Guidelines for SIW on the subject “Theoretical grammar and methods of teaching”.

Students’ task is to study and prepare presentation or report on the given theme.

SIW. 1. Report/presentation. Origin of the language.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criterion | "Excellent" 20-25% | “Good” 15-19% | “Satisfactory” 10-14% | “Unsatisfactory” 0-9% |
| Identification and Explanation of Language Origins | Provides a comprehensive and detailed explanation of the origin of languages, including different theories (e.g., divine source theory, natural sound theory, social interaction theory, genetic basis of language, etc.). Discusses the earliest known languages, proto-languages, and the role of language evolution. | Offers a mostly accurate and detailed explanation of language origins, but may overlook some key theories or aspects of language development. The explanation is still mostly comprehensive and covers the main points. | Provides a basic explanation of the origin of languages, though some important details or theories are missing. The overall understanding is sound but lacks depth.  . | The explanation of language origins is unclear or incomplete, with significant gaps in understanding. Only one or two theories may be mentioned with minimal detail |
| Understanding of Language Families and Proto-Languages | Demonstrates an in-depth understanding of major language families (e.g., Indo-European, Afro-Asiatic, Uralic, Sino-Tibetan, etc.), proto-languages, and how languages are classified. Clearly explains the development of languages from proto-languages and provides examples of linguistic evolution. | Shows a good understanding of language families and proto-languages with only minor errors or omissions. Most key language families are identified and correctly explained.        . | Demonstrates a basic understanding of language families and proto-languages, but with limited details or incomplete explanations. Only a few examples are provided. | Shows minimal understanding of language families or proto-languages, with several key omissions or inaccuracies |
| Discussion of Theories on the Evolution of Human Language | Provides a thorough discussion of the different theories on the evolution of human language (e.g., biological evolution, cultural evolution, and cognitive development theories). Includes relevant linguistic, anthropological, and genetic research supporting these theories. | Discusses the main theories of language evolution, with only minor gaps in detail. Most supporting research or evidence is presented and relevant. | Presents a basic discussion of language evolution theories, but lacks depth or supporting research. Key theories may be mentioned, but their explanations are somewhat superficial. | The discussion of language evolution is incomplete or unclear. Few theories are mentioned, and supporting evidence is minimal or incorrect. |
| Comparison of Language Origin Theories | \*\*Excellent (5 points)\*\*:  Effectively compares different theories of language origin, highlighting key similarities and differences (e.g., divine theories vs. evolutionary theories). Demonstrates a nuanced understanding of the strengths and limitations of each theory. | Provides a good comparison of the major language origin theories, with mostly accurate details. The analysis is clear, though it may lack some nuance. | Presents a basic comparison of some language origin theories, though the analysis is limited or lacks depth. Some key distinctions are noted but not fully explored. | Attempts a comparison of language origin theories but with significant gaps or inaccuracies. The analysis is unclear or superficial. |
| Clarity and Organization of Explanation | The explanation is well-organized, with clear and logical flow. Uses precise language to describe the case systems and their functions.. | The explanation is mostly clear and organized, though there may be minor lapses in structure or clarity.. | The explanation is understandable but may be disjointed or lack clarity in some areas. | The explanation is difficult to follow, with frequent lapses in clarity or structure. |

SIW. 2. Category case of the noun. Compare Case system of English, Kazakh and Russian languages.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criterion | "Excellent" 20-25% | “Good” 15-19% | “Satisfactory” 10-14% | “Unsatisfactory” 0-9% |
| Identification and Description of Noun Cases | Clearly identifies all noun cases in English, Kazakh, and Russian. Provides accurate and thorough descriptions of each case, including nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, instrumental, locative (where applicable), and vocative (in Russian and Kazakh). | Identifies most noun cases correctly in each language and provides mostly accurate descriptions, though some minor details may be missing or unclear. | Identifies most noun cases but with notable omissions or inaccuracies in description. Basic understanding of each case is demonstrated. | Incorrect or incomplete identification of noun cases with minimal or unclear description of their functions. |
| Comparison of Case Systems in English, Kazakh, and Russian | Provides a detailed comparison of the case systems, highlighting key differences and similarities. Discusses the simplicity of the English case system (with focus on possessive/genitive) and contrasts it with the more complex systems of Kazakh and Russian, covering all relevant cases. | Gives a clear comparison with minor omissions or generalizations. Key distinctions between English, Kazakh, and Russian case systems are mostly accurate and well-explained. | Provides a basic comparison of the case systems but lacks depth or misses important distinctions. Some differences and similarities are discussed but not in detail. | The comparison is vague or lacks coherence. Some attempt is made, but many key aspects of the case systems are ignored.. |
| Application of Cases in Context | Demonstrates an excellent ability to apply the correct noun case forms in sentences across all three languages. Examples provided are accurate, and the functions of each case are well understood. | Applies noun cases correctly in most contexts, with minor errors. Examples are mostly accurate, and case functions are generally well understood. | Applies some noun cases correctly, but with frequent errors or inconsistencies. Understanding of case functions may be basic or incomplete.. | Struggles to apply noun cases correctly in context. Examples are mostly inaccurate, and there is confusion about case functions. |
| Language-Specific Case Rules | Demonstrates a strong understanding of language-specific rules, such as case endings in Russian and Kazakh (e.g., declension patterns, vowel harmony in Kazakh, or soft vs. hard stems in Russian). Provides examples illustrating these rules in practice | Shows a good understanding of most language-specific rules with minor errors. Provides adequate examples demonstrating key rules. | Demonstrates some understanding of language-specific rules, but with notable errors or omissions. Examples may lack depth or specificity | Shows minimal understanding of language-specific rules, with frequent mistakes or missing details.. |
| Clarity and Organization of Explanation | The explanation is well-organized, with clear and logical flow. Uses precise language to describe the case systems and their functions.. | The explanation is mostly clear and organized, though there may be minor lapses in structure or clarity.. | The explanation is understandable but may be disjointed or lack clarity in some areas. | The explanation is difficult to follow, with frequent lapses in clarity or structure. |