

AL-FARABI KAZAKH NATIONAL UNIVERSITY
Faculty of Philology
Department of Foreign Philology and Translation Studies

PROGRAM OF FINAL EXAMINATION IN THE DISCIPLINE

Code: KL 7202
ID: 96000

“Comparativism in Literary Studies”

Educational programme "8D02306 – Foreign Philology (Western Languages)"
Doctor's degree

Course – 1
Semester – 2
Number of credits – 5

Almaty 2025

1. THE THEMATIC PROGRAM OF THE DISCIPLINE

The aim of the discipline: is to form the ability to analyze the theoretical and methodological directions of modern literary criticism, the fundamental works of the main representatives of comparative studies, the study of concepts and terms, as well as controversial issues of this scientific direction..

Learning outcomes in the discipline: 1. to demonstrate deep knowledge in the history of methodology and modern literary criticism, applying them in research work; 2. to apply comparative analysis of literary works; 3. to apply the skills of organizing and conducting linguistic / literary studies in practice; 4. to apply the skills of organizing and conducting linguistic / literary studies in abstracting and creating academic abstract; 5. to apply the skills of organizing and conducting linguistic / literary studies in annotating scientific articles, compiling.

Main topics studied in the discipline.

Module 1. Theories of Comparative Literature

Theories of Comparative Literature, World Literatures, and Comparative Cultural Studies
The Contextual Study of Literature and Culture, Globalization, and Digital Humanities
Comparative Literature and Ex-centricity
Comparative Cultural Studies and Pedagogy
Teaching World Literatures

Module 2. Comparative Literature and Philosophy

Comparative Literature and Philosophy
Comparative Cultural Studies and Cultural Anthropology
Comparative Literature and Internet Studies
Comparative Cultural Studies and Translation Studies

Module 3. Comparative Cultural Studies and the Study of Medieval Literature

Comparative Cultural Studies and the Study of Medieval Literature
Comparison and Postcoloniality
Inter)mediality and the Study of Literature
Comparative Literature in German
Comparative Literature in Italian
Comparative Literature in Russian and in Central and East Europe
East - West: Dialogue of Cultures

List of recommended sources. Main literature

1. Croce, Benedetto, Comparative Literature, Comparative Literature: The Early Years, Edited by Hans-Joachim Schultz and Philip H. Rhein, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2020, p.222.
2. Bacon, Francis, 'Of Studies', Bacon's Essays, Edited by J.Lahiri & A.L.Ganguli, Lakshmi Narayan Agarwal Educational Publishers, Agra, 2022, p.76.
3. Posnett, William, in his book called Comparative Literature published in 1886 talks about the discipline, as cited in Nagendra Ed. 'Comparative Literature', New Delhi, University of Delhi, 2021, p.1.

Additional literature:

1. Jost, Franciose, A Philosophy of Letters, 'Introduction To Comparative Literature', New York, The University of Illinois, 2020, p.29.
2. Wellek, Rene and Warren, Austen, 'General, Comparative and National Literature' in Rene Wellek and Austen Warren Eds., Theory of Literature, New York, Penguin Book, 2018, as cited in 'Aesthetics of Comparative Literature', <<http://dspace.vidyanidhi.org.in.pdf/html>> p.6.

Internet resources:

<http://www.trworkshop.net/>
<http://www.un.com/>
<https://www.theguardian.com/international>
<http://www.independent.co.uk/>
<http://www.bbc.com/news>

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

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

2.2. The purpose of the written exam is to demonstrate the learning outcomes, skills and competencies acquired during the study of the discipline, the ability to logically express one's thoughts in writing, and argue one's point of view.

2.3. Expected results of the exam tasks:

One written exam card contains 3 questions that identify learning outcomes for the course studied and are assessed according to the criteria described below:

Question 1 - Criterion 1. Knowledge of the theory and concept of the course; logic of presentation. 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 written practical tasks. Criterion 4. Disclosure and solution of the main problem given in the practical task.

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

2.4. The examination procedure.

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

2.4.2. 15 minutes before the start of the offline written exam, the teacher on duty checks the students' identities using their ID cards, and seats the students in the seats indicated on the attendance sheets.

2.4.3. In the event that a substitute person appears at the offline written exam, the teacher on duty draws up a corresponding report of violation of these Rules.

2.4.4. Late students will not be allowed to take the exam.

2.4.5. During the exam, the teacher on duty monitors students' compliance with the rules of conduct in accordance with the approved instructions.

2.4.6. At the end of the time allotted for the exam (2 astronomical hours), the teacher on duty:

- 1) collects examination papers;
- 2) puts in each work a sign of the end of writing the work in the answer sheets - the letter X;
- 3) provides answer sheets along with attendance sheets for encryption to a specialist from the dean's office.

2.4.7. In case of delay in providing work for encryption to a specialist from the dean's office, a corresponding act is drawn up with subsequent prosecution of the perpetrators.

2.4.8. 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. It is prohibited to talk with other students and strangers, or to write down your full name and/or other identifying information in your answers.

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

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

2.4.11. 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.

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

2.4.13. The final grade for the discipline can be canceled within 1 month after the exam, if a student is found to have violated the instructions for conducting final control using distance learning technologies and/or rules of behavior during the exam: using cheat sheets, cell phones, negotiating, etc. based on recordings from surveillance cameras with filling out the Report. The act cannot be annulled or appealed.

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

3. EVALUATION POLICY.

RUBRIC FOR CRITERIAL ASSESSMENT OF FINAL EXAMINATION
Discipline: Language in Use (C1). **Form:** Standard written examination (offline). **Platform:** IS Univer

№	Score Criterion	DESCRIPTORS				
		«Excellent»	«Good»	«Satisfactory»	«Unsatisfactory»	
		90-100 %	70-89 %	50-69 %	25-49 %	0-24 %
Question 1	<i>Criterion 1.</i> Knowledge of the theory and concept of the course; logic of presentation.	An “excellent” grade is given for an answer that contains an exhaustive explanation of the question, a detailed argumentation for each conclusion and statement, is constructed logically and consistently, and is supported by examples from the developed classroom topics.	A “good” grade is given for an answer that contains a complete but not exhaustive coverage of the issue, an abbreviated argumentation of the main points, and allows for a violation of the logic and sequence of presentation of the material. The answer contains stylistic errors and inaccurate use of terms.	A “satisfactory” grade is given for an answer that contains incomplete coverage of the questions proposed in the ticket, superficially argues the main points, and allows compositional imbalances in the presentation, violations of the logic and sequence of presentation of the material.	An “unsatisfactory” grade is given for incorrect coverage of the questions posed, erroneous argumentation, factual and verbal errors, and for the assumption of an incorrect conclusion.	An “unsatisfactory” grade is also given for ignorance of basic concepts and theories; for violation of the Rules for final control.
	<i>Criterion 2.</i> 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 is not fully supported by specific examples. There are some inaccuracies.	The student does not illustrate theoretical concepts with examples from the developed class notes.	Key concepts for the training course contained in questions are interpreted with significant errors.	The student does not provide examples to support the main theoretical principles of the course.
Question 2	<i>Criterion 3.</i> Application of the selected methodology and technology to written practical tasks. <i>Criterion 4.</i> Disclosure and solution of the main problem given in the practical task.	Excellent completion of the training assignment, a detailed, reasoned written answer to the question posed, followed by solving practical problems of the course.	Partial completion of the educational assignment, incomplete, sometimes reasoned answer to the question posed with an incomplete solution to the practical problems of the course; illiterate use of scientific language norms in the course.	The material is presented in fragments, in violation of logical sequence, factual and semantic inaccuracies are made, and theoretical knowledge of the course is used superficially.	An irrational method of solving a task or an insufficiently thought-out answer plan; inability to solve problems, perform tasks in general; making mistakes and omissions that exceeds the norm.	Inability to apply knowledge and algorithms to solve tasks; inability to draw conclusions and generalizations. Violation of the Rules for final control.
	<i>Criterion 4.</i> Disclosure and solution of the main problem given in the practical task.	Scientific concepts are freely applied to the task at hand, followed by a logical and evidence-based disclosure of the main problem.	The student's knowledge is adapted; the answers are weak structured, the answer contains minor factual errors, which he can correct independently, thanks to a leading question.	There is no meaningfulness of the material provided, there is no understanding of interdisciplinary connections.	The student finds it difficult to answer most of the additional questions on the content of the exam or does not give the correct answers.	The student did not fully understand the material. Violation of the Rules for final control.
Question 3	<i>Criterion 5.</i> Evaluation and written critical analysis of the applicability of the chosen methodology to the proposed practical task.	Consistent, logical and correct justification of scientific principles and the applied methodology and technology, literacy, compliance with the norms of scientific language, 1-2 inaccuracies in the presentation of the material are allowed, which do not affect the generally correct conclusions.	3-4 inaccuracies in the use of conceptual material, minor errors in generalizations and conclusions are allowed, which do not affect the good overall level of task completion.	There are conclusions on the applicability of substantiated scientific provisions are vague and unconvincing; there are stylistic and grammatical errors, as well as inaccuracies in processing the results of a practical decision.	The task was completed with gross mistakes, the answers to the questions were incomplete, the conceptual material and argumentation were poorly used.	The task has not been completed, there are no answers to the questions posed, materials and analysis tools have not been used.
	<i>Criterion 6.</i> Justification of the result	The answer is illustrated with examples and visuals.	Analysis of 3-4 provisions of existing theories, scientific schools	Poor application of the main volume of material in accordance	Demonstration of difficulty in providing written answers to	Lack of ability to apply course methods when giving examples.

	obtained from one's own practice.	materials, including from the student's own practice.	and directions with justification of the result obtained from one's own practice on the issue of the exam card with some inaccuracies.	with the training program with difficulties in independently reproducing it in writing.	problematic questions.	Violation of the Rules for final control.
--	-----------------------------------	---	--	---	------------------------	---

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	
	Final %	200	75	60	94	200+ 75 + 60 + 94 = 429 429 / 6 criteria = 71,5 Final score, as % = 72

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  Dzholdasbekova B.U.

Head of Department  Aimagambetova M.M.

Lecturer  Mussaly L.Zh