*, Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları: Ankara.
- MEB, 1998. *Türk Cumhuriyetleri ile Türk ve Akraba Toplulukları ile Eğitim İlişkilerimiz*. Ankara.
- MEB, 2004. *Sayısal Veriler*. Ankara.
- MEB, 2005. *Sayısal Veriler*. Ankara.
- Nazarbayev, N. 2000. *Yüzyılların Kavşaađında*. Bilig Yayınları: Ankara.
- Ocak, A.Y. 1996. *Türk Sufiliđine Bakıřlar*. İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul.
- OECD, 1996. *Internationalisation of Higher Education*. Center for Educational Research and Innovation.
- OECD, 1998. *Redefining Tertiary Education*. OECD Publications: Paris.
- OECD, 1999. *Reviews of National Policies for Education: Tertiary Education and Research in the Russian Federation*.
- OECD, 2004a. "Foreign Students in Tertiary Education," *Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators 2004*, pp.: 293-313.

OECD, 2004b. *On Edge: Securing a Sustainable Future for Higher Education*. Report of the OECD/IMHE-HEFCE Project on financial management and governance of higher education institutions.

Olcott, M.B. 1997. "Kazakhstan: Pushing for Eurasia," In Bremmer, I. & Taras, R. (eds.), *New States New Politics: Building the Post-Soviet Nations*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, pp.: 547-570.

Olcott, M.B. 2002. *Kazakhstan: Unfilled Promise*. Carnegie Endowment For International Peace: Washington D.C.

Oran, B. 2001. "Kafkasya ve Orta Asya'yla İlişkiler," *Türk Dış Politikası*, İletişim Yayınları: İstanbul, Cilt II, pp.: 366-440.

Qiang, Z. 2003. "Internationalization of Higher Education: Towards a Conceptual Framework," *Policy Futures in Education*, Canada, Volume 1 (2), pp.: 248-261.

Ramet, P. 1978. "Migration and Nationality Policy in Soviet Central Asia," *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations*, Vol. 6 (1), Fall/Winter, pp.: 79-101.

Rudder, D. H. 2000. "On the Europeanization of Higher Education in Europe," *International Higher Education*, No.: 19, pp.: 4-6.

Rumer, B (ed.). 2002. "The Search for Stability in Central Asia," *Central Asia: A Gathering Storm*. M.E. Sharpe: New York, pp.: 3-66.

Schatz, E. 2004. *Modern Clan Politics: The Power of Blood in Kazakhstan and Beyond*. University of Washington Press.

Şen, M. 2001. Turkish Entrepreneurs in Central Asia: The Case of Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation in Sociology. Middle East Technical University: Ankara.

Shepherd, I., Monk, J.J., and Fortuijn, J.D. 2000. "Internationalizing Geography in Higher Education: Towards a Conceptual Framework," *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, Vol. 24 (2), pp.: 285-298.

TİKA, 1998. *Kazakistan Ülke Raporu*. TİKA: Ankara.

TİKA, 2005. *Avrasya Bülteni*, Sayı: 30, TİKA: Ankara.

Tishkov, V. 1997. *Ethnicity, Nationalism and Conflict in and After the Soviet Union: The Mind A Flame*, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development and International Peace Research Institute, Sage Publications: Oslo.

Togan, İ. 1998. *Flexibility and Limitation in Steppe Formations*. Koninklijke Brill: Leiden.

Toker, Y. et al. 1984. *Ahmet Yesevi Divan-ı Hikmet and Edip Ahmet Atabet'ül Hakayık*. Toker Yayınları: İstanbul.

Trimingham, J.S. 1998. *The Sufi Orders in Islam*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, New York.

Uludağ, İ. Serin, V. 1990. *SSCB'ndeki Türk Cumhuriyetlerinin Sosyo-Ekonomik Analizleri ve Türkiye ile İlişkileri*. İstanbul Ticaret Odası Yayınları: İstanbul.

Umakoshi, T. 1997. "Internationalization of Japanese Higher Education in the 1980's and Early 1990's," *Higher Education*, No.: 34, pp.: 259-273.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme), 1997. *Education Sector Review: Turkmenistan*.

Van Damme, D. 2001. "Quality Issues in the Internationalization of Higher Education," *Higher Education*, No.: 41, pp.: 415-441.

Wagner, A. and Schnitzer, K. 1991. "Programmes and Policies for Foreign Students and Study Abroad: the search for effective approaches in a new global setting," *Higher Education*, Vol.: 21, pp.: 275-288.

Wende, M.V. 2001. The International Dimension in National Higher Education Policies: what has changed in Europe in the last five years?," *European Journal of Education*, Vol.: 36 (4), pp.: 431-441.

Yaman, E. 2002. "Turkish World from Past to Future," *TICA Eurasian Studies*, No.: 23, pp.: 3-12.

Yaman, Ş. 2001. "Türk Cumhuriyetlerinde Ekonomik Reformların 10. Yılı," *Dış Ticaret Dergisi*, Ocak Özel Sayısı. Ankara.

Yang, R. 2002. "University Internationalization: Its Meanings, Rationales and Implications," *Intercultural Education*, Vol.: 13 (1), pp.: 81-96.

Yelland, R. 2000. "Supranational Organisations and Transnational Education," *Higher Education in Europe*, Vol.: 25 (3), pp.: 297-303.

Yılmaz, D. 1995. *Yesevi Irmakları*, Ötüken: İstanbul.

YÖK, 2003. *Türk Yükseköğretiminin Bugünkü Durumu*. YÖK Yayınları: Ankara.

YÖK, 2004. *2003-2004 Yılı Yükseköğretim İstatistikleri*. ÖSYM Yayınları: Ankara.

Zeybek, N.K. 2003. *Ahmet Yesevi Yolu ve Hikmetler*. Ay Basım Yayınlar: Ankara.

Zeybek, N.K. 2005. *Türk Olmak*. Ocak Yayınları: Ankara.

Zhukov, S. 2002. "Central Asia Development Under Conditions of Globalization," in B. Rumer (ed.) *Central Asia: A Gathering Storm*, M.E. Sharpe: New York, pp.: 333-375.

## Internet Sources

*Ahmed Yasawi Kazak-Turkish International University*. Retrieved March 11, 2005 from <http://www.Turkestan.kz/default1.htm>

*Ahmet Yesevi Üniversitesi (Uluslararası Ahmet Yesevi Türk-Kazak Üniversitesi)*. Retrieved February 11, 2005 from <http://www.yesevi.edu.tr>

*Ahmet Yesevi Üniversitesi (Ahmet Yesevi Kimdir)*. Retrieved February 11, 2005, from <http://www.yesevi.edu.tr/?sayfa=ayk>

*Ahmet Yesevi Üniversitesi (Akademik Yapılanma)*. Retrieved February 11, 2005, from <http://www.yesevi.edu.tr/?sayfa=akyap>

*Ahmet Yesevi Üniversitesi (Yaygın Eğitim)*. Retrieved February 11, 2005, from <http://www.yesevi.edu.tr/?sayfa=yayegt>

Akiner, Ş. (2001). *Regional Cooperation in Central Asia*. Retrieved April 15, 2005, from <http://www.nato.int/docu/colloq/2001/2001-17e.pdf>

*American University in Washington D.C.* Retrieved March 11, 2005, from <http://www.american.edu>

*American University of Hawaii*. Retrieved March 11, 2005, from <http://www.auh.edu/about.htm>

*American University-Central Asia (About AUCA)*. Retrieved March 11, 2005, from <http://www.auca.kg/about>

Ayupova, Z. DeYoung, A. J. (1998). *The Conceptualization of Educational System Reforms in the Republic of Kazakhstan*. Retrieved May 5, 2005, from <http://www.indiana.edu/%7Eisre/NEWSLETTER/vol7no1/Deyoung.htm>

Ayvazoğlu, B. (1996). Ata Yurduna Vefa Borcu. *Aksiyon Dergisi*, Sayı 101. Retrieved March 4, 2005, from <http://www.aksiyon.com.tr/detay.php?id=19137>

Bekturganov, N.S. *Kazakhstan*. Retrieved April 15, 2005, from <http://www.ibe.unesco.org/International/ICE/ministers/Kazakhstan.pdf>

Bilici, A. (2000). Davos'ta Türk Okulları. *Aksiyon Dergisi*, Sayı 270. Retrieved March 4, 2005, from <http://www.aksiyon.com.tr/detay.php?id=14776>

Bilici, A. (2001). ABD Orta Asya'da Üstleniyor. *Aksiyon Dergisi*, Sayı 369. Retrieved March 4, 2005, from <http://www.aksiyon.com.tr/detay.php?id=17872>

Bilici, A. Başyurt, E. & Dikbaş, K. (2001). Bağımsızlığın 10. Yılı. *Aksiyon Dergisi*, Sayı 333. Retrieved March 4, 2005, from <http://www.aksiyon.com.tr/detay.php?id=13129>

*Campus Europae Concept*. Retrieved May 13, 2005, from [www.bologna-berlin2003.de/pdf/Campus.pdf](http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/pdf/Campus.pdf)

- De Wit, H. *Internationalization of Higher Education: Meaning, Rationales, Approaches, Strategies, Models and Current Issues*. Retrieved May 6, 2005, from [http://www.autc.gov.au/visiting\\_scholar/documents/de\\_wit1.pdf](http://www.autc.gov.au/visiting_scholar/documents/de_wit1.pdf)
- Eren, M.A. (1999). Okullara Karşı Olan Türkiye'ye Karşıdır. *Aksiyon Dergisi*, Sayı 216. Retrieved March 4, 2005, from <http://www.aksiyon.com.tr/detay.php?id=16140>
- Forest, J. (1995). *Regionalizm in Higher education: An International Look at National and Institutional Interdependence*. Retrieved February, 25, 2005, from <http://www.higher-ed.org/resources/JF/regionalism.pdf>
- Global Policy Forum*. Retrieved May 6, 2005, from [www.globalpolicy.org/globaliz/cultural/2003](http://www.globalpolicy.org/globaliz/cultural/2003)
- Glossary (Branch Campus)*. Retrieved from April 15, 2005, from <http://www.calib.com/education/index.cfm?fuseaction=gloss>
- Hodja Ahmed Yasevi International Turk-Kazakh University*. Retrieved April 22, 2005, from <http://byegm.gov.tr/YAYINLARIMIZ/newspot/18/N26.htm>
- International Organizations: Education, Culture, Exchange*. Retrieved April 29, 2005, from <http://www.civilsoc.org/usnisorg/usnisedu.htm>
- Kazakhstan National Report on Higher Education System Development*. Retrieved April 15, 2005, from [http://www.unesco.kz/education/he/kazakh/kazakh\\_eng.htm](http://www.unesco.kz/education/he/kazakh/kazakh_eng.htm)
- Kazakhstan*. Retrieved April 15, 2005, from [www.euroeducation.net/prof/kazanco.htm](http://www.euroeducation.net/prof/kazanco.htm)
- Kırgızistan-Türkiye Manas Üniversitesi (Kuruluş ve Misyonu)*. Retrieved March 11, 2005, from <http://www.manas.kg/index?id=2>
- Knight, J. (eds.) (2003). *Internationalization of Higher Education Practices and Priorities: 2003 IAU Survey Report*. Retrieved May 16, 2005, from [http://aei.dest.gov.au/AEI/MIP/ItemsOfInterest/04Interest34\\_pdf.pdf](http://aei.dest.gov.au/AEI/MIP/ItemsOfInterest/04Interest34_pdf.pdf)
- Knight, J. (2002). Trade in Higher Education Services: The Implications of GATS, *The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education*, London. Retrieved April 15, 2005, from <http://www.obhe.ac.uk/products/reports/publicaccesspdf/March2002.pdf>
- Kurmanaliyev, M. Köksoy, M. (2002). Ahmet Yesevi Üniversitesinde Uzaktan Eğitim Uygulamaları. Retrieved 28 April, 2005, from *Anadolu University, Open and Distance Education Symposium (in May 2002 in Eskişehir)* Web site: [http://aof20.anadolu.edu.tr/bildiriler/Musrepbek\\_Kurmanaliyev%20.doc](http://aof20.anadolu.edu.tr/bildiriler/Musrepbek_Kurmanaliyev%20.doc)
- Laumulin, M. Turkey and Central Asia. *Central Asia's Affairs*, 3, 14-19. Retrieved April 14, 2005, from [www.kisi.kz/English/Geopolitics](http://www.kisi.kz/English/Geopolitics)
- List of State-owned Higher Educational Institutions of the Republic of Kazakhstan*. Retrieved April 29, 2005, from [http://www.president.kz/articles/Science/Science\\_container.asp?lng=en&art=college](http://www.president.kz/articles/Science/Science_container.asp?lng=en&art=college)



*MEB (Projeler)*. Retrieved April 15, 2005, from <http://yeogm.meb.gov.tr/webim/hizmetler/proje.htm>

Nokkala, T. (2002). *National Policy Response to the Globalization of Higher Education*. University of Tampere, Finland. Retrieved April 22, 2005 from Utwente University Web site: <http://www.utwente.nl/cheps/documenten/susunokkola.pdf>

*OECD's CERI*. Retrieved May 23, 2005, from [http://www.oecd.org/document/0,2340,en\\_2649\\_33723\\_2516571\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/0,2340,en_2649_33723_2516571_1_1_1_1,00.html)

*OECD's Higher Education Management and Policy*. Retrieved, May 23, 2005, from <http://www.oecdwash.org/PUBS/PERIOD/per-hem.htm>

*Official Kazakhstan (Science Education)*. Retrieved April 29, 2005, from <http://www.president.kz/main/mainframe.asp?lng=en>

*MEB (Öğrenci Seçimi)*. Retrieved April 15, 2005, from <http://yeogm.meb.gov.tr/webim/rehber/TCS.htm>

Özcan, Z. (2005). Avrasya'nın Ekol Okulları. *Aksiyon Dergisi*, Sayı 529. Retrieved March 4, 2005, from <http://www.aksiyon.com.tr/detay.php?id=19436>

*Qafqaz Universiteti*. Retrieved from March 11, 2005, from <http://www.qafqaz.edu.az>

Ryukoko University. *Long-Term Plan IV: Aiming for Realization of Ryukoko University's Vision in the beginning of the 21st Century*. Retrieved May 6, 2005, from [www.ryukoku.ac.jp/english/university/project](http://www.ryukoku.ac.jp/english/university/project)

*System of Education in the Republic of Kazakhstan*. Retrieved April 29, 2005, from [http://www.president.kz/articles/Science/Science\\_container.asp?lng=en&art=education](http://www.president.kz/articles/Science/Science_container.asp?lng=en&art=education)

Taygar, S. (1997). Kırgızlar Bir Destan Daha Yazıyor. *Aksiyon Dergisi*, Sayı 151. Retrieved March 4, 2005, from <http://www.aksiyon.com.tr/detay.php?id=17779>

*TBMM Tutanak Dergisi* (2001, Mayıs). Retrieved May 3, 2005, from <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/tutanak/donem21/yil3/bas/b095m.htm>

*TİKA Hakkında*. Retrieved May 6, 2005, from <http://www.tika.gov.tr/hakkinda.asp>

*Türk Dünyası Araştırmalar Vakfı*. Retrieved May 20, 2005, from <http://www.turan.org/bilgi.htm>

*Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları Vakfı (Yurtdışı Eğitim)*. Retrieved May 20, 2005, from [http://www.turan.org/etkinlik/yd\\_egitim.htm](http://www.turan.org/etkinlik/yd_egitim.htm)

*Türk Dünyasında İlklerimiz*. Retrieved May 20, 2005, from [www.turan.org/etkinlik/ilklr.htm](http://www.turan.org/etkinlik/ilklr.htm)

*Türk ve Akraba Toplulukları ile İlişkiler*. Retrieved March 18, 2005, from <http://www.yok.gov.tr/egitim/raporlar/mart99/bolum10.html>

*Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Hükümetleri (Hükümet Programları-Turkish Governments' Programmes)*. Retrieved February 4, 2005, from <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/hukümetler.htm>

*UNESCO (University Quality and Mobility: Cross-border Providers of Higher Education)*. Retrieved from May 13, 2005, from [http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=21773&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/ev.php-URL_ID=21773&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html)

*UNESCO (University Quality and Mobility: Objectives)*. Retrieved May 13, 2005, from [http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=21666&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/ev.php-URL_ID=21666&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html)

*UNESCO-CEPES*. Retrieved May 13, 2005, from [http://www.un.ro/unesco\\_cepess.html](http://www.un.ro/unesco_cepess.html)

*Waseda University*. Retrieved May 6, 2005, from [www.waseda.jp/eng/news04](http://www.waseda.jp/eng/news04)

*YÖK (2005 ÖSYS Kılavuzunda Yer Alan Yurtdışı Üniversitelerine Ait Bilgiler)*. Retrieved March 18, 2005, from [http://www.yok.gov.tr/egitim/osys\\_yurtdisi\\_bilgi\\_2002.htm](http://www.yok.gov.tr/egitim/osys_yurtdisi_bilgi_2002.htm)

*Zhakenov, G. Kazakhstan National Report on Higher Education System Development*. Retrieved April 15, 2005, from [http://www.unesco.kz/education/he/kazakh/kazakh\\_eng.htm](http://www.unesco.kz/education/he/kazakh/kazakh_eng.htm)

## **Newspaper**

Akyol, T. "Kazakistan Tecrübesi", *Milliyet*, 04.07.2003.

Ulagay, O. "Yabancı Öğrenci ABD'den Kaçıyor", *Milliyet*, 06.12.2004.

Şimşek, G. "Ahmet Yesevi Üniversitesi", *Sabah*, 22.09.2004.

Bayer, Y. "Turkestan'da Bir Üniversite", *Hürriyet*, 21.09.2004.

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX A

#### THE ALLOCATED QUOTAS TO TURKIC STUDENTS

In 2003-2004, the allocated higher education quotas to Turkic Republics, Turkic and Relative Communities have decreased to 1.400 in total relative to the projected high numbers in 1992-1993.

Rank	Republics/Communities	Quotas	Rank	Republics/Communities	Quotas
1	Azerbaijan	150	26	Chechenia	7
2	Kazakhstan	150	27	Croatia	5
3	Kyrgyzstan	150	28	Lebanon	5
4	Turkmenistan	150	29	Ukraine	5
5	Bulgaria	83	30	Moldova	5
6	Meskhetian Turks	70	31	Yugoslavia	5
7	Mongolia	60	32	Sancak Turks	5
8	Kosova	50	33	Torbeş, Boşnak	5
9	Iraqi Turkmens	50	34	Daghestan	5
10	Tajikistan	40	35	Kabardino-Balkaria	5
11	Crimean Tatars	40	36	Karachai-Cherkessiya	5
12	FYR Macedonia	40	37	Tuva	5
13	Gagauz	35	38	Jordan	4
14	Tatarstan	30	39	Baltic Countries	4
15	Bosna-Herzegovina	30	40	Adıgey	3
16	Albania and others	25	41	Buryat	3
17	Albania	20	42	Chuvashistan	3
18	Western Thrace	20	43	Khakasia	3
19	Romania	20	44	Ingusetya	3
20	Afghanistan	20	45	Sakha (Yakuts)	3
21	Syria Turkmens	20	46	Altai	3
22	China	20	47	Montenegro	2
23	Iran	10	48	Belorussia	2
24	Georgia	10	49	Kalmukya	1
25	Bashkortostan	10	50	Şor Turks	1
<b>Total</b>			<b>1400</b>		

(Source: YÖK, 2003: 137).

## APPENDIX B

### THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD IN 2005

<b>Name-Surname</b>	<b>Public Duty During The Appointment</b>
Namık Kemal Zeybek	Head Adviser of Turkish Prime Minister
Prof. Dr. Rıza Ayhan	Rector of Gazi University
Prof. Dr. Mustafa İsen	Undersecretariat of Turkish Ministry of Culture
Dr. Öner Kabasakal	Head of TICA
Feyzullah Budak	Economist in Turkish Ministry of Finance
Prof. Dr. Serik Piraliyev	Rector of AYU
Aida Kurmanagaliyeva	Kazakh Ministry of Economy and Budget Planning
Kulaş Şamşidinova	Vice Minister in Kazakh Education and Science Ministry
Kuanganov Farhad Şaymuratuli	Kazakh Prime Ministry Head of General Documents, Chair of Social and Cultural Development Division
Nurjan Ajimetov	Kazakh Ministry of Finance

(Source: <http://www.yesevi.edu.tr>, 20.05.2005; Unpublished Document).

## APPENDIX C

### AHMET YESEVI UNIVERSITY AND MANAS UNIVERSITY COMPARED

Characteristics	Ahmet Yesevi University	Manas University
Turkish denomination	Ahmet Yesevi Üniversitesi	Manas Üniversitesi
Foundation agreement signed on	31 October 1992 in Ankara	30 September 1995 in İzmir
Duration of the agreement	Not existed	25 years
Location	Turkestan	Bishkek
Education offered since	1995-1996 ( <i>for Turkish students</i> )	1997-1998
Status	common and autonomous; administrative, academic and fiscal autonomy	common and autonomous; corporate body and scientific autonomy
Student fee	Non-paid ( <i>some parts of the Kazakh students are exceptional</i> )	Non-paid ( <i>some parts of the Kyrgyz students are exceptional</i> )
Higher governing body	Board of Trustees	Board of Trustees ( <i>but not in office</i> )
Board of Trustees	10 members (Head is from Turkey and appointed by Turkish President). Rector is member of the Board.	8 members (Head is from Turkey and appointed by “joint decree” ( <i>müşterek kararname</i> )). Rector is not member of the Board.
Rectorate	Rector is Kazakh, proposed by the senate and appointed by the Board for five years. The first vice rector is Turkish and appointed by YÖK.	Rector is Kyrgyz, proposed by the Board and appointed by Kyrgyz government. The first vice rector ( <i>acting rector-rektör vekili</i> ) is Turkish proposed by the Board and appointed by YÖK
Turkish academics	Turkish universities may send academics to AYU	By the proposal of rectorate and demand of the Board appointed by YÖK
Education levels	Pre-undergraduate, Undergraduate, Graduatuate and Post-graduate	Pre-undergraduate, Undergraduate, Graduatuate and Post-graduate
Budget	Co-finance of the both states <i>Student fee, grants and commercial activities of the university</i>	Co-finance of the both states <i>Student fee, grants and commercial activities of the university</i>
Regulation	Signed in June 1993 (21 articles)	Signed in December 1995 (25 articles)
Instruction language	Kazakh and Turkish languages	Kyrgyz and Turkish languages
Student quotas	50 % for Kazakh, 25 % for Turkish and 25 % for Turkic students	No allocation in percentage, but in the foundation agreement, it is emphasized that Kyrgyz, Turkish and Turkic students are in priority

(Appendix C continued)

<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Ahmet Yesevi University</b>	<b>Manas University</b>
Student admission Procedures for (1) Home country students (2) Turkish students (3) Turkic students	(1) Kazakh central exam (2) ÖSYM exam plus the exams of The Board of Trustees (3) Through the ministries or a sister university. If the demand is high. AYU held its exam there	(1) Kyrgyzstan-Turkey Manas University Students Selection Exam (2) ÖSS exam held by ÖSYM (3) Turkish TCS and YÖS exams
Diplomas	Acknowledged in both countries	Acknowledged in both countries
Number of students	More than 20.000	Almost 2.000
Education types	Formal, Extern and Virtual (Distance Learning)	Formal
Mission	The aim of the university emphasize to raise creative and constructive students who bound to; essentials of democratic, secular and contemporary state, equipped with a level of knowledge and skill could meet the needs of future centuries, bound to national and moral values, having free and scientific thought power, respect to human rights, having a wider world view, having balanced personal development in terms of body, mind, spirit and moral, having feeling of responsibility for society.	The mission of the university is to secure an education, in community for the Kyrgyz and Turkish young people as well as for the young in other Turkic Republics and communities, along with helping them develop common approach and cooperation. It is believed that in this way the university will contribute to contemporary scientific developments and will support the renaissance of Turkic civilization.
Campus(es) in	Turkestan, Chimkent, Taraz, Kentav and Almaty	Bishkek
Numbers of faculties and departments	22 faculties (including extern education) and more than 70 departments	4 faculties and 13 departments
Numbers of Vocational High Schools	1 (in scope of TÜRTEP)	3
The name of institutions	- Institute of Turkology - Institute for the Development of Kazakh and Turkish Economies - Institute of Ecology	- Institution of sciences - Social Science Institution
The name of research centers	- Archeological Researches - Center and Information Center	Turkic Civilization Research Center

(Source:<http://www.yok.gov.tr/mevzuat/tuzuk/tuzuk4.html>, 16.05.2005; <http://www.yok.gov.tr/mevzuat/tuzuk/tuzuk3.html>, 16.05.2005; <http://www.manas.kg/index.php?lang=en>, 16.05.2005; <http://www.yesevi.edu.tr>, 11.02.2005).

## APPENDIX D

### AMERICAN UNIVERSITY-CENTRAL ASIA

The American University in Central Asia (AU-CA)<sup>1</sup> is a selective liberal arts University based upon the American model and located in the former Soviet republic of Kyrgyzstan. The mission of the AUCA is to promote civil society, to train a new generation of leadership for Central Asia, to encourage independent thinking, problem solving and ethical behaviors, and to promote new pedagogical methods including interactive learning and research skills.

The American University has had its roots in the Kyrgyz American School of the National State University. In 1993 a group of faculty who believed that reform in higher education was progressing too slowly, broke away and started an independent institution, originally called KAF. In 1997, KAF became the American University in Kyrgyzstan, sponsored by the United States Department of State, George Soros' Open Society Institute, and the Kyrgyz Government. The American University is chartered in Kyrgyzstan and is authorized by the Kyrgyz Ministry of Education to offer the Kyrgyz National Diploma in twelve undergraduate programs and one graduate program. AU-CA also offers the American University Baccalaureate degree. Undergraduate programs include International and Comparative Politics, Business, Economics, Law, Sociology, Psychology, American Studies, French Studies, Austrian-German Studies, Journalism, Software Engineering, and Cultural Anthropology and Archaeology. Students are required to take courses in both Russian and English, and applicants who are deficient in one of these languages must take intensive language study during a preparatory year. The graduates have been admitted to prestigious doctoral and professional graduate programs in Europe and in the US. AU-CA's historical campus is located in the center of the Kyrgyz capital city, Bishkek. The Board of Trustees of the American University-Central Asia (AUCA) invites nominations and applications for President. A selective liberal arts University of 100 faculty and 1,200 students, with more than 30% of the students from 27 other countries, AUCA is based on the American model of university education located in the center of the Kyrgyz capital, Bishkek.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.auca.kg/about>, 11.03.2005.

## APPENDIX E

### “AMERICAN UNIVERSITY” IN THE WORLD

The significant famous or wealthy universities of the developed countries prefer to establish his models in the developing countries by branch campuses or universities named with the name of the home countries. The most important functions of those campuses is to appropriate the large financial sources of the home country students, educate and train the home countries relative to the traditions of the host country's culture (*usually western culture*). The US has opened many universities namely “American University” in diverse countries of the world.

American University (AU) was founded in 1893 by directives and desires of President George Washington so as to establish a “national university”. AU's mission was to prepare the public servants of the future to effectively serve their country<sup>1</sup>. Hence, AU permits his students to study abroad in the universities of 39 different countries. The other co-name University of AU in the United States is American University of Hawaii<sup>2</sup> (1994). According to the data of Association of American International Colleges and Universities, there are 14 “American University” in 13 different countries. It is significant that those universities are named with different names in the west, but they are in co-name in the eastern countries.

Unlike American University-Central Asia in Kyrgyzstan, there are 13 universities all around the world. Those are; The American University of Beirut (1866), The American University in Cairo (1919), The American College of Greece (1923), The American College of Thessaloniki (1924), The American University of Paris (1962), John Cabot University (Italy), Saint Louis University (Spain, 1969), Franklin College (Switzerland, 1969), The American International University in London (1972), American University of Armenia (1991), The American University in Bulgaria (1991), The American College in Dublin (1993), and American University of Sharjah (United Arab Emirates, 1997).

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.american.edu>, 11.03.2005.

<sup>2</sup> It came to being as the first multimedia, global university in the world. Headquartered in the State of Mississippi, United States of America, as a private, degree-granting institution of post-secondary education, and recognized and commanded as a world leader in the field of higher education, the aim of the University is to bring quality American education at the most reasonable cost to any person with aptitude for higher learning anywhere in the world. (<http://www.auh.edu>, 11.03.2005).



## APPENDIX F

### ABOUT KAZAKH HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM

Higher education, in Kazakhstan, consists of four types of institutions; classic university, institute, academy, and conservatoire. The HEIs are in charge of Ministry of Education and Science. In Kazakhstan there are 55 state-owned HEIs which include also AYU (*named as Yasavi International Kazakh-Turkish University*). On the other hand, there are such public universities in Kazakhstan named with famous figures, e.g. Al-Farabi Kazakh State National University, Dosmukhamedov Atyrau University, L.N. Gumilyov<sup>1</sup> Eurasian University, A.S. Pushkin West-Kazakhstan Humanities University, Abay Almaty State University, and Korkyt-ata Kyzylorda Humanities University.

By 2005, the state-owned higher education institutions in Kazakhstan are<sup>2</sup>;

1. A.Baitursynov Kostanay State University
2. A.S.Pushkin West-Kazakhstan Humanities University
3. Abay Almaty State University
4. Akmola State Medical Academy
5. Aktobe State Medical Academy
6. Al-Farabi Kazakh State National University
7. Almaty Institute of Power Engineering and Communication
8. Almaty Technological Institute
9. Ch.Valikhanov Kokshetau University
10. Dauletkerey West-Kazakhstan Institute of Arts
11. Dosmukhamedov Atyrau University
12. East-Kazakhstan Engineering (Technical) University
13. East-Kazakhstan State University
14. I.Altynsarin Arkalyk Pedagogical Institute
15. I.Zhakhayev Kyzylorda Polytechnical Institute.

---

<sup>1</sup> Russian Eurasian thinker (Dugin, 2003).

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.president.kz/main/mainframe.asp?lng=en>, 29.04.2005.

16. I.Zhansugurov Taldykorgan University
17. Institute of Management and Economic Prognosing under the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan
18. Jambyl Hydromelioration-and-Construction Institute
19. Jambyl Technological Institute of Light and Food Industry
20. Jambyl University
21. Karagandy Metallurgical Institute
22. Karagandy State Medical Academy
23. Karagandy State Technical (Engineering) University
24. Karagandy State University
25. Kazakh Academy of Transport and Communications
26. Kazakh Institute of Physical Culture
27. Kazakh National Technical (Engineering) University
28. Kazakh State Academy of Arts
29. Kazakh State Academy of Management
30. Kazakh State Agrarian University
31. Kazakh State Architectural-and-Construction Academy
32. Kazakh State Medical University
33. Kazakh State University of Law
34. Kazakh State University of World Languages
35. Kazakh State Woman's Pedagogical Institute
36. Korkyt-ata Kyzylorda Humanities University
37. Kostanay Agricultural Institute
38. Kurmangazy Almaty State Conservatoire
39. L.N.Gumilyov Eurasian University
40. North-Kazakhstan University
41. O.A.Baikonyrov Zhezkazgan University
42. Rudny Industrial Institute
43. S.Seifullin Akmola Agrarian University
44. S.Toraigyrov Pavlodar State University
45. "Semey" State University
46. Semipalatinsk State Medical Academy
47. Sh.Yesenov Aktau University
48. South-Kazakhstan Humanities University

49. South-Kazakhstan State Medical Academy
50. South-Kazakhstan Technical (Engineering) University
51. State Institute of Finance
52. West-Kazakhstan Agrarian University
53. Yasavi International Kazakh-Turkish University
54. Zhubanov Aktobe University
55. Zhurgenov Kazakh State Institute of Theatre and Cinema

It is noted that system of higher education in the Republic includes 126 higher educational institutions, 53 state-owned and 73 private ones<sup>1</sup>. On the other hand, Zhakenov<sup>2</sup> notes that the private HEIs were 41 in 1995. In addition to the Kazakhstan-British Technical University, “Khodja Ahmed Yassawi International Kazakhstan-Turkish University” also is indicated among the joint higher education institutions of the country.

University level studies are divided into three levels<sup>3</sup>. These are:

(a) University level first stage: Diploma of Specialist, Bachelor:

A Diploma of Specialist or Diploma of Specialized Higher Education in a particular field of study is generally awarded at the end of a five-year course (former system). Bachelor's Degrees are now also conferred after four years' studies.

(b) University level second stage: Aspirantura, Master's:

Full-time postgraduate studies (Aspirantura) leading to the qualification of Candidate of Sciences (Kandidat Nauk) normally last for three years. The submission of a thesis is required. Master's Degrees are also conferred after a further two years' study beyond the Bachelor's Degree.

(c) University level third stage: PhD, Doctorate (Doktoratura):

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.president.kz/articles/Science/Science\\_container.asp?lng=en&art=education](http://www.president.kz/articles/Science/Science_container.asp?lng=en&art=education), 29.04.2005.

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.unesco.kz/education/he/kazakh/kazakh\\_eng.htm](http://www.unesco.kz/education/he/kazakh/kazakh_eng.htm), 15.04.2005.

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.euroeducation.net/prof/kazanco.htm>, 15.04.2005.

In the new system, a PhD is conferred after two to three years' further study beyond the Master's Degree. The Doctor of Sciences (Doktor Nauk) is awarded after the Kandidat Nauk after completion of a thesis based on original research.

It is noted that the reform process in higher education sector of Kazakhstan started by “the law on education” adopted in 1993. The next law decreed in 1996 and concerned more on state institutions. Kazakh Minister of Education and Science, Bekturganov, mentions “during the ten years of the country’s independence, the educational system was able to adapt to the demands of the market economy”<sup>1</sup>. Furthermore, it is discussed by (Ayupova and De Young, 1998) that “the transition to a market economy has severely damaged this new country's ability to fund most social programmes, including education. Nevertheless, we would like to express our hope that the new Constitution of the Republic of Kazakstan will promote the adoption more perfect laws in the sphere of education, and that these laws will soon come to positively affect the provision of increased educational opportunities across the nation”.

Zhakenov notes that the reform process of the higher education is divided into three period<sup>2</sup>; first phase (1991-1994) formation of the legislation and normative base of higher education; second phase (1995-1998) modernization of higher education system, revision of its content; third phase (1999-2000) decentralization of education sector management and finance system, expansion of academic freedoms of education institution; the fourth phase (2001- present) strategic development of higher professional education system. It is defined by Zhakenov that the top priorities of higher education in Kazakhstan are “humanitarian and secular education, priority of common for all mankind values, free development of personality, respect to human rights and freedoms”.

The citizens may take higher education on a competition basis at state-owned HEIs. On the competitive basis, the entry to HEIs is open to all, but the tuition and fee policies would be diminish the possibility for the students who lack financial resources (Ayupova and De Young, 1998). In Kazakhstan, grants and loans are allocated to students (subjects) rather than HEIs (objects). Kazakh state aims to increase the access of the young to higher education mainly from low-income groups. Because states favor the self-paying education services and promotes the

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.ibe.unesco.org/International/ICE/ministers/Kazakhstan.pdf>, 15.04.2005.

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.unesco.kz/education/he/kazakh/kazakh\\_eng.htm](http://www.unesco.kz/education/he/kazakh/kazakh_eng.htm), 15.04.2005.

expansion of private HEIs. Zhakenov pointed out that Kazakhstan has more HEIs per one million of population (12) than the US, France, Germany, Japan and Russia. Likewise, 298 people for per 10 thousand citizens.

The development of Kazakh economy perhaps influenced the higher education system to more involve in international higher education market. It is discussed by Zhakenov that Kazakhstan Strategy Development Plan up to 2010, which endorsed in 2001 emphasized such main directions for higher education system by; strengthen the universities in leading positions; supporting the integration of the HEIs into the world education system; expansion of interstate information exchange in education area.

In 1995, a resolution was amended for training abroad. The “Bolashak” program was composed to offer international Presidential scholarships for the Kazakh students<sup>1</sup>. It is stated that by Zhakenov that, by 2001, 5.500 Kazakh students was studying in over 35 countries. He further stated that “the activity directed at mutual recognition of qualifications regarding higher education in Kazakhstan and foreign countries, academic awards are of primary importance. Signing, ratification and endorsement of the Lisbon Convention on Recognition of Qualifications Concerning Higher Education by Presidential Decree dated 13 December 1997 facilitated the process. The work is going on signing of bilateral agreements on acknowledge of academic awards with countries that did not join the Lisbon Convention”.

Kazakhstan has also progressed more in terms of hosting foreign higher education students. Training of foreign students is carried on in 47 higher educational establishments of Kazakhstan. Some 3,598 students from 43 countries of the world including those from other CIS countries and those from Baltic States attend these institutions<sup>2</sup>. The involvement of Kazakhstan into the international higher education is facilitated by such arrangements. It is discussed by (Olcott, 2002: 53) that the Russian language remains in wide use, its legal status being only slowly eroded, more for practical reasons than for ideological ones. The Kazakhstan’s government long-range plans call for English to become the international language of the next generation, and English language instruction was mandated for all schools by end of 2000.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.indiana.edu/%7Eisre/NEWSLETTER/vol7no1/Deyoung.htm>, 22.05.2005.

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.president.kz/articles/Science/Science\\_container.asp?lng=en&art=education](http://www.president.kz/articles/Science/Science_container.asp?lng=en&art=education), 29.04.2005.

## APPENDIX G

### THE POLICIES ON TURKIC GEOGRAPHY IN THE TURKISH GOVERNMENT PROGRAMMES

The Turkish government programmes lasting from 1995 to the date are quite explanatory for the understanding the basic motives of the official foreign policy on Turkic republics, communities and post-Soviet territories.

In the 52th Turkish Government<sup>1</sup> Program there was not any specific policy about Turkic republics or Central Asia other than arguments on the pipeline issues.

The 53th Turkish Government Program<sup>2</sup> argued that in regard to the obeyed principle, we will sustain our relations with Russian Federation with the comprehension which enable to prioritize the cooperation facilities between the both countries. One of the main targets is to empower our special relations with Central Asian republics and Azerbaijan through the deepening of the collaborations in the spheres of economic and culture. Our constructive efforts will continue both to end the dispute in Chechnya and for the withdrawal of Armenia from the occupied lands so as to secure a permanent peace for the peace negotiations took place Azerbaijan and Armenia (Mesut Yılmaz headed the government from March 1996 to June 1996).

The 54<sup>th</sup> Turkish Government Program<sup>3</sup> stated that "the implemented activities with Turkic republics and Islamic countries for the development of relations in the fields of economic, trade, culture and social will be fostered. The necessary measures will be operated to facilitate the free circulation of labor force, commodity, service and capital. The contributions to economic structuration of Turkic republics will be increased and sustained; the priority will be given to cooperation projects on transportation, communication and energy which will reinforce Turkey's position both in Balkans and Middle East. In addition, Turkey will be achieving to play an

---

<sup>1</sup> It was headed by Tansu Çiller from October 1995 to March 1996.

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/ambar/hp53.htm>, 04.02.2005.

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/ambar/hp54.htm>, 04.02.2005.

important role for the development of relations among Turkic republics and Europe” (Necmettin Erbakan headed the government from June 1996 to June 1997).

The 55th Turkish Government Program<sup>1</sup> suggested that “the implemented activities for the development of relations with Turkic republics and other Turkic kinship communities in the fields of economy, trade, industry, technique, social, education and culture will be re-accelerated” (Mesut Yılmaz headed the government from June 1997 to January 1999).

56th Turkish Government Program<sup>2</sup> argued that “Our government will be the persecutor of the efforts for the realization of the Eurasian energy corridor and for the finalization of Baku-Ceyhan pipeline. Our relations will be condensed in all spheres with Turkic republics, Turk and relative communities. In this respect, the unconditional withdraw of Armenia from the occupied lands of Azerbaijan and the initiatives for the solution of the problems between the both countries will be sustained in our period. In the Eurasianization process, the Balkans, Caucasus, Central Asia, Black Sea, Mediterranean and Middle East have obtained great importance in regard to the development and security of our country. In this respect, our pioneership and contributions for the regional solidarity and cooperation will be sustained. However, it will be continued to develop the relations with our neighbor (Bülent Ecevit headed the government from January 1999 to May 1999).

57<sup>th</sup> Turkish Government Program<sup>3</sup> argued that “Turkey’s traditional strategic importance has grow up by the recent developments took place in Balkans, Caucasia, Central Asia, Mediterranean, Black Sea and Middle East. This process called as Eurasianism process in which Turkey is a country of key role. Our government is certainly familiar with opportunities and responsibilities burdened by this situation and will evaluate the process in the light of our national interests. Our government will pursue an active and stable policy toward the development of relations in the field of economy, politic, social and cultural domains. Both in bilateral and multilateral stage we will enhance to develop the collaborative opportunities with Russian Federation” (The government headed by Bülent Ecevit from May 1999 to November 2002).

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/ambar/hp55.htm>, 04.02.2005.

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/ambar/hp56.htm>, 04.02.2005.

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/ambar/hp57.htm>, 04.02.2005.

The 59th Turkish Government Program<sup>1</sup> argued, “in spite of our historical, cultural and social proximity with Central Asian Turkic republics, it is the fact that Turkey could not meet the expectations in his relations with those countries. Our government will sustain in his efforts to transform the region into a large cooperation space through the advanced relations with the republics. The relations based on cooperation will be sustained without hamper the interests of Russian Federation and Turkey in Caucasus and Central Asia through the framework of our cultural proximity and good neighbor relations with Russia. In this respect, our governments will delicately develop Eurasia perspective, which prioritized the relations with Russian Federation. In the Caucasus, the cold war suspicions will be removed and opportunities will be searched for cooperation. The government will make efforts for the integration of this mineral rich region (Caucasus) with Middle East and Balkans in economic sense (Recep Tayyip Erdoğan is heading the government from March 2003 to date).

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/ambar/hp59.htm>, 04.02.2005.



## APPENDIX H

### THE SURVEY RESULTS OF THE TURKIC STUDENTS IN TURKEY

The survey results of MEB's "General Directorate of Abroad Education and Training" can be summarized as; 81,4 % of the students were sufficiently evaluated education supplied; just 65,7 % of the students were in good relations with their teachers; 79,5 % of the students were in good relations with their friends; 58,2 % of students were in positive and 13,6 % were in negative opinion about Turkey; 51,4 % of the students did not think any difference among Turkey and themselves in terms of origin, but 45,5 % specified on difference but mentioned the brotherhood; and 3,1 % mentioned that both sides are different totally; 36,1 % demanded for sufficient amount of scholarship; 13,8 % mentioned need to improve dormitory conditions; 14,2 % demanded for the development of educational circumstances; 3,9 % mentioned the visits of their home country representatives; and lastly 3,8 % mentioned for moral support and care.

On the other hand, the survey results of General Directorate of Higher Education Credit and Hostels Institution (*Yüksek Öğrenim Kredi ve Yurtlar Kurumu Genel Müdürlüğü*) can be summarized as: the number of students invited for Turkey should be less and qualified; need for opportunity to increase the services provided for the sake of positive communication with Turkish students; Turkish students should be informed about why those students came to educate in Turkey.

YÖK also is obliged to monitor the success of those students. According to (YÖK, 2003: 140) the main reason of "low attendance" is seen as lack of scholarship amount. Due to low amount, many Turkic students prefer to work in the market. The other main reasons of the failure are; late registration for Turkish language course, despite the insufficient Turkish competency entering to class, differences of their secondary school capacity, some expensive course book, and late possession of course books.

## APPENDIX I

### THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE AND THE QUESTIONS

#### Part I (Interview with Namık Kemal Zeybek)

1. What is the reason for the university to be established?
2. What is the importance of making investments on education for Central Asia?
3. Is AYU a result of the national education policy or Turkish foreign policy?
4. What can be said about the progress of educational relationships developed with Central Asia? What are the achievements, difficulties and expectations?
5. Why our financial and political relationships with Central Asia could not be developed sufficiently? What should be done for the repetition of the relations maintained before 1995?
6. Why Kazakhstan is the first choice? Was there the idea of establishment of a common university among Turkic Republics except Kyrgyzstan? Does it still exist?
7. If AYU did not exist how would be the relations with Central Asia?
8. What is the reason for choosing the name of Ahmet Yesevi?
9. Does the spiritual atmosphere and historical function of Turkestan comply with the aim of the university?
10. What are the goals that the university aims to achieve in future?
11. What is the reason for the term “international”? Is it the reality that the education is undertaken with international standards or that it serves to the students from different nationalities?

#### Part II (Interview with Feyzullah Budak)

12. What are the financial resources of AYU? Are they sufficient? If not what kinds of alternatives are foreseen?
13. Is the level of education in the university developed, as it is expected?
14. Is there any demand of university like AYU, and additional campus in other Turkic Republics?
15. What is the gain of Turkish higher education system, by the establishment of AYU?

16. What are the effects of AYU on Kazakh higher education system?
17. Are there any changes in the demand and support of Kazak and Turkish governments with regards to year of 1992?
18. What are the advantages and disadvantages of AYU graduates with regards to graduates of other universities of Kazakhstan and Turkey?
19. Is AYU planning to establish any exchange programs with Turkish universities?
20. Does AYU provide any opportunity of internship to its students in Turkey?
21. What are the criteria for the election of students to university?
22. Does the university have students other than countries of Eurasian countries and Central Asia?
23. Is the application demand from Turkey sufficient?

### **Part III (Interview with Dr. Öner Kabasakal)**

24. There exists a tendency for the internationalization of higher education around the world. National universities become attractive for the students all around the world, the prestigious western universities turns out to be the places collecting the successful students of all nations, European and American universities tend to extend their market arisen by the excessive demand from developing countries, popular western universities are establishing campuses in underdeveloped countries, the number of exchange programs between countries are increasing, the online university education programs are presented, the virtual campus are established. In brief, the higher education system in developed countries is no longer seen as a part of public service, rather it becomes a commodity in global capitalist market. This process has both advantages and disadvantages.

1. How do you evaluate this process? Does AYU operate this process in the benefit of developing countries? Does it have any function in the prevention of brain drain from Central Asia?
2. Is there any possibility of reactions or re-formation carried out by AYU as a result of this process?

The theorists refer four important rationales for the emergence of this process. Those are the answers of the question of why universities in the developed countries whether public or private; and national education systems or states desire to internationalize their services and systems? The rationales can be briefly summarized as

**(a) Political**

Through the rationale some countries and institutions determine their higher education policy as investing on youths and supposing that they will gain higher power positions within economy or politics in future. They plan to be the focus of global diplomacy with the research centers, which would be established. Thus, their countries will be recognized more closely and diplomatic relations will be much easily established.

**(b) Economic (financial)**

For the rationale international self-financed students are the main motive for the further internationalization of the education against the decreasing of public funds. Secondly, the HEIs and governments strive to attract more talented students from external countries in order to meet the qualified labor force of their national economies and advancement on science and technology. Thus, the public universities even involved into the process by the challenge of trade of international higher education and “academic capitalism”.

**(c) Academic (educational)**

The fact is that the students from different nationalities lead an enhancement in the quality of education by increasing the variety of expectations for the service. The increasing competition with other universities in economic arena encourages the contest of serving more qualitative and universal education. The existence of students from different nationalities also leads possibility of education in different languages. These students make the accreditation of the university certificate possible among many countries. Moreover they provide the employment of successful academicians from external countries.

**(d) Socio-cultural**

Students from different nationalities and cultures encourage others to live together and simplify the way for mutual understanding and common thought. However, they teach to understand and respect different cultures and languages. It is foreseen that by making all

students adopt same values, the achievement of universal agreement and common sense will be realized much easier. By compromising the differences, attraction of students from different nationalities will be provided. A strategy of dialogue and sharing is purposed to establish in campuses by executing a formation like “United Nation” structure.

3. How could you evaluate AYU according to these developments? Does AYU have any similar aspects with the rationales?

- 25. Does AYU compete with American or foreign universities established in Central Asia?
- 26. Does the establishment of AYU lead other countries which concerning with Eurasia to attempt to establish university in Central Asia?
- 27. Does it make AYU special that both Russian and English, which are the national languages of two opposite political polar in the cold war, but now, are serviced together?
- 28. Does AYU introduce a new university model to both Central Asia and the world?
- 29. Are there any institutions around the world its structure similar to AYU?

It is emphasized that there are two types of university models around the world: European model and American model. The European model is based on public financing, with a similar bureaucratic structure to that of central authority and has a relative autonomy. It has limited relationship with business world. It executes higher education as a public service. But, the American model, which has closer relationship with market proceeds upon entrepreneur motives. This model intends to integrate with local capital and university boosters instead of depending on public financing and therefore it perceives the university administration as a management problem. In addition, academicians have more time to concentrate on the research activities. The model justifies and improves itself by the scholarships mainly offered to the successful and poor students.

30. How can be AYU defined according to these two models? How does AYU describe itself?