

**The Judgement of Linguistics Courses in Turkish High Schools
Through School Teachers, Students and University Students**

Nalân KIZILTAN*

Abstract

This study aims at taking the attention of the administrators in the Ministry of Education and teachers offering linguistics in high schools to the importance of linguistics courses in the curriculum. In order to achieve the aim, an 'Attitude Test' towards the Linguistics courses has been developed, and then has been given to high school students in Ankara, İstanbul and Samsun in Turkey. The data have been analyzed by SPSS. The results indicate that high school students are aware of the importance of linguistics, since it raises their language awareness. The attitude of the tenth graders towards linguistics courses is significantly different from that of the eleventh graders. The text books used in the courses seem problematic for both teachers and students. For conscious future linguists, we should take a step in developing linguistics syllabuses in schools, having considered the results taken from the data collected for this study.

Key Words: Linguistics courses, Turkish high schools, high school curriculum, tenth graders, eleventh graders.

Özet

Bu çalışma, dilbilimcilerin, Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı'ndaki yetkililerin ve öğretmenlerin dikkatini liselerde okutulan dilbilim derslerinin önemine çekmektir. Bu nedenle, Ankara, İstanbul ve Samsun'daki lise öğrencilerine ve öğretmenlerine; Hacettepe Üniversitesi Dilbilim bölümündeki ve Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesinde Dilbilim Bölümünde okuyan öğrencilere sormacalar verilmiş, elde edilen bulgular SPSS programı ile değerlendirilmiştir. Elde edilen bulgular 'Dilbilim Derslerinin' gerek lise öğrencilerinin gerekse üniversite öğrencilerinin dil bilincini geliştirdiğini göstermiştir. Ancak 'Dilbilim I' dersini alan öğrencilerin tutumları 'Dilbilim II' dersini alan öğrencilerden anlamlı olarak farklı çıkmıştır. Öte yandan, liselerde kullanılan dilbilim ders kitapları incelenmiş ve yetersiz olduğu saptanmıştır. Sonuç olarak geleceğin dilbilimcilerini bilinçli yetiştirmek amacıyla, bu çalışmadan elde edilen bulgular dilbilimciler ve öğretmenler tarafından paylaşılmalıdır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Dilbilim dersleri, liseler, lise müfredatı, 10. sınıflar, 11. sınıflar

* Asst. Prof. Dr., Ondokuz Mayıs University, Faculty of Education, Department of Pre-service English Language Teacher Education, kiziltannalan@gmail.com

Introduction

The field of linguistics, which is the scientific study of the nature of language and communication, is a growing and exciting art of study with an impact on education, sociology, language teaching, psychology, philosophy, and so forth.

Thus, in Turkish high schools, Anatolian high schools, super high schools (henceforth Turkish high schools), in order to raise students' language awareness and introduce students to the relationship between Turkish and other world languages, "Linguistics I" is offered two hours a week to the tenth graders as an elective course for Turkish-math and language students. Besides, the course aims at developing students' comprehension of texts and language abilities for other courses they are taking at the moment.

"Linguistics II" is offered to the eleventh graders in social and language classes as an elective course, the aim of which is to teach the students the structure of language consisting of speech sounds, words and word order as well as their relations within the constituents.

Problem

In Turkish high schools, neither teachers nor the high school students are aware of the importance of the field of linguistics. Linguistics courses are generally offered by teachers of Turkish Language and Literature all of whom were not given linguistics courses during their undergraduate education. Therefore, these courses may be a burden for most of them.

Students confuse grammar with linguistics, since teachers give more importance to grammar than linguistics. Syllabus of Linguistics II may be sometimes ignored and students are given language tests instead. Students may not be prepared for linguistics and prospective linguistic studies. Students with lack of knowledge are generally likely to choose departments of linguistics in the University Entrance Examination by chance.

Purpose of The Study

This study aims at taking the attention of the administrators in the Ministry of Education and teachers offering linguistics in high schools to the importance of linguistics courses in the curriculum. The main objectives of this study are as follows:

1. To find out the attitude of both school linguistics teachers and students to the linguistics courses in Turkish High Schools;
2. To find out if the students in the Departments of Linguistics have chosen this field consciously or subconsciously;
3. To evaluate the syllabi of the linguistics courses in Turkish High Schools;

4. To raise the linguistic awareness of those who are interested in school curriculum, and those who are preparing for University Entrance Examination;
5. To make contributions to the syllabus of linguistics courses.

Hypotheses

1. High school students may not be aware of the importance of linguistics.
2. School teachers of linguistics may not be aware of the importance of the linguistics courses in the curriculum.
3. The attitude of the tenth graders towards linguistics courses may be significantly different from that of the eleventh graders'.
4. The attitude of the teachers of linguistics I towards linguistics course may be different from that of the teachers of linguistics II.
5. High school students' towards linguistics I and II may be significantly different in terms of cities.
6. Students in the Departments of Linguistics may be said to have chosen these departments by chance.
7. The syllabi of linguistics I and II may be incomplete in itself for high school students and teachers.

Method

In the second semester of 2005-2006 School Year, 759 students, 363 of whom are 10th graders and 396 of whom are 11th graders in high schools in Samsun, Ankara and İstanbul (71 in Samsun; 70 in Ankara; and 222 in İstanbul) have been given a questionnaire of 22 questions to check their attitudes towards the linguistics I and II courses (See Appendix 1). Besides, 32 teachers of linguistics in Samsun, Ankara and İstanbul who are offering Linguistics I and II, and who have given linguistics courses have been given another questionnaire of 22 questions to check their approach to linguistics and linguistics courses (See Appendix 2).

On the other hand, 195 students, 63 of whom are first year students, 27 of whom are second year students, 69 of whom are third year students and 36 of whom are fourth year students in Departments of Linguistics in Ankara have been given a "Questionnaire" of 30 questions (the five of which have been only evaluated in this study) to learn if they have chosen the department consciously or subconsciously (See Appendix 3). At the end of the questionnaires given, the students and teachers have been asked to write about their ideas and suggestions for linguistics, if they have any.

Data Analysis

The data have been analyzed by SPSS in the department of Statistics at Ondokuz Mayıs University.

I should thank to the instructor Taner TUNÇ, PhD and Asst. Prof. Dr. Kamil ALAKUŞ for statistical analysis and Research Assistants Ceylan YANGIN ERSANLI, Deren AKMAN YEŞİLEL, Oğuz YEŞİLEL, the instructors Özlem YENİÇERİ , Evrim KEŞMİR, Işıl ATLI and Zehra AYDIN YARDIM for data processing and typing. Special thanks to school teachers and students helping me to collect the data.

Findings and Discussion

The findings have been gathered from the answers of the high school students, teachers of linguistics courses in high schools and students in the department of linguistics. In all the tables, Q stands for Question; N stands for Number of the students and teachers; SD stands for Strongly Disagree; D stands for Disagree; U stands for Undecided; A stands for Agree; SA stands for Strongly Agree. The answers taken from the both the tenth and eleventh graders are shown in Table 1 below.

As is indicated in Table 1, the answers of the tenth and eleventh graders are significantly different at the level of $P < 0.05$ for the questions 1,2,4,8,12,15,16,18,21, and 22. In the question 1, which is “I like linguistics” when compared with the eleventh graders, the tenth graders like linguistics more than the eleventh graders. A quarter of the eleventh graders are undecided on the idea that they like linguistics. The answers given to the second question indicate that linguistics courses appeal to the eleventh graders less than the tenth graders. The fourth question reveals the fact that the tenth graders are more undecided than the eleventh graders, but they may become linguists. In the eighth question both graders indicate that they have understood the content of the linguistics courses; however, the tenth graders are more undecided when compared with the eleventh graders. The twelfth question indicates that both graders are reluctant to attend the linguistics courses. Question 15 shows that the tenth graders enjoy studying linguistics more than the eleventh graders among the courses they are taking. In question 16, whereas the tenth graders study linguistics courses to pass, the eleventh graders do not study it to pass. Question 18 points out that both groups are not bored with linguistic topics, but undecided tenth graders are more in number than the eleventh graders for the given idea. Both graders believe in the idea that linguistics courses raise their language awareness in question 21. They also believe that the linguistics courses prepare them for their prospective language studies.

When the answers of the graders are scrutinized, in question 3, both graders agree on the idea that linguistics is important for students no matter what their interests are. In the fifth question a quarter of the tenth graders are undecided on the idea that they choose a profession related with linguistics in the future. The majority of the students do not want to choose a profession related with linguistics. Both graders do not blame teachers for linguistics sessions which are boring (Q6). The tenth graders think that in real life

Table 1. Crosstables of the 10th and 11th Grades According to the Answers in the Questionnaire

Q	Class	N	SD(%)	D(%)	U(%)	A(%)	SA(%)	χ^2 -Test Result	Significance Level
1	10	363	23 (6.3)	37(10.2)	69 (19.0)	134(36.9)	100(27.5)	22.630	.000
	11	376	46 (11.6)	58(14.6)	101(25.5)	120(30.3)	71 (17.9)		
2	10	361	86 (23.8)	94(26.0)	86 (23.8)	56 (15.5)	39(10.8)	11.949	.018
	11	396	83 (21.0)	92(23.2)	74 (18.7)	75 (18.9)	72 (18.2)		
3	10	362	30 (8.3)	44(12.2)	76 (21.0)	97 (26.8)	115(31.8)	2.18	.696
	11	396	33 (8.3)	42(10.6)	75 (18.9)	101(25.5)	145(36.6)		
4	10	363	155(42.7)	86(23.7)	79 (21.8)	23 (6.3)	20 (5.5)	10.755	.029
	11	394	189(48.0)	114(28.9)	60 (15.2)	15 (3.8)	16 (4.1)		
5	10	361	70 (19.4)	57 (15.8)	95 (26.3)	58 (16.1)	81 (22.4)	7.423	.115
	11	394	88 (22.3)	55 (14.0)	75 (19.0)	76 (19.3)	100(25.4)		
6	10	361	124(34.3)	77 (21.3)	73 (20.2)	38 (10.5)	49 (13.6)	8.352	.080
	11	390	112(28.7)	80 (20.5)	68 (17.4)	54 (13.8)	76 (19.5)		
7	10	361	71 (19.7)	89 (24.7)	76 (21.1)	60 (16.6)	65 (18.0)	5.132	.274
	11	393	73 (18.6)	86 (21.9)	70 (17.8)	88 (22.4)	76 (19.3)		
8	10	362	112(30.9)	103(28.5)	70 (19.3)	42 (11.6)	35 (9.7)	13.621	.009
	11	392	123(31.4)	111(28.3)	43 (11.0)	62 (15.8)	53 (13.5)		
9	10	362	93 (25.7)	83 (22.9)	62 (17.1)	46 (12.7)	78 (21.5)	3.086	.544
	11	394	87 (22.7)	83 (21.1)	67 (17.0)	62 (15.7)	95 (24.1)		
10	10	363	92 (25.3)	83 (22.9)	70 (19.3)	72 (19.8)	46 (12.7)	5.775	.217
	11	394	125(31.7)	97 (24.6)	60 (15.2)	68 (17.3)	44 (11.2)		
11	10	361	126(34.9)	103(28.5)	66 (18.3)	37 (10.2)	29 (8.0)	7.255	.123
	11	395	129(32.7)	124(31.4)	51 (12.9)	44 (11.1)	47 (11.9)		
12	10	362	100(27.6)	84 (23.2)	79 (21.8)	65 (18.0)	34 (9.4)	15.529	.004
	11	392	138(35.2)	108(27.6)	71 (18.1)	38 (9.7)	37 (9.4)		
13	10	358	103(28.8)	106(29.6)	64 (17.9)	36 (10.1)	49 (13.7)	5.592	.232
	11	395	95 (24.1)	105(26.6)	77 (19.5)	56 (14.2)	62 (15.7)		
14	10	361	75 (20.8)	96 (26.6)	89 (24.7)	62 (17.2)	39 (10.8)	1.983	.739
	11	393	94 (23.9)	106(27.0)	88 (22.4)	70 (17.8)	35 (8.9)		
15	10	362	72 (19.9)	89 (24.6)	82 (22.7)	74 (20.4)	45 (12.4)	16.815	.002
	11	394	102(25.9)	122(31.0)	87 (22.1)	45 (11.4)	38 (9.6)		
16	10	362	76 (21.0)	101(27.9)	41 (11.3)	56 (15.5)	88 (24.3)	8.132	.087
	11	394	85 (21.6)	85 (21.6)	34 (8.6)	82 (20.8)	108(27.4)		
17	10	361	110(30.5)	97 (26.9)	71 (19.7)	34 (9.4)	49 (13.6)	7.769	.100
	11	393	111(28.2)	93 (23.7)	64 (16.3)	55 (14.0)	70 (17.8)		
18	10	362	84 (23.2)	79 (21.8)	96 (26.5)	54 (14.9)	49 (13.5)	11.340	.023
	11	393	75 (19.1)	101(25.7)	76 (19.3)	64 (16.3)	77 (19.6)		
19	10	363	127(35.0)	110(30.3)	62 (17.1)	38 (10.5)	26 (7.2)	2.729	.604
	11	396	148(37.4)	126(31.8)	51 (12.9)	41 (10.4)	30 (7.6)		
20	10	358	160(44.7)	100(27.9)	56 (15.6)	27 (7.5)	15 (4.2)	2.331	.675
	11	392	189(48.2)	107(27.3)	56 (14.3)	21 (5.4)	19 (4.8)		
21	10	361	37 (10.2)	35 (9.7)	82 (22.7)	104(28.8)	103(28.5)	9.993	.041
	11	394	63 (16.0)	43 (10.9)	66 (16.8)	125(31.7)	97 (24.6)		
22	10	363	50 (13.8)	45 (12.4)	89 (24.5)	89 (24.5)	90 (24.8)	10.146	.038
	11	396	73 (18.4)	64 (16.2)	73 (18.4)	107(27.0)	79 (19.9)		

they may make use of what they have learnt in linguistics, whereas the eleventh graders do not believe in the idea that they make use of linguistics in real life mostly (Q7). Since linguistics is an elective course, both graders are pleased with taking Linguistics I and II (Q9). Neither of the graders enjoys sharing what they have learnt in linguistics courses with the people in their environment (Q10). Both groups understand the topics in linguistics courses (Q11). Both graders feel like attending linguistics courses (Q13). Not only the tenth graders but also the eleventh graders disagree on the idea that they give advice to their friends to choose linguistics I and II (Q14). The tenth and eleventh graders indicate that linguistics is related with daily life (Q17). They strongly disagree on the idea that linguistics is hard (Q19). Besides, they strongly disagree on the statement that they take linguistics to be a language teacher (Q20). Then the answers given by the eleventh graders verify the first hypothesis whereas, the answers given by the tenth graders falsify it. However, both groups think that linguistics courses raise their language awareness and prepare them for their prospective language studies. The attitude of the tenth graders towards linguistics courses is not significantly different from that of the eleventh graders in many ways. The following Table 2 presents the answers of both graders according to the cities in Turkey to check if the answers of both graders are significantly different from each other.

As is shown in Table 2, the tenth graders' and the eleventh graders' answers to the questions 1,2,3,4,8,11,12,13,15,16,18,19,20,21,22 are significantly different in terms of the cities. Among the high school students in terms of the cities, Samsun ranks first for the significance of linguistics for high school students, since they show agreement strongly for the questions 1,3,17,21, and 22, whereas they strongly disagree on the questions 2,8,11,13,16,17,18,19,20. The tenth and eleventh graders in Ankara rank first, disagreeing on the statements given in the questions 4,12,16,20, which signify that they do not take linguistics for their prospective studies. Both graders with almost the half percentage of the students in İstanbul rank first only in the questions 16 agreeing on the idea that they take linguistics courses only to pass the exams. Students in Samsun and Ankara show disagreement on the given statement. Therefore, the fifth hypothesis of the study has been verified by the given answers of both graders in the cities.

In this study not only the attitude of the high school students towards linguistics courses I-II has been given but also the teachers' attitude which is checked through a questionnaire of 22 questions. Table 3 shows the answers of the teachers of linguistics who graduated from generally Turkish language and literature departments in Turkey.

Table 2. Crosstables of the Answers of the 10th and 11th Graders According to the Cities

Question	City	N	SD(%)	D(%)	U(%)	A(%)	SA(%)	X ² Test Result	Significance Level
1	Samsun	71	2 (2.8)	3 (4.2)	9(12.7)	31(43.7)	26(36.6)	19.483	.012
	Ankara	70	4 (5.7)	11(15.7)	15(21.4)	31(44.3)	9 (12.9)		
	Istanbul	222	17 (7.7)	23(10.4)	45(20.3)	72(32.4)	65(29.3)		
2	Samsun	71	22 (31.0)	19(26.8)	20(28.2)	6 (8.5)	4 (5.6)	19.702	.012
	Ankara	70	8 (11.4)	23(32.9)	21(30.0)	14(20.0)	4 (5.7)		
	Istanbul	220	56 (25.5)	52(23.6)	45(20.5)	36(16.4)	31(14.1)		
3	Samsun	71	3 (4.2)	8 (11.3)	16(22.5)	13(18.3)	31(43.7)	20.842	.008
	Ankara	70	10 (14.3)	12(17.1)	10(14.3)	26(37.1)	12(17.1)		
	Istanbul	221	17 (7.7)	24(10.9)	50(22.6)	58(26.2)	72(32.6)		
4	Samsun	71	20 (28.2)	20(28.2)	21(29.6)	5 (7.0)	5 (7.0)	13.987	.082
	Ankara	70	37 (52.9)	18(25.7)	10(14.3)	1 (1.4)	4 (5.7)		
	Istanbul	222	98 (44.1)	48(21.6)	48(21.6)	17 (7.7)	11 (5.0)		
5	Samsun	71	13 (18.3)	14(19.7)	26(36.6)	9 (12.7)	9 (12.7)	9.817	.278
	Ankara	70	13 (18.6)	9 (12.9)	17(24.3)	11(15.7)	20(28.6)		
	Istanbul	220	44 (20.0)	34(15.5)	52(23.6)	38(17.3)	52(23.6)		
6	Samsun	71	30 (42.3)	17(23.9)	10(14.1)	(9.9)	7 (9.9)	8.344	.401
	Ankara	70	24 (34.3)	13(18.6)	15(21.4)	11(15.7)	7(10.0)		
	Istanbul	220	70 (31.8)	47(21.4)	48(21.8)	20 (9.1)	35(15.9)		
7	Samsun	71	12 (16.9)	22(31.0)	15(21.1)	11(15.5)	11(15.5)	4.538	.806
	Ankara	70	16 (22.9)	15(21.4)	18(25.7)	9 (12.9)	12(17.1)		
	Istanbul	220	43 (19.5)	52(23.6)	43(19.5)	40(18.2)	42(19.1)		
8	Samsun	71	23 (32.4)	27(38.0)	12(16.9)	8 (11.3)	1 (1.4)	15.669	.047
	Ankara	70	20 (28.6)	23(32.9)	17(24.3)	4 (5.7)	6 (8.6)		
	Istanbul	221	69 (31.2)	55(24.0)	41(18.6)	30(13.6)	28(12.7)		
9	Samsun	71	19 (26.8)	20(28.2)	18(25.4)	5 (7.0)	9 (12.7)	12.581	.127
	Ankara	70	26 (22.9)	16(22.9)	11(15.7)	7 (10.0)	20(28.6)		
	Istanbul	221	58 (26.2)	47(21.3)	33(14.9)	34(15.4)	49(22.2)		
10	Samsun	71	13 (18.3)	12(16.9)	17(23.9)	20(28.2)	9 (12.7)	9.937	.270
	Ankara	70	24 (34.3)	16(22.9)	12(17.1)	11(15.7)	7 (10.0)		
	Istanbul	222	55 (24.8)	55(24.8)	41(18.5)	41(18.5)	30(13.5)		
11	Samsun	71	32 (45.1)	21(29.6)	10(14.1)	6 (8.5)	2 (2.8)	14.990	.059
	Ankara	70	14 (20.0)	26(37.1)	16(22.9)	9 (12.9)	5 (7.1)		
	Istanbul	220	80 (36.4)	56(25.5)	40(18.2)	22(10.0)	22(10.0)		
12	Samsun	71	13 (18.3)	16(22.5)	15(21.1)	20(28.2)	7 (9.9)	17.136	.029
	Ankara	70	24 (34.3)	18(25.7)	20(28.6)	6 (8.6)	2 (2.9)		
	Istanbul	221	63 (28.5)	50(22.6)	44(19.9)	39(17.6)	25(11.3)		
13	Samsun	71	26 (36.6)	24(33.8)	13(18.3)	5 (7.0)	3 (4.2)	24.518	.002
	Ankara	70	9 (12.9)	30(42.9)	16(22.9)	7 (10.0)	8 (11.4)		
	Istanbul	217	68 (31.3)	52(24.0)	35(16.1)	24(11.1)	38(17.5)		
14	Samsun	71	13 (18.3)	18(25.4)	17(23.9)	14(19.7)	9 (12.7)	13.147	.107
	Ankara	70	15 (21.4)	24(34.3)	23(32.9)	5 (7.1)	3 (4.3)		
	Istanbul	220	47 (21.4)	54(24.5)	49(22.3)	43(19.5)	27(12.3)		
15	Samsun	71	10 (14.1)	18(25.4)	15(21.1)	13(18.3)	15(21.1)	15.174	.056
	Ankara	70	14 (20.0)	19(27.1)	17(24.3)	19(27.1)	1 (1.4)		
	Istanbul	221	48 (21.7)	52(23.5)	50(22.6)	42(19.0)	29(13.1)		
16	Samsun	71	20 (28.2)	24(33.8)	5 (7.0)	9 (12.7)	13(18.3)	16.948	.031
	Ankara	70	12 (17.1)	27(38.6)	10(14.3)	5 (7.1)	16(22.9)		
	Istanbul	221	44 (19.9)	50(22.6)	26(11.8)	42(19.0)	59(26.7)		
17	Samsun	71	26 (36.6)	19(26.8)	17(23.9)	6 (8.5)	3 (4.2)	17.366	.027
	Ankara	70	16 (22.9)	18(25.7)	14(20.0)	13(18.6)	9 (12.9)		
	Istanbul	220	68 (30.9)	60(27.3)	40(18.2)	15 (6.8)	37(16.8)		
18	Samsun	71	23 (32.4)	19(26.8)	18(25.4)	5 (7.0)	6 (8.5)	18.272	.019
	Ankara	70	11 (15.7)	15(21.4)	17(24.3)	19(27.1)	8 (11.4)		
	Istanbul	221	50 (22.6)	45(20.4)	61(27.6)	30(13.6)	35(15.8)		
19	Samsun	71	30 (42.3)	25(35.2)	10(14.1)	3 (4.2)	3 (4.2)	16.487	.036
	Ankara	70	14 (20.0)	26(37.1)	11(15.7)	11(15.7)	8 (11.4)		
	Istanbul	222	83 (37.4)	59(26.6)	41(18.5)	24(10.8)	15 (6.8)		
20	Samsun	70	20 (28.6)	21(30.0)	14(20.0)	11(15.7)	4 (5.7)	18.315	.019
	Ankara	70	35 (50.0)	21(30.0)	7 (10.0)	6 (8.6)	1 (1.4)		
	Istanbul	218	105(48.2)	58(26.6)	35(16.1)	10 (4.6)	10 (4.6)		
21	Samsun	70	2 (2.9)	5 (7.1)	11(15.7)	24(34.3)	28(40.0)	16.514	.036
	Ankara	70	9 (12.9)	10(14.3)	15(21.4)	23(32.9)	13(18.6)		
	Istanbul	221	26 (11.8)	20 (9.0)	56(25.3)	57(25.8)	62(28.1)		
22	Samsun	71	9 (12.7)	6 (8.5)	13(18.3)	20(28.2)	23(32.4)	33.957	.000
	Ankara	70	6 (8.6)	19(27.1)	15(21.4)	24(34.3)	6 (8.6)		
	Istanbul	222	35 (15.8)	20 (9.0)	61(27.5)	45(20.3)	61(27.5)		

Table 3. Crosstables of the Answers of the Linguistics Teachers According to Linguistics I and Linguistics II

Question	Class	N	S(%)	D(%)	U(%)	Agree(%)	SA(%)
1	10	9	1(11.1)		2 (22.2)	4 (44.4)	2 (22.2)
	11	3		1(33.3)	1 (33.3)	1 (33.3)	
	10-11	13	1 (7.7)	4(30.8)	3 (23.1)	2 (15.4)	3 (23.1)
	Past Experience	7			1 (14.3)	3 (42.9)	3(42.9)
2	10	9	4(44.4)		1 (11.1)	2 (22.2)	
	11	3	1(33.3)	2(66.7)			
	10-11	13	5(38.5)	4(30.8)	1 (7.7)	3 (23.1)	
	Past Experience	7	3(42.9)	3(42.9)	1 (14.3)		
3	10	9	1(11.1)		1 (11.1)	4 (44.4)	3 (33.3)
	11	3				3 (100.0)	
	10-11	13	1 (7.7)	1 (7.7)	3 (23.1)	6 (46.2)	2 (22.2)
	Past Experience	7			3 (42.9)	4 (57.1)	
4	10	9		2(22.2)		3 (33.3)	4(44.4)
	11	3		1(33.3)	1 (33.3)		1 (33.3)
	10-11	13		1(14.3)	2 (15.4)	5 (38.5)	4 (30.8)
	Past Experience	7	1(14.3)	4(44.4)	1 (14.3)	5 (71.4)	
5	10	9	4(44.4)			1 (11.1)	
	11	3	1(33.3)	1(33.3)		1 (33.3)	
	10-11	13	3(23.1)	4(30.8)	3 (23.1)	2 (15.4)	1 (17.7)
	Past Experience	7					
6	10	9		1(11.1)	1 (11.1)	3 (33.3)	4 (44.4)
	11	3				1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)
	10-11	13		1 (1.7)	1 (1.7)	9 (69.2)	2 (15.4)
	Past Experience	7			1 (14.3)	3 (42.9)	3 (42.9)
7	10	9		2(22.2)		4 (44.4)	3 (33.3)
	11	3		1(33.3)	1 (33.3)	1 (33.3)	
	10-11	13	1 (7.7)	1 (7.7)	1 (33.3)	6 (46.2)	5 (38.5)
	Past Experience	7	1(14.3)		1 (14.3)	3 (42.9)	2 (28.6)
8	10	9	1(11.1)		1 (11.1)	4 (44.4)	3 (33.3)
	11	3			1 (33.3)		2 (66.7)
	10-11	13	2(15.4)	4(30.8)	2 (15.4)	2 (15.4)	3 (23.1)
	Past Experience	7	4(44.4)	1(11.1)	2 (28.6)	3 (42.9)	2 (28.6)
9	10	9	4(44.4)		1 (11.1)	3 (33.3)	
	11	3	1(33.3)	2(66.7)		1 (33.3)	
	10-11	13	3(23.1)	6(46.2)	1 (1.7)	3 (23.1)	
	Past Experience	7	1(14.3)	4(57.1)		2 (28.6)	
10	10	9	4(44.4)	3(33.3)	1 (11.1)	1 (11.1)	
	11	3	1(33.3)		1 (33.3)		1 (33.3)
	10-11	13	2(15.4)	5(38.5)	1 (7.7)	4 (30.8)	1 (7.7)
	Past Experience	7	2(28.6)	1(14.3)	1 (14.3)	1 (14.3)	2 (28.6)
11	10	9	4(44.4)		3 (33.3)	2 (22.2)	
	11	3	1(33.3)	1(33.3)		1 (33.3)	
	10-11	13	1 (7.7)	4(30.8)	4 (30.8)	3 (23.1)	1 (7.7)
	Past Experience	7	3(42.9)	2(28.6)	1 (14.3)		1 (14.3)
12	10	9	3(33.3)	2(22.2)	2 (22.2)	2 (22.2)	
	11	3				2 (66.7)	1 (33.3)
	10-11	13	2(15.4)	2(15.4)	7 (53.8)	2 (15.4)	
	Past Experience	7	1(14.3)	2(28.6)	1 (14.3)	2 (28.6)	1 (14.3)
13	10	9		1(11.1)	3 (33.3)	2 (22.2)	3 (33.3)
	11	3		1(33.3)	1 (33.3)		1 (33.3)
	10-11	13		1 (7.7)	3 (23.1)	9 (69.2)	
	Past Experience	7	3(33.3)	3(33.3)	1 (14.3)	4 (57.1)	2 (28.6)
14	10	9	3(33.3)		1 (11.1)	1 (11.1)	
	11	3		2(66.7)		1 (33.3)	
	10-11	13	3(23.1)	1 (7.7)	3 (23.1)	6 (46.2)	
	Past Experience	7	1(14.3)	3(42.9)	2 (28.6)	1 (14.3)	
15	10	9	7(77.8)	2(22.2)			
	11	3		2(66.7)	1 (33.3)		
	10-11	13	6(46.2)	5(38.5)	1 (7.7)	1 (7.7)	
	Past Experience	7	3(42.9)	2(28.6)		2 (28.6)	
16	10	9	6(66.7)	1(11.1)	1 (11.1)	1 (11.1)	
	11	3	1(33.3)	1(33.3)			1 (33.3)
	10-11	13	3(23.1)	5(38.5)	2 (15.4)	2 (15.4)	1 (7.7)
	Past Experience	7	2(28.6)	3(42.9)		2 (28.6)	
17	10	9	2(22.2)	3(33.3)	2 (22.2)	2 (22.2)	
	11	3		1(33.3)		1 (33.3)	1 (33.3)
	10-11	13	2(15.4)		3 (23.1)	6 (46.2)	2 (15.4)
	Past Experience	7		3(42.9)	1 (14.3)	1 (14.3)	2 (28.6)
18	10	9			1 (11.1)	5 (55.6)	3 (33.3)
	11	3				1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)
	10-11	13			1 (7.7)	9 (69.2)	3 (23.1)
	Past Experience	7	1(14.3)			3 (42.9)	3 (42.9)
19	10	9	8(88.9)	1(11.1)			
	11	3	1(33.3)	1(33.3)	1 (33.3)		
	10-11	13	6(46.2)	4(30.8)	3 (23.1)		
	Past Experience	7	3(42.9)	2(28.6)	1 (14.3)	1 (14.3)	
20	10	9		2(22.2)		1 (11.1)	6 (66.7)
	11	3	1(33.3)				2 (66.7)
	10-11	13	1 (7.7)	1 (7.7)	3 (23.1)	6 (46.2)	2 (15.4)
	Past Experience	7			2 (28.6)	4 (57.1)	1 (14.3)
21	10	9	5(55.6)	1(11.1)			3 (33.3)
	11	3		1(33.3)			2 (66.7)
	10-11	13	2(15.4)	2(15.4)	1 (7.7)	5 (38.5)	3 (23.1)
	Past Experience	7	1(14.3)	3(42.9)		2 (28.6)	1 (14.3)
22	10	9	1(11.1)	2(22.2)		5 (55.6)	1 (11.1)
	11	3			1 (33.3)	1 (33.3)	1 (33.3)
	10-11	13	1 (7.7)	6(46.2)	2 (15.4)	1 (7.7)	3 (23.1)
	Past Experience	7	1(14.3)	1(14.3)	1 (14.3)	2 (28.6)	2 (28.6)

As is seen in the above Table, the significance value is not given, since a significant difference has not been detected among the teachers who are offering linguistics courses I, linguistics courses II, I and II at the moment and in the past.

According to the questions in succession, their answers are as follows:

In the first question which checks if they like giving linguistics courses, they show their enjoyment. In the second question, they indicate that they strongly disagree on the idea that linguistics does not appeal to them. In the third question, they agree that linguistics course is important for every student no matter what his interest is. In the fourth question they point out that people around do not think that linguistics is an important course. The fifth question reveals the fact that they strongly disagree on the idea that linguistics is not important. The following question six shows that they are trying to make their students like linguistics courses. In the seventh question, they take the same side with the given statement that is linguistics courses will be more helpful for those who are going to choose foreign language studies for their profession. In question eight, the teachers think that linguistics should not be elective. In the next question they state that they have no difficulty in preparing the outline of linguistics courses. In the tenth question, they do not think that they need in-service training for linguistics courses. In the eleventh question, they confess that they do not motivate the students to choose linguistics as a profession. In the twelfth question, it is indicated that almost half of the teachers follows the publications on linguistics, whereas the others do not. In question 13 and 14, the teachers indicate that whereas they know some Turkish linguists, they do not know foreign linguists. Question 15 shows that the teachers do not attend congresses, seminars, lectures on linguistics. In the sixteenth question the teachers admit that they have no difficulty in teaching linguistics. In Question 17, they state that they usually teach grammar in linguistic courses. In question 18, they put forward that they do not use only text book, but also some supplementary linguistics sources in sessions (Q19). They do not take the same side with the given statement that they refer to the departments of Linguistics at Universities whenever they need. Question 20 indicates that according to the teachers, linguistics courses raise the students' language awareness. In question 21 it is seen that half of the teachers took linguistics in their undergraduate education, whereas the half of them did not take. In the last question, 22, in the questionnaire, the teachers strongly agree on the idea that they usually give language tests to the students in linguistics courses.

As is seen in the answers given to the questions, the teachers are aware of the importance of linguistics in developing students' language awareness, and enjoy giving linguistics and think that linguistics courses are more helpful for language students. The teachers in the study are experienced teachers, since their working period is between thirty and seven years. The following points are also suggested by the teachers for linguistics courses:

- Linguistics courses in undergraduate programs of teacher education
- More supplementary sources for linguistics courses.
- A guidance for choosing linguistics courses.
- More than two hours a week for linguistics courses in the curriculum.

The suggestions above are very plausible for training students and preparing them for language studies in universities. The following Table 4 shows the students in departments of linguistics have chosen those departments consciously.

Table 4. Crosstables of the Answers of the Students in the Departments of Linguistics According to the Classes

Q	Class	N	SD(%)	D(%)	U(%)	A(%)	SA(%)	X ² -Test Result	Significance Level
1	1	63	8 (12.7)	17 (27.0)	7 (11.1)	21 (33.3)	10 (15.9)	9.717	.641
	2	27	6 (22.2)	5 (18.5)	6 (22.2)	4 (14.8)	6 (22.2)		
	3	69	7 (10.1)	13 (18.8)	13 (18.8)	22 (31.9)	14 (20.3)		
	4	36	6 (16.7)	8 (22.2)	4 (11.1)	13 (36.1)	5 (13.9)		
2	1	63	16 (25.4)	21 (33.3)	19 (30.2)	5 (7.9)	2 (3.2)	10.662	.558
	2	27	8 (29.6)	9 (33.3)	4 (14.8)	4 (14.8)	2 (7.4)		
	3	68	17 (25.0)	19 (27.9)	20 (29.4)	8 (11.8)	4 (5.9)		
	4	36	16 (44.4)	6 (16.7)	8 (22.2)	5 (13.9)	1 (2.8)		
3	1	63	1 (1.6)			5 (7.9)	57 (90.5)	17.421	.134
	2	27				1 (3.7)	26 (96.3)		
	3	69	3 (4.3)			1 (1.4)	65 (94.2)		
	4	36	3 (8.3)	1 (2.8)			32 (88.9)		
4	1	62	20 (32.3)	12 (19.4)	5 (8.1)	16 (25.8)	9 (14.5)	24.128	.020
	2	27	4 (14.8)	11 (40.7)	3 (11.1)	5 (18.5)	4 (14.8)		
	3	69	31 (44.9)	17 (24.6)	12 (17.4)	6 (8.7)	3 (4.3)		
	4	36	15 (41.7)	7 (19.7)	5 (13.9)	3 (8.3)	6 (16.7)		
5	1	47	18 (38.3)	5 (10.6)	4 (8.5)	8 (17.0)	12 (25.5)	25.037	.015
	2	21		2 (9.5)	2 (9.5)	11 (52.4)	6 (28.6)		
	3	51	16 (31.4)	6 (11.8)	3 (5.9)	12 (23.5)	14 (27.5)		
	4	24	6 (25.0)	3 (12.5)	6 (25.0)	2 (8.3)	7 (29.2)		

As is seen in the above Table, all the classes in the departments of linguistics have chosen the department consciously. However, they indicate that they have not chosen the department to be linguists. That they have not chosen the department by chance may lie in the fact that they were in language classes in high schools. Although there is not a significant difference among the classes in the first three questions, in the fourth question, a significant difference is detected. The third year university students are more conscious about choosing the department when compared with the first year students. It may indicate that the desire for linguistics departments is likely to decrease, if the required importance to linguistics courses is not given in high schools.

The above findings from the questionnaires may help us to get a profile of linguistics courses in high schools. For judgment of linguistics courses in high schools, the syllabi of linguistics I and II should be also scrutinized.

When they are gone through, it is seen that they are prepared in line with the content of the linguistics text book published by the Ministry of National Education. Lise Dilbilim I (High School Linguistics I) consists of three units. In the first unit, language and linguistics with their definitions are given. The origin of language is discussed with the lack of theories of language. The characteristics of language are incomplete, since cultural transmission and interchangeability features are missing. Language acquisition is discussed at definition level with incomplete steps in acquisition.

Although a dichotomy between linguistics and grammar is given in the books, the students have indicated that teachers devote more time to teach grammar. Under the heading of branches of linguistics, only structural linguistics (micro linguistics) has been given.

In the second unit, the definitions of communication with its types and types of language, such as standard, dialect, regional dialect, jargon, argot without the term sociolinguistics are presented.

In the third unit, semantics, context, meaning, use, internal and external factors in memory and text are discussed without discourse elements, such as anaphora, cataphora, deictic items, and so forth.

At the end of each unit, some tests have been given. The above given topics are discussed from September to June.

Her Yönüyle Dil: Ana Çizgileriyle Dilbilim, by Doğan AKSAN; Üniversiteler için Türk Dili by Muharrem ERGİN; Dilbilim ve Gösterge Bilim Kuramları by Mehmet RIFAT; Dil Denen Mucize by Walter PORZIG, Yazılı ve Sözlü Anlatım by Enise KANDEMİR are also used as supplementary books by the teachers, as they are indicated in the syllabus of Linguistics I course.

The eleventh graders use Lise Dil Bilim 2 (High School Linguistics 2) as a text book. As is seen, the Turkish Dil Bilim is misspelled. It must be “Dilbilim”. Students are exposed to the name of the course with the misspelled title unfortunately. The syllabus of Linguistics II correlates with the above given text book which consists of three units in which structural linguistics is only presented.

In the first unit, phonetics: the sounds of language and the types of phonetics are given. The book gives mistranslated word for phonetics. Turkish “sesbilgisi” is used as “sesbilim”. Besides, phonology is given as one of the branches of phonetics.

Vocal organs are illustrated with consonant and vowel charts. Speech sounds are discussed in terms of place and manner of articulation. The book uses “anlam ayırt eden ses” for “sesbirim” phoneme.

In the second unit: vocabulary construction and sentence construction are discussed. The term “biçimbirim” for morpheme is not used. There is also a saying in the book which violates one of the characteristics of linguistics: “The richness of a language is associated with its civilization”, since all languages in the world are equally complex. They cannot be primitive or rich.

In the third unit, the medium of language with written and spoken language is discussed. Under the headings of writing systems, only alphabets are given; petrolyph, pictographs, ideograms, logograms, syllabaries are missing.

In the syllabus, Dilbilgisi by Muharrem ERGİN, Dilbilgisi by Tahir Nejat GENCAN, Türkçe'nin Grameri by Tahsin BANGUOĞLU, have been also used as supplementary materials. The units take 10 months in School Year as in Linguistics I.

Ten months for each linguistics course may seem enough for the graders but not for the teachers. Students complain that teachers highly give importance to grammar in linguistics II, although they study grammar in literature courses. Macro linguistics is not introduced to the graders. Although majority of teachers of linguistics state that they have no difficulty in teaching linguistics, if they were asked to teach macro linguistics which is missing in the syllabi of the linguistics courses, they would have difficulty in teaching topics in macro linguistics. Unless they are taught macro linguistics, they may be said not to be efficient in teaching linguistics. Since the topics in course outline are related with the topics they use in language and literature courses, they can be said to be successful. To be more helpful to the students in the University Entrance Examination, teachers prefer language tests to linguistic topics in courses, as it is indicated in question five in Table 4, although they know the fact stated by Kocaman (2005, p.21). (See Question 20 in the Appendix 2)

Linguistics as Kocaman (2005, p.21) points out “Generally contributes to the development of both language awareness and our mother tongue awareness. All in all it accelerates the development of language awareness”.

If a field is so important for language development of human beings, its teaching in high schools and universities should deserve the best. As is in the questionnaire results, all the teachers do not have the linguistic background although they are teachers of language and literature. As Kocaman (2005, p.21) claims, these departments need more courses on linguistics. Özsoy (2005, p.21) taking the same side with Kocaman, asserts that “universities should open new departments where university students are educated with the mission that language is not seen only a means but also an aim”. By the term “department” , “departments of linguistics” are meant implicitly. Then linguistics courses in high schools may be offered by teachers who are graduates of linguistics departments.

Conclusion

In this study, linguistics courses in high schools have been judged through questionnaire findings from both teachers of linguistics and students. Besides, the syllabi of linguistics courses have been discussed.

The results indicate that high school students are aware of the importance of linguistics, since it raises their language awareness although the courses do not appeal to the eleventh graders much. The attitude of the tenth graders towards linguistics courses is significantly different from that of the eleventh graders. Teachers offering linguistics courses in high school enjoy linguistics although they are not graduates of linguistics departments. The attitude of teachers of linguistics I courses is not significantly different from that of the teachers of linguistics II courses, whereas the attitude of students

towards linguistics courses according to the cities in Turkey is significantly different. Students in Samsun are the most aware of the significance of linguistics. Since linguistics courses develop students' curiosity and pleasure, they have not chosen the departments of linguistics by chance. The motivation of the students in high schools may be higher through well-prepared text books. The books used in the courses seem problematic for both teachers and students.

Linguistics II highly depends on grammar. It is an overuse of grammar in linguistics. Examples are not enough for the topics discussed. Macro linguistics should be also taught in high schools. Since it may be problematic for teachers of language and literature, students who are graduates of the departments of linguistics may be recruited as teachers of linguistics in high schools.

This study aims at taking attention of both school and university administrators to linguistics courses in high schools and helping linguistics to take its place as it deserves. If linguists help administrators of Ministry of Education to raise students' awareness of linguistics, high school students will gain the importance of language and language studies in the world. Students in the Departments of Linguistics will be more conscious about what they are trying to do, and for what they are preparing. For conscious future linguists, we should take a step in developing linguistics syllabi in schools, having considered the results taken from the data collected for this study.

References

- Aksan, D. (1995). *Her Yönüyle Dil: Ana Cizgileriyle Dilbilim*. Ankara: TDK Yayınları.
- Banguoğlu, T. (1990). *Türkçe'nin Grameri*. Ankara: TDK Yayınları.
- Ergin, M. (1988). *Üniversiteler için Türk Dili*. İstanbul: Bayrak Yayınları.
- Gencan, T. N. (1979). *Dilbilgisi*. Ankara: TDK Yayınları.
- Kandemir, E. (1997). *Yazılı ve Sözlü Anlatım*. Ankara: Ergin Yayınları.
- Kocaman, A. (23 Temmuz 2005). Üniversitelerde dilbiliminin yeri üzerine. *Cumhuriyet Bilim Teknik*. s. 21.
- Özdamar, K. et al. (2000). *Lise Dil bilim II*. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- . (2001). *Lise Dilblim I*. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Özsoy, S. (5 Kasım 2005). Ülkemizde anlaşılamayan bir bilim dalı: Dilbilim. *Cumhuriyet Bilim Teknik*. s. 20-21.
- Porzig, W. (1986). *Dil Denen Mucize*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Rifat, M. (1983). *Dilbilim ve Göstergibilim Kuramları*. İstanbul: Yazko.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Dear Student,

The statements on this form are given to learn your attitude towards linguistics courses you are taking at the moment. The answers may be different for each of you. Feel free to answer, since the answer will reflect your own idea. Please read each statement carefully before you answer. Mark your answer with (X). To assure anonymity, your name is not requested on this form. Please answer all the statements. We thank you for your help.

A)Personal Information :

Gender: Female() Male()

Class:

City:

B)Your Attitude

Strongly Agree: 5

Agree: 4

Undecided: 3

Disagree: 2

Strongly Disagree: 1

		5	4	3	2	1
1	I like linguistics.					
2	A Linguistics Course does not appeal to me.					
3	To study linguistics is important for every student no matter what his interest is.					
4	I want to be a linguist.					
5	I do not want to choose a profession related with linguistics in the future.					
6	The reason why linguistics courses are boring is teachers.					
7	I do not think that I won't be able to use what I have learnt in linguistics courses.					
8	I haven't understood anything from the content of linguistics course.					
9	If possible I could have taken another course rather than Linguistics Course.					
10	I enjoy explaining what I have learnt in linguistics courses to people around me.					
11	I do not understand anything in linguistics courses.					
12	I am looking forward to attending linguistics courses.					
13	I do not feel like attending linguistics courses.					
14	I advice my friends to choose linguistics courses.					
15	I enjoy studying linguistics more than I do in other courses.					
16	I study linguistics courses only to pass the exams.					
17	Linguistics is not related with daily life.					
18	Being busy with the topics related with linguistics is boring to me.					
19	I think that linguistics is hard.					
20	I take linguistics to be a language teacher.					
21	I believe that linguistics courses raise my language awareness.					
22	I believe that linguistics courses prepare me for my prospective language studies.					

C)Please write your ideas and suggestions about linguistics.

Appendix 2

Dear Colleague,

The aim of the study is to learn your attitude towards Linguistics Courses. To assure anonymity, your name is not requested on this form. Thank you for your cooperation.

Personal / Professional Information

A- 1. Institution you have graduated from

University:

Faculty:

Department:

2. Year of Graduation:

3. Type of the school you are working for:

Anatolian High School:

Super High School:

High School:

4. Working Period:

5. Name of the City:

6. Name of the Linguistics Course:

B- Attitude Test:

Strongly Agree: 5

Agree: 4

Undecided: 3

Disagree: 2

Strongly Disagree: 1

Please mark the following statements with (X) .

		5	4	3	2	1
1	I like giving linguistics courses.					
2	A Linguistics course does not appeal to me.					
3	A Linguistics Course is important for every student no matter what their interests are.					
4	People around me do not think that linguistics is an important course.					
5	I do not think that linguistics course is important.					
6	I am trying to have my students like linguistics courses.					
7	I believe that linguistics courses will be more helpful for those who are going to choose foreign language studies for their profession.					
8	Linguistics courses should not be elective.					
9	I have difficulty in preparing the outline of linguistics courses.					
10	I need an in-service training for linguistics courses.					
11	I motivate the students to choose linguistics as a profession.					
12	I follow the publications on linguistics.					
13	I know Turkish linguists.					
14	I know foreign linguists.					
15	I attend congresses, seminars on linguistics and so forth.					
16	I have difficulty in teaching linguistics.					
17	I usually teach grammar in linguistics courses.					
18	I do not use only a text book, but also some other supplementary sources in linguistics courses.					
19	While I am giving linguistics courses, I refer to the departments of Linguistics at Universities.					
20	I believe that linguistics courses raise the students' language awareness.					
21	I took linguistics courses in my undergraduate education.					
22	I usually use language texts in linguistics courses.					

C- Please write your ideas or suggestions about linguistics.

Appendix 3

Dear Student,

This questionnaire is prepared to learn your attitude towards Linguistics. Please indicate your ideas with a mark (X).

To assure anonymity, your name is not requested on this form. Thank you for your contributions.

A- Personal Information

Gender : Female () Male ()

University :

Faculty :

Department :

Class :

B- Attitude Test

Strongly Agree: 5

Agree: 4

Undecided:3

Disagree: 2

Strongly Disagree: 1

	STATEMENTS	5	4	3	2	1
1	I have chosen the linguistics department consciously.					
2	I have chosen the linguistics department to be a linguist.					
3	In high school my major was foreign language.					
4	I have chosen the linguistics department by chance.					
5	We were given language tests in linguistics courses in high school.					