

**AL-FARABI KAZAKH NATIONAL UNIVERSITY**  
**Faculty of Philology**  
**Department of Turkology and Language Theory**

**PROGRAM OF FINAL EXAMINATION ON THE DISCIPLINE**

**Code: AD 5301**

**ID 91289**

**Academic discourse**

Educational programme "**7MO2307 – Linguistics**

Course – 1  
Semester – 2  
Number of credits – 5

**Almaty, 2024**

# 1. THE THEMATIC PROGRAM OF THE DISCIPLINE

## The aim of the discipline:

The purpose of the discipline Academic discourse is a sphere of communication associated with a specific sphere of human activity — the acquisition and transmission of scientific knowledge. During the study of course, students should be competent in: discourse, discourse linguistics, academic discourse, institutional discourse, text, analyze various types of discourses, identify language features of academic discourse, consider academic discourse in the field of Kazakhstan education, describe the multilingual linguistic situation in the educational sphere

## Expected learning outcomes:

LO 1. Demonstrate an understanding and knowledge of the basic concepts and terms of discourse theory

LO2. Master the theoretical and methodological foundations of the theory and practice of academic discourse;

LO3. Be able to apply the main concepts of the course - text, discourse, scientific communication, strategy of speech self-presentation, discursive markers, etc..;

LO 4. Effectively apply knowledge of the theory and methodology of modern knowledge in determining the specificity of universal and national-specific features of scientific communication through the prism of academic discourse;

LO 5. Formulate and justify their point of view on theoretical problems of modern discourse; present the results of the analysis in the form of an essay, presentation, review.

## Topics of the Discipline

**Module 1.** Discourse and Its Characteristics. Discourse as an Interdisciplinary Field of Knowledge. Academic Discourse and its Place in Discourse Study. The Concept of National Discourse Pragmatics. Academic discourse as a special sphere of communication. Problems of stereotypical perceptions of the properties of academic communication. Features of Academic Discourse. Linguistic directions developing original models of discourse. The problem of relating to the concepts of academic or scientific discourse. Discourse Competence as a Specific Form of Cognitive Activity.

**Module 2.** Academic Discourse in Western Studies (the Twentieth and Twenty-First Centuries). Theoretical Framework of the development of Discourse Studies. Theoretical Framework of the development of Discourse Studies. Theoretical Framework of the development of Discourse Studies. The study of academic discourse in national and foreign linguistics. Scientific style as a speech system specially adapted for optimal communication of people in the scientific sphere of activity. The issue of the relationship between discourse analysis and functional stylistics. The essential characteristics of discourse.

**Module 3.** The scientific article as a genre of academic discourse. The main linguodiscursive and genre characteristics of the scientific article. Functional features of scientific discourse. The cognitive-discursive essence of the scientific article. Research article methodology and scientific categories of research. Relevance, hypothesis, purpose, object and results as scientific categories of research. Analysis of the scientific categories. Concepts of discourse markers in modern linguistics. Fundamental works devoted to the problems of discursive lexicon functioning.

## References:

1. The Discourse in which we live (to the problem of defining "discourse"). [Electronic resource] - access Mode: [http://workinggroun.org.ua\\_nuhldzo.shtml](http://workinggroun.org.ua_nuhldzo.shtml).

2. Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary / GL. ed. V. N. Yartseva, - M.: Sov. enciklopediya, 1990. - 685 p.: Il. [Electronic resource] - access Mode: <http://lingvisticheskiy-slovar.ru/description/diskurs/168>

3. Discourse. The types of discourse [Electronic resource]- Mode of access: <http://diskursmyblog.ru/tag/diskurs/>.

4. Stubbs, M. (1996) Text and Discourse Analysis. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

5. Grigorieva, V. S. Discourse as an element of the communicative process: Pragmalinguistic and cognitive aspects: monograph / V. S. Grigorieva. Tambov: publishing house of Tambov state technical University. UN-TA, 2007. - 288 p.

6. Karasik V. I. Language circle: personality, concepts, discourse. - Volgograd: Peremena, 2002. - 477 p.

7. Karasik V. I. On the types of discourse. Research laboratory "Axiological linguistics". [Electronic resource] - access Mode: <http://homepages.tversu.ru/~ips/JubKaras.html>.

8. Arakelova, O. G. the Place of advertising discourse in the system of discourses.

[[http://www.rusnauka.com/6\\_PNI\\_2012/Philologia/7\\_102328.doc.htm](http://www.rusnauka.com/6_PNI_2012/Philologia/7_102328.doc.htm)]

9. Mironova, N. N. Evaluative discourse: problems of semantic analysis // Izv. RAS, Ser. lit. and yaz. - N. 4. - vol. 56. - 1997. - P. 52-59.

Internet resources;

1. <http://elibrary.kaznu.kz/ru>

2. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/lektsiya-kak-sostavlyayuschaya-sovremennogo-kommunikativnogo-prostranstva-vuza>

3. <https://scipress.ru/philology/articles/lingvokulturologicheskie-osobennosti-akademicheskogo-diskursa-v-mezhkulturnoj-internet-kommunikatsii.html>

## 2. METHODOLOGICAL INSTRUCTION FOR FINAL EXAMINATION: STANDARD ORAL EXAMINATION (OFFLINE)

**2.1. Exam format:** Standard oral examination (offline). **Platform:** IS Univer

**2.2. The purpose of the oral examination:** to demonstrate the learning outcomes, skills and competencies acquired during the study of the discipline, the ability to logically express one's thoughts out loud, and to argue one's point of view.

**2.3. Expected results of the exam tasks:**

One oral exam ticket contains 3 questions that identify learning outcomes for the studied course and are assessed according to the following criteria:

Question 1 - Criterion 1. Knowledge of the theory and concept of the course. Criterion 2. Understanding and confirmation with examples of the theoretical principles presented in the course content.

Question 2 - Criterion 3. Application of the selected methodology and technology to specific practical tasks. Criterion 4. Disclosure and solution of the main problem given in the practical task.

Question 3 - Criterion 5. Evaluation and critical analysis of the applicability of the chosen methodology to the proposed practical task. Criterion 6. Justification of the obtained result from one's own practice; ability to conduct scientific discussions.

**2.4. The examination procedure.**

2.4.1. The standard offline oral exam is conducted in accordance with the approved schedule.

2.4.2. The duration of the oral examination should not exceed 6 academic hours per day. However, no more than 25 people per day are allowed to take the oral exam.

2.4.3. No more than 5 examinees may be present in the room where the oral examination is being conducted at the same time. The remaining examinees of the current group await an individual invitation outside the exam room without leaving the faculty building.

2.4.4. When entering the exam room, the student must provide the examiner with an identification card and sign the appearance form.

2.4.5. Standing up and/or changing places, or leaving the classroom before completing your answer to the ticket during the exam is prohibited.

2.4.6. When conducting an oral examination, the examination card is chosen by the examinee himself.

2.4.7. In preparation for the answer, the student is given sheets for compiling a summary of the answer. The time for students to prepare an oral response is 10 minutes. To defend the answer, the student speaks in front of the examiner for no more than 5 minutes.

2.4.8. After announcing his last name, the student begins his answer on the ticket. Each question is scored based on the maximum possible points indicated in the questionnaire.

2.4.9. In order to more deeply ascertain the student's level of knowledge, the examiner has the right to ask him additional questions, as well as offer tasks and examples within the framework of the questions on the exam card.

2.4.10. During the exam, students are PROHIBITED from carrying and/or using cheat sheets, cell phones, smart watches and other technical and other means that can be used for unauthorized access to auxiliary information.

2.4.11. If a student appears for the exam and refuses to answer the ticket, passing the exam will be graded as an "F."

2.4.12. If there is no good reason, failure to appear for the exam will be assessed as an "F".

2.4.13. If a student violates one or more of these points, an act of cancellation of the examination work (hereinafter referred to as the Act) is filled out, and a grade of "F" ("unsatisfactory") is assigned for the discipline.

2.4.14. For repeated violation of these Rules during the exam, the student is presented for consideration by the Faculty Council on Ethics.

2.4.15. All violations during exams are recorded in the student's transcript.

## 3. EVALUATION POLICY.

## RUBRICTOR FOR CRITERIAL ASSESSMENT OF FINAL EXAMINATION

**Discipline:** Academic Discourse. **Form:** Standard oral examination (offline). **Platform:** IS Univer

№	e	Scor	DESCRIPTORS				
			«Excellent»	«Good»	«Satisfactory»	«Unsatisfactory»	
			90-100 %	70-89 %	50-69 %	25-49 %	0-24 %
Criterion							
Question 1	Criterion 1. Knowledge of the theory and concept of the course.	1. Student knows the theory and concepts of the course fully; the answer is presented in literate scientific language, all terms and concepts were used correctly and explained correctly.	In general, the correct answer was given to the question, but with some inaccuracies that are not of a fundamental nature. Not all terms of the course are used correctly; there are some incorrect statements and grammatical/stylistic errors in presentation.	The answer to the question is fragmentary; correct conclusions were interspersed with incorrect ones. The substantive blocks of the course necessary for a full disclosure of the topic were missed.	The answer did not correspond to the content of the question; the significant mistakes were found.	There is no answer to the question; ignorance of educational material was revealed.	
	Criterion 2. Understanding and confirmation with examples of the theoretical principles presented in the course content.	A comprehensive answer with illustrated examples was given to the question; the answer is presented in literate scientific language, all terms and concepts are used correctly and explained correctly.	The answer was not sufficiently illustrated by examples.	The student generally understands the subject matter of the course, but has problems uncovering specific issues.	Key concepts for the training course contained in the questions are interpreted incorrectly.	Student's misunderstanding of most or most important part educational material. Violation of the Rules for Conducting the Final examination.	
Question 2	Criterion 3. Application of the selected methodology and technology to specific practical tasks	The technology and methodology of the course were applied with deep content, taking into account the specifics of the students' training area.	The course methodology and the knowledge acquired by the student were poorly integrated and adapted to the solution of specific practical tasks proposed in the exam card.	The course tools were used superficially and differ low content, there are inaccuracies in the answer, the logic of presentation is broken.	Student incorrectly applied the essential part of the discipline, makes significant factual errors that the student cannot correct on his own.	Student's inability to apply knowledge to solve assignments and explain course phenomena. When answering (one question), he makes more than 3-4 gross mistakes, which he cannot correct even with	

						the help of a teacher.
	<i>Criterion 4.</i> Disclosure and solution of the main problem given in the practical task	Scientific concepts were freely applied to the task at hand, followed by a logical and evidence-based disclosure of the main problem.	The student's knowledge was adapted; the answers are weak structured, the answer contains minor factual errors, which he can correct independently, thanks to a leading question.	Lack of meaningfulness of the provided material, there is no understanding of interdisciplinary connections.	Student finds it difficult to answer most of the additional questions on the content of the exam or does not give the correct answers.	Student did not fully understand the material. Violation of the Rules for final control.
<b>Question 3</b>	<i>Criterion 5.</i> Evaluating and critically analyzing the applicability of the chosen methodology to the proposed practical task.	Possessing the ability to critically analyze, integrate, validity and analysis of methods and technology on a specific topic, structuring the answer, analysis of the provisions of existing theories, scientific schools, directions on the issue of the exam card.	Integration and critical analysis of the application of methods and course technology followed by the use of visual materials to consolidate one's reasoning through the use of scientific concepts with the allowance of minor errors when reproducing knowledge.	Superficial justification of the patterns and principles of the course.	Lack of validity and analysis of the application of methods and technology of the course.	Lack of critical analysis of the applicability of the methodology to the proposed task.
	<i>Criterion 6.</i> Justification of the result obtained from one's own practice; ability to conduct scientific discussions	The answers were illustrated with examples and visuals. materials, including from the student's own practice; student demonstrated the ability to conduct dialogue and engage in scientific discussion.	Analysis of 3-4 provisions of existing theories, scientific schools and directions with justification of the result obtained from one's own practice on the question of the exam card with some inaccuracies.	There was poor application of the main volume of material in accordance with the training program with difficulties in reproducing it independently and the requirement of leading questions.	There was demonstration of difficulty in providing answers to questions of a reproductive nature.	Lack of ability to apply course methods when giving examples was revealed. Violation of the Rules for final examination.

**Formula for calculating the final grade:**

Final grade (FG) = (%1+%2+%3+%4+%5+%6) / K, where % is the level of task completion by criterion, K is the total number of criteria.

**Example of calculating the final grade**

№	Score Criterion	«Excellent»	«Good»	«Satisfactory»	«Unsatisfactory»	
		90-100 %	70-89%	50-69%	25-49%	0-24%
1.	Criterion 1	100				
2.	Criterion 2		75			
3.	Criterion 3			60		
4.	Criterion 4				45	
5.	Criterion 5	100				
6.	Criterion 6				49	
	<b>Final %</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>200+ 75 + 60 + 94 = 429</b> <b>429 / 6 criteria = 71,5</b> <b>Final score, as % = 72</b>

Based on percentage obtained during the calculation, we can compare the score with the rating scale.

72 points range from 70 points to 89 points, which corresponds to the “Good” category according to the grading scale.

Thus, with this calculation, the project will be rated 72 points “Good” in accordance with the point-rating letter system for assessing educational achievements students with their transfer to the traditional grading scale and ECTS.

Dean  
Head of the Department

Lecturer



B.U. Dzholdasbekova  
R.A. Avakova

A.T. Aliakbarova